

Homotopy equivalence of Grassmannians and MacPhersonians in rank 3

Michael Gene Dobbins

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Binghamton University (SUNY), Binghamton,
New York, USA. mdobbins@binghamton.edu

Abstract

We confirm a long standing conjecture in the case of rank 3 that MacPhersonians are homotopy equivalent to Grassmannians.

1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation and History

Vector configurations, affine points sets, and linear subspaces of a real vector space are closely related and ubiquitous in math, but they are uncountable objects, so we often need to use some finite representation, which sign covector sets provide. The sign covector set of a subspace of \mathbb{R}^n records all possible sign patterns that the coordinates of a vector in that subspace can have. Unfortunately, given such data, it is computationally intractable to determine if there exists a subspace with the given data as its sign covector set [26]. Oriented matroids are defined by natural combinatorial axioms that are necessary but not sufficient for such sign data to arise from a linear subspace [27, 9].

Many geometric questions can be reformulated as a statement about the sign covector set of an appropriately defined linear subspace, and as such, we can ask analogous questions for oriented matroids. However, since oriented matroids are not always realizable, what is true for linear subspaces might not always hold for oriented matroids. A long standing open question is whether oriented matroids and linear subspaces have the same global topology. By the global topology of linear subspaces, we mean the homotopy type of the (k, n) real Grassmannian, which is the space of all k -dimensional subspaces of \mathbb{R}^n . Oriented matroids have a natural partial order, and the (k, n) geometric MacPhersonian is the geometric realization of the order complex of rank k oriented matroids on index set $[n]$. More precisely, the question is whether each MacPhersonian is homotopy equivalent to the corresponding Grassmannian. Nicolai Mnëv and Günter Ziegler stated this as a folklore conjecture that originated from the work of Robert MacPherson [21]. Here we show that this conjecture holds in rank 3, Theorem 1.1.

Interest in the conjecture grew from the work of Gelfand and MacPherson on a combinatorial formula for the rational Pontrjagin cohomology classes of a smooth manifold. This is in the spirit of the Euler characteristic as a formula for the Euler class, but is much

more technically involved. The formula for Pontrjagin classes uses combinatorial differential manifolds, which are combinatorial analogs of smooth manifolds where the tangent fibers are replaced by oriented matroids. [17, 16, 1].

A further source of interest in the conjecture comes from matroid bundles. Matroid bundles are the combinatorial analog of vector bundles and generalize combinatorial differential manifolds much like vector bundles generalize tangent bundles. Matroid bundles are defined by an order preserving map from a poset, the base space, to the MacPhersonian. This corresponds to the classifying map from the base space of a vector bundle to the Grassmannian. Moreover, this correspondence gives a functor from the category of vector bundles to the category of matroid bundles [3]. Our hope is to use matroid bundles to develop data structures and algorithms for working with vector bundles. For this to be effective, we would want the classifying space of matroid bundles, the MacPhersonian, to have the same homotopy type as that of vector bundles, the Grassmannian.

Eric Babson showed that the MacPhersonian conjecture holds in rank 2 [5], and Olakunle Abawonse gave another proof that showed these spaces are actually homeomorphic in rank 2 [2]. An erroneous proof of the full conjecture was published and later retracted [7, 8]. Analogous versions of this conjecture have been shown to fail for broader combinatorial analogs of Grassmannians [21, 19].

The rank 3 case is particularly significant since Mnëv’s universality theorem has been a chief reasons to doubt the MacPhersonian conjecture. There is a natural map from the Grassmannian to the MacPhersonian defined by sending each subspace to the oriented matroid defined by its sign covector set. An earlier conjecture of Gerhard Ringel posited that the fibers of this map, which are the realization spaces of oriented matroids, are connected [25]. Mnëv showed not only that this fails, but the realization space can have the homotopy type of any semialgebraic set, and moreover, this holds even in rank 3 [20]. Theorem 1.1 indicates that Mnëv’s universality theorem no longer serves as evidence against the MacPhersonian conjecture.

1.2 Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Laura Anderson, Seunghun Lee, and Andreas Holmsen for helpful discussions and insights. A significant part of this work was done while the author was visiting KAIST with support from KAIST Institute of Science-X (KAI-X).

1.3 Main theorem

Here we state the main theorem and give a minimal description of the objects involved. More detailed definitions will be given in Subsection 1.5.

The *real Grassmannian* $G_{k,n}$ for $k \leq n$ is the space of all k -dimensional linear subspaces

of \mathbb{R}^n . Up to homeomorphism, this can be equivalently defined as the quotient space of all n -element spanning vector configurations in \mathbb{R}^k modulo the general linear group. The *oriented real Grassmannian* $G_{k,n}$ is the space of all oriented k -dimensional linear subspaces of \mathbb{R}^n , and is homeomorphic to the quotient space of all n -element spanning vector configurations in \mathbb{R}^k modulo the special linear group. In both cases the correspondence between the two definitions is given by associating the columns of a full rank $k \times n$ matrix with its row space.

The *order type* $\text{ot}(V)$ of a vector configuration $V = \{v_i \in \mathbb{R}^k : i \in I\}$ on index set I is the map given by the sign of the determinant of each k -tuple

$$\text{ot}(V) : I^k \rightarrow \{0, +, -\}, \quad \text{ot}(V, i_1, \dots, i_k) = \text{sign}(\det(v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_k})).$$

That is, $\text{ot}(V)$ gives the orientation of each basis and is 0 for nonbases. A *rank k chirotope* on ground set I is a map $\chi : I^k \rightarrow \{0, +, -\}$ that satisfies the chirotope axioms [9, Section 3.5], which are necessary but not sufficient for χ to be the order type of a spanning vector configuration. Chirotopes are widely regarded as the combinatorial analog of a vector configuration in an oriented vector space.

We define a partial order (\leq_v) on $\{0, +, -\}$ where $0 <_v (+)$, and $0 <_v (-)$, and $(+)$ and $(-)$ are incomparable. The *weak order* on chirotopes is the partial order where $\chi_0 \leq_w \chi_1$ when $\chi_0(i_1, \dots, i_k) \leq_v \chi_1(i_1, \dots, i_k)$ for all inputs i_j . This is the combinatorial analog of ordering vector configurations by degeneracy in the sense that $\chi_0 \leq_w \chi_1$ when each basis of χ_1 is either a basis in χ_0 with the same orientation or is a dependent set in χ_0 . The *oriented MacPhersonian* $\text{MacP}_{3,n}$ is the poset of all rank k chirotopes on $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$ with the weak order, and the *geometric oriented MacPhersonian* $\|\text{MacP}_{3,n}\|$ is the geometric realization of the order complex of $\text{MacP}_{3,n}$.

Oriented matroids are the discrete analogs of vector configurations in a vector space that lacks a specified orientation, and can be defined in several equivalent ways. Here we define an oriented matroid to be a primitive object \mathcal{M} with an associated pair of chirotopes $\text{chi}(\mathcal{M}) = \{\chi, -\chi\}$ of opposite sign, and we let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{N}$ when $\text{chi}(\mathcal{M}) = \text{chi}(\mathcal{N})$. The weak order on chirotopes induces a partial order on oriented matroids, and we define the (unoriented) MacPhersonian $\text{MacP}_{k,n}$ and geometric (unoriented) MacPhersonian $\|\text{MacP}_{k,n}\|$ analogously.

Theorem 1.1. *The rank 3 geometric MacPhersonian $\|\text{MacP}_{3,n}\|$ is homotopy equivalent to the corresponding real Grassmannian $G_{3,n}$ for $n \leq \infty$. Also, the rank 3 oriented geometric MacPhersonian $\|\widetilde{\text{MacP}}_{3,n}\|$ is homotopy equivalent to the corresponding oriented real Grassmannian $\widetilde{G}_{3,n}$ for $n \leq \infty$.*

1.4 Outline

In the predecessor to this paper, the author introduced spaces of weighted pseudocircle arrangements $\text{PsG}_{3,n}$ and showed that these spaces are homotopy equivalent to the corresponding Grassmannians. We prove Theorem 1.1 by showing that $\text{PsG}_{3,n}$ is also homotopy equivalent to the corresponding MacPhersonian. We focus mainly on the unoriented case, as the oriented case follows by the same arguments with minor adjustments.

To obtain the desired homotopy equivalence, we construct an open cover of $\text{PsG}_{3,n}$ in Section 3 with nerve complex isomorphic to the order complex of the MacPhersonian and apply the nerve theorem [18, Corollary 4G.3]. This cover consists of an open neighborhood $\frac{\text{hood}}{\mathcal{O}_3}(\mathcal{M}) \subset \text{PsG}_{3,n}$ of the subspace of topological representations of \mathcal{M} for each oriented matroid $\mathcal{M} \in \text{MacP}_{3,n}$. To use the nerve theorem, we need the following three ingredients. First, we show in Subsection 3.1 that if \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} are incomparable, then the associated neighborhoods are disjoint. Second, we show in Section 4 that $\frac{\text{hood}}{\mathcal{O}_3}(\mathcal{M})$ is open. Third, we show in Section 5 for each finite chain $\mathcal{C} \subset \text{MacP}_{3,n}$, that the intersection of the associated neighborhoods $\frac{\text{hood}}{\mathcal{O}_3}(\mathcal{C}) = \bigcap \{ \frac{\text{hood}}{\mathcal{O}_3}(\mathcal{M}) : \mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{C} \}$ is contractible by constructing a deformation retraction $\text{crush}(\mathcal{C}, \Omega)$ from $\frac{\text{hood}}{\mathcal{O}_3}(\mathcal{C})$ to a point. The construction of $\text{crush}(\mathcal{C}, \Omega)$ involves subdividing the sphere into zones in Section 7 so that a topological representation in $\frac{\text{hood}}{\mathcal{O}_3}(\mathcal{C})$ has a simpler form in each zone, and then constructing appropriate deformations on the zones in Section 8.

In Section 2, we present tools that will be needed for the rest of the paper. This includes a metric on partial functions in Subsection 2.1, and a canonical parametrization for paths in Subsection 2.3, and a description of how a conformal parametrization (i.e., Riemann mapping) of a Jordan domain behaves as the region converges to a path in Subsection 2.5. In Section 6, we define a canonical parametrization of a region with a system of paths that makes the paths x -monotone, which is used to construct the zones in Section 7 as well as the deformations in Section 8. In the rest of the introduction, we give basic definitions.

The paper is largely structured in a top-down fashion. For instance, we state three lemmas in Section 3 needed for the proof of Theorem 1.1, and then prove the theorem. Those lemmas are then proven later in the paper, and we continue like this, stating a new lemma and then using it to prove a previous lemma, until we stop needing new lemmas.

1.5 Oriented matroids and covectors

Here we define additional combinatorial data associated to oriented matroids. A *signed subset* of a set I is a map $\sigma \in \{0, +, -\}^I$. We call σ a signed set when I is understood. We let $\sigma^0 = \{i : \sigma(i) = 0\}$ and we define σ^+ and σ^- analogously. We may denote the all zero signed set by 0.

Given a rank k oriented matroid \mathcal{M} on index set I with chirotope $\chi \in \text{chi}(\mathcal{M})$, then

$\sigma = \chi(i_1, \dots, i_{k-1})$ is the signed set where $\sigma(x) = \chi(i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}, x)$. The *cocircuit set* of \mathcal{M} is the collection of signed sets

$$\mathcal{C}^* = \{\chi(i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}) : \chi \in \text{chi}(\mathcal{M}), i_i \in I\}.$$

The poset $\{0, +, -\}^I$ ordered by (\leq_v) together with a top element \top forms a lattice, and the *topped covector sphere* $\widehat{\text{csph}}(\mathcal{M})$ of \mathcal{M} is the join-semilattice generated by \mathcal{C}^* . We also associate to \mathcal{M} the sets

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{csph}}(\mathcal{M}) &= \widehat{\text{csph}}(\mathcal{M}) \setminus \{\top\} && \text{covector sphere,} \\ \text{cov}(\mathcal{M}) &= \widehat{\text{csph}}(\mathcal{M}) \cup \{0\} && \text{covector set,} \\ \widehat{\text{cov}}(\mathcal{M}) &= \text{cov}(\mathcal{M}) \cup \{\top\} && \text{topped covector set.} \end{aligned}$$

In the case where \mathcal{M} has rank 3, then $\widehat{\text{csph}}(\mathcal{M})$ is a graded poset with 3 ranks of elements. Here we will refer to the elements in the top rank as *facet covectors* or *topes*, and the elements in the next rank down as *edge covectors*, and the elements in the bottom rank as *vertex covectors* or *cocircuits*.

We may equivalently define an oriented matroid as a primitive object with an associated covector set $\text{cov}(\mathcal{M})$ that satisfies the vector axioms of oriented matroids [9, Section 3.7], and let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{N}$ when $\text{cov}(\mathcal{M}) = \text{cov}(\mathcal{N})$. By *primitive object*, we mean an object that is not composed of other objects. For example, numbers are generally treated as primitive objects, although $\mathbb{3}$ is sometimes iconoclastically defined for convenience in some contexts as the set $\mathbb{3} = \{0, 1, 2\}$, which is not a primitive object. Here we define oriented matroids as primitive objects rather than as a pair of oppositely signed chirotopes or as its covector set to avoid conflict with other ways to define oriented matroids, such as by the set of vectors of \mathcal{M} . This also provides some notational benefits similar to that provided by encapsulation in object oriented programming.

An element $i \in I$ is a *loop* of \mathcal{M} when $\sigma(i) = 0$ for all $\sigma \in \text{cov}(\mathcal{M})$, and the *support* $\text{supp}(\mathcal{M})$ of \mathcal{M} is the set of nonloops. A set $B = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \subset I$ is a *basis* for a chirotope χ when $\chi(i_1, \dots, i_k) \neq 0$, and $J \subset I$ is an *independent* set when J is a subset of a basis, and likewise for the oriented matroid \mathcal{M} with $\chi \in \text{chi}(\mathcal{M})$.

1.6 Pseudocircle arrangements

Jim Lawrence showed that $\|\widehat{\text{csph}}(\mathcal{M})\|$ is homeomorphic to a k -sphere for every rank k oriented matroid \mathcal{M} [15]. This provides a topological representation for oriented matroids by pseudosphere arrangements, which are pseudocircle arrangements in rank 3. A *pseudocircle arrangement* on index set I is a collection $A = \{S_i : i \in I\}$ of simple closed curves $S_i = S_i(A)$, which we call pseudocircles, such that each pair S_i, S_j either coincide or intersect in exactly 2 points, in which case any other pseudocircle S_k either

contains $S_i \cap S_j$ or separates the points $S_i \cap S_j$. Additionally, we define an *orientation* on each pseudocircle by specifying a positive and negative connected component of $\mathbf{S}^2 \setminus S_i$, which we call *pseudohemispheres* and denote by S_i^+ and S_i^- . We say A is a *weighted pseudocircle arrangement* when each pseudocircle S_i has an associated positive weight, which we denote by $\text{wt}_i = \text{wt}_i(A)$. We also allow the trivial pseudocircle where $S_i = \mathbf{S}^2$, and $S_i^+ = S_i^- = \emptyset$, and $\text{wt}_i = 0$, which we denote by $S_i = 0$. For a signed set σ we let $S_i^\sigma = S_i^{\sigma(i)}$.

The *pseudolinear Stiefel manifold* $\text{PsV}_{3,I}$ is the set of all spanning weighted pseudocircle arrangements indexed by I , and $\text{PsV}_{3,n} = \text{PsV}_{3,[n]}$. We endow $\text{PsV}_{3,I}$ with a metric defined by the maximum Fréchet distance between corresponding pseudocircles scaled by their associated weights. That is,

$$\text{dist}(A, \tilde{A}) = \max_{i \in I} \inf_{\varphi, \tilde{\varphi}} \sup_{x \in \mathbf{S}^1} \|\text{wt}_i \varphi(x) - \tilde{\text{wt}}_i \tilde{\varphi}(x)\|$$

where $\varphi : \mathbf{S}^1 \rightarrow S_i$ is a homeomorphism directed so that S_i^+ is on the left and analogously for $\tilde{\varphi}$, and $\tilde{\text{wt}}_i = \text{wt}_i(\tilde{A})$. For more about Fréchet distance and additional notation, see Subsection 1.7.

We define the left and right actions $(*)$ of $\text{hom}(\mathbf{S}^2)$ on $\text{PsV}_{3,I}$. These actions do not change weights. The *left action* is given by $S_i(\varphi * A) = \varphi(S_i(A))$ and $S_i^+(\varphi * A) = \varphi(S_i^+(A))$ and similarly for S_i^- . For the *right action*, let $\theta_i(A) : \mathbf{S}^2 \rightarrow \{0, +, -\}$ where $\theta_i(A, x) = (+)$ for $x \in S_i^+$ and similarly for S_i^- and S_i . Then, $A * \varphi$ is the pseudocircle arrangement where $\theta_i(A * \varphi) = \theta_i(A) \circ \varphi$. We also define $\varphi * A$ for a continuous map $\varphi : \mathbf{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbf{S}^2$ by

$$S_i^+(\varphi * A) = \{x : \varphi^{-1}(x) \subseteq S_i^+(A)\},$$

with S_i^- defined analogously, and S_i is the complement of $S_i^+ \cup S_i^-$; however, $\varphi * A$ is not always guaranteed to be a pseudocircle arrangement in this case.

Remark 1.2. $\varphi^{-1} * A = A * \varphi$ since

$$S_i^+(A * \varphi) = \{x : [\theta_i(A) \circ \varphi](x) = (+)\} = \{\varphi^{-1}(y) : \theta_i(A, y) = (+)\} = \varphi^{-1} * S_i^+.$$

The *pseudolinear Grassmannian manifold* and *oriented pseudolinear Grassmannian manifold* are the quotient spaces

$$\text{PsG}_{3,n} = \text{PsV}_{3,n} / \text{O}_3 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Ps}\tilde{\text{G}}_{3,n} = \text{PsV}_{3,n} / \text{SO}_3.$$

To define the *Psv-realization space* $\text{PsV}(\mathcal{M})$ of an oriented matroid, let

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sign}(A, x, i) &= \begin{cases} 0 & x \in S_i \\ + & x \in S_i^+ \\ - & x \in S_i^-, \end{cases} \\ \text{csph}(A) &= \{\text{sign}(A, x) : x \in \mathbf{S}^2\}, \\ \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M}) &= \{A \in \text{PsV}_{3,n} : \text{csph}(A) = \text{csph}(\mathcal{M})\}, \\ \text{PsG}(\mathcal{M}) &= \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M}) / \text{O}_3. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\text{om}(A)$ be the oriented matroid with covector sphere $\text{csph}(A)$ and associate to A the corresponding oriented matroid data such as $\text{cov}(A)$, let $A \geq_w \mathcal{M}$ denote $\text{om}(A) \geq_w \mathcal{M}$, and

$$\text{cell}(A, \sigma) = \{x \in \mathbf{S}^2 : \text{sign}(A, x) = \sigma\}.$$

To define the *pseudolinear realization space* $\text{PsV}(\chi)$ of a chirotope, let $\text{ot}(A) : I^k \rightarrow \{0, +, -\}$ by $\text{ot}(A, i_1, i_2, i_3) = 0$ unless $\text{cov}(S_{i_1}, S_{i_2}, S_{i_3}) = \{0, +, -\}^3$ in which case $\text{ot}(A, i_1, i_2, i_3) = (+)$ if $S_{i_1}, S_{i_2}, S_{i_3}$ appear in counter-clockwise order around the cell $S_{i_1}^+ \cap S_{i_2}^+ \cap S_{i_3}^+$; otherwise $\text{ot}(A, i_1, i_2, i_3) = (-)$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \text{PsV}(\chi) &= \{A \in \text{PsV}_{3,n} : \text{ot}(A) = \chi\}, \\ \text{Ps}\tilde{\text{G}}(\chi) &= \text{PsV}(\chi) / \text{SO}_3. \end{aligned}$$

In the predecessor to this paper, the author showed the following.

Theorem 1.3 ([11, Theorem 2.7.2]). *Given a rank 3 oriented matroid $\mathcal{M} \in \text{PsV}_{3,n}$ and a pseudolinear realization $\Omega \in \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M})$, there is a strong O_3 -equivariant deformation retraction $\text{crush}(\Omega)$ from the pseudolinear realization space $\text{PsV}(\mathcal{M})$ to the O_3 -orbit of Ω .*

Theorem 1.4 ([11, Theorem 2.7.1]). *There is a strong equivariant deformation retraction from the pseudolinear Stiefel manifold $\text{PsV}_{3,n}$ to the corresponding real Stiefel manifold $\text{V}_{3,n}$.*

We say A is *symmetric* when $\text{sign}(A, -x) = -\text{sign}(A, x)$, or equivalently, when each pseudocircle of A is an antipodally symmetric curve.

Remark 1.5. The author showed that the space of homeomorphisms of the projective plane strongly deformation retracts to the SO_3 using curvature flow [12, 13]. Consequently, Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 also hold for the subspace of symmetric pseudocircle arrangements. This follows by the same argument as in [11], except in one place. The proofs of Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 use a theorem of Kneser that the group of homeomorphisms of the 2-sphere deformation retracts to the orthogonal group, which we can replace by the analogous

deformation for the projective plane. Similarly, the author has shown this for the subspace of nullity preserving homeomorphisms, and consequently we have analogs of Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 for the subspace of measure 0 pseudocircles, and we can additionally require symmetry or not. Hence, each of these spaces is homotopic to the corresponding Grassmannian and MacPhersonian, and can serve as a classifying space for vector bundles.

1.7 Basic definitions and notation

Many of the definitions and notation here are fairly standard, but some are not, and less common or nonstandard definitions are mostly recalled later when they are used. This is intended as a convenient place for the reader to refer back to later.

Let $[n]$ or $[n]_{\mathbb{N}}$ denote the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$. Let \mathbf{D} denote the unit disk in \mathbb{R}^2 , and \mathbf{S}^d denote the unit d -sphere in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} . Let $\text{hom}(\mathbf{S}^d)$ denote the space of homeomorphisms of the sphere, and let $\text{hom}^+(\mathbf{S}^d)$ denote the space of orientation preserving homeomorphisms. Let $X \sqcup Y$ denote the disjoint union of X and Y . For $X \subset U$, let $X^c = U \setminus X$ denote the compliment of X , let $\text{cl}(X)$ denote the closure of X as a subset of a topological space U , and $X^\circ = X \setminus \text{cl}(X^c)$ denote the interior, and let $\partial X = \text{cl}(X) \cap \text{cl}(X^c)$ denote the boundary of X where the ambient space U is understood from context. We may sometimes omit the head in set-builder notation when the meaning is unambiguous, so that $\{\Phi(x)\} = \{x : \Phi(x)\}$. We denote open and closed intervals in \mathbb{R} by $(a, b)_{\mathbb{R}} = \{a < x < b\}$ and $[a, b]_{\mathbb{R}} = \{a \leq x \leq b\}$.

A *path* or *1-cell* is a homeomorphic embedding of a closed interval. Note that a single point is not a path, but we will often consider an object P that is a path or a point, which we call a *possibly degenerate path* or a (≤ 1) -cell, and we say P is degenerate when P is a point. A path is *directed* when the embedding map is fixed up to an increasing reparameterization. Equivalently, we specify one endpoint of P as the *source* s , or specify the other endpoint as the *terminal* t , or by a total ordering $(<_P)$ of P given by $x <_P y$ when x separates y from s . The *reverse* of P is the path obtained by swapping the source and terminal. A *closed curve* is a homeomorphic embedding of a circle, and a *curve* can be either a path or a closed curve. A *directed closed curve* has a cyclic ordering preserved by the embedding.

A *metric disk* is the set of points on \mathbb{R}^2 or \mathbf{S}^2 that are within some positive distance $r > 0$ of a center point p , provided this is not all of \mathbf{S}^2 . A *topological disk* or *2-cell* is a homeomorphic embedding of a metric disk. A (≤ 2) -cell is a k -cell for $k \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. Disks are closed unless specified as open. A *Jordan domain* is an open topological disk D , such that ∂D is a closed curve.

Given subsets $S, T \subset X$ of a metric space (X, dist) and $\delta \geq 0$, let

$$S \oplus \delta = \{x \in X : \exists s \in S : \text{dist}(x, s) \leq \delta\}$$

be the set of points that are within distance δ of some point of S . The **Hausdorff distance** $\text{dist}_H(T, S)$ between subsets $S, T \subset X$ is the infimum among δ such that $S \subseteq T \oplus \delta$ and $T \subseteq S \oplus \delta$.

The **undirected Fréchet distance** between (≤ 1)-cells P_i in a metric space is

$$\text{dist}_F(P_1, P_0) = \inf_{\varphi} \sup_{x \in P_0} \text{dist}(\varphi(x), x)$$

among homeomorphisms $\varphi : P_0 \rightarrow P_1$ if P_0 and P_1 are not degenerate, or $\text{dist}_F(P_1, P_0) = \text{dist}_H(P_1, P_0)$ in the case where P_0 or P_1 is a point. The **Fréchet distance** between directed paths P_i is as above, but where φ is order preserving. Fréchet distance and undirected Fréchet distance are defined analogously for closed curves.

Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ denote a partial function from X to Y , and $f(x) = \perp$ indicate that $f(x)$ is not defined. The **preimage** $\text{pre}(f) = \{f(x) \neq \perp\}$ is the set of $x \in X$ where $f(x)$ is defined. We say $f(x)$ **varies continuously as x varies** when f is sequentially continuous. This will be convenient when we do not explicitly name f as a function. Let $\text{rest}(S, f)$ denote the **restriction** of f to $S \subset X$. The **restriction** $\text{rest}(J, \mathcal{M})$ to a subset $J \subset I$ is the oriented matroid with covectors

$$\text{cov}(\text{rest}(J, \mathcal{M})) = \{\text{rest}(J, \sigma) : \sigma \in \text{cov}(\mathcal{M})\} \quad \text{where} \quad \text{rest}(J, \sigma, i) = \begin{cases} \sigma(i) & i \in J \\ \perp & i \notin J. \end{cases}$$

Similarly for a pseudocircle arrangement A , the restriction to J is

$$\text{rest}(J, A) = (T_1, \dots, T_n) \quad \text{where} \quad T_i = \begin{cases} S_i & i \in J \\ \perp & i \notin J. \end{cases}$$

Given an arrangement $A \in \text{PsV}_{3,J}$, the space of **extensions** of A to index set I is

$$\text{Ext}(I, A) = \{X \in \text{PsV}_{3,I} : \text{rest}(J, X) = A\}.$$

Let $\text{Ext}(A) = \text{Ext}([n], A)$.

A **chain** of a poset P is a totally ordered subset of P . The **order complex** $\text{oc}(P)$ of P is the set of all finite chains of P ordered by containment. For $c \in P$, let

$$P_{\leq c} = \{x \in P : x \leq c\}$$

and analogously for $\geq, <, >$. Given an abstract simplicial complex Δ on a ground set E ,

the geometric realization of Δ is the geometric simplicial complex

$$\|\Delta\| = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^E : \text{supp}(x) \in \Delta, \sum_{e \in E} x(e) = 1 \right\}.$$

For a poset P , we let $\|P\| = \|\text{oc}(P)\|$ denote the geometric realization of the order complex of P .

A *conformal* map is a continuous function that preserves both angle and orientation, and an *isogonal* map preserves angles, but not necessarily orientation. An *internally conformal* map is a map that is conformal on the interior of its domain, and the same goes for internally isogonal. A *hyperbolic geodesic* in the open unit disk \mathbf{D}° is the intersection of a circle with \mathbf{D}° that meets the boundary \mathbf{S}^1 at right angles. A path g in a simply connected open domain C is a hyperbolic geodesic when $g = h(\tilde{g})$ for a conformal embedding $h : \mathbf{D}^\circ \rightarrow C$ and a hyperbolic geodesic $\tilde{g} \subset \mathbf{D}^\circ$. We may include endpoints or not as convenient. We denote the cross-ratio by $\text{cr}(w, x; y, z) = \frac{(w-y)(x-z)}{(w-z)(x-y)}$.

2 Tools

2.1 The partial map metric

Here we extend the sup metric to partial maps. Given metric spaces X, Y , let $C_p(X, Y)$ be the space of continuous partial maps $f : X \rightarrow Y$ where $\text{pre}(f)$ is closed. We define the *partial map metric* $\text{dist}_{C_p}(g, f)$ on $C_p(X, Y)$ to be the Hausdorff distance between the respective graphs of f and g with respect to the max metric on the product space $X \times Y$. We simply write $\text{dist}(g, f)$ for $\text{dist}_{C_p}(g, f)$ when there is no ambiguity about the metric. Note that this is an extended metric since Hausdorff distance is an extended metric on closed subsets of a metric space, and $\text{graph}(f)$ is closed. Equivalently, $\text{dist}(g, f)$ is the infimum among δ such that if $x \in \text{pre}(f)$ then $f(x) \in g(x \oplus \delta) \oplus \delta$ and if $x \in \text{pre}(g)$ then $g(x) \in f(x \oplus \delta) \oplus \delta$.

Lemma 2.1. *If X is compact, then the partial map distance on $C(X, Y)$ is topologically equivalent to the sup metric.*

Proof. Suppose $\text{dist}(g(x), f(x)) < \varepsilon$ for all x . Then,

$$g(x) \in f(x) \oplus \varepsilon \subseteq f(x \oplus \varepsilon) \oplus \varepsilon$$

and $f(x) \in g(x \oplus \varepsilon) \oplus \varepsilon$ for all x , so $\text{dist}(g, f) \leq \varepsilon$. Hence, the sup metric ball of radius ε about f is contained in the partial map metric ball of radius ε about f .

For the other direction, consider $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, $f \in C(X, Y)$ is uniformly continuous by the

Heine-Cantor Theorem, so we can let $\delta > 0$ such that $f(x \oplus \delta) \subseteq f(x) \oplus \varepsilon/2$ for all $x \in X$. Let $\varepsilon_1 = \min(\varepsilon/2, \delta)$ and consider $g \in C(X, Y)$ such that $\text{dist}(g, f) \leq \varepsilon_1$. Then,

$$g(x) \in f(x \oplus \varepsilon_1) \oplus \varepsilon_1 \subseteq f(x \oplus \delta) \oplus \varepsilon/2 \subseteq f(x) \oplus \varepsilon.$$

Hence, the partial map metric ball of radius ε_1 about f is contained in the sup metric ball of radius ε about f . \square

Lemma 2.2. $\text{dist}(f, g) \geq \text{dist}_H(\text{pre}(f), \text{pre}(g))$.

Proof. Let $\text{dist}_H(\text{pre}(f), \text{pre}(g)) > r_1 > r_2$, and let us assume there is $x \in \text{pre}(f) \setminus (\text{pre}(g) \oplus r_1)$; otherwise swap f and g . Then, $x \oplus r_2$ is disjoint from $\text{pre}(g)$, so $g(x \oplus r_2) \emptyset$, so $f(x) \notin g(x \oplus r_2) \oplus r_2$, so $\text{dist}_{C_p}(f, g) \geq r_2$. Since this holds for all $r_2 < \text{dist}_H(\text{pre}(f), \text{pre}(g))$, we have $\text{dist}_{C_p}(f, g) \geq \text{dist}_H(\text{pre}(f), \text{pre}(g))$. \square

Let us see a description of convergence.

Lemma 2.3. *Let X be compact. Then, a sequence of maps $f_k \in C_p(X, Y)$ converges to a map in $C_p(X, Y)$ in the partial map metric if and only if $\text{pre}(f_k)$ converges to a closed set in Hausdorff distance and $f_k(x_k)$ converges for every convergent sequence $x_k \rightarrow x_\infty$ with $x_k \in \text{pre}(f_k)$.*

Proof. For the ‘if’ direction, suppose $\text{pre}(f_k) \rightarrow D$ compact in Hausdorff distance and $y_k = f_k(x_k) \rightarrow y_\infty$ for each convergent sequence $x_k \rightarrow x_\infty$.

Let us first define the map f_∞ that will be the limit of the f_k . Let D be the preimage of f_∞ , and let $f_\infty(x_\infty) = y_\infty$ where $y_\infty = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} y_k$ and $y_k = f_k(x_k)$ for a choice of $x_k \rightarrow x_\infty$. We know such a choice exists since $\text{pre}(f_k) \rightarrow D$, so there is a sequence $x_k \in \text{pre}(f_k)$ such that $\text{dist}(x_k, x_\infty) \rightarrow 0$.

We claim f_∞ is well-defined. Suppose there were some other choice of convergent sequence $\tilde{x}_k \rightarrow x_\infty$ with $\tilde{x}_k \in \text{pre}(f_k)$ such that $f_k(\tilde{x}_k) \rightarrow \tilde{y}_\infty \neq y_\infty$. Then, the sequence $x_1, \tilde{x}_2, x_3, \tilde{x}_4, \dots$ would converge to x_∞ , but the sequence of images $f_1(x_1), f_2(\tilde{x}_2), \dots$ would not converge, contradicting our hypothesis. Hence, f_∞ is well-defined.

Suppose f_∞ were not continuous. Then there would be some convergent sequence $w_k \rightarrow x_\infty$ with $w_k \in D$ such that $f_\infty(w_k)$ is bounded apart from $f_\infty(x_\infty)$. That is, $\text{dist}(f_\infty(w_k), f_\infty(x_\infty)) > \delta > 0$ for all k sufficiently large. Since $\text{pre}(f_k) \rightarrow D$ in Hausdorff distance, we can find a sequence $x_k \in \text{pre}(f_k)$ such that $\text{dist}(x_k, w_k) \rightarrow 0$. Hence, $x_k \rightarrow x_\infty$, so $f_k(x_k) \rightarrow f_\infty(x_\infty)$ by definition of f_∞ since f_∞ is well-defined. Also, for each k there is a sequence $x_{k,j} \rightarrow w_k$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ where $x_{k,j} \in \text{pre}(f_j)$ since $\text{pre}(f_j) \rightarrow D$, so $f_j(x_{k,j}) \rightarrow f_\infty(w_k)$, so $\text{dist}(f_j(x_{k,j}), f_\infty(w_k)) < \delta/2$ and $\text{dist}(x_{k,j}, w_k) < 1/k$ for $j \geq J_k$ sufficiently large.

Consider a new sequence $\tilde{x}_k = x_{k, j_k}$ where $j_k = \max(k, J_k)$. Then, $\text{dist}(f_{j_k}(\tilde{x}_k), f_\infty(w_k)) < \delta/2$. Also, $\text{dist}(\tilde{x}_k, w_k) \rightarrow 0$ and $\text{dist}(w_k, x_\infty) \rightarrow 0$, so $\tilde{x}_k \rightarrow x_\infty$, so $f_{j_k}(\tilde{x}_k) \rightarrow f_\infty(x_\infty)$, so $\text{dist}(f_{j_k}(\tilde{x}_k), f_\infty(x_\infty)) < \delta/2$ for k sufficiently large, so $\text{dist}(f_\infty(w_k), f_\infty(x_\infty)) < \delta$, which is a contradiction. Thus, f_∞ is continuous.

For the ‘if’ direction, it remains to show that $f_k \rightarrow f_\infty$ in the partial map metric.

Suppose $\text{graph}(f_k) \not\subseteq \text{graph}(f_\infty) \oplus \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$ infinitely often, and let us restrict to this subsequence. Then, there would be some sequence $(x_k, f_k(x_k))$ that is distance $\delta > 0$ away from $\text{graph}(f_\infty)$. Let us also restrict to a subsequence where x_k converges to a point x_∞ since X is compact, and $x_\infty \in \text{pre}(f_\infty)$ and $f_k(x_k) \rightarrow f_\infty(x_\infty)$ by definition of f_∞ , which contradicts our choice of sequence $(x_k, f_k(x_k))$ bounded away from $\text{graph}(f_\infty)$.

Suppose $\text{graph}(f_\infty) \not\subseteq \text{graph}(f_k) \oplus \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$ infinitely often, and again restrict to this subsequence. Then, there would be some sequence $(w_k, f_\infty(w_k))$ that is distance $\delta > 0$ away from $\text{graph}(f_k)$. Since $\text{pre}(f_k) \rightarrow \text{pre}(f_\infty)$, we can find $x_k \in \text{pre}(f_k)$ such that $\text{dist}(x_k, w_k) \rightarrow 0$, and since X is compact, we may restrict to a subsequence where $x_k \rightarrow x_\infty$, so $w_k \rightarrow w_\infty$, and $f_k(x_k) \rightarrow f_\infty(x_\infty)$ by definition of f_∞ , and $f_\infty(w_k) \rightarrow f_\infty(x_k)$ since f_∞ is continuous, so $\text{dist}(f_k(x_k), f_\infty(w_k)) \rightarrow 0$, which contradicts our choice of sequence $(w_k, f_\infty(w_k))$. Thus, $f_k \rightarrow f_\infty$.

For the ‘only if’ direction, suppose $f_k \rightarrow f_\infty$. Then, $\text{pre}(f_k) \rightarrow \text{pre}(f_\infty)$ in Hausdorff distance by Lemma 2.2. Consider a convergent sequence $x_k \rightarrow x_\infty$ with $x_k \in \text{pre}(f_k)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Since X is compact, f_∞ is uniformly continuous by the Heine-Cantor Theorem, so for some $\delta > 0$, we have $f_\infty(x \oplus \delta) \subset f_\infty(x) \oplus \varepsilon/2$. Let $r = \min(\delta, \varepsilon)/2$. Then, for k sufficiently large we have $x_k \in x_\infty \oplus \delta/2$ since $x_k \rightarrow x_\infty$, so $x_k \oplus r \subseteq x_\infty \oplus \delta$, and since $f_k \rightarrow f_\infty$, we have

$$f_k(x_k) \in f_\infty(x_k \oplus r) \oplus r \subset f_\infty(x_\infty \oplus \delta) \oplus \varepsilon/2 \subset f_\infty(x_\infty) \oplus \varepsilon.$$

Thus, $f_k(x_k) \rightarrow f_\infty(x_\infty)$. □

Recall that $f(x)$ *varies continuously as x varies* when the function f is sequentially continuous. This will be convenient when we do not explicitly name f as a function.

We show that operation that we like to use on functions are continuous. Moreover, inversion is an isometry.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $f \in C_p(X, Y)$ and $g \in C_p(W, X)$ for metric spaces W, X, Y , and let W, X be compact.*

Inversion *If $f, \tilde{f} \in C_p(X, Y)$ are homeomorphic embeddings then*

$$\text{dist}(f, \tilde{f}) = \text{dist}(f^{-1}, \tilde{f}^{-1}). \text{ Hence, } f^{-1} \text{ varies continuously as } f \text{ varies.}$$

Composition $f \circ g$ varies continuously as f and g vary provided that $g(W) \cap \text{pre}(f)$ varies continuously, and in particular if $g(W) \subseteq \text{pre}(f)$.

Restriction $\text{rest}(D, f)$ varies continuously as f and D vary provided that $D \cap \text{pre}(f)$ varies continuously in Hausdorff distance, and in particular if $D \subset \text{pre}(f)$.

Gluing If $X = C_1 \cup C_2$ is a closed cover, $C_i = \text{pre}(f_i)$, and $f(x) = f_i(x)$ for $x \in C_i$ then f varies continuously as the f_i and C_i vary.

Partial application On a product space $X = X_1 \times X_2$, the map $f(x_1) \in C_p(X_2, Y)$ varies continuously as f and x_1 vary provided that $\text{pre}(f(x_1))$ varies continuously, and in particular if $\text{pre}(f) = S_1 \times S_2$ factors as a product.

Proof. Consider convergent sequences $f_k \rightarrow f_\infty$ and $g_k \rightarrow g_\infty$ as in the hypotheses.

For inversion, $\text{graph}(f) = \text{graph}(f^{-1})$ are the same subset of $X \times Y$.

For continuity of composition, consider a convergent sequence $w_k \rightarrow w_\infty$ with $w_k \in \text{pre}(f_k)$. $g_k(w_k) \rightarrow g_\infty(w_\infty)$ by Lemma 2.3, so $[f_k \circ g_k](w_k) \rightarrow [f_\infty \circ g_\infty](w_\infty)$ converges appropriately, so $f_k \circ g_k$ converges appropriately by Lemma 2.3. In the case where $g(W) \subseteq \text{pre}(f)$, observe that $\text{pre}(f \circ g) = g^{-1}(\text{pre}(f)) = \text{pre}(g)$ varies continuously in Hausdorff distance since g varies continuously.

For restriction, consider $D_k \rightarrow D_\infty$ and $x_k \rightarrow x_\infty$ as in the hypotheses. Then, $f_k(x_k)$ converges appropriately for every convergent sequence $x_k \in D_k$, so $\text{rest}(D_k, f_k)$ converges appropriately by Lemma 2.3.

For gluing, consider a convergent sequence $x_k \rightarrow x_\infty$. If $x_k \in C_{1,k}$, then $x_\infty \in C_{1,\infty}$ since $C_{1,k} \rightarrow C_{1,\infty}$ in Hausdorff distance, so $f_k(x_k)$ converges appropriately since f_1 varies continuously, and similarly if $x_k \in C_{2,k}$. Hence, $f_k(x_k)$ converges appropriately since the subsequences with $x_k \in C_{i,k}$ converge appropriately.

For partial application, consider convergent sequences $a_k \rightarrow a_\infty$ and $b_k \rightarrow b_\infty$ in X_1 and X_2 . Then, $f_k(a_k, b_k)$ converges appropriately, and since this holds for each convergent sequence $b_k \in X_2$, we have that $f_k(a_k) \rightarrow f_\infty(a_\infty)$ by Lemma 2.3. In the case where $\text{pre}(f) = S_1 \times S_2$ factors, since f_k converges appropriately, $\text{pre}(f_k) = S_{1,k} \times S_{2,k}$ must converge appropriately, so both $S_{i,k}$ converge appropriately, so $\text{pre}(f_k(a_k)) = S_{2,k}$ converges appropriately. \square

For us restriction to a path will be of particular importance.

Lemma 2.5. *If $P \subseteq \text{pre}(f)$ is a path and f is a topological embedding of $\text{pre}(f)$, then $f(P)$ varies continuously in Fréchet distance as f varies in the partial map metric and P varies in Fréchet distance.*

Note that Lemma 2.5 does not always hold if f is not always an embedding as it varies.

Proof. Consider convergent sequences $P_k \rightarrow P_\infty$ and $f_k \rightarrow f_\infty$. Then, there are parameterizations $\gamma_k : [0, 1]_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow P_k$ such that $\sup\{\text{dist}(\gamma_k(x), \gamma_\infty(x)) : x \in [0, 1]\} \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ by definition of Fréchet distance, which means $\gamma_k \rightarrow \gamma_\infty$ in the sup metric, so $f_k \gamma_k \rightarrow f_\infty \gamma_\infty$ in the partial map topology by Lemma 2.4, and therefore in the sup metric as well, and

$$\text{dist}_F(f_k(P_k), f_\infty(P_\infty)) \leq \text{dist}_{\text{sup}}(f_k \gamma_k, f_\infty \gamma_\infty)$$

since both $f_k \gamma_k$ and $f_\infty \gamma_\infty$ are homeomorphisms, so $f_k(P_k) \rightarrow f_\infty(P_\infty)$ in Fréchet distance. □

In the case of total functions, we have the following.

Lemma 2.6. *Given $f : X \rightarrow Y$ with $X = A \times B$ and B compact, if $f(x) \in Y$ varies continuously as $x \in X$ varies, then $f(a) \in Y^B$ varies continuously in the sup metric as $a \in A$ varies. Furthermore, the converse holds provided that X is compact.*

Remark 2.7. By letting $A = \{1/k, 0 : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $f_k = f(1/k) : B \rightarrow Y$ with B compact, we have $f_k \rightarrow f_\infty$ uniformly if and only if $f_k(b_k) \rightarrow f_\infty(b_\infty)$ for every convergent sequence $b_k \rightarrow b_\infty$ if and only if f is continuous as a special case of Lemma 2.6.

Proof. Suppose that $f(x_k) \rightarrow f(x_\infty)$ for every convergent sequence $x_k = (a_k, b_k) \rightarrow x_\infty \in X$. Then, $f(a_k)$ converges appropriately in the partial map metric by Lemma 2.3, so $f(a_k)$ converges appropriately in the sup metric by Lemma 2.1.

Alternatively, suppose that X is compact and that $f(a_k) \rightarrow f(a_\infty)$ in the sup metric for every convergent sequence $a_k \rightarrow a_\infty \in A$. Then, $f(a_k)$ converges appropriately in the partial map metric by Lemma 2.1, so $f(a_k, b_k)$ converges appropriately for every convergent sequence $b_k \rightarrow b_\infty$ by Lemma 2.4. Hence, $f(x_k)$ converges appropriately for every convergent sequence x_k . □

2.2 Extension to \mathbb{R} and tail extrema

Here we treat convergence for the canonical extension of a function on an interval to \mathbb{R} . We also introduce tail extrema, which will be useful for finding a continuously varying monotone upper or lower bound for a given function.

Given a function $f : [a, b]_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, let $\text{ext}_{\mathbb{R}}(f) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\text{ext}_{\mathbb{R}}(f, x) = \begin{cases} f(a) & x < a \\ f(x) & x \in [a, b] \\ f(b) & x > b, \end{cases}$$

and for an interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, let $\text{ext}_I(f) = \text{rest}(I, \text{ext}_{\mathbb{R}}(f))$.

Lemma 2.8. $\text{ext}_{\mathbb{R}}(f)$ varies continuously in the sup metric as f varies in the partial map metric. Moreover, if $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a strictly monotonic partial function defined on a closed interval, then $\text{ext}_{\mathbb{R}}(f^{-1})$ varies continuously.

Proof. Consider a sequence $f_k \rightarrow f_{\infty}$ that converges in the partial map metric. Let $[a_k, b_k] = \text{pre}(f_k)$. Then, $\text{pre}(f_k) \rightarrow \text{pre}(f_{\infty})$, so for all k sufficiently large, $\text{pre}(f_k)$ is contained in a closed interval such as $I = \text{pre}(f_{\infty}) \oplus 1$, which is compact. Consider a convergent sequence $x_k \rightarrow x_{\infty}$ in I . In the case where $x_k \in \text{pre}(f_k)$, then $f_k(x_k) \rightarrow f_{\infty}(x_{\infty})$ by Lemma 2.3. Consider the case where $x_k < a_k$, then $f_k(x_k) = f_k(a_k) \rightarrow f_{\infty}(a_{\infty})$ by Lemma 2.3 since $a_k \rightarrow a_{\infty}$, and $x_{\infty} \leq a_{\infty}$ so $f_{\infty}(x_{\infty}) = f_{\infty}(a_{\infty})$. This holds similarly in the case where $x_k > b_k$, so $f_k(x_k) \rightarrow f_{\infty}(x_{\infty})$ for every convergent sequence in I , so $\text{ext}_I(f_k) \rightarrow \text{ext}_I(f_{\infty})$ in the partial map metric by Lemma 2.3, so $\text{ext}_I(f_k) \rightarrow \text{ext}_I(f_{\infty})$ in the sup metric by Lemma 2.1, and $\text{ext}_{\mathbb{R}}(f_k)$ on the rest of \mathbb{R} agrees with $\text{ext}_I(f_k)$ at the endpoints of I , so $\text{ext}_{\mathbb{R}}(f_k) \rightarrow \text{ext}_{\mathbb{R}}(f_{\infty})$ in the sup metric by Lemma 2.1. The second part of the lemma then follows since inversion is isometric by Lemma 2.4. \square

Later we will use $\text{ext}_{\mathbb{R}}$ to find an input s where some map $b_{\text{test}} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ becomes sufficiently large or small, but b_{test} will not always be guaranteed to be monotonic. Therefore, we will use tailsup or tailinf to replace a function b_{test} with a monotonic function b and use $\text{ext}_{\mathbb{R}}(b^{-1})$. See Definition 5.3 for example.

Let $\text{tailsup}, \text{tailinf} : \mathbb{R}^{[0,1]} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tailsup}(f, u) &= \sup\{f(x) : x \in [u, 1]\} \\ \text{tailinf}(f, u) &= \inf\{f(x) : x \in [u, 1]\} \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.9. $\text{tailsup}(f)$ and $\text{tailinf}(f)$ vary continuously as f varies in the sup metric.

Proof. Suppose $f_k \rightarrow f_{\infty}$ in the sup metric and let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, $|f_k(x) - f_{\infty}(x)| < \varepsilon$ for k sufficiently large. Since $[u, 1]$ is compact, the supremum of $\{f_k(x) : x \in [u, 1]\}$ is attained at some $x_{k,u} \in [u, 1]$, so $\text{tailsup}(f_k, u) = f_k(x_{k,u}) \leq f_{\infty}(x_{k,u}) + \varepsilon \leq \text{tailsup}(f_{\infty}, u) + \varepsilon$, and similarly $\text{tailsup}(f_{\infty}, u) \leq \text{tailsup}(f_k, u) + \varepsilon$. Hence, $|\text{tailsup}(f_k, u) - \text{tailsup}(f_{\infty}, u)| < \varepsilon$, which means that $\text{tailsup}(f_k) \rightarrow \text{tailsup}(f_{\infty})$ in the sup metric. \square

2.3 Parameterization

Here we state some useful properties of conformal maps and we construct a canonical parameterization of paths in the sphere that will satisfy the following.

Lemma 2.10. *Given a directed (≤ 1)-cell $P \subset \mathbf{S}^2$, then $\text{param}(P) : [0, 1] \rightarrow P$ satisfies the following.*

1. *If P is a 1-cell, then $\text{param}(P)$ is a homeomorphism.*
2. *$\text{param}(P)$ varies continuously in the sup-metric as P varies in Fréchet distance. Likewise, for $\text{param}^{-1}(P) = [\text{param}(P)]^{-1}$ in the partial map metric.*
3. *param is O_3 -equivariant.*
4. *$\text{param}(P^-, t) = \text{param}(P, 1 - t)$ where P^- is the reverse of P .*

Definition 2.11 (parameterization of a path). Given a path $P \subset \mathbf{S}^2$ directed from s to t , and a point $y \in P$. Let $\text{param}^{-1}(P) : P \rightarrow [0, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}$ by $x = \text{param}^{-1}(P, y) = \text{area}(C)/4\pi$ where C is the closed region bounded by the hyperbolic geodesic curve $g = g(P, y)$ from y to y through $\mathbf{S}^2 \setminus P$ that contains s provided that $y \notin \{s, t\}$. Otherwise, $g(P, y) = y$ for an endpoint, and $\text{param}^{-1}(P, s) = 0$, and $\text{param}^{-1}(P, t) = 1$. Let $\text{param}(P, x) = y$ provided P is not degenerate, and let $\text{param}(P, x) = P$ for a degenerate path.

Extensions of the Riemann mapping theorem by Constantin Carathéodory and Tibor Radó will be vital.

Theorem 2.12 (Carathéodory [10]). *A conformal map from the open unit disk to a Jordan domain extends to a homeomorphism of their closures.*

Theorem 2.13 (Radó [24]; see also [23, Theorem 2.11]). *Given a sequence of conformal maps h_k from the open unit disk to a Jordan domain with $h_k(0) = 0$ and $dh_k(z)/dz > 0$, if there is a parameterization of $\partial h_k(\mathbf{D})$ that converges uniformly, then h_k converges uniformly.*

Remark 2.14. We can restate Radó's theorem as saying that h varies continuously in the sup metric as ∂h varies in Fréchet distance. Also, we can replace the conditions $h_k(0) = 0$ and $dh_k(z)/dz > 0$ with the condition that there are 3 points on the unit circle where the image of the continuous extension of h_k converges.

We say a path or a simple closed curve S is **nonOsgood** when the 2-dimensional Hausdorff measure of S is 0 [22]. We show that the area bounded by a nonOsgood curve is continuous. Note that the area of the region bounded by a curve is not continuous in general, as can be seen in the case of a sequence of nonOsgood curves converging to an Osgood curve.

Lemma 2.15. *Let $S \subset \mathbf{S}^2$ be a nonOsgood directed closed curve and C be the region to the left of S , then $\text{area}(C)$ varies continuously as S varies in Fréchet distance.*

Proof. Consider a convergent sequence of such curves $S_k \rightarrow S_{\infty}$ bounding respective

regions C_k . We claim that if $\text{dist}(S_k, S_\infty) < \varepsilon$ for ε sufficiently small, then the symmetric difference $\Delta_k = (C_k \setminus C_\infty) \cup (C_\infty \setminus C_k)$ is contained in $S_\infty \oplus \varepsilon$. We may assume ε is small enough that there exists points p_0, p_1 such that $(p_0 \oplus \varepsilon) \cap C_\infty = \emptyset$ and $(p_1 \oplus \varepsilon) \subset C_\infty$. Since $\text{dist}(S_k, S_\infty) < \varepsilon$ there is a map $f : S_\infty \rightarrow S_k$ such that $\|f(x) - x\| < \varepsilon$, so x is always closer to $f(x)$ than to p_0 or p_1 . Therefore, a homotopy by spherical linear interpolation from S_k to S_∞ stays within $\mathbf{S}^2 \setminus \{p_0, p_1\}$, which implies that $p_0 \notin C_k$ and $p_1 \in C_k$. Since this holds for each such pair p_0, p_1 , each point of $\mathbf{S}^2 \setminus (S_\infty \oplus \varepsilon)$ stays on the same side of S_k throughout a homotopy to S_∞ , and as such is not a point of Δ_k . Thus, $\Delta_k \subseteq S_\infty \oplus \varepsilon$.

Consider $\varepsilon_1 > 0$. Since S_∞ has area 0, there is an open cover U of S_∞ that has area at most ε_1 . Since $\mathbf{S}^2 \setminus U$ and S_∞ are compact and disjoint, they are bounded apart by some $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ depending on ε_1 . Since $S_k \rightarrow S_\infty$, we have for all k sufficiently large that $\text{dist}(S_k, S_\infty) < \varepsilon_2$, so by the claim above, $\Delta_k \subseteq S_\infty \oplus \varepsilon_2$, so $\Delta_k \subseteq U$, so Δ_k has area at most ε_1 . Thus, $\text{area}(\Delta_k) \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, which implies that $\text{area}(C_k) \rightarrow \text{area}(C_\infty)$. \square

Claim 2.16. *g in Definition 2.11 varies continuously in Fréchet distance as P and y vary. Moreover, if $y_1 <_P y_2$, then $C_1 \subset C_2^\circ$ where C_i are the corresponding bounded regions.*

Proof. Let us first assume that P is a path from 0 to ∞ that does not meet 1. Let $f(z) = \left(\frac{z+1}{z-1}\right)^2$. Then f is 2-to-1 everywhere except at $f(1) = \infty$ and $f(-1) = 0$. Therefore, the preimage by f of each point of P is a pair of points except at the endpoints of P , and by analytic continuation of the square root along P , the preimage of P is a pair of paths that share common endpoints, but are otherwise disjoint. Hence, $f^{-1}(P)$ is a closed curve, and since P avoids 1, $f^{-1}(P)$ avoids $f^{-1}(1) = \{0, \infty\}$. Let $C \subset \mathbb{C}$ be the closure of the region bounded by $f^{-1}(P)$ that contains 0.

Let P vary in Fréchet distance and let $y \in P$ vary. Then, $f^{-1}(P)$ varies continuously in Fréchet distance with respect to the spherical metric on $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$ since f is uniformly continuous. Also, there is a unique internally conformal homeomorphism $h : \mathbf{D} \rightarrow C$ by Carathéodory's theorem (2.12), and h varies continuously in the sup-metric by Radó's theorem (2.13), so h^{-1} varies continuously in the partial map metric by Lemma 2.4. In the case where y is not an endpoint, then $h^{-1}f^{-1}(y)$ consists of a pair of points on the unit circle that vary continuously, and the hyperbolic geodesic $\tilde{g}(P, y) \subset \mathbf{D}$ between the points $h^{-1}f^{-1}(y)$ varies continuously, so $g = fh\tilde{g}(P, y)$ is the hyperbolic geodesic from y to itself through $\mathbb{C} \setminus P$, and g varies continuously in Fréchet distance by Lemma 2.5. In the case where y converges to an endpoint, then $h^{-1}f^{-1}(y)$ is a single point, and \tilde{g} converges to $h^{-1}f^{-1}(y)$, so g converges to the same endpoint as y . In either case g varies continuously.

Consider the case where P is an arbitrary directed path, and let P and $y \in P$ and $q \notin P$ vary. Let $a(z) = a_{s,t,q}(z) = \text{cr}(z, q; s, t)$ be the conformal automorphism of \mathbf{S}^2 that sends the source s to 0, the terminal t to ∞ , and q to 1. Then, $a = a_{s,t,q}$ varies continuously in the sup-metric as q and the endpoints of P vary, so $a(P)$ varies continuously in Fréchet

distance by Lemma 2.5, so $ga(P, y)$ vary continuously. Also, a^{-1} varies continuously by Lemma 2.4, so $a^{-1}ga(P, y)$ varies continuously and is the hyperbolic geodesic from y to itself through $\mathbf{S}^2 \setminus P$.

For the second part, suppose $y_1 <_P y_2$. If $y_1 = s$, then C_2° contains s by definition, so let us consider the case where $y_1 \neq s$. Then, $h^{-1}f^{-1}(y_1)$ is a pair of points that separate $h^{-1}f^{-1}(y_2)$ from $h^{-1}f^{-1}(s)$ in \mathbf{S}^1 by Carathéodory's theorem, so $\tilde{g}(P, y_1)$ separates $\tilde{g}(P, y_2)$ from $h^{-1}f^{-1}(s)$ in \mathbf{D} , so $g(P, y_1)$ separates $g(P, y_2)$ from s in \mathbf{S}^2 , so $C_1 \subset C_2^\circ$. \square

Proof of Lemma 2.10. Let us start with continuity of the inverse. Consider convergent sequences $P_k \rightarrow P_\infty$ and $y_k \rightarrow y_\infty$ as in Definition 2.11.

Consider first the case where y_∞ is not an endpoint of P_∞ , and let C_k be the region bounded by the hyperbolic geodesic $g_k = g(P_k, y_k)$. Then, $g_k \rightarrow g_\infty$ by Claim 2.16, and g_k is analytic except at a single point, so in particular g_k is nonOsgood, so $\text{param}^{-1}(P_k, y_k) = \text{area}(C_k) \rightarrow \text{area}(C_\infty)$ by Lemma 2.15.

In the case where y_∞ is the source of P_∞ , if y_k is also the source of P_k for $k < \infty$, then $\text{param}^{-1}(P_k, y_k) = 0 = \text{param}^{-1}(P_\infty, y_\infty)$, otherwise g_k converges to the point $g_\infty = y_\infty$ by Claim 2.16, so C_k converges to y_∞ , so $\text{param}^{-1}(P_k, y_k) \rightarrow 0$. In either case $\text{param}^{-1}(P_k, y_k) \rightarrow \text{param}^{-1}(P_\infty, y_\infty)$.

Hence, $\text{param}^{-1}(P)$ varies continuously in the partial map metric as P varies in Fréchet distance by Lemma 2.3, and $\text{param}^{-1}(P)$ is strictly monotone with respect to the total order on P by the second part of Claim 2.16, so $\text{param}(P)$ varies continuously in the the partial map metric by Lemma 2.4, and $\text{param}(P)$ varies continuously in the the sup-metric by Lemma 2.1. Thus, parts 1 and 2 hold.

Part 3 follows from the observation that orthogonal transformations preserve area and are isogonal, so hyperbolic geodesics are sent to hyperbolic geodesics. Part 4 follows from the observation that the area of the complement of C in Definition 2.11 is $4\pi - \text{area}(C)$ and contains t . \square

2.4 Extension to a disk and interpolation

Here we present useful properties and implications of the Douady-Earle extension, which extends a homeomorphism of the circle to a homeomorphism of the disk. More generally, we use the Douady-Earle extension to extend a homeomorphism of the boundary of a 2-cell to the rest of the 2-cell, which we then use with Lemma 2.10 to define an interpolation map between regular cell decompositions.

Lemma 2.17. *Given an isomorphism $\lambda : \mathcal{C}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_1$ between regular cell decompositions \mathcal{C}_k of $X_k \subset \mathbf{S}^2$, then*

$$\text{interp}(\lambda) : X_0 \rightarrow X_1$$

is a homeomorphism satisfying the following.

1. Each face $F \in \mathcal{C}_0$ has $\text{interp}(\lambda; F) = \lambda(F)$.
2. $\text{interp}(\lambda)$ varies continuously in the partial map metric (and in the sup-metric if X_0 is fixed) as \mathcal{C}_0 and \mathcal{C}_1 vary in Fréchet distance on 1-cells and Hausdorff distance on 2-cells.
3. interp is O_3 -equivariant on both sides. That is, $\text{interp}(Q_1 \circ \lambda \circ Q_0) = Q_1 \circ \text{interp}(\lambda) \circ Q_0$. for $Q_i \in O_3$.
4. $\text{interp}(\text{id}) = \text{id}$.

This is essentially the same as the map interp in [11, Subsection 3.2], except there the cell decomposition consisted of the cells of a pseudocircle arrangement. Here we give a more elegant proof using Douady-Earle extension.

Theorem 2.18 (Douady and Earle, 1986 [14]). *Given a homeomorphism $\varphi : \mathbf{S}^1 \rightarrow \mathbf{S}^1$, then $\text{ext}(\varphi) : \mathbf{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$ is a homeomorphism that satisfies the following.*

1. $\text{ext}(\varphi)$ restricts to φ on the boundary, i.e., $\text{rest}(\mathbf{S}^1, \text{ext}(\varphi)) = \varphi$.
2. $\text{ext}(\text{id}) = \text{id}$.
3. $\text{ext}(\varphi)$ varies continuously as φ varies in the sup-metric.
4. ext is isogonally equivariant on the left and right, i.e.,

$$\text{ext}(g\varphi h) = g \text{ext}(\varphi) h$$

for isogonal automorphisms g, h of the disk.¹

Definition 2.19 (Interpolation). We build up $\iota = \text{interp}(\lambda)$ one dimension at a time, starting with vertices. On each vertex $v \in \mathcal{C}_0$, let $\iota(v) = \lambda(v)$. On each 1-cell $P \in \mathcal{C}_0$, choose a direction on P , direct $\lambda(P)$ as induced by λ , and let $\iota = \text{param}(\lambda(P)) \text{param}^{-1}(P)$. Finally, on each 2-cell $C \in \mathcal{C}_0$, choose conformal maps $h_0 : \mathbf{D} \rightarrow C$ and $h_1 : \mathbf{D} \rightarrow \lambda(C)$, and let $\iota = h_1 \text{ext}(h_1^{-1} \iota h_0) h_0^{-1}$. We will show that this is well-defined in the proof of Lemma 2.17.

Proof of Lemma 2.17. To see that $\text{interp}(\lambda)$ is well defined on a 1-cell P , let $\tilde{\iota}$ be define with the opposite choice of direction on P . Then for $x \in P$ we have

$$\tilde{\iota}(x) = \text{param}(\lambda(P)^-) \text{param}^{-1}(P^-) = \text{param}(\lambda(P), 1 - (1 - \text{param}^{-1}(P, x))) = \iota(x)$$

by Lemma 2.10 part 4. For a 2-cell C , let $\tilde{\iota}$ be defined by some other choice of conformal

¹Douady and Earle defined conformal maps to be angle preserving, which we call isogonal.

maps g_i . Then, $g_0^{-1}h_0$ and $h_1^{-1}g_1$ are conformal automorphisms of the unit disk, so

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\iota} &= g_1 \text{ext}(g_1^{-1}\iota g_0)g_0^{-1} \\ &= g_1 g_1^{-1} h_1 h_1^{-1} g_1 \text{ext}(g_1^{-1}\iota g_0)g_0^{-1} h_0 h_0^{-1} g_0 g_0^{-1} \\ &= h_1 \text{ext}(h_1^{-1}g_1 g_1^{-1}\iota g_0 g_0^{-1}h_0)h_0^{-1} \\ &= \iota\end{aligned}$$

by Theorem 2.18 part 4. The restriction of ι to the 1-skeleton is a well defined homeomorphism since $\text{param}(P)$ is a homeomorphism by Lemma 2.10, and the source of P is $\text{param}(P, 0)$, which ι sends to the source $\text{param}(\lambda(P), 0)$ of $\lambda(P)$, and similarly for the terminal endpoint. On the boundary of a 2-cell C , we have

$$h_1 \text{ext}(h_1^{-1}\iota h_0)h_0^{-1} = h_1 h_1^{-1} \iota h_0 h_0^{-1} = \iota$$

by Theorem 2.18 part 1. so the definition of ι on the boundary of C agrees with that on the 1-skeleton. Thus, ι is well-defined homeomorphism by the gluing lemma.

Each face F has $\iota(F) = \lambda(F)$ directly from the definition, so part 1 holds.

By Lemma 2.10 part 2, $\text{param}^{-1}(P)$ and $\text{param}(P)$ vary continuously in the partial map metric as 1-cells of \mathcal{C}_0 and \mathcal{C}_1 vary in Fréchet distance, so ι varies continuously on the 1-skeleton by Lemma 2.4. We may choose h_i that vary continuously as λ varies by Radó's theorem, so h_i^{-1} vary continuously in the partial map metric by Lemma 2.4, so $h_1 h_0^{-1}$ varies continuously in the sup-metric by Lemma 2.1, so $\text{ext}(h_1 h_0^{-1})$ varies continuously in the sup-metric by Theorem 2.18 part 3, so ι varies continuously by Lemma 2.4, which means part 2 holds.

Since orthogonal maps are isogonal, interp is equivariant by Lemma 2.10 part 3 and Theorem 2.18 part 4, so part 3 holds.

Finally, if $\lambda = \text{id}$, then $\text{param}(\lambda(P)) \text{param}^{-1}(P) = \text{id}$, so $\iota = \text{id}$ on the 1-skeleton, and we can choose $h_0 = h_1$ in each 2-cell, so $\iota = \text{id}$ by Theorem 2.18 part 2, so part 4 holds. \square

2.5 Squishing conformal maps

Here we study the behavior of conformal parameterizations of a Jordan domain that converges to a path. Specifically, we show that if the parameterizations converge anywhere then the image converges to a single point along the path.

Lemma 2.20.

- Let A_k, B_k be a pair of paths from p_k to q_k for $k \in \{1, \dots, \infty\}$ that each converge in Fréchet distance as $k \rightarrow \infty$ to a path $A_\infty = B_\infty = C_\infty$ such that $A_k \cup B_k$ is a closed curve bounding a closed 2-cell C_k for $k < \infty$.

- Let $x_k, y_k \in C_k$ respectively converge to distinct points $x_\infty, y_\infty \in C_\infty \setminus \{p_\infty, q_\infty\}$.
- Let $h_k : \mathbf{D} \rightarrow C_k$ for $k < 1$ be internally conformal maps such that $h_k(1) = p_k$, $h_k(-1) = q_k$ and $|h_k^{-1}(x_k)|$ is bounded away from $\{1, -1\}$, i.e., $|h_k^{-1}(x_k) - 1| > \varepsilon$ and $|h_k^{-1}(x_k) + 1| > \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$.

If y_∞ is on the arc of C_∞ from p_∞ to x_∞ , then $h_k^{-1}(y_k) \rightarrow 1$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Alternatively, if y_∞ is on the arc of C_∞ from q_∞ to x_∞ , then $h_k^{-1}(y_k) \rightarrow -1$. Hence, if $z_k \in \mathbf{D}$ is bounded away from $\{1, -1\}$, then $h_k(z_k) \rightarrow x_\infty$.

Claim 2.21. *There is a sequence of paths M_k in C_k from A_k to B_k that converge to x_∞ .*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be sufficiently small that $p_\infty, q_\infty, x_\infty$ are all more than 3ε away from each other. Let P be a path from $p_\infty \oplus \varepsilon$ to $q_\infty \oplus \varepsilon$ that is disjoint from C_∞ , and let $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ be sufficiently small that P is disjoint from $C_\infty \oplus \varepsilon_1$ and $\varepsilon_1 \leq \varepsilon$. Let k be sufficiently large that $C_k \subset C_\infty \oplus \varepsilon_1$, and A_k and B_k pass within distance ε_1 of x_∞ .

Let M be a path of diameter at most ε_1 that cross C_∞ at x_∞ and meets C_∞ at no other point. Then, A_k intersects M for k sufficiently large since $A_k \rightarrow C_\infty$, and likewise for B_k . Choose an arc N_k of M from a point of A_k to a point of B_k , and let M_k be the arc along N_k from the last time N_k meets A_k to the next time N_k meets ∂C_k . Then, M_k must be a path from A_k to B_k through the complement of ∂C_k .

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that M_k were not in C_k . Then, we would have a Jordan domain D bounded by circular arcs of radius ε about p_∞ and q_∞ and an arc of A_k and B_k . Also, P and M_k would be cross-cuts of D with endpoints alternating around the boundary of D , so P and M_k must intersect, which is a contradiction since M_k is contained within $x_\infty \oplus \varepsilon_1$, which is disjoint from P . Thus, M_k is a path in C_k .

Each subsequence of $M_k \cap A_k$ has a convergent subsubsequence since M is compact, and a limit point of $M_k \cap A_k$ must be on both M and C_∞ , so $M_k \cap A_k \rightarrow x_\infty$, and likewise for $M_k \cap B_k$, so $M_k \rightarrow x_\infty$. □

To complete the proof of Lemma 2.20 we will use extremal length.

Definition 2.22 (Extremal length). Let $L^2(\Omega)$ denote the space of square-integrable functions on $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$, and given $\rho \in L^2(\Omega)$, let

$$\text{area}(\Omega, \rho) = \int_{\Omega} \rho(z)^2 dz.$$

Given a continuous map $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \Omega$, the length of γ with respect to ρ is

$$\text{len}(\gamma, \rho) = \int_{\gamma} \rho(s) ds.$$

where ds is arc-length. We say γ is a *rectifiable curve* when its arc-length is finite. Let $\text{area}(\Omega) = \text{area}(\Omega, 1)$ and $\text{len}(\gamma) = \text{len}(\gamma, 1)$. The *extremal length* of a collection of rectifiable curves Γ in Ω is

$$\text{el}(\Gamma) = \sup_{\rho \in L^2(\Omega)} \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \frac{\text{len}^2(\gamma, \rho)}{\text{area}(\Omega, \rho)}$$

We call (Γ, Γ^*) a *conformal rectangle* when Γ is the collection of rectifiable curves in a 2-cell Ω between a pair of disjoint arcs E, F on the boundary of Ω , and Γ^* is the collection of rectifiable curves in Ω separating E and F .

Extremal length has two features that are important for us. First, extremal length is a conformal invariant. Second, if (Γ, Γ^*) is a conformal rectangle, then $\text{el}(\Gamma) \text{el}(\Gamma^*) = 1$ [6, Chapter 4, see examples].

Proof of Lemma 2.20. We will just consider the case where y_∞ is on the arc of C_∞ from p_∞ to x_∞ . The other case is similar.

Let ε_1 be sufficiently small that $p_\infty, q_\infty, x_\infty, y_\infty$ are all at least distance $5\varepsilon_1$ from each other. Let $\tilde{y} \in C_\infty$ be the first point of C_∞ from x_∞ to y_∞ that is distance ε_1 from y_∞ , and let $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ be at most $1/4$ the distance between the arc of C_∞ from p_∞ to y_∞ and the arc of C_∞ from \tilde{y} to q_∞ . Let $M_{y,k}$ be a path from A_k to B_k that converges to \tilde{y} as implied by Claim 2.21, and let k be sufficiently large that $M_{y,k}$ is within distance ε_2 of \tilde{y} ; see Figure 1.

Let ε_2 also be sufficiently small and k be sufficiently large for \tilde{x} and $M_{x,k}$ to be defined analogously. That is, \tilde{x} is the last point of C_∞ from x_∞ to y_∞ that is distance ε_1 from x_∞ . The arcs of C_∞ from q_∞ to x_∞ and from \tilde{x} to p_∞ are at least $4\varepsilon_2$ apart. And, $M_{x,k}$ is a cross-cut of C_k from A_k to B_k that converges to \tilde{x} and is within distance ε_2 of \tilde{x} .

Let \tilde{C}_k be the region of C_k that is between $M_{x,k}$ and $M_{y,k}$, and let \tilde{C}_∞ be the arc of C_∞ from \tilde{x} to \tilde{y} . Note that ε_2 was chosen so that x_k is separated from \tilde{C}_k by $M_{x,k}$ and y_k is separated from \tilde{C}_k by $M_{y,k}$ for k sufficiently large. Let Γ_k be the family of all rectifiable curves from $M_{x,k}$ to $M_{y,k}$ through \tilde{C}_k . Let \tilde{A}_k and \tilde{B}_k respectively be the arcs of A_k and B_k along the boundary of \tilde{C}_k , and let Γ_k^* be the family of all rectifiable curves from \tilde{A}_k to \tilde{B}_k through \tilde{C}_k . Since (Γ_k, Γ_k^*) is a conformal rectangle, we have $\text{el}(\Gamma_k) \text{el}(\Gamma_k^*) = 1$ [6, Chapter 4, examples].

We claim that $\text{el}(\Gamma_k) \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Consider first the case where \tilde{C}_∞ is a rectifiable path. Then, $\text{area}(\tilde{C}_k) \rightarrow 0$ since we can cover \tilde{C}_∞ with $\text{len}(C_\infty)/\varepsilon_3$ disks of radius $\varepsilon_3 > 0$ spaced evenly along \tilde{C}_∞ , and eventually $\tilde{C}_k \subset \tilde{C}_\infty \oplus \varepsilon_3$, so $\text{area}(\tilde{C}_k) \leq \pi \text{len}(C_\infty) \varepsilon_3$. For each curve $\gamma \in \Gamma_k$, we have

$$\text{len}(\gamma) \geq \|\tilde{y} - \tilde{x}\| - 2\varepsilon_2 \geq \|y_\infty - x_\infty\| - 4\varepsilon_1 \geq \varepsilon_1,$$




Figure 1: Construction of \tilde{C}_k in the proof of Lemma 2.20

since the paths $M_{x,k}$ and $M_{y,k}$ are respectively within ε_2 of \tilde{x} and \tilde{y} , so

$$\text{el}(\Gamma_k) \geq \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma_k} \frac{\text{len}^2(\gamma)}{\text{area}(\tilde{C}_k)} \geq \frac{\varepsilon_1^2}{\text{area}(\tilde{C}_k)} \rightarrow \infty.$$

Consider the case where \tilde{C}_∞ is not rectifiable. Then, $\text{area}(\tilde{C}_k) \leq A$ for some fixed A since \tilde{C}_∞ is bounded. Also, for each $L > 0$, every $\gamma_k \in \Gamma_k$ for k large enough has $\text{len}(\gamma_k) > L$ since \tilde{C}_∞ has a piecewise linear approximation P of length at least $2L$ with vertices on \tilde{C}_∞ , and eventually every $\gamma_k \in \Gamma_k$ must pass within $\delta > 0$ of each vertex in order along \tilde{C}_∞ where δ is chosen so that each pair of vertices of P is at least 4δ apart. Letting $L \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\text{el}(\Gamma_k) \geq \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma_k} \frac{\text{len}^2(\gamma)}{\text{area}(\tilde{C}_k)} \geq \frac{L^2}{A} \rightarrow \infty.$$

In any case $\text{el}(\Gamma_k) \rightarrow \infty$, so $\text{el}(\Gamma_k^*) \rightarrow 0$, and so $\text{el}(h_k^{-1}(\Gamma_k^*)) \rightarrow 0$ since extremal length is a conformal invariant, so there is a sequence of rectifiable curves $\zeta_k \in h_k^{-1}(\Gamma_k^*)$ from the arc $h_k^{-1}(\tilde{A}_k)$ of the upper unit semicircle to the arc $h_k^{-1}(\tilde{B}_k)$ of the lower unit semicircle, and $\text{len}(\zeta_k) \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Also, $h^{-1}(x_k)$ is on the same side of ζ_k as -1 since we are in the case where y_∞ is on the arc of C_∞ from p_∞ to x_∞ , and $h^{-1}(x_k)$ is bounded away from -1 ,

so some ark of ζ_k must be bounded away from -1 , and so ζ_k is bounded away from -1 since $\text{len}(\zeta_k) \rightarrow 0$.

Hence, ζ_k is a sequence of paths of vanishing length from the upper unit semicircle to the lower unit semicircle bounded away from -1 , and as such, must converge to 1. Thus, $h^{-1}(y_k) \rightarrow 1$ since $h^{-1}(y_k)$ is on the same side of ζ_k as 1. \square

3 The neighborhood.

Here we will prove Theorem 1.1 using the nerve theorem. To do so, we define an open neighborhood of the set of topological representations of a rank 3 oriented matroid such that for every incomparable pair of oriented matroids, the corresponding neighborhoods are disjoint; see Lemma 3.3, and for every chain of oriented matroids, the corresponding intersection of neighborhoods is contractible; see Lemma 3.4.

Informally, an arrangement A will be in the neighborhood corresponding to an oriented matroid \mathcal{M} when the geometric features of A that correspond to nondegenerate features of \mathcal{M} are larger than those that correspond to degenerate features of \mathcal{M} . We define the neighborhood in terms of parameters $\text{minbig}(\mathcal{M}, A)$, which measures the minimum size of a big feature of A , i.e., a nondegenerate feature of \mathcal{M} , and $\text{maxlit}(\mathcal{M}, A)$, which measures the maximum size of a little feature, i.e., degenerate in \mathcal{M} . These parameters will use a map $\text{maxcov}(\mathcal{M}, A)$ to associate features of \mathcal{M} to features of A .

An arrangement A is in the intersection of neighborhoods corresponding to a chain $\mathcal{C} \subset \text{MacP}_{3,n}$ when features that correspond to a degeneracy are smaller the lower that degeneracy appears in the chain. Conceptually, A can appear to represent a different oriented matroid at different magnifications. For example, two distinct pseudocircles that are very close together might appear to coincide in a low resolution image. In this sense, higher oriented matroids in the chain \mathcal{C} correspond to viewing A at a higher magnification, and at a higher magnification we can distinguish smaller features, so fewer features appear degenerate; see Figure 2.

Definition 3.1 (neighborhoods). Given oriented matroids $\mathcal{M}_0 \leq_w \mathcal{M}_1$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \text{maxcov}(\mathcal{M}_0, \mathcal{M}_1) : \text{cov}(\mathcal{M}_1) &\rightarrow \text{cov}(\mathcal{M}_0) \text{ by} \\ \text{maxcov}(\sigma_1) &= \max(\text{cov}(\mathcal{M}_0)_{\leq \sigma_1}). \end{aligned}$$

Laura Anderson showed that the map $\text{maxcov}(\mathcal{M}_0, \mathcal{M}_1)$ is well-defined and surjective for $\mathcal{M}_0 \leq_w \mathcal{M}_1$ [4]




Figure 2: Part of an arrangement $A \in \text{hood}(\{\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2, \mathcal{M}_3\})$ at different magnifications. Only \mathcal{M}_1 has a vertex covector σ with $\{2, \dots, 6\} \subseteq \sigma^0$. In both \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 , the elements 3,4,5 are parallel and element 7 is a loop, but not in \mathcal{M}_3 . Pseudocircles 2 through 6 appear to meet at a common point at low magnification, but not at medium or high. Pseudocircles 3, 4, and 5 coincide and pseudocircle 7 vanishes at low and medium magnification, but not at high.

Given a rank 3 oriented matroid \mathcal{M} , and an arrangement $A \geq_w \mathcal{M}$, and $x \in \mathbf{S}^2$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \text{maxcov}(\mathcal{M}, A) : \mathbf{S}^2 &\rightarrow \text{cov}(\mathcal{M}) \text{ by} \\ \text{maxcov}(\mathcal{M}, A, x) &= \text{maxcov}(\mathcal{M}, \text{om}(A), \text{sign}(A, x)) \end{aligned}$$

We may simply write $\text{maxcov} = \text{maxcov}(\mathcal{M}, A)$ when \mathcal{M} and A are understood from context, and let $\text{maxcov}^{-1} = \text{maxcov}^{-1}(\mathcal{M}, A) = [\text{maxcov}(\mathcal{M}, A)]^{-1}$. In particular, for $\sigma \in \text{cov}(\mathcal{M})$, we have

$$\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma) = \{x \in \mathbf{S}^2 : \max(\text{cov}(\mathcal{M})_{\leq \text{sign}(A, x)}) = \sigma\};$$

see Figure 3. Let

$$\text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A) = \{p \in \mathbf{S}^2 : \exists i \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{M}) : \text{maxcov}(\mathcal{M}, A, p, i) = 0\}.$$

The *inradius* of a set X is the radius of the largest open metric disk contained in X . Let $\text{vanrad}(\mathcal{M}, A)$ be the inradius of $\text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A)$, and let $\text{maxlit}(\mathcal{M}, A)$ be the maximum value among $\text{vanrad}(\mathcal{M}, A)$ and the weights of loops of \mathcal{M} .

For a facet covector σ of \mathcal{M} , let $\text{inrad}(\mathcal{M}, \sigma, A)$ be the inradius of $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\mathcal{M}, A, \sigma)$. Let $\text{minbig}(\mathcal{M}, A)$ be the minimum among the value of $\text{inrad}(\mathcal{M}, \sigma, A)$ among facet covectors σ of \mathcal{M} and the weights of nonloops of \mathcal{M} .




Figure 3: Left: Oriented matroid \mathcal{M} represented by an oriented line arrangement. Right: Part of a pseudocircle arrangement, and $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma)$ for $\sigma = (+, 0, 0, 0, 0)$ in teal and for $\sigma = (+, +, +, 0, 0)$ in purple. Arrows indicate the positive side of each pseudocircle.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} \text{upa}(\mathcal{M}) &= \{A \in \text{PsV}_{3,n} : A \geq_w \mathcal{M}\}, \\ \text{hood}(\mathcal{M}) &= \{A \in \text{upa}(\mathcal{M}) : \text{maxlit}(\mathcal{M}, A) < \text{minbig}(\mathcal{M}, A)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Given a chain $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{M}_1 < \dots < \mathcal{M}_L\}$, let

$$\text{hood}(\mathcal{C}) = \bigcap_{k=1}^L \text{hood}(\mathcal{M}_k).$$

Let $\text{upa}(\chi), \text{hood}(\chi) \subset \text{PsV}_{3,n}$ be defined analogously for a chirotope $\chi \in \widetilde{\text{MacP}}_{3,n}$.

Lemma 3.2 (Open neighborhood). *hood(\mathcal{M}) is an O_3 -symmetric open neighborhood of $\text{PsV}(\mathcal{M})$.*

Lemma 3.3 (Disjoint neighborhoods). *If \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} are incomparable in the weak order, then $\text{hood}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\text{hood}(\mathcal{N})$ are disjoint.*

In Definition 5.3, we will define a map $\text{crush}(\mathcal{C}, \Omega)$ that satisfies the following.

Lemma 3.4 (Crush). *Given a finite chain $\mathcal{C} \subset \text{MacP}_{3,n}$ and $\Omega \in \text{upa}(\max(\mathcal{C}))$, then the map $\text{crush}(\mathcal{C}, \Omega)$ is a strong O_3 -equivariant deformation retraction from $\text{hood}(\mathcal{C}) \cap \text{upa}(\Omega)$ to the O_3 -orbit of Ω . Hence, $\text{hood}(\mathcal{C})/O_3$ is contractible.*

We will prove Lemma 3.3 in the next subsection, and Lemma 3.2 at the end of Section 4, and Lemma 3.4 at the end of Subsection 5.1.

Note that each oriented matroid \mathcal{M} corresponds to a pair of chirotopes $\chi, -\chi$. Moreover,

$\text{ot}(-A) = -\text{ot}(A)$, and order type is SO_3 -invariant, so $\text{hood}(\mathcal{M})$ is the disjoint union of $\text{hood}(\chi)$ and $\text{hood}(-\chi)$ since $\text{hood}(\mathcal{M})$ is O_3 -symmetric by Lemma 3.2, so by Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 we have the following.

Corollary 3.5. *If χ, ψ are incomparable chirotopes, then $\text{hood}(\chi)$ is a SO_3 -symmetric open neighborhood of $\text{PsV}(\chi)$, and $\text{hood}(\chi)$ and $\text{hood}(\psi)$ are disjoint.*

Similarly a chain of oriented matroids \mathcal{C} corresponds to a pair of chains $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}, -\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ of chirotopes, and $\text{hood}(\mathcal{C})$ is the disjoint union of $\text{hood}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})$ and $\text{hood}(-\tilde{\mathcal{C}})$. Also, the action of O_3 on $\text{PsV}_{3,n}$ is free by [11, Lemma 5.0.1], so the O_3 -orbit of an arrangement Ω has two connected components, namely the SO_3 -orbit of Ω and that of $-\Omega$, and by Lemma 3.4 we have the following.

Corollary 3.6. *If $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} \subset \widetilde{\text{MacP}}_{3,n}$ is a chain, then $\text{hood}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})/\text{SO}_3$ is contractible.*

The main theorem now follows from the above lemmas and their corollaries.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let

$$\mathcal{U} = \{\text{hood}(\mathcal{M})/\text{O}_3 : \mathcal{M} \in \text{MacP}_{3,n}\}.$$

Then, \mathcal{U} is an open cover of $\text{PsG}_{3,n}$ by Lemma 3.2. Also, every nonempty intersection of finitely many sets among \mathcal{U} is contractible by Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4, so $\text{PsG}_{3,n}$ is homotopy equivalent to the nerve of \mathcal{U} by the nerve theorem [18, Corollary 4G.3]. Moreover, a collection of sets among \mathcal{U} have a nonempty intersection precisely when the corresponding oriented matroids form a chain, so the nerve of \mathcal{U} is isomorphic as a simplicial complex to the geometric realization of the order complex of $\text{MacP}_{3,n}$, which is $\|\text{MacP}_{3,n}\|$. Thus, $\|\text{MacP}_{3,n}\|$ is homotopy equivalent to $\text{PsG}_{3,n}$, which is homotopy equivalent to $\text{G}_{3,n}$ by Theorem 1.4. Similarly, $\|\widetilde{\text{MacP}}_{3,n}\|$ is homotopy equivalent to $\tilde{\text{G}}_{3,n}$ by Corollaries 3.5 and 3.6. \square

While $\text{MacP}_{3,\infty}$ contains infinite ascending chains, we only need to consider finite chains, since only finite chains define a simplex of the nerve, or a simplex in the geometric realization of $\text{MacP}_{3,\infty}$.

3.1 Disjointness

In this subsection we prove Lemma 3.3.

Lemma 3.7. *If there is some triple $I \in \binom{[n]}{3}$ that is a basis for \mathcal{M}_1 but not for \mathcal{M}_0 and $A \in \text{upa}(\mathcal{M}_0) \cap \text{upa}(\mathcal{M}_1)$, then $\text{minbig}(\mathcal{M}_1, A) \leq \text{maxlit}(\mathcal{M}_0, A)$.*

Proof. Consider first the case where there is $i \in I$ such that i is a loop of \mathcal{M}_0 but not \mathcal{M}_1 . Then, by definitions of minbig and maxlit , we have

$$\text{minbig}(\mathcal{M}_1, A) \leq \text{wt}_i(A) \leq \text{maxlit}(\mathcal{M}_0, A).$$

Next, consider the case where no $i \in I$ is a loop of \mathcal{M}_0 . Since I is not a basis for \mathcal{M}_0 , there is some $\sigma \in \{+, -\}^I$ that is not in the restriction of $\text{cov}(\mathcal{M}_0)$ to I , but I is a basis for \mathcal{M}_1 , so every element of $\{+, -\}^I$ appears in the restriction of $\text{cov}(\mathcal{M}_1)$ to I , so there is a facet covector τ of \mathcal{M}_1 such that $\text{rest}(I, \tau) = \sigma$. Let r be the maximum radius of a disk D in $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\mathcal{M}_1, A, \tau)$. Then, $\text{rest}(I, \text{sign}(A, p)) = \sigma$ on each point $p \in D$, so $\text{maxcov}(\mathcal{M}_0, A, p)$ must vanish on some $i \in I$, which is a nonloop of \mathcal{M}_0 in this case, so $D \subset \text{van}(\mathcal{M}_0, A)$. Thus,

$$\text{minbig}(\mathcal{M}_1, A) \leq r \leq \text{maxlit}(\mathcal{M}_0, A). \quad \square$$

Proof of Lemma 3.3. Suppose there were $A \in \text{hood}(\mathcal{M}) \cap \text{hood}(\mathcal{N})$. Then, there would be some triple that is a basis for \mathcal{M} but not for \mathcal{N} , since $\mathcal{M} \not\leq \mathcal{N}$ and both are below $\text{om}(A)$ in the weak order, so

$$\text{minbig}(\mathcal{M}, A) \leq \text{maxlit}(\mathcal{N}, A) < \text{minbig}(\mathcal{N}, A)$$

by Lemma 3.7. Likewise, there would be some other triple that is a basis for \mathcal{N} but not \mathcal{M} , so $\text{minbig}(\mathcal{N}, A) < \text{minbig}(\mathcal{M}, A)$, which is a contradiction. \square

4 Openness and borders

Here we will prove Lemma 3.2. Most of the work will be to show that $\text{hood}(\mathcal{M})$ is open. To this end, we show that minbig and maxlit are continuous, by showing that the borders between regions $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma)$ vary continuously. This is captured by the following lemma, which will also be useful for showing continuity in the proof of Lemma 3.4.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\Sigma = \{v < \sigma\} \subset \text{csp}(\mathcal{M})$ and consider an arrangement $A \geq_w \mathcal{M}$. Then,*

1. $B = \text{cl}(\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma)) \cap \text{cl}(\text{maxcov}^{-1}(v))$ is a (≤ 1) -cell.
2. There are precisely 2 covectors $\tau_0, \tau_1 \in \text{csp}(\mathcal{M})$ such that $\Sigma \cup \{\tau_i\}$ is a chain. Moreover, the endpoints of B are $p_i = B \cap \text{cl}(\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\tau_i))$.
3. B directed from p_0 to p_1 varies continuously in Fréchet distance as the arrangement A varies.

Recall we order define a partial order \leq_v on signs $\{0, +, -\}$ by $0 <_v (+)$, and $0 <_v (-)$, and $(+), (-)$ are incomparable.

Lemma 4.2. $\text{sign} : \text{PsV}_{3,n} \times \mathbf{S}^2 \rightarrow \{0, +, -\}^n$ is lower semicontinuous for $n \leq \infty$. That is, if $A_t \rightarrow A_\infty$ and $x_t \rightarrow x_\infty$ are convergent sequences, then $\text{sign}(A_\infty, x_\infty) \leq_v \text{sign}(A_t, x_t)$ for all t sufficiently large.

Proof. Let $\sigma_t = \text{sign}(A_t, x_t)$. In the case where $\sigma_\infty(i) = 0$, then $\sigma_\infty(i) \leq \sigma_t(i)$ regardless of the value of $\sigma_t(i)$, so let us assume by symmetry that $\sigma_\infty(i) = (+)$. Let δ be the distance between x_∞ and $S_i(A_\infty)$. Then, $\text{wt}_i(A_\infty) > 0$, and $\text{wt}_i(A_t) \rightarrow \text{wt}_i(A_\infty)$, so $\text{wt}_i(A_t) > 0$ for t sufficiently large, and so $S_i(A_t) \rightarrow S_i(A_\infty)$ in Fréchet distance, so $S_i^+(A_t)$ is within Hausdorff distance $\delta/3$ of $S_i^+(A_\infty)$ for t sufficiently large. Also, x_t is within $\delta/3$ of x_∞ for t sufficiently large, so $x_t \in S_i^+(A_t)$, so $\sigma_\infty(i) = \sigma_t(i)$ in the case where $\sigma_\infty(i) \neq 0$. \square

Lemma 4.3. $\text{om} : \text{PsV}_{3,n} \rightarrow \text{MacP}_{3,n}$ is lower semicontinuous for $n \leq \infty$. That is, if $A_t \rightarrow A_\infty$, then $A_\infty \leq_w A_t$ for t sufficiently large. Likewise, ot is lower semicontinuous.

Proof. Consider $\sigma_\infty \in \text{cov}(A_\infty)$. Then, there is $p \in \mathbf{S}^2$ such that $\text{sign}(A_\infty, p) = \sigma_\infty$. We may assume that A_t has the same support as A_∞ ; otherwise $A_t \geq_w A_\infty$ provided that $\text{rest}(\text{supp}(\mathcal{M}), A_t) \geq_w A_\infty$. Hence, there are only finitely many $\sigma_t \in \{0, +, -\}^n$ such that $\text{sign}(A_t, p) = \sigma_t$ occurs infinity often as $t \rightarrow \infty$, and $\sigma_\infty \leq_v \sigma_t$ by Lemma 4.2, so $A_\infty \leq_w A_t$ in each of these cases, so $A_\infty \leq_w A_t$ for t sufficiently large since there are finitely many cases. \square

Let us next show that the endpoints of the border between adjacent regions defined by maxcov are indeed well-defined points.

Lemma 4.4.

$$p = \bigcap_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \text{cl}(\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma))$$

is a single point for each maximal chain $\Sigma \subset \text{csph}(\mathcal{M})$, and each arrangement $A \geq_w \mathcal{M}$.

Proof. Let $\Sigma = \{v < \sigma < \tau\}$ and let $\tau_{\text{top}} > \sigma$ be the only facet covector other than τ that is above σ . Then, $\text{om}(A)$ can be represented by x-monotone pseudolines in the projective plane \mathbf{P}^2 as the closure of \mathbb{R}^2 such that $\text{cell}(A, \tau_{\text{top}})$ is the region above the upper envelope of each curve [9, Theorem 6.3.3]. Let us assume that $\pi(A)$ is such a pseudoline arrangement where $\pi : \mathbf{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^2$ is the standard covering map. Moreover, let us assume by choice of horizon of the projective plane on the 2-sphere that $C = \pi(\text{cell}(A, \tau)) \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \subset \mathbf{P}^2$ is a cell in the Euclidean plane. Since $\sigma = \tau \wedge \tau_{\text{top}}$ is an edge covector, i.e., a subtope, each nonloop i satisfies $\tau(i) \neq \tau_{\text{top}}(i)$ if and only if $i \in \sigma^0$ [9, Lemma 4.2.2]. Hence, the curves above C are precisely the curves S_i for $i \in \sigma^0$, so the upper envelope of C is $E = \text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma) \cap \text{cl}(\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\tau))$, and since $\text{sign}(A)$ is lower semicontinuous, p is an endpoint of E . \square

Proof of Lemma 4.1 parts 1 and 2. Consider the case where $\Sigma = \{v < \sigma\}$ consists of a vertex covector and an edge covector, and let $p \in B$. Then, p is the limit point of one sequence $p_{\sigma,k}$ in $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma)$ and the limit point of another sequence $p_{v,k}$ in $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(v)$, so $\text{sign}(A, p_{v,k}) <_v \sigma \leq_v \text{sign}(A, p_{\sigma,k})$, so $\text{sign}(A, p) <_v \sigma$ since sign is lower semicontinuous, so $p \in S_i = S_i(A)$ for some $i \in v^0 \setminus \sigma^0$. Hence, B is a union of vertices and edges of A .

Consider a vertex v of B , and let $I_v = \{i : \text{sign}(A, v) = 0\}$. Then, $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma)$ coincides locally around v with the intersection of the open pseudohemispheres $S_i^{\sigma(i)}$ for $i \in I_v \setminus \sigma^0$ and closed pseudohemispheres $\text{cl}(S_j^{-\tau(j)})$ for $j \in (I_v \cap \sigma^0) \setminus \tau^0$ where $\tau > \sigma$ is a facet covector.

In the case where there is no such facet covector τ , then $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma)$ coincides locally with an intersection of open pseudohemispheres, and the compliment coincides locally with $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(v)$, so two of the corresponding pseudocircles are on the boundary between $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma)$ and $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(v)$, so v has degree 2 in B .

In the case where there is only one such τ , then $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma)$ coincides locally with an intersection of open pseudohemispheres $S_i^{\sigma(i)}$ and one closed pseudohemisphere $\text{cl}(S_j^{-\tau(j)})$. Also, τ must be a facet covector of A as well as \mathcal{M} since $A \geq_w \mathcal{M}$, so there is an open cell $C = \text{cell}(A, \tau)$ and v is on the boundary of this cell. If the compliments $\text{cl}(S_i^{-\sigma(i)})$ of the open pseudohemispheres were to locally cover the compliment $S_j^{\tau(j)}$ of the closed pseudohemisphere, then for every point p sufficiently close to v , if $\text{sign}(A, p, j) = \tau(j)$ then $\text{sign}(A, p, i) \neq \sigma(i) = \tau(i)$ for some $i \in I_v \setminus \sigma^0$ depending on p , which would mean $p \notin C$, but that would contradict that v is on the boundary of C . Hence, the closed pseudohemisphere $\text{cl}(S_j^{-\tau(j)})$ is not covered by the closure of the open pseudohemispheres, so one of the pseudocircles S_i is on the boundary between $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma)$ and $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(v)$ and another S_j is on the boundary between $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma)$ and $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\tau)$, so v has degree 1 in B .

In the case where there are two such τ , then $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma)$ locally intersects the boundaries of $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\tau)$ for each such τ , and this locally covers the boundary of $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma)$ by a similar argument as above, so v is an isolated vertex of B .

By Lemma 4.4, B intersects each closed region $\text{cl}(\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\tau))$ for $\tau > \sigma$ at a point, so B has either 2 vertices of degree 1 or has a single isolated vertex, and all other vertices, if there be any, have degree 2. Therefore, B consists of one connected component that is either an isolated vertex or a path along with a disjoint union of cycles.

Suppose B had a cycle C . Then, C would divide the sphere into two regions by the Jordan curve theorem with $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(v)$ and $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma)$ locally on either side of C . Also, $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(v)$ and $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma)$ are path connected and no path through either set could cross C , since that would give B a vertex of degree at least 3, so $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(v) \setminus C$ and $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma)$ would be separated by C , but that contradicts that B also has a connected component that is a path or point. Thus, the disjoint union of cycles is empty, and so B is

a path or point. An analogous argument holds in the cases where Σ consists of a vertex and facet covector or of an edge and facet covector, which means part 1 holds, and since the vertices of degree 1 in the case where B is a path are those on a closed pseudohemisphere $\text{cl}(S_j^{-\tau(j)})$, part 2 holds. \square

To complete the proof of Lemma 4.1, it remains to show that the boarder B varies continuously. We first show that objects appearing in the definition of B vary continuously.

Lemma 4.5. *If P, Q are a pair of directed paths that meet at a single point, then $P \cap Q$ varies continuously as P and Q vary in Fréchet distance. This holds analogously for undirected paths and for closed curves in the projective plane.*

This is essentially the same as [11, Lemma 3.1.3]. We do not repeat the argument here.

Lemma 4.6. *If $P_{i,k} \rightarrow P_\infty$ is a sequence of directed paths that converges in Fréchet distance as $k \rightarrow \infty$ for each $i \in [n]_{\mathbb{N}}$, and Q_k is a directed path that first traverses an arc of $P_{1,k}$, and then an arc of $P_{2,k}$, and so on until traversing an arc of $P_{n,k}$, then $Q_k \rightarrow P_\infty$ in Fréchet distance.*

Proof. Let us assume that $n = 2$ since the general case will follow by induction using the same argument as in the $n = 2$ case.

Let $\varphi_{i,k} : [0, 1]_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow P_{i,k}$ be parameterizations that converge to some parameterization $\varphi_\infty : [0, 1]_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow P_\infty$ in the sup-metric as in the hypothesis of the Lemma. Note what we may assume that these converge to the same φ_∞ for both $i \in \{1, 2\}$; otherwise we can reparameterize appropriately. Let $a_k \in [0, 1]$ be the last time where $P_{1,k}$ traverses Q_k , i.e.,

$$a_k = \sup\{t \in [0, 1] : \varphi_{1,k}([0, t]) \subset Q_k\},$$

and let $q_k = \varphi_{1,k}(a_k)$. Observe that every point of Q_k after q_k must be in $P_{2,k}$, and in particular, $q_k \in P_{1,k} \cap P_{2,k} \cap Q_k$.

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, and cover P_∞ by open arcs of diameter at most ε . Since P_∞ is compact, we may choose a finite subcover. Let C be the finite cover of P_∞ by the closure of each arc, and let δ be the minimum separation distance between disjoint arcs of this cover. Note that $\delta > 0$ since the arcs are each compact. Let us assume that $\delta < \varepsilon$ and k is sufficiently large that $\|\varphi_{i,k} - \varphi_\infty\|(t) < \delta/4$.

Let $b_k \in [a_k, 1]$ be the first time after a_k where $P_{2,k}$ is at least ε away from q_k , or 1 if this never occurs, i.e.,

$$b_k = \inf\{1, t \in [a_k, 1] : \|\varphi_{2,k}(t) - q_k\| \geq \varepsilon\}.$$

Then, $\|\varphi_{2,k} - \varphi_{1,k}\|(t) < \delta/2 < \varepsilon/2$, so $\|\varphi_{2,k}(a_k) - q_k\| < \varepsilon/2$, so $b_k > a_k$.

Let $c_k = \varphi_{2,k}^{-1}(q_k)$. Then, $\|\varphi_\infty(c_k) - q_k\| < \delta/4$ and likewise for a_k , so $\|\varphi_\infty(c_k) - \varphi_\infty(a_k)\| < \delta/2$, so $\varphi_\infty(a_k)$ and $\varphi_\infty(c_k)$ cannot be in disjoint arcs of the cover C , so $\varphi_\infty([c_k, a_k])$ has diameter no more than 2ε , so $\varphi_{2,k}([c_k, a_k])$ has diameter less than 3ε , so $\varphi_{2,k}([c_k, b_k])$ has diameter less than 5ε . Note that we do not know the order of a_k and c_k , but if $a_k \leq c_k$, then $\varphi_{2,k}([c_k, b_k]) \subseteq \varphi_{2,k}([a_k, b_k])$ has diameter at most 2ε .

We now define a parameterization ψ_k of Q_k , which also depends on ε . For $t \leq a_k$, let $\psi_k(t) = \varphi_{1,k}(t)$. For $t \geq b_k$, let $\psi_k(t) = \varphi_{2,k}(t)$. And for $t \in [a_k, b_k]$, let ψ_k be an arbitrarily chosen parameterization of the arc $\varphi_{2,k}([c_k, b_k]) \subseteq P_{2,k}$ from q_k to $\varphi_{2,k}(b_k)$. Then, $\|\psi_k - \varphi_\infty\|(t) < \varepsilon/4$ for $t \notin (a_k, b_k)$ by choice of k sufficiently large. Also, $\|\psi_k - \varphi_\infty\|(t) < 9\varepsilon$ for $t \in [a_k, b_k]$ since the arc $\psi_k([a_k, b_k]) = \varphi_{2,k}([c_k, b_k])$ has diameter less than 5ε , and the arc $\varphi_\infty([a_k, b_k])$ has diameter less than 3ε , and $\|\psi_k - \varphi_\infty\|(b_k) < \delta/4 < \varepsilon$. Hence $\text{dist}_F(Q_k, P_\infty) < 9\varepsilon$.

By letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we have $Q_k \rightarrow P_\infty$ in Fréchet distance. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.1 part 3. Consider a convergent sequence $A_k \rightarrow A_\infty$. and let B_k and $p_{i,k}$ be defined from A_k as in the statement of the lemma.

In the case where B_k is a point for k sufficiently large, there is some curve S_j through B_k with $j \in \nu^0 \setminus \sigma^0$ that crosses a curve along the boundary of $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\tau_0)$ at $p_{0,k} = B_k$, so $B_k \rightarrow B_\infty$ by Lemma 4.5.

Consider the case where B_k is not a point for all k sufficiently large. We already have that B_k consists of a sequence of arcs along curves $S_{j_1}(A_k), \dots, S_{j_m}(A_k)$ from $p_{0,k}$ to $p_{1,k}$ from the proof of parts 1 and 2 above. Since it suffices to show convergence in finitely many cases, we may assume that the sequence j_1, \dots, j_m is fixed for each $k < \infty$. The curve B_∞ also consists of such a sequence of arcs, but possibly with additional degeneracies since $A_\infty \leq A_k$ by Lemma 4.3, so we can partition j_1, \dots, j_m into subintervals $j_{1,1}, \dots, j_{1,m_1}, j_{2,1}, \dots, j_{n,m_n}$ as follows. For i even, each curve of the subinterval $S_{j_{i,1}}, \dots, S_{j_{i,m_i}}$ converges to a common curve that traverses an arc of B_∞ that is not a single point. Let the i th subinterval for i odd be the intervening curves. Note that the subinterval could be empty in the case where i is odd, or all curves could be contained in a single subinterval, which could be $i = 1$ or $i = 2$, but at least one subinterval is nonempty. Also, B_∞ is a sequence of arcs along $S_{j_{2,1}}, S_{j_{4,1}} \dots, S_{j_{n-1,1}}$.

The even subintervals converge appropriately by Lemma 4.6, so let us consider the case where i is odd. To reduce the need for special cases, let $S_{j_{0,1}}$ be a curve along the boundary of $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\tau_0)$ through $p_{0,k}$ and let $S_{j_{n+1,1}}$ be that of $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\tau_1)$ through $p_{1,k}$. Then, curves $S_{j_{i-1,m_{i-1}}}$ and $S_{j_{i+1,1}}$ never become parallel, so their intersection varies continuously by Lemma 4.5. Similarly, $S_{j_{i-1,m_{i-1}}} \cap S_{j_{i,h}}$ and $S_{j_{i,h}} \cap S_{j_{i+1,1}}$ vary continuously, provided that the i -th subinterval is nonempty. Moreover, the order type of $[S_{j_{i-1,m_{i-1}}}, S_{j_{i,h}}, S_{j_{i+1,1}}](A_\infty)$ is either the same as that in A_k or 0 by Lemma 4.3. In the former case, a curve of an odd

interval would intersect B_∞ in more than one point contradicting the choice of partition into even and odd intervals. Hence, the later case must hold, which means the curves $[S_{j_{i-1}, m_{i-1}}, S_{j_i, h}, S_{j_{i+1}, 1}](A_\infty)$ meet at a common point, and the arc of B_k along the i -th interval converges to that point by Lemma 4.5. Thus, $B_k \rightarrow B_\infty$. \square

Next we show that objects and parameters in the definition of $\text{hood}(\mathcal{M})$ vary continuously.

Lemma 4.7. *Given a covector $\sigma \in \text{cspH}(\mathcal{M})$, then $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\mathcal{M}, A; \sigma)$ varies continuously in Hausdorff distance as $A \succeq_w \mathcal{M}$ varies. Hence, $\text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A)^c$ varies continuously in Hausdorff distance.*

Proof. Consider a convergent sequence $A_k \rightarrow A_\infty$ in $\text{upa}(\mathcal{M})$, and let $R_k = R_k(\sigma) = \text{maxcov}^{-1}(\mathcal{M}, A_k, \sigma)$. Since $\widehat{\text{cov}}(\mathcal{M})$ is thin and \mathcal{M} has rank 3, the intersection graph of pairs $\{\tau, \nu\}$ that form a chain with σ is a regular graph G of degree 2, and G is connected by the circuit elimination axiom, so G is a cycle. Also, ∂R_k is covered by (≤ 1) -cells of the form $B_{\nu, k} = \text{cl}(R_k) \cap \text{cl}(\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\nu))$ with endpoints of the form $p_{\nu, \tau, k} = B_{\nu, k} \cap B_{\tau, k}$ by Lemma 4.1 parts 1 and 2, and so we have surjective maps $\varphi_k : \mathbf{S}^1 \rightarrow \partial R_k$ such that $\varphi_k \rightarrow \varphi_\infty$ in the sup-metric by Lemma 4.1 part 3. Also, R_k is on the same side of $B_{\nu, k}$ for all k sufficiently large since $A_k \rightarrow A_\infty$, so membership in R_k is determined by winding number of φ_k . If $x \in \mathbf{S}^2$ is at least distance $\varepsilon > 0$ away from ∂R_∞ , then the winding number of φ_k around x is the same as that of φ_∞ for k sufficiently large, so $x \in R_k$ if and only if $x \in R_\infty$. Hence, the Hausdorff distance between R_k and R_∞ is at most ε , so $R_k \rightarrow R_\infty$. For the last part, observe that

$$\text{dist}_H(\text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A_k)^c, \text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A_\infty)^c) \leq \max_\sigma \text{dist}_H(R_k(\sigma), R_\infty(\sigma))$$

among facet covectors σ . \square

Lemma 4.8. *The maps $\text{vanrad}(\mathcal{M}), \text{inrad}(\mathcal{M}, \sigma), \text{minbig}(\mathcal{M}), \text{maxlit}(\mathcal{M}) : \text{upa}(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are each continuous.*

Proof. We start with $\text{vanrad}(\mathcal{M})$, which will take most of the work. Consider a convergent sequence $A_m \rightarrow A_\infty$, and suppose $r_m = \text{vanrad}(\mathcal{M}, A_m)$ does not converge to $r_\infty = \text{vanrad}(\mathcal{M}, A_\infty)$. Since the range of $\text{vanrad}(\mathcal{M})$ is compact, we may assume $r_m \rightarrow \tilde{r}_\infty$.

Consider the case where $\tilde{r}_\infty \leq r_\infty - \varepsilon$ with $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, $\text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A_\infty)$ contains a metric disk D of radius r_∞ . Also, $\text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A_m)^c \rightarrow \text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A_\infty)^c$ in Hausdorff distance by Lemma 4.7, so $\text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A_m)^c \subseteq \text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A_\infty)^c \oplus (\varepsilon/3)$ for all m sufficiently large. Let C be the disk concentric with D of radius $r_\infty - (\varepsilon/2)$. Then, each point of C is at least distance $(\varepsilon/2)$ from any point in $\text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A_\infty)^c$, whereas each point of $\text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A_m)^c$ is within distance $(\varepsilon/3)$ of some point in $\text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A_\infty)^c$, so C is disjoint from $\text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A_m)^c$, so $C \subset \text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A_m)$, so $r_m \geq r_\infty - (\varepsilon/2)$, so $\tilde{r}_\infty \geq r_\infty - (\varepsilon/2)$, which is a contradiction.

Consider the case where $\tilde{r}_\infty \geq r_\infty + \varepsilon$ with $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, $\text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A_m)$ contains a disk D_m of radius $r_\infty + (\varepsilon/2)$ for all m sufficiently large. Since \mathbf{S}^2 is compact, we may restrict to a subsequence where the center points of these disks converge to point, and this is the center point of a disk D of radius $r_\infty + (\varepsilon/3)$, which is contained in $\text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A_m)$ for m sufficiently large. Again by Lemma 4.7, we have $\text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A_m)^c \rightarrow \text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A_\infty)^c$ in Hausdorff distance, so $\text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A_\infty)^c \subseteq \text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A_m)^c \oplus (\varepsilon/6)$ for all m sufficiently large. Let C be a disk concentric with D of radius $r_\infty + (\varepsilon/9)$. Then, each point of C is at least distance $(r_\infty + (\varepsilon/3)) - (r_\infty + (\varepsilon/9)) = (2\varepsilon/9)$ from any point in $\text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A_m)^c$, whereas each point of $\text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A_\infty)^c$ is within distance $(\varepsilon/9)$ of some point in $\text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A_m)^c$, so C is disjoint from $\text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A_\infty)^c$, so $C \subset \text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A_\infty)$, so $r_\infty \geq r_\infty + (\varepsilon/9)$, which is a contradiction. In each case we have a contradiction, so we must have $r_\infty = r_\infty$, and so $\text{vanrad}(\mathcal{M})$ is continuous.

Since $\partial \text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma)$ varies continuously in Fréchet distance by Lemma 4.1, the radius of the largest disk contained in the region bounded by the closed curve $\partial \text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma)$ also varies continuously, so $\text{inrad}(\mathcal{M}, \sigma)$ is continuous. Also, weights wt_i vary continuously by definition of the metric on $\text{PsV}_{3,n}$. With this, minbig and maxlit are respectively a minimum and a maximum of a finite collection of continuous functions, and as such are continuous □

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Consider $A \in \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M})$. Then, $\text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A)$ is a collection of pseudocircles, so $\text{vanrad}(\mathcal{M}, A) = 0$, and loops of \mathcal{M} are loops of A , so $\text{maxlit}(\mathcal{M}, A) = 0$. Also, $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma)$ is a Jordan domain for each facet covector σ , so $\text{inrad}(\mathcal{M}, \sigma, A) > 0$, and nonloops of \mathcal{M} are nonloops of A , so $\text{minbig}(\mathcal{M}, A) > 0$. Hence, $A \in \text{hood}(\mathcal{M})$, so $\text{PsV}(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq \text{hood}(\mathcal{M})$.

We have $\text{upa}(\mathcal{M}) \subset \text{PsV}_{3,n}$ is open by Lemma 4.3, and $\text{hood}(\mathcal{M}) \subset \text{upa}(\mathcal{M})$ is defined by a strict inequality between continuous functions by Lemma 4.8, so $\text{hood}(\mathcal{M})$ is open.

Also, $\text{van}(\mathcal{M}, QA) = Q \text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A)$ and $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\mathcal{M}, QA; \sigma) = Q \text{maxcov}^{-1}(\mathcal{M}, A; \sigma)$ for $Q \in O_3$, so $\text{vanrad}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\text{inrad}(\mathcal{M}, \sigma)$ are O_3 -invariant, and weights of pseudocircles are also invariant, so minbig and maxlit are invariant, so $\text{hood}(\mathcal{M})$ is O_3 -symmetric. □

5 Crushing neighborhoods

5.1 Ebb to Crush

Here we define the deformation retraction $\text{crush}(\mathcal{C}, \Omega)$ of Lemma 3.4 and prove the lemma. For this we use the deformation retraction $\text{crush}(\Omega)$ of Theorem 1.3 from $\text{PsV}(\Omega)$ to the orbit of Ω , and another deformation $\text{ebb}_R(\mathcal{C}, r)$ in Definition 5.10, which will use another deformation $\text{ebb}_D(\mathcal{C}, \varepsilon)$ in Definition 8.2. These deformations will make use of the following parameter.

Definition 5.1 (Little-big ratio).

$$\text{lbr}(\mathcal{M}, A) = \frac{\text{maxlit}(\mathcal{M}, A)}{\text{minbig}(\mathcal{M}, A)}$$

Note that $\text{lbr}(\mathcal{M})$ tests membership in both $\text{hood}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\text{PsV}(\mathcal{M})$ among $A \in \text{upa}(\mathcal{M})$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{hood}(\mathcal{M}) &= \{A \in \text{upa}(\mathcal{M}) : \text{lbr}(\mathcal{M}, A) < 1\}, \\ \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M}) &= \{A \in \text{upa}(\mathcal{M}) : \text{lbr}(\mathcal{M}, A) = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

The properties of ebb_R we use are as follows.

Lemma 5.2 (Ratio ebb). *Let $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_{L-1} \sqcup \{\mathcal{M}_L\} = \{\mathcal{M}_1 < \dots < \mathcal{M}_{L-1} < \mathcal{M}_L\}$ be a nonempty chain of oriented matroids and $r \in [0, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}$. Then, $\varphi = \text{ebb}_R(\mathcal{C}, r)$ is a strong equivariant deformation retraction from $\text{hood}(\mathcal{C}_{L-1}) \cap \text{upa}(\mathcal{M}_L)$ to $\text{hood}(\mathcal{C}_{L-1}) \cap \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M}_L)$ satisfying the following.*

1. $\varphi(A, t)$ varies continuously as (r, A, t) vary.
2. $\text{ot}(\varphi(A, t)) = \text{ot}(A)$ is unchanging for $t < 1$.
3. If $\text{lbr}(\mathcal{M}_L, A) \leq r$, then $\varphi(A, t) \in \text{hood}(\mathcal{M}_L)$ for all t .

Definition 5.3 (Crush). Here we globally define the map $\text{crush}(\mathcal{C}, \Omega) : X \times [0, 1]_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow X$ on $X = \text{hood}(\mathcal{C}) \cap \text{upa}(\Omega)$. Let $A_t = \text{crush}(\mathcal{C}, \Omega; A, t)$ locally within this subsection.

We define crush recursively on the length of \mathcal{C} . Given $A \in \text{hood}(\mathcal{C})$, let

$$\text{crush}(\emptyset, \Omega; A, t) = A_t = [\text{crush}(\Omega) \cdot \text{ebb}_R(\text{om}(\Omega), 0)](A, t)$$

be the deformation in the case where the chain is empty, and for the recursive step with $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_L\}$ nonempty, let

$$\text{crush}(\mathcal{C}, \Omega; A, t) = A_t = \text{ebb}_R(\mathcal{C}, r; A_{\text{rec}, t}, s_t)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\text{rec}, t} &= \text{crush}(\mathcal{C}_{L-1}, \Omega; A, t), \\ \mathcal{C}_{L-1} &= \{\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_{L-1}\}, \\ r &= \max\{\text{lbr}(\mathcal{M}_L; A_x) : A_x \in \{A, \Omega\}\}, \end{aligned}$$

and where $s_t = s_t(A)$ is a stopping time defined as follows. We want s_t to be large enough to guarantee that $\text{ebb}_R(\mathcal{C}, r; A_{\text{rec}, t}, s_t) \in \text{hood}(\mathcal{M}_L)$, and s_t should depend continuously on

A and t . To this end, we should use some parameter that tells us when the arrangement is in hood(\mathcal{M}_L) and we can stop applying ebb. The little-big ratio is such a parameter, but while ebb will eventually reduce the little-big ratio to a sufficiently small value, we would rather have a parameter that is strictly decreasing as a function of stopping time so that our stopping time will be well defined. Instead, we will define a strictly decreasing upper bound b_t for the little-big ratio. Formally, let

$$s_t = \text{ext}(b_t^{-1}, y_t) = \begin{cases} b_t^{-1}(y_t) & b_t(0) > y_t \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} b_t(x) &= \text{tailsup}(b_{\text{test}}(A_{\text{rec},t}), x) + c(1 - x) \\ b_{\text{test}}(A_x; x) &= \text{lbr}(\mathcal{M}_L, \text{ebb}_R(\mathcal{C}, r; A_x, x)) \\ y_t &= tb_1(0) + (1 - t)b_0(0). \\ c &= (1/2)(1 - \sup\{b_{\text{test}}(A_x, x) : A_x \in \{A, \Omega\}, x \in [0, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}\}) \end{aligned}$$

We will show in Claim 5.7 that the two expressions for s_t are equivalent and that s_t is well defined.

Lemma 5.4. *Given $A \in \text{upa}(\mathcal{M})$, then $\text{minbig}(\mathcal{M}, A) > 0$ and $\text{maxlit}(\mathcal{M}, A) \geq 0$ with ‘=’ if and only if $A \in \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M})$. Hence, $\text{lbr}(\mathcal{M})$ is well defined, nonnegative, and continuous on $\text{upa}(\mathcal{M})$, and $\text{lbr}(\mathcal{M}, A) = 0$ if and only if $A \in \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M})$.*

Proof. Both minbig and maxlit are defined as extrema of weights of pseudocircles and radii of disks, so both are nonnegative.

If $A \in \text{upa}(\mathcal{M})$, then each pseudocircle of A corresponding to a nonloop of \mathcal{M} has positive weight, and $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\mathcal{M}, A, \sigma)$ is a nonempty open region for each facet covector σ , and as such contains a disk of positive radius, so $\text{minbig}(\mathcal{M}, A) > 0$ in the case where $A \in \text{upa}(\mathcal{M})$.

If $A \in \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M})$, then each pseudocircle of A corresponding to a loop of \mathcal{M} has weight 0, and each facet covector of A is a facet covector of \mathcal{M} , so $\text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A)$ is a finite collection of pseudocircles, so $\text{van}(\mathcal{M}, A)$ does not contain a disk of positive radius, so $\text{maxlit}(\mathcal{M}, A) = 0$ in the case where $A \in \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M})$.

If $A \in \text{upa}(\mathcal{M}) \setminus \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M})$, then $\text{om}(A) >_{\text{w}} \mathcal{M}$, so some triple $I \in \binom{[n]}{3}$ is a basis for A but not for \mathcal{M} , so by Lemma 3.7, $0 < \text{minbig}(\text{om}(A), A) \leq \text{maxlit}(\mathcal{M}, A)$ in this case.

For the last part, $\text{lbr}(\mathcal{M}, A)$ is well-defined since $\text{minbig}(\mathcal{M}, A) > 0$, and $\text{lbr}(\mathcal{M}, A) = 0$ if and only if $A \in \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M})$ since the same holds for $\text{maxlit}(\mathcal{M}, A)$. Also, $\text{lbr}(\mathcal{M})$ is

continuous since $\text{minbig}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\text{maxlit}(\mathcal{M})$ are continuous by Lemma 4.8. \square

Claim 5.5. $s_0 = s_1 = 0$ and $A_0 = A_{\text{rec},0} = A$.

Proof. We have $y_0 = b_0(0)$ and $y_1 = b_1(0)$ so $s_0 = s_1 = 0$ by definition. Hence,

$$A_0 = \text{ebb}_R(\mathcal{C}, r; A_{\text{rec},0}, 0) = A_{\text{rec},0}$$

since $\text{ebb}_R(\mathcal{C}, r)$ is a deformation retraction by 5.2, and

$$A_{\text{rec},0} = \text{crush}(\mathcal{C}_{L-1}, \Omega; A, 0) = A$$

since $\text{crush}(\mathcal{C}_{L-1}, \Omega)$ is a deformation retraction by induction on L . \square

Claim 5.6. $c > 0$ and $0 < y_t < 1$.

Proof. We have $r \geq \text{lbr}(\mathcal{M}_L, A_x)$ for $A_x \in \{A, \Omega\}$ by definition, so $\text{ebb}_R(\mathcal{C}, r; A_x, x) \in \text{hood}(\mathcal{M}_L)$ by Lemma 5.2 part 3, so $b_{\text{test}}(A_x, x) < 1$ for each $x \in [0, 1]$ by definition of hood, so $\sup\{b_{\text{test}}(A_x, x) : x \in [0, 1]\} < 1$ since x is in a compact domain, so $c > 0$.

Also, $A_{\text{rec},0} = A$ by Claim 5.5, so

$$f_0(0) = \sup\{b_{\text{test}}(A, x) : x \in [0, 1]\} + c \leq (1/2)(1 + \sup\{b_{\text{test}}(A, x) : x \in [0, 1]\}) < 1.$$

Similarly $b_1(0) < 1$ since $A_{\text{rec},1} = \Omega$ by induction using Lemma 3.4. Hence, $y_t < 1$. Also, lbr is always nonnegative, so b_{test} is nonnegative, so $b_t(0) > 0$ since $c > 0$, so $y_t > 0$. \square

Claim 5.7. b_t is strictly decreasing and $b_t(1) = 0$. Hence, $s_t < 1$ is well defined.

Proof. $b_t(x)$ is the sum of a nonincreasing function of x , namely $\text{tailsup}(b_{\text{test}}(A_{\text{rec},t}), x)$, and $c(1 - x)$, which is a strictly decreasing since $c > 0$ by Claim 5.6. Since $\text{ebb}_R(\mathcal{C}, r)$ is a deformation retraction to a subset of $\text{PsV}(\mathcal{M}_L)$, we have

$$b_t(1) = \text{tailsup}(b_{\text{test}}(A_{\text{rec},t}), 1) = b_{\text{test}}(A_{\text{rec},t}, 1) = \text{lbr}(\mathcal{M}_L, \text{ebb}_R(\mathcal{C}, r; A_{\text{rec},t}, 1)) = 0,$$

by Lemma 5.4. Either $y_t \geq b_t(0)$, in which case $s_t = 0$, or $0 < y_t < b_t(0)$, in which case y_t is in the range of b_t , so $s_t = b_t^{-1}(y_t)$ is well defined since b_t is strictly decreasing. Moreover, $\text{ebb}_R(\mathcal{C}, r; A_{\text{rec},t}, x) \in \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M})$ only at $x = 1$ by Lemma 5.2 part 2, so $b_t(x) = 0$ only at $x = 1$ by Lemma 5.4, so $b_t^{-1}(y)$ only attains the value 1 at $y = 0$, but $y_t > 0$ by Claim 5.6, so $s_t < 1$. \square

Claim 5.8. s_t varies continuously as A, t vary.

Proof. $A_{\text{rec},t}$ varies continuously by induction, and $\text{ebb}_R(\mathcal{C})$ is continuous by Lemma 5.2 part 1, and $\text{lbr}(\mathcal{M}_L)$ is continuous by Lemma 5.4, so $r = \max(\text{lbr}(\mathcal{M}_L, \{A, \Omega\}))$ varies continuously, so $b_{\text{test}}(A_{\text{rec},t}, x) = \text{lbr}(\mathcal{M}_L, \text{ebb}_R(\mathcal{C}, r, A_{\text{rec},t}, x))$ varies continuously as x varies. Hence, $b_{\text{test}}(A_{\text{rec},t})$ varies continuously in the sup-metric by Lemma 2.6, so $\text{tailsup}(b_{\text{test}}(A_{\text{rec},t}))$ and c vary continuously by Lemma 2.9, so b_t varies continuously in the sup-metric, so y_t varies continuously, and b_t is strictly decreasing by Claim 5.7, so s_t varies continuously by Lemma 2.8. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.4. We proceed by induction on the length of a chain. Let us start with the base case where $\mathcal{C} = \emptyset$. Then, $\text{ebb}_R(\text{om}(\Omega), 0)$ is a strong equivariant deformation retraction from $\text{upa}(\Omega)$ to $\text{PsV}(\Omega)$ by Lemma 5.2. Also, $\text{crush}(\Omega)$ is a strong equivariant deformation retraction from $\text{PsV}(\text{om}(\Omega))$ to the orbit of Ω by Theorem 1.3. Hence, the lemma holds for the empty chain.

Let us assume by induction that $\text{crush}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{rec}}, \Omega)$ is such a deformation retraction for $\mathcal{C}_{\text{rec}} = \{\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_{L-1}\}$. Let $A_t = \text{crush}(\mathcal{C}, \Omega; A, t)$ for $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_L\}$ and $A_{\text{rec},t} = \text{crush}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{rec}}, \Omega; A, t)$.

Let us first show that $\text{crush}(\mathcal{C}, \Omega)$ is continuous. We have $A_{\text{rec},t} = \text{crush}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{rec}}, \Omega; A, t)$ varies continuously as a function of (A, t) by inductive assumption. Also, r is continuous by Lemma 5.4, and the stopping time s_t is continuous by Claim 5.8, so $\text{ebb}(\mathcal{C}, r; A_{\text{rec},t}, s_t)$ varies continuously by Lemma 5.2 part 1. Hence, $\text{crush}(\mathcal{C}, \Omega)$ is continuous.

Let us next show that the range of $\text{crush}(\mathcal{C}, \Omega)$ is in $\text{hood}(\mathcal{C}) \cap \text{upa}(\Omega)$. We have $A_{\text{rec},t} \in \text{hood}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{rec}}) \cap \text{upa}(\Omega)$ by induction, so $A_t \in \text{hood}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{rec}}) \cap \text{upa}(\mathcal{M}_L)$ by Lemma 5.2. Also, $s_t < 1$ by Claim 5.7, so $\text{ot}(A_t) = \text{ot}(A_{\text{rec},t})$ by Lemma 5.2 part 2, so $A_t \in \text{upa}(\Omega)$. Also,

$$\text{lbr}(\mathcal{M}_L, A_t) = \text{lbr}(\mathcal{M}_L, \text{ebb}_R(\mathcal{C}, r; A_{\text{rec},t}, s_t)) = b_{\text{test}}(A_{\text{rec},t}, s_t) \leq b_t(s) \leq y_t < 1$$

by Claim 5.6, so $A_t \in \text{hood}(\mathcal{M}_L)$. Thus, $A_t \in \text{hood}(\mathcal{C}) \cap \text{upa}(\Omega)$.

Let us show that $\text{crush}(\mathcal{C}, \Omega)$ is trivial on the orbit of Q . Consider the case where $A = \Omega * Q$. Then, $r(A) = r(\Omega)$ since little-big ratio is constant on O_3 -orbits, and $\text{ebb}_R(\mathcal{C}, r; A, x) = \text{ebb}_R(\mathcal{C}, r; \Omega, x) * Q$, since $\text{ebb}_R(\mathcal{C}, r)$ is equivariant by Lemma 5.2, so $b_{\text{test}}(A, x) = \text{lbr}(\mathcal{M}, \text{ebb}_R(\mathcal{C}, r; A, x)) = b_{\text{test}}(\Omega, x)$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$ since $\text{lbr}(\mathcal{M}_L)$ is O_3 -invariant, so $f_1(0) = f_0(0)$, so $y_t = y_0$ is unchanging. Also, $A_{\text{rec},t} = \text{crush}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{rec}}, \Omega; A, t) = A$ since we assume by induction that $\text{crush}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{rec}}, \Omega)$ is a strong deformation retraction, so $b_t(0) = b_0(0)$ is unchanging, so $b_t(0) = b_0(0) = y_0 = y_t$, so $s_t = 0$, so $A_t = \text{ebb}_R(\mathcal{C}, r; A, 0) = A$ in this case.

Finally, We have $A_0 = A$ by Claim 5.5. Also, $s_1 = 0$ by Claim 5.5, so $A_1 = \text{ebb}_R(\mathcal{C}, r; A_{\text{rec},1}, 0) = A_{\text{rec},1}$ since $\text{ebb}_R(\mathcal{C}, r)$ is a deformation by Lemma 5.2, and $A_{\text{rec},1}$ is in the orbit of Ω by induction, so $\text{crush}(\mathcal{C}, \Omega)$ is a strong deformation retraction to

the orbit of Ω . Also, $\text{crush}(\mathcal{C}, \Omega)$ is equivariant since $\text{ebb}_R(\mathcal{C}, r)$ is equivariant by Lemma 5.2 and $\text{crush}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{rec}}, \Omega)$ is equivariant by induction. \square

5.2 Diff ebb to ratio ebb

The ratio between maxlit and minbig has the advantage that it distinguishes both membership in $\text{hood}(\mathcal{M})$ as well as membership in $\text{PsV}(\mathcal{M})$, which was useful in constructing the deformation crush . On the other hand, the difference between maxlit and minbig has the advantage that it can be controlled by bounding how far pseudocircles can move, making it easier to construct a deformation. Here we switch between this ratio and difference.

Lemma 5.9 (Diff ebb). *Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{M}_1 < \dots < \mathcal{M}_L\}$ be a nonempty chain of oriented matroids and $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, $\varphi = \text{ebb}_D(\mathcal{C}, \varepsilon)$ is a strong equivariant deformation retraction from $\text{upa}(\mathcal{M}_L)$ to $\text{PsV}(\mathcal{M}_L)$ satisfying the following:*

1. $\varphi(A, t)$ varies continuously as ε, A, t vary.
2. $\text{ot}(\varphi(A, t)) = \text{ot}(A)$ is unchanging for $t < 1$.
3. $\text{minbig}(\mathcal{M}_k, \varphi(A, t)) \geq \text{minbig}(\mathcal{M}_k, A) - \varepsilon$ for each $k \in [L]$.
4. $\text{maxlit}(\mathcal{M}_k, \varphi(A, t)) \leq \text{maxlit}(\mathcal{M}_k, A) + \varepsilon$ for each $k \in [L]$.

Definition 5.10 (Ratio ebb).

$$\text{ebb}_R(\mathcal{C}, r; A, t) = \text{ebb}_D(\mathcal{C}, \varepsilon; A, t)$$

where $M_k = \text{minbig}(\mathcal{M}_k, A)$, and $m_k = \text{maxlit}(\mathcal{M}_k, A)$, and $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(A, r)$ is the minimum among $(1/3)(1-r)M_L$ and $(1/3)(M_k - m_k)$ for $k \in [L-1]$.

Proof of Lemma 5.2. Let $A_t = \text{ebb}(\mathcal{C}, r; A, t)$. The parameters $\text{minbig}(\mathcal{M}_k)$ and $\text{maxlit}(\mathcal{M}_k)$ are continuous by Lemma 4.8, so $\varepsilon(A, r)$ in the definition of ebb is continuous as function of r and A , so $A_t = \text{ebb}(\mathcal{C}, r; A, t)$ is continuous as a function of r, A , and t by Lemma 5.9 part 1, which gives us part 1 of Lemma 5.2.

Each $k \in [L-1]_{\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies $m_k < M_k$ where $m_k = \text{maxlit}(\mathcal{M}_k, A)$ and $M_k = \text{minbig}(\mathcal{M}_k, A)$ since $A \in \text{hood}(\mathcal{M}_k)$, and $\varepsilon \leq (1/3)(M_k - m_k)$ by choice of ε , so by Lemma 5.9 parts 3 and 4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{maxlit}(\mathcal{M}_k; A_t) &\leq m_k + \varepsilon \leq m_k + (1/3)(M_k - m_k) < M_k - (1/3)(M_k - m_k) \leq M_k - \varepsilon \\ &\leq \text{minbig}(\mathcal{M}_k; A_t), \end{aligned}$$

so $A_t \in \text{hood}(\mathcal{M}_k)$.

Hence, $A_t \in \text{hood}(\mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{M}_L) \cap \text{upa}(\mathcal{M}_L)$, so $\text{ebb}(\mathcal{C}, r)$ is a strong deformation retraction from $\text{hood}(\mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{M}_L) \cap \text{upa}(\mathcal{M}_L)$ to $\text{hood}(\mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{M}_L) \cap \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M}_L)$ by Lemma 5.9. Also, $\text{minbig}(\mathcal{M}_k)$ and $\text{maxlit}(\mathcal{M}_k)$ are constant on orbits, so ε is constant on orbits as well, so $\text{ebb}(\mathcal{C}, r)$ is equivariant.

Suppose $\text{lbr}(\mathcal{M}_L, A) \leq r$. Then, $m_L \leq rM_L$. Also, $\varepsilon < (1/2)(1-r)M_L$ by choice of ε in the definition of ebb_R , so

$$\text{lbr}(\mathcal{M}_L, A_t) \leq \frac{m_L + \varepsilon}{M_L - \varepsilon} < \frac{rM_L + (1/2)(1-r)M_L}{M_L - (1/2)(1-r)M_L} = \frac{(1/2)(1+r)M_L}{(1/2)(1+r)M_L} = 1.$$

Thus, $A_t \in \text{hood}(\mathcal{M}_L)$ in the case where $\text{lbr}(\mathcal{M}_L, A_0) \leq r$, so part 3 of Lemma 5.2 holds. □

6 Mox

In this section, we introduce a map mox in Lemma 6.2 which sends systems of paths to x -monotone paths, i.e., implicit functions. This map will then be used to define the deformation ebb_D from Lemma 5.9. Specifically, ebb_D will deform $A \in \text{upa}(\mathcal{M})$ to $\text{PsV}(\mathcal{M})$ by first defining a region $Z(\Sigma)$ of the sphere for each chain of covectors $\Sigma \subset \text{cspH}(\mathcal{M})$; see Section 7, and then defining a deformation separately in each of these regions; see Definition 8.2.

In the case of edge covectors, the pseudocircles of A corresponding to nonloops of σ^0 intersect $Z(\sigma)$ as a collection of paths, and ebb_D will deform this collection paths to a single path. To do so, we use the map mox to send these paths to a collection of x -monotone paths, so that we can simply deform each path to the same horizontal segment by scaling each path vertically. We will also use mox to define the regions $Z(\Sigma)$.

Definition 6.1 (Pseudomonotonic path system). A **cardinal region** is a compact contractible set $R \subset \mathbf{S}^2$ with a set $B = \{B_N, B_E, B_S, B_W\}$ consisting of (≤ 1)-cells indexed by cardinal direction such that

- $\bigcup B = \partial R$,
- $B_i \cap B_j$ is a single point for consecutive cardinal directions i, j ,
- B_E and B_W are disjoint,
- either B_N and B_S intersect at finitely many points without crossing, or $R = B_N = B_S$ is a path with endpoints B_W, B_E .

We call B_N the **northern border** of R and $B_{NE} = B_N \cup B_E$ the **northeastern border** and analogously for the other cardinal and intercardinal directions.

An **pseudomonotonic path system** through R is a finite family of paths $P = \{P_i \subset R : i \in I\}$ from B_W to B_E that covers B_N and B_S , and where each pair of paths either coincide, are disjoint, or intersect at a single point and cross at that point.

A **latitude** for P is a map $h : J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $J \subseteq I \subseteq [n]_{\mathbb{N}}$ such that the curves P_j for $j \in J$

- are pairwise either disjoint or the same,
- appear along B_W in the same order as h_j .

A pseudomonotonic path system may include h or not.

Lemma 6.2 (Mox). *Let $E = (R, B, P, h)$ be pseudomonotonic path system as in Definition 6.1. Then, $\xi = \text{mox}(E) : R \rightarrow [0, 1]_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{R}$ is an embedding of R in \mathbb{R}^2 satisfying the following.*

1. ξ varies continuously in the partial map metric as R varies in Hausdorff distance, each curve of B and P varies in Fréchet distance, and h_j varies for each $j \in J$.
2. mox is O_3 -equivariant, i.e., $\text{mox}(Q(R, B, P), h) = \xi \circ Q^*$.
3. $\xi(B_W) \subset 0 \times \mathbb{R}$, $\xi(B_E) \subset 1 \times \mathbb{R}$.
4. $\xi(P_j) = [0, 1] \times h_j$ for each $j \in J$.
5. $\xi(P_i)$ is an x -monotone curve for each $i \in I$.
6. $\xi(R, \tilde{B}, P, -h; p) = (x, -y)$ where $(x, y) = \xi(p)$ and

$$(\tilde{B}_W, \tilde{B}_E) = (B_W, B_E), \quad (\tilde{B}_N, \tilde{B}_S) = (B_S, B_N).$$

We will construct mox in Definition 6.5 using a pair of foliations $\text{fol}(R, B, P)$ from Lemma 6.4, which will be sent to lines of slope 1 and -1 . That is, we partition R into level sets of a northeast-southeast coordinate system, which we call **leaves**.

Remark 6.3 (Cardinal direction). We consider a directed path L through R from B_{SW} to B_{NE} to be directed northward and eastward. If L is directed the opposite way, then we consider L to be directed southward and westward. The component of $R \setminus L$ that contains $B_W \cap B_N$ is to the west and to the north of L , and the other component is to the south and to the east. We also use analogous language for paths from B_{NW} to B_{SE} .

Lemma 6.4 (Coordinate foliations). *Given a pseudomonotonic path system (R, B, P) as in Lemma 6.2, $(\mathcal{L}_+, \mathcal{L}_-) = \text{fol}(R, B, P)$ is a pair of partitions of R into (≤ 1) -cells called **leaves** satisfying the following.*

1. Each $L_+ \in \mathcal{L}_+$ is a path from $B_{\text{SW}} = B_{\text{S}} \cup B_{\text{W}}$ to $B_{\text{NE}} = B_{\text{N}} \cup B_{\text{E}}$, or a point on $B_{\text{SW}} \cap B_{\text{NE}}$. Also, each $L_- \in \mathcal{L}_-$ is a path from $B_{\text{NW}} = B_{\text{N}} \cup B_{\text{W}}$ to $B_{\text{SE}} = B_{\text{S}} \cup B_{\text{E}}$, or a point on $B_{\text{NW}} \cap B_{\text{SE}}$.
2. fol is O_3 -equivariant.
3. The path $L_+(q) \in \mathcal{L}_+$ through a given point q varies continuously in Fréchet distance as (R, B, P, q) vary, and likewise for \mathcal{L}_- .
4. Each pair $(L_+, L_-) \in \mathcal{L}_+ \times \mathcal{L}_-$ cross at most once and have no other intersection.
5. Each path $P_i \in P$ intersects each $L_+ \in \mathcal{L}_+$ at most once, in which case $P_i \cap L_+$ is either an endpoint of L_+ or P_i directed eastward crosses L_+ from northwest to southeast. Likewise for $L_- \in \mathcal{L}_-$, except P_i crosses L_- from southwest to northeast.
6. If L is a directed path consisting of an alternating sequence of leaves of \mathcal{L}_+ and \mathcal{L}_- directed southward, then the sequence is finite.
7. $\text{fol}(D, \tilde{B}, P) = (\mathcal{L}_-, \mathcal{L}_+)$ with \tilde{B} as in Lemma 6.2.

Definition 6.5 (Mox). We first define $\xi = \text{mox}(R, B, P, h)$ in the case where $J = \{0\}$ is a singleton. On P_0 , let

$$\xi = \text{param}^{-1}(P_0) \times h_0$$

with P_0 directed eastward and param^{-1} as in Definition 2.11. On the rest of R , let ξ be the unique continuous map that sends each path of \mathcal{L}_+ to a segment with slope 1, and sends each path of \mathcal{L}_- to a segment with slope -1 where $(\mathcal{L}_+, \mathcal{L}_-) = \text{fol}(R, B, P)$. In the case where $|J| > 1$, we first construct ξ as above, and then modify ξ to send each path P_j to $[0, 1] \times h_j$ for $j \in J$ by linear interpolation in each vertical line, and by vertical translation outside the extrema of h .

Claim 6.6. ξ is well-defined.

To show ξ is well-defined, we give an equivalent construction starting with $P_0 \cup B_{\text{W}} \cup B_{\text{E}}$ for the case where $J = \{0\}$. For $q \in B_{\text{W}}$ that is north of P_0 , let $Z(q)$ be the path emanating from q that traverses a leaf of \mathcal{L}_- until either reaching P_0 , or reaching B_{E} , in which case $Z(q)$ then traverses a leaf of \mathcal{L}_+ until either reaching P_0 , or reaching B_{W} , in which case $Z(q)$ continues alternating between leaves of \mathcal{L}_- and \mathcal{L}_+ in this manner. We call $Z(q)$ a **zigzag path**. and we call each such leaf an **edge** of $Z(q)$.

The zigzag path $Z(q)$ can only have finitely many such edges by Lemma 6.4 part 6, and our starting point q is north of P_0 , so $Z(q)$ must end at some point $z(q) \in P_0$. If the last edge of $Z(q)$ is a path of \mathcal{L}_- , then let $\xi_2(q) = m - 1 + \xi_1(z(q))$ where $\xi = \xi_1 \times \xi_2$ and m is the number of edges of $Z(q)$. Otherwise, the last edge of $Z(q)$ is a path of \mathcal{L}_+ , in which case $\xi_2(q) = m - \xi_1(z(q))$. Let $Z(q)$ and ξ_2 be defined analogously on B_{E} .

Claim 6.7. ξ_2 is increasing northward on B_W and likewise on B_E .

Proof. Consider the case where $q_k \in B_W$ with q_2 north of q_1 north of P_0 and where $Z(q_k)$ has 1 edge. Then $Z(q_k)$ for each k consists of a single arc of a path in \mathcal{L}_- , and $Z(q_2)$ is entirely north of $Z(q_1)$ as in Remark 6.3 since \mathcal{L}_- is a partition, which is also east of $Z(q_1)$, so $z(q_2)$ is east of $z(q_1)$, so $\xi_2(z(q_2)) = \xi_1(z(q_2)) > \xi_1(z(q_1)) = \xi_1(z(q_1))$. The claim holds by a similar argument on B_E and south of P_0 in the case where $Z(q_k)$ has a single edge, and the claim holds on the rest of B_W and B_E by induction on the number of edges of $Z(q_k)$. \square

Now consider a point $q \in R$, and let q_W be the endpoint of the path $L_+(q) \in \mathcal{L}_+$ through q on $P_0 \cup B_W$, and define q_E analogously.

Claim 6.8. If $q_E \in P_0$, then $|\xi_2(q_W)| \leq \xi_1(q_E)$. If $q_W \in P_0$, then $|\xi_2(q_E)| \leq 1 - \xi_1(q_W)$. Otherwise, $|\xi_2(q_E) - \xi_2(q_W)| \leq 1$.

Proof. Let us assume that q is north of P_0 ; otherwise we can replace ξ_2 with $-\xi_2$.

Consider the case where $q_E \in P_0$. Then, q_W is either to the south of or on $L_-(q)$ as in Remark 6.3, which is also to the west of $L_-(q)$. Hence, either $q_W \in P_0$, in which case $\xi_2(q_W) = 0$, or $q_W \in B_W$, in which case $L_-(q_W)$ is either entirely to the west of $L_-(q)$ or coincides with $L_-(q)$ since \mathcal{L}_- is a partition. Also, the arc of B_E that is to the north of P_0 is entirely east of $L_-(q)$, so $L_-(q_W)$ meets P_0 at $z(q_W)$, which is either at or to the west of q_E , so $\xi_2(q_W) = \xi_1(z(q_W)) \leq \xi_1(z(q_E))$. The claim follows by a similar argument in the case where $q_W \in P_0$.

Consider the case where $q_E, q_W \notin P_0$. Then, $q_W \in B_W$ and $q_E \in B_E$. Suppose we had $\xi_2(q_W) > \xi_2(q_E) + 1$, and let q_{WE} be the endpoint of $L_-(q_W)$ that is not on B_W . Then, we would have $\xi_2(q_{WE}) = \xi_2(q_W) - 1 > \xi_2(q_E)$, but q is to the north of $L_-(q_W)$, so q_E is to the north of q_{WE} , which contradicts Claim 6.7. Hence, we must have $\xi_2(q_W) \leq \xi_2(q_E) + 1$, and by a similar argument we have $\xi_2(q_E) \leq \xi_2(q_W) + 1$, so $|\xi_2(q_E) - \xi_2(q_W)| \leq 1$. \square

Proof of Claim 6.6. By Claim 6.8, $\xi(q_W)$ and $\xi(q_E)$ are close enough vertically to be connected by a unimodal path Λ with slope 1 and -1 . Let $\xi(q)$ be the coordinates at the highest point of Λ . The point q_W is the same for each choice of q on a path $L_+ \in \mathcal{L}_+$, so the increasing portion of Λ is on the same line for each $q \in L_+$, so the image of L_+ by ξ is a segment of slope 1, and similarly the image of $L_- \in \mathcal{L}_-$ has slope -1 , which is the defining feature of ξ on $R \setminus P_0$. Thus, ξ in Definition 6.5 is equivalent to the construction of ξ using zigzag paths. \square

Proof of Lemma 6.2. We have that ξ is equivariant and varies continuously on S_0 by Lemma 2.10, and the levels sets $(\mathcal{L}_+, \mathcal{L}_-)$ vary equivariantly and continuously by Lemma 6.4, so ξ varies equivariantly and continuously by induction on the number of edges of

$Z(q_W)$ and $Z(q_E)$, which means that parts 1 and 2 hold. We have $\mu(B_W) \subset 0 \times \mathbb{R}$, and $\mu(B_E) \subset 1 \times \mathbb{R}$, and $\mu(P_j) = [0, 1] \times h_j$ for each $j \in J$ by construction, so parts 3 and 4 hold.

Since ξ sends each path of \mathcal{L}_+ and \mathcal{L}_- to a segment of slope 1 and -1 respectively by construction, and each path of $\mu(P_i)$ only crosses these segments from east to west by Lemma 6.4 part 5, the path $\mu(P_i)$ is the graph of a 1-Lipschitz function, and in particular is x -monotone, which means that part 5 holds.

Let $\tilde{\xi}$ be defined as in Definition 6.5, but with B replaced with \tilde{B} , and S^+ with $-S^+$, and h with $-h$ as in part 6. Replacing S^+ with $-S^+$ in the definition of ξ on P_0 swaps ξ_+ and ξ_- , so $\xi_1 = \frac{\xi_+ + \xi_-}{2}$ is unchanged on P_0 , so $\tilde{\xi} = (\xi_1, -h_0) = [(x, y) \mapsto (x, -y)] \circ \xi$, so part 6 holds on P_0 . The map $[(x, y) \mapsto (x, -y)]$ swaps segments with slope 1 and segments with slope -1 , and replacing B with \tilde{B} in $\text{fol}(D, B, P)$ swaps \mathcal{L}_+ and \mathcal{L}_- by Lemma 6.4 part 7, so $[(x, y) \mapsto (x, -y)] \circ \tilde{\xi}$ sends \mathcal{L}_+ to the class of segments with slope 1 and sends \mathcal{L}_- to the class of segments with slope -1 , and agrees with ξ on P_0 , which are the defining characteristics of ξ , so part 6 holds. \square

6.1 Coordinate foliations

In this subsection we define the function fol and prove Lemma 6.4. We will define foliations in each cell of R subdivided by P using conformal maps, and then glue the foliations of adjacent cells together. We first prove two claims to show the existence and uniqueness of the northeast most point of a cell, which will be used in the definition.

Let \mathcal{C} be the set of closed 2-cells of R subdivided by P .

Claim 6.9. *$B \cup P$ has no northeastward directed cycles. Likewise southeastward.*

Proof. A northeastward directed cycle cannot include B_W since there are no paths directed toward B_W . Also, a northeastward directed cycle cannot include B_E since there are no paths directed away from B_W . Hence, we are left with paths of P .

Suppose we had such a cycle ∂C with edges E_1, \dots, E_m along paths P_1, \dots, P_m in that order directed northeastward. We will get a contradiction from the order that the paths intersect B_W .

We may assume that ∂C is a simple closed curve; otherwise traverse the cycle until the first time a point is repeated, and take the directed cycle at that point. Then, ∂C bounds a cell $C \in \mathcal{C}$. Otherwise, if there is some path P_j passing through the interior of C , we can find a new directed cycle $\partial C'$ that bounds a proper subset $C' \subset C$ on one side of P_j , and by induction on the number of cells in C , we get a minimal such C , which is a cell of R .

Consider how P_1, P_2 cross at the vertex v of the cycle. We may assume by symmetry that E_2 is north of P_1 . Then, $P_2 \cap B_W$ must be south of $P_1 \cap B_W$ along B_W . Also, C is on or to

the north of P_2 since C is a cell, so E_3 must be north of P_2 , so $P_3 \cap B_W$ must be south of $P_2 \cap B_W$ along B_W , and continuing likewise, $P_{j+1} \cap B_W$ must be south of $P_j \cap B_W$, and $P_1 \cap B_W$ must be south of $P_m \cap B_W$, which is south of $P_1 \cap B_W$ along B_W , which is a contradiction. \square

Claim 6.10. *The boundary of a cell $C \in \mathcal{C}$ directed northeastward has a unique source and a unique sink. Likewise directed southeastward.*

Proof. The boundary of a cell C has at least one sink and source by Claim 6.9. Suppose there were more than one. Directing curves northeastward defines a partial order on $P \cup B$ by Claim 6.9, and we extend this to a total order (\leq_{NE}). Then, the sources and sinks are the respective local minima and maxima with respect to (\leq_{NE}), which alternate in the cyclic order around ∂C . We can find sources $\{s_1, s_2\}$ and sinks $\{t_1, t_2\}$ alternating around ∂C such that $\{s_1, s_2\} <_{NE} \{t_1, t_2\}$. For instance, let t_1 be a global maximum and s_1, s_2 be the sources adjacent to some other sink t_2 . We can find a walk W from s_1 to s_2 by first traversing a path of P from s_1 southwest to B_W , then traversing B_W to a path of P that we can traverse northeast to s_2 . Every point of this walk is either west along a path through s_1 or s_2 or south of such a path along B_W , so $W \leq_{NE} \{s_1, s_2\}$. Then, W is connected, so W has a path P_s from s_1 to s_2 . Similarly, we can find a path P_t from t_1 to t_2 such that

$$P_s \leq_{NE} \{s_1, s_2\} <_{NE} \{t_1, t_2\} \leq_{NE} P_t,$$

so the paths P_s and P_t cannot cross each other, and cannot cross any edge of the cycle ∂C , since ∂C bounds a cell, so $\partial C \cup P_s \cup P_t$ is a planar embedding of a 4-clique. We can then add a point $c \in C^\circ$ with disjoint paths from c to each of the points s_1, s_2, t_1, t_2 in C to get a planar embedding of a 5-clique, which is impossible. Thus, ∂C has one source and one sink. \square

Definition 6.11 (Coordinate foliations). We first define the foliations on a cell $C \in \mathcal{C}$ where \mathcal{C} is the set of closed 2-cells of R subdivided by P . Let p_{SW} be the source and p_{NE} be the sink of ∂C directed northeastward as in Claim 6.10, and define p_{NW} and p_{SE} analogously. Let C_N be the path from p_{NW} to p_{NE} with C to the south as in Remark 6.3, and let $C_{NE} = C_N \cup C_E$ with other cardinal and intercardinal directions defined analogously.

For $k \in \{+, -\}$, let $h_k : C \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be an internally isogonal map sending C to the upper half-plane of \mathbb{C} satisfying the following.

$$\begin{aligned} h_+(C_{SW}) &= [0, \infty]_{\mathbb{R}}, & h_+(C_{NE}) &= [-\infty, 0]_{\mathbb{R}}, & h_+(p_{NW}) &= 0, & h_+(p_{SE}) &= \infty, \\ h_-(C_{SE}) &= [0, \infty]_{\mathbb{R}}, & h_-(C_{NW}) &= [-\infty, 0]_{\mathbb{R}}, & h_-(p_{SW}) &= 0, & h_-(p_{NE}) &= \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the h_k are only defined up to a positive scalar multiple. Let $\Theta(c, r)$ be the

semicircle with center c and radius r . Let

$$\mathcal{L}_+(C) = \{h_+^{-1}(\Theta(-r, 3r)) : r \in [0, \infty]\}, \quad \mathcal{L}_-(C) = \{h_-^{-1}(\Theta(r, 3r)) : r \in [0, \infty]\}.$$

Let each path of $\mathcal{L}_+(C)$ be directed northeast from C_{SW} to C_{NE} , and let \mathcal{L}_+ be the set of all maximal directed paths L formed by a union of paths among

$$\mathcal{L}_+(\mathcal{C}) = \bigcup\{\mathcal{L}_+(C) : C \in \mathcal{C}\}, \text{ define } \mathcal{L}_- \text{ analogously, and let } \text{fol}(R, B, P) = (\mathcal{L}_+, \mathcal{L}_-).$$

Remark 6.12. h_+ is only defined up to a positive scalar multiple, but \mathcal{L}_+ does not depend on the choice of scalar multiple. Likewise for h_- and \mathcal{L}_- . Also, the h_k are internally conformal provided that east is clockwise of north, which we may assume by symmetry.

Remark 6.13. Note that on C_{W} northeastward coincides with northwestward, so C_{W} is either an arc along B_{W} or a single point, which is the source directed northeastward and southeastward. Similarly, C_{E} is either an arc along B_{E} or a single point, which is the sink directed northeastward and southeastward, so C_{W} and C_{E} must be disjoint. Hence, C_{N} and C_{S} are 1-cells, $p_{\text{NW}} \neq p_{\text{NE}}$, and $p_{\text{SW}} \neq p_{\text{SE}}$.

Justification 6.14. We use preimages of $\Theta(-r, 3r)$ and $\Theta(r, 3r)$ rather than the level sets of $|h_+|$ and $|h_-|$ because in some cases we can have $p_{\text{NW}} = p_{\text{SW}}$ and $p_{\text{NE}} = p_{\text{SE}}$, in which case we have $h_+ = h_-$, but we cannot allow \mathcal{L}_+ and \mathcal{L}_- to coincide in a cell.

We will show in Claim 6.16 that \mathcal{L}_+ and \mathcal{L}_- are partitions. To prove this, we first partition D into regions that determine how paths of \mathcal{L}_+ continue northeastward. Let

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{NE}} = \{B_{\text{NE}}, C \setminus C_{\text{NE}} : C \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

Claim 6.15. \mathcal{D}_{NE} is a partition of R , and likewise for \mathcal{D}_{SE} defined analogously.

Proof. B_{NE} is only on the northeast boarder of cells by definition, so B_{SE} does not intersect any other set of \mathcal{D}_{NE} . If q is in the interior of a cell C , then $q \in C \setminus C_{\text{NE}}$ and is not in any other cell, so q is in a unique set of \mathcal{D}_{NE} . If q is on an edge of $P \cup B$ that is not along B_{N} or B_{E} , then q is only on the southwest boarder of one cell C and possibly on the northeast boarder of another, so q is in a unique set of \mathcal{D}_{NE} .

One case remains, which is where q is at a point where paths of $P \cup B$ meet. Consider the case where $q \in B_{\text{W}}$ and q is in one or more path of P . Then each edge incident to q directed southeastward is directed outward except for the edge E extending northward along B_{W} , so q is the southeastward source p_{NW} for each adjacent cell C except the cell C_0 that contains the edge E , and p_{NW} is an endpoint of C_{NE} , so $q \notin C \setminus C_{\text{NE}}$. There is only one cell C_0 that contains E since E is on the boundary of R , so q is in a unique set of \mathcal{D}_{NE} .

Consider the case where q is at a point where paths of P cross. Note that this also includes the case where $q \in B_S$, since P covers B_S . Let P_1, \dots, P_n be the paths ordered by the position of their endpoints on B_W directed northward. Then, the cyclic order of eastward directed edges around q consists of edges on the paths P_1, \dots, P_n directed inward to q and then paths P_1, \dots, P_n directed outward from q since the paths of P pairwise intersect at a single point where they cross. Hence, q is either a source or sink for each cell incident to q except the pair of cells incident to P_1 and P_n . One cell has q on its northern border, and the other has q on its southern border, since the paths separate B_N and B_S . Thus, q is in a unique member of \mathcal{D}_{NE} . \square

Claim 6.16. *Each point $q \in R$ is in at most one maximal path $L_+(q) \in \mathcal{L}_+$. Hence, \mathcal{L}_+ is a partition of R into (≤ 1)-cells, and likewise for \mathcal{L}_- .*

Let $L_+(C, q)$ be the path of $\mathcal{L}_+(C)$ through $q \in C$ and let $L_+(q)$ be the path of \mathcal{L}_+ through $q \in R$.

Proof. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that q is in two distinct maximal paths $L_1, L_2 \in \mathcal{L}_+$. Since these paths are distinct, there must be some $p_1 \in L_1 \setminus L_2$, and we may assume by symmetry that p_1 is northeast of q along L_1 . Since L_2 is maximal, there must also be a point $p_2 \in L_2 \setminus L_1$ that is northeast of q along L_2 ; otherwise we could extend L_2 with the arc of L_1 from q to p_1 . Let q_0 be the last point on the arc A_1 of L_1 from q to p_1 that is on L_2 .

Then, L_1 and L_2 must continue northeastward along separate paths of the form $L_+(C_1, q_0)$ and $L_+(C_2, q_0)$ by construction, and q_0 cannot be the northeast endpoint of $L_+(C_1, q_0)$, so $q_0 \in C_1 \setminus C_{1,NE}$, and likewise $q_0 \in C_2 \setminus C_{2,NE}$, so $C_1 = C_2$ by Claim 6.15, so L_1 and L_2 continue along the same path, which is a contradiction. \square

Proof of Lemma 6.4 parts 1 and 2. Consider the case where q is in a path $L \in \mathcal{L}_+$. Then, the sink t of L directed northeastward cannot be on the southwest boarder of any cell; otherwise L could be extended in that cell, which would contradict the maximality of L . Hence, $t \in B_{NE}$, and similarly the source of L is in B_{SW} . In the case where q is not in a path of \mathcal{L}_+ , then q cannot be in the southwest boarder of cell or in the northeast boarder, so $q \in B_{SW} \cap B_{NE}$. An analogous argument applies for \mathcal{L}_- , so part 1 holds.

Consider a cell $C \in \mathcal{C}$ of R subdivided by P , and $Q \in O_3$. Then, $QC \in Q\mathcal{C}$ is a cell of QD subdivided by QP , and h_+Q^{-1} is an internally angle preserving map from QC to the upper half-plane that sends QC_{SW} to $[0, \infty]_{\mathbb{R}}$ and analogously for the other defining conditions of h_+ , and for each $L \in \mathcal{L}_+$ there is some $r \in [0, \infty]$ such that $h_+(L) = \Theta(-r, 3r)$, so $h_+Q^{-1}(QL) = \Theta(-r, 3r)$, and analogously for \mathcal{L}_- . Thus, $\text{fol}(Q(R, B, P)) = (Q\mathcal{L}_+, Q\mathcal{L}_-)$, which means part 2 holds. \square

Proof of Lemma 6.4 part 3. Consider a sequence of valid inputs (D_k, B_k, P_k, q_k) to fol that

converge to $(D_\infty, B_\infty, P_\infty, q_\infty)$, and let $(\mathcal{L}_{+,k}, \mathcal{L}_{-,k}) = \text{fol}(D_k, B_k, P_k, q_k)$ and similarly add a corresponding subscript to each object in Definition 6.11.

Let $L_k = L_{+,k}(q_k)$, and consider the case where $L_k = q_k$ infinitely often. Then, $q_k = L_k \in B_{\text{SW},k} \cap B_{\text{NE},k}$, and since q_k and B_k converge appropriately, $q_\infty \in B_{\text{SW},\infty} \cap B_{\text{NE},\infty}$, so $L_\infty = q_\infty$ is the limit point of L_k . Let us then assume that L_k is not a point.

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $L_k = L_{+,k}(q_k)$ does not converge to L_∞ in Fréchet distance. Then, we may assume that L_k crosses the paths P_k in a fixed order for $k < \infty$; otherwise restrict to such a subsequence. If each edge of L_k subdivided by P_k were to converge to a corresponding edge or vertex of L_∞ in Fréchet distance, then L_k would converge to L_∞ in Fréchet distance, so there must be some edge L'_k of L_k that does not converge to an edge or vertex of L_∞ .

Let us choose L'_k to be separated from q_k by the fewest number of paths of P_k among arcs that do not converge appropriately. Then, either $q_k \in L'_k$ or L'_k shares an endpoint with an arc that does converge appropriately, so in either case some point q'_k of L'_k converges to a point q'_∞ on L_∞ . Let us assume that $q_k \in L'_k$; otherwise we will get a contradiction by the same argument with q'_k instead q_k . Hence, q_k is in a cell $C_k \in \mathcal{C}_k$ with $I_N(C_k)$ and $I_S(C_k)$ fixed and $L'_k = L_{+,k}(C_k, q_k)$ for $k < \infty$, and L'_k neither converges to an edge nor to a vertex of L_∞ in Fréchet distance that is on or between the corresponding paths of P_∞ .

If C_k converges to a point in Hausdorff distance, then C_k converges to q_∞ , which is a vertex of P_∞ , so $L'_k \subset C_k$ converges to a vertex of P_∞ , which is a contradiction. Therefore, we shall assume that C_k does not converge to a point.

Let us restrict to a subsequence where the cyclic order of paths along ∂C_k is fixed for $k < \infty$. Since \mathbf{S}^2 is compact, we may restrict to a subsequence where each vertex of ∂C_k converges. Then, $p_{\text{NW},k}$ and $p_{\text{SE},k}$ respectively converge to points \tilde{p}_{NW} and \tilde{p}_{SE} , and $\tilde{p}_{\text{NW}} \neq \tilde{p}_{\text{SE}}$, otherwise C_k would converge to a point. Also, $C_{\text{NE},k}$ and $C_{\text{SW},k}$ respectively converge to paths \tilde{C}_{NE} and \tilde{C}_{SW} from \tilde{p}_{NW} to \tilde{p}_{SE} in Fréchet distance by Lemma 4.6.

Consider the case where $q_k = p_{\text{NW},k}$. Then, $L'_k = q_k$, and $\tilde{p}_{\text{NW}} = q_\infty$ is a vertex of L_∞ , since $p_{\text{NW},k}$ is on a path of P_k , so \tilde{p}_{NW} is on a path of P_∞ . Hence, L'_k converges to a vertex of L_∞ . A similar argument shows convergence in the case where $q_k = p_{\text{SE},k}$. Therefore, let us assume that $q_k \notin \{p_{\text{NW},k}, p_{\text{SE},k}\}$.

We split into cases depending on whether \tilde{C}_{NE} and \tilde{C}_{SW} intersect at a point other than \tilde{p}_{NW} or \tilde{p}_{SE} .

Consider the case where there is a point $v \in \tilde{C}_{\text{NE}} \cap \tilde{C}_{\text{SW}} \setminus \{\tilde{p}_{\text{NW}}, \tilde{p}_{\text{SE}}\} \neq \emptyset$. We claim that $\tilde{C}_{\text{NE}} = \tilde{C}_{\text{SW}}$ in this case. Since $C_{\text{NE},k} \rightarrow \tilde{C}_{\text{NE}}$ in Fréchet distance, there is a sequence of points $v_k \in C_{\text{NE},k}$ such that $v_k \rightarrow v$, so there is some path $P_{i,k} \in P_k$ along $C_{\text{NE},k}$ such that $v_k \in P_{i,k}$ infinitely often, so $v \in P_{i,\infty}$. Similarly, there is some $P_{j,k}$ along $C_{\text{SW},k}$ such that $v \in P_{j,\infty}$.

Suppose $P_{i,\infty}$ and $P_{j,\infty}$ crossed at v . Let us assume by symmetry that $P_{i,\infty}$ directed eastward crosses $P_{j,\infty}$ from north to south at v . Then, \tilde{p}_{SE} would be east of v along paths of P_∞ , so \tilde{p}_{SE} would be on or north of $P_{i,\infty}$, but $p_{SE,k}$ is on or south of $P_{i,k}$, so \tilde{p}_{SE} would have to be on $P_{i,\infty}$, and similarly \tilde{p}_{SE} would be on $P_{j,\infty}$, so $P_{i,\infty}$ and $P_{j,\infty}$ meet at $\tilde{p}_{SE} \neq v$, which contradicts the condition that distinct curves of P_∞ intersect in at most one point where they cross. Hence, $P_{i,\infty}$ and $P_{j,\infty}$ cannot cross at v , so we must have $P_{j,\infty} = P_{i,\infty}$.

Also, $C_{NE,k} \cup C_{SW,k}$ is on or south of $P_{i,k}$, so $\tilde{C}_{NE} \cup \tilde{C}_{SW}$ is on or south of $P_{i,\infty}$, and similarly $\tilde{C}_{NE} \cup \tilde{C}_{SW}$ is on or north of $P_{j,\infty}$, so $\tilde{C}_{NE} \cup \tilde{C}_{SW}$ is on $P_{i,\infty} = P_{j,\infty}$, and $C_{NE,k}$ is an eastward directed path from $p_{NW,k}$ to $p_{SW,k}$, so \tilde{C}_{NE} is an eastward directed arc from \tilde{p}_{NW} to \tilde{p}_{SE} along $P_{i,\infty}$ and likewise for \tilde{C}_{SW} . Hence, $\tilde{C}_{NE} = \tilde{C}_{SW}$.

Let $\eta(z) = \frac{i-z}{i+z}$ be the conformal map sending the upper half-plane to the unit disk, so $\eta(0) = 1$ and $\eta(\infty) = -1$ and $\eta(i) = 0$. Then, $[\eta h_{+,k}]^{-1}$ satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2.20. Recall that $h_{+,k}$ is only defined up to a positive scalar factor, and let us choose this factor so that $|h_{+,k}(q_k)| = 1$. Let \hat{q}_k be the point on L'_k that is farthest away from q_k . Then, $1/2 \leq |h_{+,k}(\hat{q}_k)| \leq 2$ by the definition of $\mathcal{L}_+(C)$ in Definition 6.11, so $|h_+(\hat{q}_k)|$ is bounded away from 0 and ∞ in the spherical metric, so $\eta h_+(q_k)$ and $\eta h_+(\hat{q}_k)$ are both bounded away from 1 and -1 , so $\hat{q}_k \rightarrow q_\infty$ by Lemma 2.20. Hence $L'_k \rightarrow q_\infty$ since \hat{q}_k is the farthest point from q_k on L'_k , and q_∞ is the vertex of L_∞ at the point of intersection with $P_{i,\infty}$, which is a contradiction since we chose L'_k to be an edge that does not converge to a vertex of L_∞ . This completes the case where $\tilde{C}_{NE} \cap \tilde{C}_{SW} \setminus \{\tilde{p}_{NW}, \tilde{p}_{SE}\} \neq \emptyset$.

Consider the case where $\tilde{C}_{NE} \cap \tilde{C}_{SW} \setminus \{\tilde{p}_{NW}, \tilde{p}_{SE}\} = \emptyset$. Then, $\partial C_k \rightarrow \partial C_\infty$ in Fréchet distance for a cell $C_\infty \in \mathcal{C}_\infty$, so with an appropriate choice of scalar factor in the definition of h_+ , we have $[\eta h_{+,k}]^{-1} \rightarrow [\eta h_{+,\infty}]^{-1}$ in the sup-metric by Radó's theorem, so $h_{+,k}^{-1} \rightarrow h_{+,\infty}^{-1}$ with the spherical metric on $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$, and so $h_{+,k} \rightarrow h_{+,\infty}$ in the partial map topology by Lemma 2.4, so $h_{+,k}(q_k) \rightarrow h_{+,\infty}(q_\infty)$, so the sequence of semicircles $\Theta(-r_k, 3r_k)$ that pass through $h_{+,k}(q_k)$ converge appropriately in Fréchet distance, so $L'_k \rightarrow L_+(C_\infty, q_\infty)$ in Fréchet distance by Lemma 2.5, and $L_+(C_\infty, q_\infty)$ is an edge of L_∞ , which is a contradiction.

Thus, $L_k = L_{+,k}(q_k)$ converges to L_∞ in Fréchet distance, and by a similar argument $L_{-,k}(q_k)$ converges to $L_{-,\infty}(q_\infty)$. \square

6.2 Journey to the boarder

To prove the rest of Lemma 6.4, we need to follow the paths of \mathcal{L}_+ or \mathcal{L}_- to the boarder of R . By symmetry, it suffices to follow one of these.

For a point $q \in C \in \mathcal{C}$, let $q_{NE} = L_+(C, q) \cap C_{NE}$. Let $\hat{g}_{NE} : R \rightarrow R$ by $\hat{g}_{NE}(q) = q_{NE}$ as above for the cell C such that $q \in C \setminus C_{NE}$. Note that \hat{g}_{NE} is well-defined on R by Claim

6.15. Let $g_{\text{NE}} : R \rightarrow B_{\text{NE}}$ by

$$g_{\text{NE}}(q) = \begin{cases} q & q \in B_{\text{NE}} \\ g_{\text{NE}}(\hat{g}_{\text{NE}}(q)) & q \in B_{\text{NE}}. \end{cases}$$

Define the corresponding points for the other intercardinal directions analogously. Let $I_S(q)$ denote the set of i such that q is to the south of P_i as in Remark 6.3

Remark 6.17. If $q \in R \setminus B_{\text{NE}}$, then $I_S(\hat{g}_{\text{NE}}(q)) \subset I_S(q)$ since q is in a cell C that is to the south of some path through $\hat{g}_{\text{NE}}(q)$ and q is not on that path, and q is not on or separated from $\hat{g}_{\text{NE}}(q)$ any path north of $\hat{g}_{\text{NE}}(q)$, since $\hat{g}_{\text{NE}}(q) \in C$ and $q \notin C_{\text{NE}}$. Therefore, iterating \hat{g}_{NE} eventually stabilizes at a point on B_{NE} . Hence, g_{NE} is well-defined.

Claim 6.18. $L_+(C, q) \cap L_-(C, q) = q$. Also, q_{NE} is either northeast of q_{NW} or q_{SE} along ∂C , and q_{NE} is strictly northeast of one of these points unless $q \in C_{\text{NE}}$. This holds analogously for the other intercardinal directions.

Claim 6.19. If q_1 is strictly southeast of q_0 along paths of P , B , and \mathcal{L}_- , then $g_{\text{NE}}(q_1)$ is strictly southeast of $g_{\text{NE}}(q_0)$.

Proof. Let $L_i = L_+(C, q_i)$, and $K_i = h_+(L_i)$.

Consider the case where $q_1, q_0 \in C_{\text{SW}}$ for some cell C . Then, $h_+(q_1) > h_+(q_0) > 0$, so the semicircle K_0 is contained in the half-disk bounded by K_1 , so $h_+\hat{g}_{\text{NE}}(q_1) < h_+\hat{g}_{\text{NE}}(q_0) < 0$, so $\hat{g}_{\text{NE}}(q_1)$ is strictly southeast of $\hat{g}_{\text{NE}}(q_0)$, so $g_{\text{NE}}(q_1)$ is strictly southeast of $g_{\text{NE}}(q_0)$ by induction on the number of iterations for \hat{g}_{NE} reach B_{NE} .

Next, consider the case where $q_1, q_0 \in L \in \mathcal{L}_-$ in the same region $C \setminus C_{\text{NE}}$ of \mathcal{D}_{NE} . Then, $q_{\text{SE}} = q_{1,\text{SE}} = q_{0,\text{SE}}$ is strictly southeast of one of the points $\{q_{0,\text{NE}}, q_{0,\text{SW}}\} = L_0 \cap \partial C$ by Claim 6.18, so $h_+(q_{\text{SE}})$ is outside the semicircle K_0 . Also, q_1 appears between q_0 and q_{SE} on L since q_1 is strictly southeast of q_0 , so $h_+(q_1)$ appears between between $h_+(q_0)$ and $h_+(q_{\text{SE}})$ on $h_+(L)$, so $h_+(q_1)$ is outside the semicircle K_0 , so K_1 is outside the semicircle K_0 , so $h_+\hat{g}_{\text{NE}}(q_1) < h_+\hat{g}_{\text{NE}}(q_0) \leq 0$, so $g_{\text{NE}}(q_1)$ is strictly southeast of $g_{\text{NE}}(q_0)$ as above.

Paths of P and B are either along the southwest boarder of a cell or on B_{NE} , so the above cases cover the cases where q_1 and q_0 are in the same region of \mathcal{D}_{NE} . In general we have that $g_{\text{NE}}(q_1)$ is strictly southeast of $g_{\text{NE}}(q_0)$ by induction on the number of regions of \mathcal{D}_{NE} along the southeastward path from q_0 to q_1 . \square

To prove Claim 6.18, we first prove the analogous numerical claim, namely Claim 6.20. Let

$$x_k = h_+(q_k), \quad y_k = h_-(q_k)$$

for each intercardinal direction k .

Claim 6.20. *If $x_{SE} \neq 0$ and $x_{NW} \neq \infty$, then one of the following four strings of inequalities holds,*

$$\begin{aligned} x_{NE} < x_{NW} \leq x_{SW} \leq x_{SE} > 0, \\ x_{NE} \leq x_{NW} \leq x_{SW} < x_{SE} > 0, \\ 0 > x_{SE} < x_{NE} \leq x_{NW} \leq x_{SW}, \\ 0 > x_{SE} \leq x_{NE} \leq x_{NW} < x_{SW}. \end{aligned}$$

If $x_{SE} = 0$, then $x_{NE} = x_{NW} = x_{SW} = 0$. If $x_{NW} = \infty$, then $x_{SW} = x_{SE} = x_{NE} = \infty$.

Note that the values x_k are in the one point compactification of the real line, $\overline{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R} \cup \infty$. Also, (\leq) is only a total order on \mathbb{R} . We use the convention that if $x \neq \infty$, then both $x < \infty$ and $\infty < x$ hold, and we write the latter inequality as $-\infty < x$, although the meaning is the same.

Proof. We start by dealing with several special cases. We first deal with special cases where $x_{SE} = 0$, and then where $x_{NW} = \infty$, and then where q is one of the points p_{NW}, p_{NE}, p_{SE} , or p_{SW} . We then deal with the cases where $x_{SE} = \infty$, $x_{SE} > 0$, and $x_{SE} < 0$.

The cases where $x_{SE} > 0$ and $x_{SE} < 0$ will use calculations involving h_+ and h_- . Recall that the maps h_k were only defined up to positive scaling. We would like to choose these scaling factors so that $h_+(p_{NE}) = -1$ and $h_-(p_{SE}) = 1$, but to do so we will need to deal with another special case where $p_{NE} = p_{SE}$ to ensure that $h_+(p_{NE})$ and $h_-(p_{SE})$ are finite.

Let $h = h_+ h_-^{-1}$, and let

$$\Theta_+ = h_+(\mathcal{L}_+(C, q)), \quad \Theta_- = h_-(\mathcal{L}_-(C, q)).$$

Observe that Θ_+ , Θ_- , and $h(\Theta_-)$ are the possibly degenerate upper semicircles centered on the real line where Θ_+ has endpoints x_{SW} and x_{NE} , and Θ_- has endpoints y_{NW} and y_{SE} , and $h(\Theta_-)$ has endpoints x_{NW} and x_{SE} . Also,

$$x_{NE} = -2x_{SW}, \quad y_{NW} = \frac{-1}{2}y_{SE}$$

by Definition 6.11.

Consider the case where $x_{SE} = 0$. Then, $q_{SE} = h_+^{-1}(0) = p_{NW} \in C_{NW}$, so $q_{SE} \in C_{NW} \cap C_{SE} = \{p_{NE}, p_{SW}\}$, so $q_{SE} = p_{NW} = p_{SW}$ by Remark 6.13, and so Θ_- has endpoints $y_{SE} = h_-(q_{SE}) = h_-(q_{SW}) = 0$ and $y_{NW} = \frac{-1}{2}y_{SE} = 0$, so $\Theta_- = 0$, so $q = p_{SW} = p_{NW}$, so $q_{NE} = q_{NW} = q_{SW} = p_{NW}$, so $x_{NE} = x_{NW} = x_{SW} = 0$.

Consider the case where $x_{NW} = \infty$. Then, $q_{NW} = h_+^{-1}(\infty) = p_{SE} \in C_{SE}$, so

$q_{NW} \in C_{NW} \cap C_{SE} = \{p_{NE}, p_{SW}\}$, so $q_{NW} = p_{SE} = p_{NE}$ by Remark 6.13, so $y_{NW} = h_-(q_{NW}) = h_-(p_{NE}) = \infty$, and so Θ_- is the possibly degenerate semicircle with endpoints $y_{NW} = \infty$ and $y_{SE} = -2y_{NW} = \infty$, so $\Theta_- = \infty$, and $h_-(q) \in \Theta_-$, so $q = p_{NE} = p_{SE}$, so $q_{NE} = q_{SE} = q_{SW} = p_{SE}$, so $x_{SW} = x_{SE} = x_{NE} = \infty$.

Next, we deal with the cases where $q \in \{p_{NE}, p_{NW}, p_{SW}, p_{SE}\}$ and $x_{SE} \neq 0$, $x_{NW} \neq \infty$.

If $q = p_{SE}$, then $q_{NE} = q_{SE} = q_{SW} = p_{SE}$, so $-\infty = x_{NE} < x_{NW} < x_{SW} = x_{SE} = \infty$.

If $q = p_{NW}$, then $q_{NE} = q_{NW} = q_{SW} = p_{NW}$, so $x_{NE} = x_{NW} = x_{SW} = 0$.

If $q = p_{NE}$, then $q_{NW} = q_{NE} = q_{SE}$, so $x_{SE} = x_{NE} = x_{NW} < 0 \leq x_{SW}$.

If $q = p_{SW}$, then $q_{NW} = q_{SW} = q_{SE}$, so $x_{NE} \leq 0 < x_{NW} = x_{SW} = x_{SE}$.

For the rest of the proof let us assume that $q \notin \{p_{NE}, p_{NW}, p_{SW}, p_{SE}\}$ and $x_{SE} \neq 0$, $x_{NW} \neq \infty$. This means that Θ_+ and $h(\Theta_-)$ are nondegenerate semicircles that pass through $h_+(q)$, and therefore $\infty \notin \{x_{NE}, x_{SW}\}$ and the endpoints of these semicircles alternate on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$. Hence, $x_{SE} \neq x_{NW}$ and $x_{SW} \neq x_{NE}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{either } x_{NE} \leq x_{SE} \leq x_{SW} \quad \text{and} \quad x_{NW} \notin (x_{NE}, x_{SW})_{\mathbb{R}} \quad (\text{clockwise}), \\ & \text{or } x_{NE} \leq x_{NW} \leq x_{SW} \quad \text{and} \quad x_{SE} \notin (x_{NE}, x_{SW})_{\mathbb{R}} \quad (\text{counter-clockwise}). \end{aligned}$$

To distinguish these, in the first case we say the x_k increase clockwise, and in the second case say the x_k increase counter-clockwise. This is consistent with the convention that southeast is clockwise of northeast. To complete the proof, we show that the x_k increase counter-clockwise.

If $x_{SE} = \infty$, then $x_{SE} \notin [x_{NE}, x_{SW}]_{\mathbb{R}}$, so the x_k increase counter-clockwise.

For the sake of contradiction, let us assume that the x_k are finite and increase clockwise.

Consider the case where $p_{NE} = p_{SE}$. Then,

$$h_+^{-1}(\infty) = p_{SE} = p_{NE} = h_-^{-1}(\infty),$$

so h is a linear fractional transformation that preserves the real line and preserves the point at ∞ , and since h_+ and h_- are only defined up to positive scalar multiple, which we are free to choose, we may choose these so that h is a translation. Also,

$h(0) = h_+ \circ h_-^{-1}(0) = h_+(p_{SW}) \geq 0$, since $p_{SW} \in C_{SW}$, so $h(z) = z + h_+(p_{SW})$, and $h_+(p_{SW}) < \infty$, since $p_{SW} \neq p_{NE} = p_{SE}$. Hence,

$$x_{NW} = h(y_{NW}) = h\left(\frac{-1}{2}y_{SE}\right) = h\left(\frac{-1}{2}h^{-1}(x_{SE})\right) = \frac{-1}{2}x_{SE} + \frac{3}{2}h_+(p_{SW}) \geq \frac{-1}{2}x_{SE}.$$

Also, $C_E = p_{SE}$ is a single point, so $q_{SE} \in C_{SE} = C_S$, so $x_{SE} \geq h_+(p_{SW}) \geq 0$, and we have already eliminated the case where $x_{SE} = 0$, so $x_{SE} > 0$. Since we assume the x_k increase

clockwise, we have $x_{NE} \leq x_{SE} \leq x_{SW}$ and $x_{NW} \notin (x_{NE}, x_{SW})_{\mathbb{R}}$, so

$$x_{NW} \geq \frac{-1}{2}x_{SE} \geq \frac{-1}{2}x_{SW} > -2x_{SW} = x_{NE},$$

so $x_{NW} > x_{NE}$, which implies that $x_{NW} \geq x_{SW}$, so

$$x_{NW} \geq x_{SW} \geq x_{SE} \geq h_+(p_{SW}) \geq x_{NW},$$

but that contradicts $x_{NW} \neq x_{SE}$.

For the rest of the proof let us assume that $p_{NE} \neq p_{SE}$. Then, $h_+(p_{NE}) \in (-\infty, 0)$ and $h_-(p_{SE}) \in (0, \infty)$, and h preserves cross-ratios, so

$$\frac{h_-(p_{NW})}{h_-(p_{SE})} = \text{cr}(0, \infty; h_-(p_{NW}), h_-(p_{SE})) = \text{cr}(h_+(p_{SW}), h_+(p_{NE}); 0, \infty) = \frac{h_+(p_{SW})}{h_+(p_{NE})}.$$

Since h_+ and h_- were only defined up to positive scalar, let us choose these scalars and $r > 0$ so that

$$h_+(p_{NE}) = -1, \quad h_+(p_{SW}) = r, \quad h_-(p_{SE}) = 1, \quad h_-(p_{NW}) = -r.$$

Then, h is the linear fractional transformation such that $h(1) = h_+(p_{SE}) = \infty$, $h(-r) = h_+(p_{NW}) = 0$, and $h(\infty) = h_+(p_{NE}) = -1$, so

$$h(z) = \frac{-z - r}{z - 1}, \quad h^{-1}(z) = \frac{z - r}{z + 1}.$$

Since $q_{NW} \in C_{NW}$ and $q_{SE} \in C_{SE}$, we have

$$-1 \leq x_{NW} \leq r \quad \text{and} \quad x_{SE} \notin (-1, r).$$

Consider the case where $x_{SE} > 0$. Then, $q_{SE} \in C_S$, so $x_{SE} \geq r$. Also,

$$h \circ \frac{-1}{2}h^{-1}(z) = \frac{(-1 + 2r)z + 3r}{3z - r + 2}$$

is decreasing except at $\frac{r-2}{3}$ since $\frac{d}{dz}[h \circ \frac{-1}{2}h^{-1}](z) = \frac{-2(r^2+2r+1)}{(3z-r+2)^2} < 0$, and $\frac{r-2}{3} < r \leq x_{SE} \leq x_{SW}$ by our assumption that the x_k increase clockwise, so

$$\begin{aligned} 3x_{SW} - r + 2 &> 0, \\ ((-1 + 2r)x_{SW} + 3r) + 2x_{SW}(3x_{SW} - r + 2) &= 6x_{SW}^2 + 3x_{SW} + 3r > 0, \\ x_{NW} = h \circ \frac{-1}{2}h^{-1}(x_{SE}) &\geq h \circ \frac{-1}{2}h^{-1}(x_{SW}) = \frac{-(1 + 2r)x_{SW} + 3r}{3x_{SW} - r + 2} > -2x_{SW} = x_{NE}. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality $x_{NW} > x_{NE}$ together with our assumption that the x_k increase clockwise

implies that $x_{NW} \geq x_{SW}$, so $r \leq x_{SE} \leq x_{SW} \leq x_{NW} \leq r$, but that contradicts $x_{NW} \neq x_{SE}$.

Consider the case where $x_{SE} < 0$. Then, $q_{SE} \in C_E \setminus \{p_{NE}, p_{SE}\}$, so $x_{SE} \leq -1$, and $\frac{r-2}{3} > -1 \geq x_{SE} \geq x_{NE}$ by our assumption that the x_k increase clockwise, so

$$2((-1 + 2r)x_{NE} + 3r) + x_{NE}(3x_{NE} - r + 2) = 3x_{NE}^2 + 3rx_{NE} + 6r > 0,$$

$$x_{NW} = h \circ \frac{-1}{2}h^{-1}(x_{SE}) \leq h_3 \circ \frac{-1}{2}h^{-1}(x_{NE}) = \frac{(-1 + 2r)x_{NE} + 3r}{3x_{NE} - r + 2} < \frac{-1}{2}x_{NE} = x_{SW}.$$

The inequality $x_{NW} < x_{SW}$ together with our assumption that the x_k increase clockwise implies that $x_{NW} \leq x_{NE}$, so $-1 \leq x_{NW} \leq x_{NE} \leq x_{SE} \leq -1$, but that contradicts $x_{NW} \neq x_{SE}$.

Thus, the x_k increase counter-clockwise. \square

Proof of Claim 6.18. Let us use the same notation as in the proof of Claim 6.20. Θ_+ and $h(\Theta_-)$ are either distinct upper semicircles centered on the real line or a single point, so Θ_+ and $h(\Theta_-)$ cannot intersect at multiple points, so $\Theta_+ \cap h(\Theta_-) = h_+(q)$, so $L_+(C, q) \cap L_-(C, q) = q$.

For the second part of the proof, we split into cases where q_{NE} is in C_N or C_E .

Consider the case where $q_{NE} \in C_N$. Then, $x_{NE} \leq x_{NW}$ by Claim 6.20. If $x_{NE} = x_{NW}$, then $\Theta_+ \cap h(\Theta_-) = x_{NE}$, since x_{NE} is an endpoint of Θ_+ and x_{NW} is an endpoint of $h(\Theta_-)$, so $L_+(C, q) \cap L_-(C, q) = q_{NE} = q_{NW} = q$, so $q \in C_{NE}$ and q_{NE} is northeast of q_{NW} , so the claim holds. If $x_{NE} < x_{NW}$, then $h_+(q_{NE}) < h_+(q_{NW})$ and h_+ is decreasing northeastward on C_N , so q_{NE} is strictly northeast of q_{NW} . Thus, the claim holds in the case where $q_{NE} \in C_N$.

Consider the case where $q_{NE} \in C_E$. If $q_{SE} \in C_S$, then q_{NE} is strictly northeast of q_{SE} and the claim holds, so let us assume that $q_{SE} \notin C_S$. Then, $q_{SE} \in C_E \setminus p_{SE}$, so $x_{SE} < 0$, so $x_{SE} \leq x_{NE}$ by Claim 6.20. If $x_{SE} = x_{NE}$, then $q = q_{NE} = q_{SE} \in C_{NE}$ and q_{NE} is northeast of q_{SE} as above, so the claim holds. If $x_{SE} < x_{NE}$, then $h_+(q_{SE}) < h_+(q_{NE})$ and h_+ is increasing northeastward on C_E , so q_{NE} is strictly northeast of q_{SE} . Thus, the claim holds in the case where $q_{NE} \in C_E$.

Analogous statements for the other intercardinal directions follow similarly. \square

Proof of Lemma 6.4 parts 4 and 5. Suppose there were $L_+ \in \mathcal{L}_+$ and $L_- \in \mathcal{L}_-$ with distinct points q_0, q_1 on $L_+ \cap L_-$. Then, $g_{NE}(q_0) = L_+ \cap B_{NE} = g_{NE}(q_1)$, but one of the points must be southeast of the other on L_- , which would contradict Claim 6.19. Similarly, if there were distinct points q_0, q_1 on $L_+ \cap P_i$ for $P_i \in P$, then we would have a contradiction in the same way. Suppose $q = L_+ \cap P_i$ is not an endpoint of L_+ . Then $q \in C_{SW} \setminus \{p_{NW}, p_{SE}\}$ and P_i directed eastward traverses C_{SW} directed from p_{NW} to p_{SE} , which is from the northwest of L_+ to the southeast. A similar argument shows that we cannot have distinct points on $L_- \cap P_i$, and P_i directed eastward crosses from southwest to northeast. Thus, parts 4 and 5 hold. \square

Proof of Lemma 6.4 part 6. Consider a southward directed zigzag path Z that alternates between leaves of \mathcal{L}_+ and \mathcal{L}_- as in part 6. Since the path Z is directed southward, $I_N(q)$ for $q \in Z$ shrinks each time Z crosses a path of P by Remark 6.17, so the path cannot return to a cell more than once. Hence, there must be a cell $C \in \mathcal{C}$ where Z traverses infinitely many leaves of \mathcal{L}_+ and \mathcal{L}_- . Since B_W and B_E are disjoint, the southern boarder C_S cannot be a single point, so $p_{SW} \neq p_{SE}$, and $p_{SW} \in C_{SW}$, so $0 \leq h_+(p_{SW}) < h_+(p_{SE}) = \infty$.

Let q_0 be the southwest most point of an edge $L_+(q_0) \in \mathcal{L}_+$ of Z . We claim that there are only finitely many edge of Z in C south of q_0 . If q_0 is not an endpoint of $L_+(q_0)$, then $L_+(q_0)$ continues into another cell south of C , so $L_+(q_0)$ is the last edge of Z through C and the claim holds. Let us suppose q_0 is an endpoint of $L_+(q_0)$. If $q_0 \in C_S$, then $q_0 \in B_S$ is the southeast endpoint of the edge $L_-(q_0)$, so the leaf $L_-(q_0)$ extends northward from q_0 , so Z cannot continue along a leaf of \mathcal{L}_- , which again means that $L_+(q_0)$ is the last edge.

Let us suppose $q_0 \notin C_S$, and let q_1, q_2, \dots be the sequence of vertices of Z continuing south from q_0 . Then, $q_1 \in C_{SE}$ since q_1 is the southeast endpoint of $L_-(q_0)$, and if $q_1 \in C_S$ then q_1 is the southwest endpoint of $L_+(q_1)$ and Z cannot continue southward along a leaf of \mathcal{L}_+ in C .

Let us suppose that $q_1 \notin C_S$. Then, $q_1 = \hat{g}_{SE}(q_0) \in C_E$, so q_1 is not comparable to $\hat{g}_{SW}(q_0) \in C_{SW}$ on ∂C directed southeastward, so q_1 is strictly southeast of $\hat{g}_{NE}(q_0)$ by Claim 6.18, so

$$h_+(q_2) = h_+(\hat{g}_{SW}(q_1)) = \frac{-1}{2}h_+(q_1) < \frac{-1}{2}h_+(\hat{g}_{NE}(q_0)) = h_+(q_0),$$

which means that q_2 is strictly southeast of q_0 .

Let us suppose that $q_1, q_2, q_3, \dots \notin C_S$. Then, $q_2, q_4, q_6, \dots \in C_W$ is monotonic on C_W by the argument above, and since C_W is compact, the sequence converges to a point $q_{2\infty} \in C_W$.

Also, $q_{2i+2} = \hat{g}_{SW}\hat{g}_{SE}(q_{2i})$, and the restriction of $\hat{g}_{SW}\hat{g}_{SE}$ to S_W is a Möbius transformation, and in particular is continuous, so $q_{2\infty} \in C_{SW}$ is a fixed-point of $\hat{g}_{SW}\hat{g}_{SE}$, and also q_1, q_3, q_5, \dots converges to a fixed-point $q_{2\infty+1} = \hat{g}_{SE}(q_{2\infty})$ of $\hat{g}_{SE}\hat{g}_{SW}$ on C_E , but by the same argument as above, $\hat{g}_{SW}\hat{g}_{SE}(q_{2\infty})$ is strictly southeast of $q_{2\infty}$, which is a contradiction.

Thus, there is no southward zigzag path with infinitely many edges, which means part 6 holds. \square

Proof of Lemma 6.4 part 7. Let $(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_+, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_-) = \text{fol}(R, \tilde{B}, P)$ where B_N and B_S are swapped in \tilde{B} and denote the corresponding objects in the construction of $\text{fol}(R, \tilde{B}, P)$ in Definition 6.11 with the diacritic. Then, we have the same cells, but $\tilde{C}_N = C_S$ and $\tilde{C}_S = C_N$, so $-h_-(\tilde{p}_{NW}) = -h_-(p_{SW}) = 0$, and $-h_-(\tilde{p}_{SE}) = -h_-(p_{NE}) = \infty$ and $-h_-(\tilde{C}_{NE}) = -h_-(C_{SE}) = [-\infty, 0]$, and $-h_-$ is internally isogonal, so $\tilde{h}_+ = -h_-$ with appropriate choice of positive scalar as in Remark 6.12, so $\tilde{h}_+^{-1}(rK_+) = h_-^{-1}(-rK_+) = h_-^{-1}(rK_-)$, so $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_+ = \mathcal{L}_-$, and similarly $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_- = \mathcal{L}_+$. Thus, part 7

holds. □

7 Zoning

The construction of ebb_D from Lemma 5.9 in Definition 8.2, will involve subdividing the sphere into a face decomposition, called a zoning, and defining the deformation separately in each face. While there are many ways that this could potentially be done, the decomposition that we use is the result of a 3-way compromise between simplicity of the definition, ease of construction, and applicability to constructing an appropriate deformation.

This decomposition will include a subregion within each facet covector region that pseudocircles will be forbidden from moving into so as to prevent the inradius of a facet covector region from shrinking too much, which will ensure that part 3 of Lemma 5.9 holds. This will also prevent the inradius of the vanishing region from growing too much, which will ensure that part 4 holds.

Definition 7.1 (Zoning). A **generic \mathcal{M} -zoning** is a face lattice decomposition Z of the 2-sphere with a 2-cell $Z(\Sigma)$ for each chain of $\text{cspH}(\mathcal{M})$ that intersect as in Figure 4. Specifically, cells $Z(\Sigma_1)$ and $Z(\Sigma_2)$ share a common edge when $\Sigma_1 \subset \Sigma_2$ and $|\Sigma_2| = |\Sigma_1| + 1$ or when $\Sigma_2 = \{v, \sigma, \tau\}$ and $\Sigma_1 = \{\tau\}$ for a maximal chain $v < \sigma < \tau$.




Figure 4: A portion of an \mathcal{M} -zoning in black with an accommodated arrangement in light blue. Zones $Z(\Sigma)$ for $\Sigma \subset \{v, \sigma, \tau\}$ are labeled.

Note that a generic \mathcal{M} -zoning Z has a $2k$ -gonal cell $Z\{v\}$ for each vertex covector v of degree k , and has a $4k$ -gonal cell $Z\{\tau\}$ for each facet covector τ of degree k , and has a square cell for each edge covector. Z also has a square cell $Z\{\sigma, \tau\}$ for comparable pair $\sigma < \tau$ of covectors, which is adjacent to the cells $Z\{\sigma\}$ and $Z\{\tau\}$, and Z has a square cell $Z(\Sigma)$ for each maximal chain Σ , which is adjacent to each cell corresponding to a pair of covectors in Σ and the the cell corresponding to the facet covector; see Figure 4.

We generally just define the 2-cells of Z , which we call *zones*, since this determines all lower dimensional cells. We may write $Z(\sigma)$ for $Z\{\sigma\}$, and we write $Z(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2)$ for the face $Z(\Sigma_1) \cap Z(\Sigma_2)$.

For the sake of some compactness arguments later, we define a *degenerate* \mathcal{M} -zoning Z by

$$Z(\Sigma) = \bigcap \{ \text{cl}(\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\mathcal{M}, A; \sigma)) : \sigma \in \Sigma \}.$$

for some arrangement $A \in \text{upa}(\mathcal{M})$. We say Z is *fully degenerate* when $A \in \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M})$, and we may identify Z with A when convenient. A \mathcal{M} -zoning could be generic or degenerate.

We measure *distance* between \mathcal{M} -zonings by the maximum Fréchet distance between corresponding edges of the face decomposition. That is,

$$\text{dist}(Z_1, Z_0) = \max_{\Sigma, \Sigma'} \text{dist}_F(Z_1(\Sigma, \Sigma'), Z_0(\Sigma, \Sigma'))$$

where Σ, Σ' are an adjacent pair of chains in the face lattice of a generic \mathcal{M} -zoning with $Z(\Sigma, \Sigma')$ directed according to some fixed ordering on covectors. Note that this is well-defined for degenerate zonings since $Z(\Sigma, \Sigma')$ is a path or point by Lemma 4.1 part 1.

Let $Z(\Sigma)$ be an *inner* $(i, +)$ -zone when $i \in \sigma^+$ for each $\sigma \in \Sigma$, and let $Z(\Sigma)$ be a *wider* $(i, +)$ -zone when $i \in \sigma^+$ for some $\sigma \in \Sigma$. Let $\text{inner}(Z, i, +)$ be the union of the inner $(i, +)$ -zone and $\text{wider}(Z, i, +)$ be the union of the wider $(i, +)$ -zone. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{inner}(Z, i, +) &= \bigcup \{ Z(\Sigma) : i \in \bigcap \Sigma^+ \}, \\ \text{wider}(Z, i, +) &= \bigcup \{ Z(\Sigma) : i \in \bigcup \Sigma^+ \}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Sigma^+ = \{ \sigma^+ : \sigma \in \Sigma \}$. We define Σ^- and Σ^0 and inner and wider $(i, -)$ -zones and $(i, 0)$ -zones analogously.

Remark 7.2.

$$\begin{aligned} &\{ \text{inner}(Z, i, 0), \text{wider}(Z, i, +), \text{wider}(Z, i, -) \}, \\ &\{ \text{wider}(Z, i, 0), \text{inner}(Z, i, +), \text{inner}(Z, i, -) \} \end{aligned}$$

are subdivisions of \mathbf{S}^2 .

Definition 7.3 (Accommodating an arrangement). We say a generic \mathcal{M} -zoning Z **accommodates** an arrangement A when for each nonloop i of \mathcal{M} in the ground set of A ,

$$\text{inner}(Z, i, 0)^\circ \supset S_i, \quad \text{wider}(Z, i, +) \subset S_i^+, \quad \text{wider}(Z, i, -) \subset S_i^-,$$

and $S_i \cap Z(\Sigma)$ is a path with endpoints $S_i \cap \partial Z(\Sigma)$ for each inner $(i, 0)$ -zone $Z(\Sigma)$. Also, the fully degenerate zoning defined by A accommodates A as well as the restriction to a smaller ground set.

Let $\text{facet}(Z)$ denote the set of zones $Z(\sigma)$ for each facet covector σ of $\text{csph}(\mathcal{M})$. We say $F = \text{facet}(Z)$ **accommodates** A when the above holds for each zone $F(\sigma)$. That is, $F(\sigma) \subset S_i^\sigma$ for each $i \in \text{supp}(\sigma)$.

We say that Z accommodates A ε -**tightly** when each facet covector σ has the boundary of its zone $\partial Z(\sigma)$ within Fréchet distance ε of $\partial \text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma)$, and $\text{wider}(Z, i, 0) \subset S_i \oplus \varepsilon$ for each nonloop i . We also say the fully degenerate zoning defined by A accommodates A 0-tightly. Let $\text{tight}(Z, A)$ be the infimum of ε such that Z accommodates A ε -tightly.

Definition 7.4 (Preference). Given subsets $N_1 \subset \dots \subset N_L \subseteq [n]_{\mathbb{N}}$, let

$$(\lesssim) = \text{pref}(N_1, \dots, N_L)$$

be the total preorder on $[n]_{\mathbb{N}}$ where $j \lesssim i$ when each of the sets N_k that contain i also contain j . That is, the N_k are upper sets of (\lesssim) . We may also call (\lesssim) a **preference**. We write $j \lesssim i$ when $j \lesssim i$, but the reverse does not hold, or equivariantly, strictly more of the sets N_k contain i than contain j .

The **greedy choice** i_g from $I \subseteq [n]$ is the minimum element in the natural order on $[n]$ among the maximal elements of I with respect to (\lesssim) . That is,

$$i_g = \min\{i \in I : \forall j \in I, j \lesssim i\}.$$

We say i is a **greedy element** of (\mathcal{M}, \lesssim) when i is the greedy choice from its span.

We say (\lesssim) **favors nonloops** of \mathcal{M} when if j is a loop of \mathcal{M} but i is not, then $j \lesssim i$. We say (\lesssim) favors nonloops of a chain \mathcal{C} when (\lesssim) favors nonloops for each oriented matroid in \mathcal{C} . A **preferred set** is a full rank upper set.

A **generic** (\mathcal{M}, \lesssim) -**zoning** Z consists of a \mathcal{N}_k -zoning Z_k for each restriction $\mathcal{N}_k = \text{rest}(N_k, \mathcal{M})$ to a preferred set N_k satisfying the following. If $N_j \subset N_k$ and $i \in N_j$, then we require

$$\text{inner}(Z_j, i, +)^\circ \supset \text{wider}(Z_k, i, +) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{inner}(Z_j, i, -)^\circ \supset \text{wider}(Z_k, i, -).$$

Equivalently, if $Z_j(\Sigma_1) \cap Z_k(\Sigma_2) \neq \emptyset$ for $j < k$, then $\sigma_j \geq_v \text{rest}(N_j, \sigma_k)$ for each pair of $\sigma_j \in \Sigma_j$, $\sigma_k \in \Sigma_k$. We also define a **degenerate** (\mathcal{M}, \lesssim) -zoning as a sequence of \mathcal{N}_k -zonings where one or more Z_k is degenerate and

$$\text{inner}(Z_j, i, +) \supseteq \text{wider}(Z_k, i, +) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{inner}(Z_j, i, -) \supseteq \text{wider}(Z_k, i, -)$$

for $i \in N_j \subset N_k$ and we say Z is **fully degenerate** when each Z_k is fully degenerate.

We say that Z **accommodates** A when each Z_k accommodates A , and $\text{tight}(Z, A)$ is the maximum among $\text{tight}(Z_k, A)$. To measure distance between (\mathcal{M}, \lesssim) -zonings, we take the maximum distance between the corresponding \mathcal{N}_k -zonings.

7.1 Zone map

Lemma 7.5 (Zone map). *Given $A \in \text{upa}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\varepsilon \geq 0$, then $Z = \text{zone}(\mathcal{M}, \lesssim, \varepsilon, A)$ is a (\mathcal{M}, \lesssim) -zoning that ε -tightly accommodates A and depends continuously and O_3 -equivariantly on (ε, A) . Also, Z is generic if $\varepsilon > 0$.*

Definition 7.6 (Zone map). To construct $\text{zone}(\mathcal{M}, \lesssim, \varepsilon, A)$, we first construct a continuous family of \mathcal{M} -zonings $Z(A, x)$ for $x \in [2/3, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}$ for which the tightness decreases to 0 as $x \rightarrow 1$. We will construct regions

$$Z_\omega(\Sigma) = Z(A, x, \Sigma) \cap \text{cl}(\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\omega))$$

for each $\omega \in \text{csp}(\mathcal{M})$ and chain $\Sigma \leq \omega$. That is, $\sigma \leq \omega$ for each $\sigma \in \Sigma$.

In the case where $\omega = v$ is a vertex covector of \mathcal{M} , let $Z_v(v) = \text{maxcov}^{-1}(v)$.

Consider the case where $\omega = \sigma$ is an edge covector of $\text{csp}(\mathcal{M})$. Since $\widehat{\text{cov}}(\mathcal{M})$ is thin, there are exactly two vertex covectors $\{v_1, v_2\} < \sigma$, and two facet covectors $\{\tau_1, \tau_2\} > \sigma$. Let $R = \text{cl}(\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma))$,

$$\begin{aligned} B_N &= R \cap \text{cl}(\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\tau_1)), & B_W &= R \cap \text{maxcov}^{-1}(v_1), \\ B_S &= R \cap \text{cl}(\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\tau_2)), & B_E &= R \cap \text{maxcov}^{-1}(v_2). \end{aligned}$$

Let P be the restriction of pseudocircles of A that vanish on σ to R . Let i_0 be the greedy choice from σ^0 , and $h(i_0) = 0$. Let $\xi = \text{mox}(R, B, P, h)$, and let ξ_1 be the projection of ξ to

the first coordinate. Let

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_\sigma(v_1) &= \xi_1^{-1}[0, \frac{1-x}{2}], \\
Z_\sigma(\{v_1, \sigma\}) &= \xi_1^{-1}[\frac{1-x}{2}, 1-x], \\
Z_\sigma(\sigma) &= \xi_1^{-1}[1-x, x], \\
Z_\sigma(\{v_2, \sigma\}) &= \xi_1^{-1}[x, \frac{x+1}{2}], \\
Z_\sigma(v_2) &= \xi_1^{-1}[\frac{x+1}{2}, 1].
\end{aligned}$$

Consider the case where $\omega = \tau$ is a facet covector of $\text{csph}(\mathcal{M})$. Let $(\Sigma_0, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2)$ be the greedily chosen triple of extensions of τ to maximal chains of $\text{csph}(\mathcal{M})$ that only have τ in common, and let

$$p_k = \bigcap_{\sigma \in \Sigma_k} \text{cl}(\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma))$$

as in Lemma 4.4, and let $\varphi : \mathbf{D} \rightarrow C_\tau = \text{cl}(\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\tau))$ be the internally isogonal map where $\varphi(e^{2\pi ki/3}) = p_k$. Note that our greedy choice is by support, so for $\omega = -\tau$ we choose the chains $(-\Sigma_0, -\Sigma_1, -\Sigma_2)$. Let

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_\tau(\tau) &= \varphi(x \mathbf{D}), \\
C_\Sigma &= \{ru : r \in [0, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}, u \in \varphi^{-1}(Z_{\tilde{\omega}}(\Sigma)), \tilde{\omega} < \omega\}, \\
Z_\tau(\Sigma) &= \varphi(C_\Sigma \setminus \frac{1+x}{2} \mathbf{D}^\circ) \\
Z_\tau(\Sigma \cup \{\tau\}) &= \varphi(C_\Sigma \cap \frac{1+x}{2} \mathbf{D} \setminus x \mathbf{D}^\circ)
\end{aligned}$$

That is, C_Σ is the cone emanating from the origin that meets the circle at the union of arcs covered by $Z_{\tilde{\omega}}(\Sigma)$ among $\tilde{\omega} < \tau$, which is where the portion of $Z(\Sigma)$ that we just defined above meets C_τ , and $Z_\tau(\Sigma)$ and $Z_\tau(\Sigma \cup \{\tau\})$ are portions of the cone C_Σ in annuli close the unit circle.

Let $Z(A, x)$ be the subdivision of \mathbf{S}^2 into zones

$$Z(A, x, \Sigma) = \bigcup \{Z_\omega(\Sigma) : \omega \in \text{csph}(\mathcal{M})\}.$$

To construct $\text{zone}(\mathcal{M}, \lesssim, \varepsilon, A)$ from $Z(A, x)$, we start with the coarsest preference $(\lesssim_{\mathcal{M}})$ favoring nonloops of \mathcal{M} and define zonings for finer preferences recursively on the number

of preferred sets. That is, $i \lesssim_{\mathcal{M}} j$ unless j is a loop and i is a nonloop. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \text{zone}(\mathcal{M}, \lesssim_{\mathcal{M}}, \varepsilon, A) &= Z(A, s) \quad \text{where} \\ s &= \text{ext}(b^{-1}, \varepsilon) = \begin{cases} b^{-1}(\varepsilon) & b(2/3) > \varepsilon \\ 2/3 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ b(x) &= \text{tailsup}(b_{\text{test}}; x) + (1 - x), \\ b_{\text{test}}(x) &= \text{tight}(Z(A, x), A). \end{aligned}$$

We next define zones for a general preference. Consider $(\lesssim) = \text{pref}(N_1, \dots, N_L)$ favoring nonloops of \mathcal{M} . Let

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{\text{top}} &= \text{zone}(\mathcal{N}_L, \lesssim_{\mathcal{N}_L}, \varepsilon, A), \\ Z_{\text{rec}} &= \text{zone}(\mathcal{N}_{L-1}, \lesssim_{\text{rec}}, \varepsilon_{\text{rec}}, A), \\ \mathcal{N}_k &= \text{rest}(N_k, \mathcal{M}), \\ \lesssim_{\text{rec}} &= \text{pref}(N_1, \dots, N_{L-1}), \end{aligned}$$

and ε_{rec} is half the minimum distance between $\text{wider}(Z_{\text{top}}, i, s)$ and S_i^{-s} . That is, ε_{rec} is the minimum value satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{wider}(Z_{\text{top}}, i, +) \oplus 2\varepsilon_{\text{rec}}) &\subseteq \text{cl}(S_i^+), \\ (\text{wider}(Z_{\text{top}}, i, -) \oplus 2\varepsilon_{\text{rec}}) &\subseteq \text{cl}(S_i^-). \end{aligned}$$

for each $i \in N_{L-1}$. Let $\text{zone}(\mathcal{M}, \lesssim, \varepsilon, A)$ be the set of zonings Z_{rec} together with Z_{top} .

Claim 7.7. $Z(A, x)$ varies continuously as (A, x) vary.

Proof. We first show continuity of Z_{σ} for an edge covector σ . The region $R = \text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma)$ varies continuously in Hausdorff distance by Lemma 4.7, and the borders B vary continuously in Fréchet distance by Lemma 4.1, so the endpoints of each P_i path of P vary continuously by Lemma 4.5, so P_i varies continuously in Fréchet distance [11, Lemma 3.2.4], so $\xi = \text{mox}(R, B, P, h)$ varies continuously in the partial map metric by Lemma 6.2, so the edges of the cell decomposition $Z_{\sigma}(\Sigma)$ vary continuously in Fréchet distance by Lemma 2.5. Next consider a facet covector τ . The map φ varies continuously in the sup-metric by Radó's theorem, so the edges of $Z_{\tau}(\Sigma)$ vary continuously in Fréchet distance by Lemma 2.5. None of the edges of $Z(A, x)$ pass through $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(v)$ for a vertex covector v , so we need not consider this case. Thus, edges of $Z_{\omega}(\Sigma)$ vary continuously in Fréchet distance for each pair (ω, Σ) , so $Z(A, x)$ varies continuously. \square

Proof of Lemma 7.5. We will induct on the number of preferred sets of (\lesssim) . We start with $(\lesssim_{\mathcal{M}})$.

We first show that $Z = \text{zone}(\mathcal{M}, \lesssim_M, \varepsilon, A)$ accommodates A . We only have regions $Z_\omega(\Sigma) = Z(\Sigma) \cap \text{maxcov}^{-1}(\omega)$ for chains $\Sigma \leq \omega$, so if there is $\sigma \in \Sigma$ with $\sigma(i) = (+)$, then $\omega(i) = (+)$, so $Z(\Sigma) \subset S_i^+$, and similarly for the case where $\sigma(i) = (-)$.

Consider the case where $\sigma(i) = 0$ for some nonloop i and all $\sigma \in \Sigma$, and ω is an edge covector. Then, the arc P_i of S_i is among the paths P , in the construction of $Z_\omega(\Sigma)$, so S_i traverses R from B_W to B_E , and $\xi(S_i)$ is an x -monotone curve, which crosses the vertical lines at x and $1 - x$, which are the endpoints of $\xi(S_i \cap Z(\Sigma))$. The pseudocircle S_i might traverse some portion of B_N , but $Z_\tau(\Sigma)$ for $\tau > \sigma$ is a region of $Z(\Sigma)$ on the other side of S_i , and similarly for B_S , so $S_i \cap Z(\Sigma)$ is a path that intersects $\partial Z(\Sigma)$ at its endpoints. The chain Σ cannot include a facet covector, and this also holds by a similar argument in the case where Σ is a vertex covector or a pair of covectors, so Z accommodates A .

Next we show that Z accommodates A ε -tightly. Observe that $\text{tailsup}(b_{\text{test}})$ is non-increasing, so b is strictly decreasing, so $s = \text{ext}(b^{-1}, \varepsilon)$ is well-defined. Also, $\text{tight}(Z, A) = b_{\text{test}}(s) < b(s) \leq \varepsilon$, so Z accommodates A ε -tightly.

Also, $b(1) = \text{tailsup}(b_{\text{test}}; 1) = b_{\text{test}}(1) = \text{tight}(Z(A, 1); A) = \text{tight}(A; A) = 0$, so if $\varepsilon > 0$, then $b^{-1}(\varepsilon) < 1$ since b is strictly decreasing, so $s < 1$. By construction we have $Z(A, s; \Sigma)$ has nonempty interior for each Σ if $s < 1$, so Z is not degenerate if $\varepsilon > 0$.

Next we show continuity. The boundary of the zone $Z(A, x; \Sigma)$ varies continuously in Fréchet distance by Claim 7.7, so $b_{\text{test}}(x) = \text{tight}(Z(A, x), A)$ varies continuously, so b_{test} varies continuously in the sup-metric by Lemma 2.6, so b varies continuously in the sup-metric, so s varies continuously in the sup-metric by Lemma 2.8, so $Z = Z(A, s(\varepsilon))$ varies continuously.

Next, we show equivariance. The map mox in the construction of Z_σ for an edge covector σ is O_3 -equivariant by Lemma 6.2, so

$$\begin{aligned} Z_\sigma(QA, x, \sigma) &= [\text{mox}(Q(R, B, P), h)]^{-1}([1 - x, x] \times \mathbb{R}) \\ &= Q[\text{mox}(R, B, P, h)]^{-1}([1 - x, x] \times \mathbb{R}) \\ &= QZ_\sigma(\sigma). \end{aligned}$$

and likewise for other chains $\Sigma \ni \sigma$. Also, $Q\varphi$ is isogonal for the map φ the construction of Z_τ for a facet covector τ , and so $Q\varphi$ satisfies the defining conditions of φ with A replaced by QA , and $[Q\varphi]^{-1}(Z_\omega(QA, x, \Sigma)) = \varphi^{-1}(Z_\omega(\Sigma))$, so C_Σ remains unchanged by the O_3 -action on A , so $Z_\tau(QA, x, \Sigma) = QZ_\tau(A, x, \Sigma)$. Thus, zone is O_3 -equivariant.

We now consider a general preference (\lesssim) and argue by induction. We have continuity and equivariance and that Z accommodates A by induction and the same argument above applied to Z_{top} .

If $\varepsilon > 0$, then $\text{wider}(Z_{\text{top}}, i, +)$ is a closed subset of the open region S_i^+ , so $\varepsilon_{\text{rec}} > 0$ and Z is

not degenerate by induction.

If we had $\varepsilon_{\text{rec}} \geq \varepsilon$, then $\text{inner}(Z_{\text{top}}, i, +) \subset \text{wider}(Z_{\text{top}}, i, +)$ would be disjoint from $\text{cl}(S^- \oplus \varepsilon) \subset \text{cl}(S^- \oplus \varepsilon_{\text{rec}})$, and therefore bounded apart, by definition of ε_{rec} , but $\text{inner}(Z_{\text{top}}, i, +) \cup (S^- \oplus \varepsilon)$ covers \mathbf{S}^2 since Z_{top} is ε -tight, which is a contradiction. Hence, $\varepsilon_{\text{rec}} < \varepsilon$ and Z accommodates A ε -tightly by induction.

Lastly we show that Z is indeed a generic (\mathcal{M}, \lesssim) -zoning for $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $Z_k = \text{rest}(\mathcal{N}_k, Z_{\text{rec}})$ and $i \in N_k$ for $k < L$. Then,

$$\text{inner}(Z_k, i, +)^\circ \supseteq \mathbf{S}^2 \setminus (S_i^- \oplus \varepsilon_{\text{rec}}) \supset \text{wider}(Z_{\text{top}}, i, +).$$

The first containment holds since Z_k accommodates A ε_{rec} -tightly by induction, and the second containment holds since no point of $\text{wider}(Z_{\text{top}}, i, +)$ is within distance ε_{rec} of a point of S^- by definition of ε_{rec} . Similarly $\text{inner}(Z_k, i, -)^\circ \supset \text{wider}(Z_{\text{top}}, i, -)$, so Z is a (\mathcal{M}, \lesssim) -zoning. \square

8 Zone ebb

Here we define the deformation retraction $\text{ebb}_{\mathbb{D}}$ of Lemma 5.9 using a map ebb_Z with the following properties.

Lemma 8.1 (Zone ebb wrapper). *Given a preference $(\lesssim) = \text{pref}(N_1, \dots, N_L)$ favoring nonloops of \mathcal{M} , a generic or fully degenerate (\mathcal{M}, \lesssim) -zoning that accommodates $A \in \text{upa}(\mathcal{M})$, and $t \in [0, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}$, then $A_t = \text{ebb}_Z(Z, A, t) \in \text{upa}(\mathcal{M})$ satisfies the following:*

1. A_t varies continuously as (Z, A, t) vary.
2. $A_0 = A$.
3. $A_1 \in \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M})$.
4. If $Z = A \in \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M})$ is degenerate, then $A_t = A$ is unchanging.
5. ebb_Z is equivariant, i.e., $\text{ebb}_Z(Q(Z, A), t) = QA_t$ for $Q \in \text{O}_3$.
6. For $t < 1$, order type does not change, i.e., $\text{ot}(A_t) = \text{ot}(A)$.
7. $\text{facet}(Z)$ accommodates A_t ,
8. weights of loops decrease and weights of nonloops do not change, i.e., $\text{wt}_i(A_t) \leq \text{wt}_i(A)$ with equality for nonloops.

We will see later that ebb_Z depends on a given zoning Z that accommodates A , but that Z might not continue to accommodate A_t as it evolves, so while ebb_Z has many properties of a deformation retraction, ebb_Z is not exactly a deformation retraction, since A_t leaves the

domain of $\text{ebb}_Z(Z)$ for a fixed Z . Nevertheless, we will get a deformation retraction ebb_D using the continuous dependence on Z .

Definition 8.2 (Diff ebb). Given a chain $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{M}_1 < \cdots < \mathcal{M}_L\}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, let

$$\text{ebb}_D(\mathcal{C}, \varepsilon; A, t) = \text{ebb}_Z(Z, A, t)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \text{zone}(\mathcal{M}_L, \lesssim, \varepsilon_Z, A), \\ \varepsilon_Z &= \min(\varepsilon, \text{maxlit}(\mathcal{M}_L, A)), \end{aligned}$$

and $i \lesssim j$ when i is a loop of more oriented matroids of \mathcal{C} than j is.

Remark 8.3. (\lesssim) favors nonloops of \mathcal{C} since the sets of nonloops of the oriented matroids of a chain are nested.

We will use the following to show that maxlit and minbig do not grow and shrink too much respectively.

Lemma 8.4. *If $D \subseteq C$ are nested 2-cells, then $\delta = \text{dist}_F(\partial D, \partial C) \geq \text{dist}_H(D, C)$. Moreover, every point $p \in C \setminus D$ is strictly within distance δ of ∂C .*

Proof. By definition of Fréchet distance, for each $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a homeomorphism $\psi : \partial D \rightarrow \partial C$ such that $\|\psi(x) - x\| < \delta + \varepsilon$. We can construct a deformation retraction ρ from $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus p$ to ∂C since ∂C is a Jordan curve. We will also construct a map $\xi : \tilde{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ from a 2-cell \tilde{D} that consists of D together with formal linear interpolations between each $x \in \partial D$ and its image $\psi(x) \in \partial C$. That is, \tilde{D} is the union of D and $\partial D \times [0, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}$ with ∂D and $\partial D \times \{0\}$ identified. Note that $\partial \tilde{D} = \partial D \times \{1\}$. Let $\xi : \tilde{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ be the identity on D and send $(x, t) \in \partial D \times [0, 1]$ to $\xi(x, t) = t\psi(x) + (1-t)x$. Note that the definitions of ξ on D and $\partial D \times [0, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}$ agree on ∂D and $\partial D \times \{0\}$. If ξ never hit p , then we would get a homotopy equivalence between \tilde{D} and ∂C via the map $\rho \circ \xi$, but that is impossible, since \tilde{D} is simply connected, but ∂C is not. The restriction of ξ to D cannot hit p , since $p \notin D$, so there must be some (x, t) such that $p = \xi(x, t) = t\psi(x) + (1-t)x$ with $t > 0$. Hence, p is within distance $(1-t)(\delta + \varepsilon)$ of ∂C , and this holds for all $\varepsilon > 0$, so the distance from p to ∂C is strictly less than δ . \square

Lemma 8.5. *If $\mathcal{M}_0 \leq_w \mathcal{M}_1$ have the same set of loops, then each facet covector σ of $\text{cov}(\mathcal{M}_0)$ is also a facet covector of $\text{cov}(\mathcal{M}_1)$, and $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\mathcal{M}_0, A, \sigma) = \text{maxcov}^{-1}(\mathcal{M}_1, A, \sigma)$.*

Proof. Consider a facet covector σ of $\text{cov}(\mathcal{M}_0)$. Then, $\text{maxcov}(\mathcal{M}_0, \mathcal{M}_1)$ is a surjective

map from $\text{cov}(\mathcal{M}_1)$ to $\text{cov}(\mathcal{M}_0)$ [4], so there is some $\tau \in \text{maxcov}^{-1}(\mathcal{M}_0, \mathcal{M}_1, \sigma)$, which is a covector of \mathcal{M}_1 such that $\sigma \leq_v \tau$. Since τ is a covector of \mathcal{M}_1 , the support of τ is contained in the set of nonloops N of \mathcal{M}_1 , which is also the set of nonloops of \mathcal{M}_0 . Since σ is a facet covector of $\text{cov}(\mathcal{M}_0)$, the support of σ is N , and so the support of τ must contain N , since $\sigma \leq_v \tau$. Hence, σ and τ have the same support, so $\sigma = \tau$.

For the last part observe that since σ is a facet covector of \mathcal{M}_0 , we have

$$\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\mathcal{M}_0, A, \sigma) = \bigcup \{\text{cell}(A, v) : v \in \text{cov}(A), v \geq_v \sigma\}$$

and likewise for \mathcal{M}_1 . □

Let $\varphi = \text{ebb}_D(\mathcal{C}, \varepsilon)$, and $A_t = \varphi(A, t)$, and $S_{i,t} = S_i(A_t)$. Let N_k be the set of nonloops of \mathcal{M}_k , and let $\mathcal{N}_k = \text{rest}(\mathcal{M}_L, N_k)$.

Claim 8.6. *Given a facet covector σ of \mathcal{M}_k , the inradius of $C_t = \text{maxcov}^{-1}(\mathcal{M}_k, A_t, \sigma)$ is at most ε smaller than that of C_0 .*

Proof. Suppose not. Then, we could find a disk $D_0 \subseteq C_0$ of radius $r > \varepsilon$ such that no disk of radius $r - \varepsilon$ is contained in C_t . Let D_1 be the disk of radius $r - \varepsilon$ concentric with D_0 . Then, there must be some point $p \in D_1 \setminus C_t$, so $p \in D_0$ is at least distance ε away from ∂D_0 , so p is at least distance ε away from ∂C_0 . Also, σ is a facet covector of \mathcal{N}_k by Lemma 8.5, and N_k is a preferred set of (\leq_c) by Remark 8.3, and $\text{facet}(Z)$ accommodates A_t by Lemma 8.1 part 7, so we have a zone

$$Z(\sigma) \subseteq \text{maxcov}^{-1}(X, \mathcal{N}_k, A_t) = C_t.$$

Z accommodates A ε_Z -tightly by Lemma 7.5, so $\partial Z(\sigma)$ is within Fréchet distance $\varepsilon_Z \leq \varepsilon$ of ∂C_0 , and $p \notin Z(\sigma)$, so p is strictly closer than ε to ∂C_0 by Lemma 8.4, which is a contradiction. □

Claim 8.7. *The inradius of $\text{van}(\mathcal{M}_k, A_t)$ is at most ε greater than that of $\text{van}(\mathcal{M}_k, A_0)$.*

Proof. Suppose not. Then we could find a metric disk $D_1 \subset \text{van}(\mathcal{M}_k, A_t)$ of radius $r > \varepsilon$ such that no disk of radius $r - \varepsilon$ is contained in $\text{van}(\mathcal{M}_k, A_0)$. Let D_0 be the metric disk concentric with D_1 with radius $r - \varepsilon$. Then, D_0 must intersect C_0 at a point p for some some cell $C_t = \text{maxcov}^{-1}(\mathcal{M}_k, A_t, \sigma)$ at time $t = 0$, where σ is a facet covector of \mathcal{M}_k . Then, σ is also a facet covector of \mathcal{N}_k by Lemma 8.5, and N_k is a preferred set of (\mathcal{M}_L, \lesssim) by Remark 8.3. Also, $\text{facet}(Z)$ accommodates A_t by Lemma 8.1 part 7, so $Z(\sigma) \subset C_t$ is disjoint from $\text{van}(\mathcal{M}_k, A_t)$, which contains D_1 , so D_1 cannot intersect $Z(\sigma)$. Hence, $p \in D_0$ is distance at least ε away from $Z(\sigma)$, but p is contained in C_0 , so C_0 and $Z(\sigma)$ are at least ε apart in Hausdorff distance, so ∂C_0 and $\partial Z(\sigma)$ are at least ε apart in Fréchet distance by

Lemma 8.4, which is a contradiction since Z accommodates A ε -tightly in Definition 8.2 by Lemma 7.5. \square

Proof of Lemma 5.9. The map $\text{ebb}_D(\mathcal{C})$ is continuous since Z varies continuously as (ε_Z, A) vary by Lemma 7.5, and ε_Z varies continuously by Lemma 4.8, and ebb_Z is continuous by Lemma 8.1 part 1, so part 1 holds. Order type does not change for $t < 1$ by part 6 of Lemma 8.1, so part 2 holds.

We have $A_0 = A$, $A_1 \in \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M}_L)$, and $\text{ebb}_D(\mathcal{C}, \varepsilon)$ is equivariant by the respective parts 2, 3, and 5 of Lemma 8.1. In the case where $A \in \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M}_L)$, we have $\text{maxlit}(\mathcal{M}_L, A) = 0$, so $\varepsilon_Z = 0$, so $Z = \text{zone}(\mathcal{M}_L, \lesssim, 0, A) = A$ since Z is 0-tight by Lemma 7.5, so $\text{ebb}_D(\mathcal{C}, \varepsilon)$ is trivial on $\text{PsV}(\mathcal{M}_L)$ by Lemma 8.1 part 4. Thus, $\text{ebb}_D(\mathcal{C}, \varepsilon)$ is a strong equivariant deformation retraction to $\text{PsV}(\mathcal{M}_L)$.

By Claim 8.6, $\text{inrad}(\mathcal{M}_k, \sigma, \varphi(A, t)) \geq \text{inrad}(\mathcal{M}_k, \sigma, A) - \varepsilon$ for each facet covector σ of \mathcal{M}_k , and the nonloops of \mathcal{M}_k are also nonloops of $\mathcal{M}_L \geq_w \mathcal{M}_k$, so the weights of nonloops of \mathcal{M}_k do not change by Lemma 8.1 part 8. Thus, $\text{minbig}(\mathcal{M}_k, \varphi(A, t)) \geq \text{minbig}(\mathcal{M}_k, A) - \varepsilon$, so part 3 holds.

By Claim 8.7, $\text{vanrad}(\mathcal{M}_k, \varphi(A, t)) \leq \text{vanrad}(\mathcal{M}_k, A) + \varepsilon$, and weights do not increase by Lemma 8.1 part 8, so $\text{maxlit}(\mathcal{M}_k, \varphi(A, t)) \leq \text{maxlit}(\mathcal{M}_k, A) + \varepsilon$, so part 4 holds. \square

8.1 Zone ebb accumulator

To construct ebb_Z , we will recursively build the output for successively larger preferred sets. For this, we define an accumulator map acc that takes as part of its input a partially constructed output and contributes the portion of the output for the next preferred set. In this subsection, we give the inductive argument for the accumulator and prove Lemma 8.1. in the next subsection, we will construct the deformation step that the accumulator uses to construct the next portion of the output and show it has the desired properties.

Recall that $\text{ext}(\Omega)$ denotes the space of all extensions of an arrangement Ω on a ground set $N \subset [n]$ to an arrangement in $\text{PsV}_{3,n}$.

Lemma 8.8 (Zone ebb accumulator). *Let N_L be the set of nonloops of \mathcal{M} , $N_0 = \emptyset$,*

$$(\lesssim) = \text{pref}(N_1, \dots, N_L), \quad k \in \{0, \dots, L\}, \quad \mathcal{N}_k = \text{rest}(N_k, \mathcal{M}),$$

Z be either a generic or fully degenerate (\mathcal{M}, \lesssim) -zoning,

$$Z \text{ accommodate } A \in \text{upa}(\mathcal{M}), \quad Z_k = \text{rest}(\mathcal{N}_k, Z) \text{ accommodate } \Omega \in \text{PsV}(\mathcal{N}_k),$$

$$S_i(A) \cap Z_k(\Sigma) = S_i(\Omega) \cap Z_k(\Sigma) \tag{1}$$

for each chain Σ where $i = i_\Sigma$ is the greedy choice from $\bigcap \Sigma^0$. Then,

$$\psi_t = \text{acc}(\Omega, Z, A, t) : \mathbf{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbf{S}^2$$

satisfies the following.

1. $\psi_t \in \text{hom}^+(\mathbf{S}^2)$ for $t < 1$,
2. ψ_t varies continuously in the sup-metric as (Ω, Z, A, t) vary,
3. $\psi_0 = \text{id}$.
4. $\psi_t * A \rightarrow \psi_1 * A \in \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M}) \cap \text{ext}(\Omega)$ as $t \rightarrow 1$,
5. if Z is degenerate, then $\psi_t = \text{id}$,
6. acc is O_3 -equivariant, i.e., $\text{acc}(Q(\Omega, Z, A), t) = Q\psi_t$,
7. ψ_t is the identity on $Z_L(\sigma)$ for each facet covector σ of $\text{csph}(\mathcal{M})$,
8. $\psi_t(S_i(\Omega)) = S_i(\Omega)$ for $i \in N_k$,
9. $\psi_1(\text{inner}(Z_L, i, 0)) = S_i(\Omega)$ for $i \in N_k$.

Lemma 8.9 (Zone ebb recursive step). *Given the setup of Lemma 8.8 with $k = L$ or $k = L - 1$, but with a \mathcal{M} -zoning $Z = Z_k = Z_L$ that accommodates both A and Ω where (1) holds for $i \in \text{supp}(\Omega)$, then $\psi_t = \text{step}(\lesssim, \Omega, Z, A, t)$ satisfies the 9 conditions stated in Lemma 8.8 along with the following.*

10. $\psi_t(S_i(A)) \cap Z(\Sigma) = S_i(A) \cap Z(\Sigma)$ where i is the greedy choice from $\bigcap \Sigma^0$.
11. $\psi_t(\text{inner}(Z, i, 0)) \subset \text{inner}(Z, i, 0)^\circ$ for $t > 0$ and Z generic,
12. $\psi_t(\text{wider}(Z, i, 0)) \subseteq \text{wider}(Z, i, 0)$,

Note that for Z to accommodate Ω in the hypotheses of Lemma 8.9, only the conditions of Definition 7.3 for $i \in N_k$ need to be satisfied since N_k is the ground set of Ω .

To deform an arrangement in $\text{upa}(\mathcal{M})$, we also have to reduce the weights of loops to 0.

Definition 8.10 (Zone ebb wrapper).

$$\text{ebb}_Z(Z, A, t) = \text{acc}(\emptyset, Z, A, t) * A_{\text{wt}}(t)$$

where $A_{\text{wt}}(t)$ is the arrangement where loops of the oriented matroid \mathcal{M} associated to Z are scaled by $1 - t$. That is,

$$\text{wt}_i(A_{\text{wt}}(t)) = \begin{cases} (1 - t) \text{wt}_i(A) & i \in N \\ \text{wt}_i(A) & i \notin N, \end{cases}$$

N is the set of nonloops of \mathcal{M} , and $S_i(A_{\text{wt}}(t)) = S_i(A)$ is unchanging except that $S_i(A_{\text{wt}}(1)) = 0$ if i is a loop.

Proof of Lemma 8.1. Each part of the lemma follows immediately from the corresponding part of Lemma 8.8 as a special case where $\Omega = \emptyset$, except parts 8 and 3 and part 1 in the case where $t \rightarrow 1$ from below.

Applying $\text{acc}(\emptyset, Z, A, t)$ to $A_{\text{wt}}(t)$ does not change weights, and $A_{\text{wt}}(t)$ only decreases weights of loops, so part 8 holds.

Consider $t \rightarrow 1$ from below. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rest}(N, \text{ebb}_Z(Z, A, t)) &= \text{rest}(N, \text{acc}(\emptyset, Z, A, t) * A_{\text{wt}}(t)) \\ &= \text{acc}(\emptyset, Z, A, t) * \text{rest}(N, A) \\ &\rightarrow \text{acc}(\emptyset, Z, A, 1) * \text{rest}(N, A) \in \text{rest}(N, \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M})) \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 8.8 parts 2 and 4, and loops $i \notin N$ are scaled by $(1-t)$ in $\text{ebb}_Z(Z, A, t)$ by definition of $A_{\text{wt}}(t)$, so loops vanish as $t \rightarrow 1$, so $\text{ebb}_Z(Z, A, t) \rightarrow \text{ebb}_Z(Z, A, 1)$, which means parts 3 and 1 hold. \square

Definition 8.11 (Zone ebb accumulator). In the case where $k \in \{L, L-1\}$, let $\text{acc}(\Omega, Z, A, t) = \text{step}(\lesssim, \Omega, Z, A, t)$. Otherwise, let

$$\text{acc}(\Omega, Z, A, t) = \psi_{\text{com}}(t, s)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\text{com}}(t, x) &= \psi_{\text{rec}}(t) \circ \psi_{\text{new}}(x), \\ \psi_{\text{rec}}(t) &= \text{acc}(\Omega_{\text{rec}}, Z, A, t), \\ \psi_{\text{new}}(x) &= \text{step}(\lesssim, \Omega, Z_{k+1}, A, x), \\ \Omega_{\text{rec}} &= \psi_{\text{new}}(1) * \text{rest}(N_{k+1}, A), \\ s &= \text{ext}(b_t^{-1}, b_0(0)) = \begin{cases} b_t^{-1}(b_0(0)) & b_t(0) < b_0(0) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ b_t(x) &= \text{tailinf}(b_{\text{test}}, x) + c(x-1), \\ b_{\text{test}}(x) &= b_{\text{test},t}(x) = \min\{\text{dist}_H(Z(\sigma), C_{\sigma,t,x}) : \sigma \in \text{facet}(\mathcal{N}_{k+1})\}, \\ C_{\sigma,t,x} &= \psi_{\text{com}}(t, x, \text{maxcov}^{-1}(\mathcal{N}_{k+1}, A, \sigma)), \\ c &= (1/2) \inf\{b_{\text{test},0}(x) : x \in [0, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we will prove Lemma 8.8. We assume that Lemma 8.8 holds for $\psi_{\text{rec}}(t)$ by induction on the size of $N_L \setminus N_k$ and we assume that Lemma 8.9 holds. We start with some claims

needed for the proof, the first of which are that the respective inputs to `step` and `acc` in the definitions of ψ_{new} and ψ_{rec} are valid.

Claim 8.12. $(\lesssim, \Omega, Z_{k+1}, A)$ satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 8.9. Hence, ψ_{new} is well-defined.

Proof. Let us first show that Equation 1 holds. Consider a chain Σ of $\text{csph}(\mathcal{N}_{k+1})$ with highest covector $\sigma = \max \Sigma$ and let $i \in N_k$ be the greedy choice from $\bigcap \Sigma^0 = \sigma^0$. Let $\tau = \text{rest}(N_k, \sigma)$. Then, $\sigma^0 \cap N_{k+1} = \sigma^0 \cap N_k$, otherwise the greedy choice from σ^0 would be chosen from N_{k+1} , so i is also the greedy choice from τ^0 . Additionally,

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{k+1}(\Sigma) &\subset \bigcap \{\text{wider}(Z_{k+1}, j, \sigma) : j \in \text{supp}(\sigma)\} \\ &\subset \bigcap \{\text{wider}(Z_{k+1}, j, \tau) : j \in \text{supp}(\tau) = \text{supp}(\sigma) \cap N_k\} \\ &\subseteq \bigcap \{\text{inner}(Z_k, j, \tau) : j \in \text{supp}(\tau)\} \\ &= \bigcup \left\{ Z_k(\tilde{\Sigma}) : \forall \tilde{\sigma} \in \tilde{\Sigma}, j \in \text{supp}(\tau) : \tilde{\sigma}(j) = \tau(j) \right\} \\ &\subseteq \bigcup \left\{ Z_k(\tilde{\Sigma}) : \tilde{\Sigma} \in \text{oc}(\text{csph}(\mathcal{N}_k)), \max \tilde{\Sigma} \geq \tau \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where the third containment is by Definition 7.4 since Z is a (\mathcal{M}, \lesssim) -zoning.

Consider $\tilde{\Sigma} \in \text{oc}(\text{csph}(\mathcal{N}_k))$ such that $\max \tilde{\Sigma} \geq \tau$. Either, $i \in \max(\tilde{\Sigma})^0$, in which case i is the greedy choice from $\bigcap \tilde{\Sigma}^0$ since $\max(\tilde{\Sigma})^0 \subseteq \tau^0$, so $S_i(\Omega) \cap Z_k(\tilde{\Sigma}) = S_i(A) \cap Z_k(\tilde{\Sigma})$ by Equation 1 for Z_k in the hypotheses of the lemma. Or, $i \notin \max(\tilde{\Sigma})^0$, in which case $S_i(\Omega) \cap Z_k(\tilde{\Sigma}) = \emptyset = S_i(A) \cap Z_k(\tilde{\Sigma})$ since Z_k accommodates both Ω and A . Hence, $S_i(\Omega) \cap Z_{k+1}(\Sigma) = S_i(A) \cap Z_{k+1}(\Sigma)$ since this holds analogously in each zone $Z_k(\tilde{\Sigma})$, so (1) holds for Z_{k+1} .

Next, let us show that Z_{k+1} accommodates Ω . According to Definition 7.3, we only need to consider $S_i(\Omega)$ for $i \in N_k$, which is the ground set of Ω . In the case where Z is fully degenerate we have $\text{rest}(N_k, Z_{k+1}) = \text{rest}(N_k, \text{rest}(N_{k+1}, A)) = \text{rest}(N_k, A) = \Omega$, so Z_{k+1} is a fully degenerate \mathcal{N}_{k+1} -zoning the accommodates Ω . Let us consider the case where Z is generic. Then,

$$S_i^+(\Omega) \supset \text{wider}(Z_k, i, +) \supset \text{inner}(Z_k, i, +) \supseteq \text{wider}(Z_{k+1}, i, +)$$

where the first containment holds since Z_k accommodates Ω and the last containment holds since Z is a (\mathcal{M}, \lesssim) -zoning, and similarly for $S_i^-(\Omega)$, and so $S_i(\Omega) \subset \text{inner}(Z_{k+1}, i, 0)^\circ$ by Remark 7.2.

Consider the intersection of $S_i(\Omega)$ and an inner $(i, 0)$ -zone $Z_{k+1}(\Sigma)$. Let us first consider

the case where $\Sigma = \{v, \sigma\}$ has 2 elements, and let σ be an edge covector. Then,

$$S_i(\Omega) \cap Z_{k+1}(\Sigma) = S_{i_0}(\Omega) \cap Z_{k+1}(\Sigma) = S_{i_0}(A) \cap Z_{k+1}(\Sigma)$$

where i_0 is the greedy choice from the span of i since $\Omega \in \text{PsV}(\mathcal{N}_k)$ and by (1). Therefore, $S_i(\Omega) \cap Z_{k+1}(\Sigma)$ is a path with endpoints on $\partial Z_{k+1}(\Sigma)$ since Z_{k+1} accommodates A .

Now consider the case where Σ is a singleton. Then, $\Sigma = \{v\}$ is contained in exactly two other chains $\Sigma_j = \{v, \sigma_j\}$ of $\text{csph}(\mathcal{N}_{k+1}/i)$ since the contraction \mathcal{N}_{k+1}/i has rank 2 and $\widehat{\text{cov}}(\mathcal{N}_{k+1}/i)$ is a thin lattice, so $Z_{k+1}(\Sigma)$ is adjacent to exactly two other inner $(i, 0)$ -zones, namely $Z_{k+1}(\Sigma_j)$. From the previous case, we have $S_i(\Omega) \cap Z_{k+1}(\Sigma_j) = S_{i_0}(A) \cap Z_{k+1}(\Sigma_j)$ since Σ_j has two elements, so $S_i(\Omega) \cap Z_{k+1}(\Sigma)$ intersects the boundary $\partial Z_{k+1}(\Omega)$ at exactly two points, and therefore $S_i(\Omega) \cap Z_{k+1}(\Sigma)$ is a path. Thus, Z_{k+1} accommodates Ω , and the rest of the hypotheses of Lemma 8.9 follow immediately from our assumption that (Ω, Z, A) satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 8.8. \square

Claim 8.13. $(\Omega_{\text{rec}}, Z, A)$ satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 8.8. Hence, ψ_{rec} is well-defined.

Proof. Consider a chain $\Sigma \subset \text{csph}(\mathcal{N}_j)$, let σ be the highest covector of Σ , and let i be the greedy choice from σ^0 . Then,

$$S_i(A) \cap Z_{k+1}(\Sigma) = \psi_{\text{new}}(1, S_i(A)) \cap Z_{k+1}(\Sigma) = S_i(\Omega_{\text{rec}}) \cap Z_{k+1}(\Sigma)$$

by Lemma 8.9 part 10, so Equation 1 holds.

Next, let us show that Z_{k+1} accommodates Ω_{rec} . In the case where Z is fully degenerate, we have $Z_{k+1} = \text{rest}(N_{k+1}, A) = \Omega_{\text{rec}}$ since Z accommodates A and by part 5 of Lemma 8.9, so Z_{k+1} accommodates Ω_{rec} . Let us consider the case where Z is generic. Then, $S_i(A) \subset \text{inner}(Z_{k+1}, i, 0)$ since Z_{k+1} accommodates A , so

$$S_i(\Omega_{\text{rec}}) = \psi_{\text{new}}(1, S_i(A)) \subset \text{inner}(Z_{k+1}, i, 0)^\circ$$

by Lemma 8.9 part 11, and $S_i^+(\Omega_{\text{rec}}) \supset \text{wider}(Z_{k+1}, i, +)$ and similarly for S_i^- by Remark 7.2. Also, the intersection of $S_i(\Omega_{\text{rec}})$ with each inner $(i, 0)$ -zone $Z_{k+1}(\Sigma)$ is a path with endpoints on $\partial Z_{k+1}(\Sigma)$ by the same argument as in Claim 8.12. The rest of the hypotheses hold by our assumption that (Ω, Z, A) satisfies the hypotheses of the Lemma 8.8. \square

Claim 8.14. b_t is continuous and varies continuously in the sup-metric as (Ω, Z, A, t) vary.

Proof. The maps $\psi_{\text{rec}}(t)$ and $\psi_{\text{new}}(x)$ vary continuously in the sup-metric as (Ω, Z, A, t) and x vary by part 2 and induction, so $\psi_{\text{com}}(t, x)$ varies continuously. Also, $\text{maxcov}^{-1}(\sigma)$ varies continuously in Hausdorff distance by Lemma 4.7, so $C_{\sigma, t, x}$ varies continuously, so $b_{\text{test}}(x)$

varies continuously, so $b_t(x)$ varies continuously by Lemma 2.9. Hence, b_t varies continuously in the sup-metric by Lemma 2.6 since x is chosen from a compact set. \square

Claim 8.15. $b_0(0) = c > 0$.

Proof. $\psi_{\text{com}}(0, x) = \psi_{\text{new}}(x)$ by Lemma 8.8 part 3 and induction, so $F_{k+1} = \text{facet}(Z_{k+1})$ accommodates $\psi_{\text{com}}(0, x) * A = \psi_{\text{new}}(x) * A$ by Lemma 8.9 part 7, so $Z(\sigma)$ is in the interior of $C_{\sigma,0,x}$ for each facet covector σ , so $b_{\text{test},0}(x) > 0$, and since x is chosen from a compact domain, we have $\text{tailinf}(b_{\text{test},0}, 0) = 2c > 0$ by definition of c , so $b_0(0) = \text{tailinf}(b_{\text{test},0}, 0) - c = c > 0$. \square

Claim 8.16. *Vertices of Ω_{rec} are fixed points of $\psi_{\text{rec}}(t)$, and edges of Ω_{rec} are preserved by $\psi_{\text{rec}}(t)$.*

Proof. Each vertex v of Ω_{rec} is on a pair of curves $[S_i \cap S_j](\Omega_{\text{rec}}) = \{u, v\}$ for some independent pair i, j of \mathcal{N}_{k+1} , which only meet at a pair of points, and $\psi_{\text{rec}}(t; v)$ moves continuously by part 2 and stays within the pair $\{u, v\}$ by part 8 for our inductive assumption. Hence, u and v must be fixed points, and edges are preserved by part 8. \square

Claim 8.17. *s is well-defined, varies continuously, and $s < 1$.*

Proof. Since $c > 0$ by Claim 8.15, and b_t is strictly increasing since $\text{tailinf}(b_{\text{test}})$ is non-decreasing by definition and $c(x-1)$ is strictly increasing since $c > 0$ by Claim 8.15, and b_t is continuous by Claim 8.14, so b_t^{-1} is well-defined on the interval $[b_t(0), b_t(1)]_{\mathbb{R}}$.

We have $\psi_{\text{new}}(1) * A = \Omega_{\text{rec}}$ by definition, so the boundary of $C_{\sigma,0,1} = \text{cell}(\sigma, \Omega_{\text{rec}})$ consists of edges of Ω_{rec} , so $\partial C_{\sigma,t,1} = \psi_{\text{rec}}(t; \partial C_{\sigma,0,1}) = \partial C_{\sigma,0,1}$ by Claim 8.16, so $b_{\text{test}}(1)$ is unchanging as t varies, so $b_t(1) = b_{\text{test}}(1) = b_{\text{test},0}(1) = b_0(1)$, and b_0 is strictly increasing, so $b_0(0) < b_0(1) = b_t(1)$. Hence, either $b_0(0)$ is in the range of b_t or $b_0(0) < b_t(0)$. In either case s is well defined. The only way we can have $s = 1$ would be $b_t(1) = b_0(0)$, which we have just seen is impossible, so $s < 1$.

Since b_t varies continuously in the sup-metric, we can extend b_t^{-1} to a function that varies continuously in the sup-metric as in the definition of s by Lemma 2.8. Thus, s varies continuously. \square

Lemma 8.18. *If ψ is a near-homeomorphism of \mathbf{S}^2 and $A \subset \mathbf{S}^2$, then $\partial\psi(A) \subseteq \psi(\partial A)$.*

Proof. Consider $y \in \partial\psi(A)$. Then, there are a sequences $a_k \in A$ such that $\psi(a_k) \rightarrow y$ and $z_k \rightarrow y$ such that $\psi^{-1}(z_k)$ is disjoint from A . Hence, $z_k \neq \psi(a_k)$. Let $b_k \in \psi^{-1}(z_k)$ since ψ is homotopic to a homeomorphism and therefore surjective. By compactness, we may assume $a_k \rightarrow a$ and $b_k \rightarrow b$, so $\psi(a_k) \rightarrow \psi(a)$, so $\psi(a) = y$ and similarly $\psi(b) = y$. Since \mathbf{S}^2 is locally path connected, let $\gamma_k : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{S}^2$ such that $\gamma_k(0) = \psi(a_k)$, $\gamma_k(1) = z_k$ and

$\gamma_k([0, 1]) \rightarrow y$ in Hausdorff distance. Since ψ is a near-homeomorphism, there is $\psi_k \in \text{hom}(\mathbf{S}^2)$ such that $\psi_k \rightarrow \psi$, and we may choose ψ_k so that $\psi_k(a_k) = \psi(a_k)$ and $\psi_k(b_k) = \psi(b_k)$ since $\psi(b_k) \neq \psi(a_k)$. Otherwise, compose ψ_k with a homeomorphism converging to the identity that sends $\psi_k(a_k)$ to $\psi(a_k)$ and $\psi_k(b_k)$ to $\psi(b_k)$. Then, $\psi_k^{-1}\gamma_k$ is a curve from $a_k \in A$ to $b_k \notin A$, so there is t_k such that $x_k = \psi_k^{-1}\gamma_k(t_k) \in \partial A$, and by compactness we may assume $x_k \rightarrow x \in \partial A$. Hence, $\psi_k(x_k) \rightarrow \psi(x)$ and $\psi_k(x_k) = \gamma_k(t_k) \rightarrow y$, so $\psi(x) = y$. Thus, $y \in \psi(\partial A)$. \square

Claim 8.19. $C_{\tau,1,x} = \text{cell}(\Omega_{\text{rec}}, \tau)$.

Proof. We have $\psi_{\text{com}}(1, x)$ is the identity on $Z_L(\tau) \subset \text{cell}(\Omega_{\text{rec}}, \tau)$, by part 7 of Lemma 8.9 and the inductive hypothesis, and $C_{\tau,0,0} = \text{maxcov}^{-1}(\mathcal{N}_{k+1}, A, \tau) \supset Z_L(\tau)$ since Z accommodates A , so $Z_L(\tau) \subset C_{\tau,1,x}$. Also, $C_{\tau,0,0}$ is disjoint from $\text{wider}(Z_{k+1}, i, -\tau)$, so $C_{\tau,0,x}$ is disjoint from $\text{wider}(Z_{k+1}, i, -\tau)$ by Lemma 8.9 part 12, so $C_{\tau,0,x} \subset \text{inner}(Z_{k+1}, i, -\tau) \cup (Z_{k+1}, i, \tau)$, so $C_{\tau,1,x} \subseteq S_i^\tau$ by part 9 and induction. Hence, $C_{\tau,1,x} \subseteq \text{cell}(\Omega_{\text{rec}}, \sigma)$. Also, $\partial C_{\tau,0,0}$ consists of arcs along pseudocircles S_i with $i \in I = \text{supp}(\tau)$, which are contained in $\text{inner}(Z_{k+1}, i, 0)$, so

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial C_{\tau,1,x} &= \partial \psi_{\text{com}}(1, x, C_{\tau,0,0}) \\
&\subseteq \psi_{\text{com}}(1, x, \partial C_{\tau,0,0}) && \text{by Lemma 8.18} \\
&\subseteq [\psi_{\text{com}}(1, x)] \bigcup_{i \in I} \text{inner}(Z_{k+1}, i, 0) \\
&\subseteq [\psi_{\text{com}}(1, x)] \bigcup_{i \in I} \text{wider}(Z_{k+1}, i, 0) \\
&\subseteq [\psi_{\text{rec}}(1)] \bigcup_{i \in I} \text{wider}(Z_{k+1}, i, 0) && \text{Lemma 8.9 part 12} \\
&\subseteq [\psi_{\text{rec}}(1)] \bigcup_{i \in I} \text{inner}(Z_L, i, 0) && Z \text{ is a } (\mathcal{M}, \lesssim)\text{-zoning} \\
&\subseteq \bigcup_{i \in I} S_i(\Omega_{\text{rec}}) && \text{part 9 and induction.}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $Z(\tau) \subset C_{\tau,1,x} \subseteq \text{cell}(\Omega_{\text{rec}}, \tau)$, and $\partial C_{\tau,1,x} \subseteq \partial \text{cell}(\Omega_{\text{rec}}, \tau)$, so $C_{\tau,1,x} = \text{cell}(\Omega_{\text{rec}}, \tau)$. \square

Claim 8.20. *If $t = 1$, then $s = 0$.*

Proof. $C_{\tau,1,x} = \text{cell}(\tau, \Omega_{\text{rec}})$ is unchanging as x varies by Claim 8.19, so $b_{\text{test}}(x)$ is unchanging, so

$$\begin{aligned}
b_{\text{test},1}(x) &= b_{\text{test},1}(1) = b_{\text{test},0}(1) \geq \text{tailinf}(b_{\text{test},0}, 0) = 2c, \\
b_1(0) &= \text{tailinf}(b_{\text{test},1}, 0) - c \geq 2c - c = c = b_0(0),
\end{aligned}$$

so $s = 0$ in the case $t = 1$. □

Proof of Lemma 8.8. Here we assume that Lemma 8.9 holds, which will also serve as the base case for induction. Parts 5, 6, and 8 hold by induction and the corresponding parts of Lemma 8.9.

We have $\psi_{\text{new}}(s) \in \text{hom}^+(\mathbf{S}^2)$ by Lemma 8.9 part 1 since $s < 1$ by Claim 8.17, and $\psi_{\text{rec}}(t) \in \text{hom}^+(\mathbf{S}^2)$ for $t < 1$ by part 1 and induction, so $\psi_t = \psi_{\text{rec}}(t) \circ \psi_{\text{new}}(s) \in \text{hom}^+(\mathbf{S}^2)$, which means part 1 holds.

Let us show that ψ_t varies continuously in the sup-metric as Ω, Z, A, t vary. We have s varies continuously by Claim 8.17, and Z_{k+1} varies continuously since this is a restriction of Z , so $\psi_{\text{new}}(s) = \text{step}(\lesssim, \Omega, Z_{k+1}, A, s)$ and $\Omega_{\text{rec}} = \text{step}(\lesssim, \Omega, Z_{k+1}, A, 1) * \text{rest}(N_{k+1}, A)$ vary continuously by Lemma 8.9 part 2, so $\psi_{\text{rec}}(t) = \text{acc}(\Omega_{\text{rec}}, Z, A, t)$ varies continuously by part 2 of the inductive assumption, so ψ_t varies continuously since composition is continuous with respect to the sup-metric, which means that part 2 holds.

Consider the case where $t = 0$. Then, $b_t(0) = b_0(0)$, so $s = 0$, so $\psi_{\text{new}}(s) = \text{id}$ by Lemma 8.9 part 3 and $\psi_{\text{rec}}(t) = \text{id}$ by part 3 and induction, so part 3 holds.

Let us show that $\psi_1 * A \in \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M}) \cap \text{ext}(\Omega)$. We have Ω_{rec} is an extension of Ω by Lemma 8.9 part 4, so $\text{ext}(\Omega_{\text{rec}}) \subset \text{ext}(\Omega)$. Also, $\psi_{\text{new}}(0) = \text{id}$ by Lemma 8.9 part 3, and $s = 0$ at $t = 1$ by Claim 8.20, so $\psi_1 = \psi_{\text{rec}}(1)$, and $\psi_{\text{rec}}(1) * A \in \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M}) \cap \text{ext}(\Omega_{\text{rec}})$ by part 4 of the inductive assumption, so

$$\psi_1 * A = \psi_{\text{rec}}(1) * A \in \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M}) \cap \text{ext}(\Omega_{\text{rec}}) \subset \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M}) \cap \text{ext}(\Omega).$$

Now consider the limit as $t \rightarrow 1$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Since $[0, 1]_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbf{S}^2$ is compact, ψ_{rec} is uniformly continuous by part 2 and induction, so there is some δ_1 such that if $\|p - q\| < \delta_1$, then we have $\|\psi_{\text{rec}}(t, p) - \psi_{\text{rec}}(t, q)\| < \varepsilon$ for all t . Also, $s \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 1$ by Claims 8.17 and 8.20, so $\psi_{\text{new}}(s) \rightarrow \text{id}$ in the sup-metric by parts 2 and 3, so there is some δ_2 such that if $|t - 1| < \delta_2$, then $\|\psi_{\text{new}}(s; p) - p\| < \delta_1$. Hence, $\psi_t(S_i) = \psi_{\text{rec}}(t, \psi_{\text{new}}(s; S_i))$ is less than ε from $\psi_{\text{rec}}(t, S_i)$ in Fréchet distance. Also, $\psi_{\text{rec}}(t, S_i) \rightarrow \psi_{\text{rec}}(1, S_i) = \psi_1(S_i)$ by induction, so $\psi_{\text{rec}}(t, S_i)$ is less than ε from $\psi_1(S_i)$ in Fréchet distance for t sufficiently close to 1. Hence,

$$\text{dist}_{\text{F}}(\psi_t(S_i), \psi_1(S_i)) \leq \text{dist}_{\text{F}}(\psi_t(S_i), \psi_{\text{rec}}(t, S_i)) + \text{dist}_{\text{F}}(\psi_{\text{rec}}(t, S_i), \psi_1(S_i)) < 2\varepsilon,$$

so $\psi_t * A \rightarrow \psi_1 * A$, so part 4 holds.

Let σ be a facet covector of \mathcal{M} . Then, $\tau = \text{rest}(N_{k+1}, \sigma)$ is a facet covector of \mathcal{N}_{k+1} ,

$$Z(\tau) = \bigcap_{i \in N_{k+1}} \text{inner}(Z_{k+1}, i, \tau) \supset \bigcap_{i \in N_L} \text{wider}(Z_L, i, \sigma) \supset Z(\sigma),$$

and ψ_{new} is the identity on $Z(\tau)$ by Lemma 8.9 part 7, so part 7 holds by induction.

Finally, $\psi_1 = \psi_{\text{rec}}(1)$ by Claim 8.20, and $S_i(\Omega_{\text{rec}}) = S_i(\Omega)$, so part 9 holds by induction. \square

8.2 Zone ebb recursive step

In this subsection we define $\psi_t = \text{step}(\lesssim, \Omega, Z, A, t)$ and prove Lemma 8.9. Let N_1 be the support of Ω and N_2 be the support of \mathcal{M} . Note that these respectively correspond to N_k and N_L in Lemma 8.9. Let us assume that Z is not degenerate; otherwise let $\psi_t = \text{id}$. For each edge or facet covector σ , let

$$D_\sigma = \bigcup_{\Sigma \ni \sigma} Z(\Sigma).$$

We will define ψ_t as the composition of maps ψ_σ , which are the identity on the complement of D_σ .

8.2.1 Edge covectors

Let σ be an edge covector of \mathcal{M} , and i_0 be the greedy choice from σ^0 , and τ_1, τ_2 be the facet covectors incident to σ , and v_1, v_2 be the vertex covectors incident to σ . We partition D_σ into 3 regions, which we call columns, and we define ψ_σ in each column.

Definition 8.21 (Central column). Let us start with the central column. Let

$$\begin{aligned} C_\sigma &= Z(\sigma) \cup Z(\{\sigma, \tau_1\}) \cup Z(\{\sigma, \tau_2\}), \\ P &= \{S_i(A) \cap Z(\sigma) : i \in I\} \cup \{P_{N_2}, P_{N_1}, P_{S_1}, P_{S_2}\} \end{aligned}$$

where I is the set of nonloops of \mathcal{M} in σ^0 , and

$$\begin{aligned} P_{N_1} &= Z(\sigma, \{\sigma, \tau_1\}), & P_{S_1} &= Z(\sigma, \{\sigma, \tau_2\}), \\ P_{N_2} &= B_N = Z(\tau_1, \{\sigma, \tau_1\}), & P_{S_2} &= B_S = Z(\tau_2, \{\sigma, \tau_2\}). \end{aligned}$$

Let B_E and B_W be the closure of the components of $\partial C_\sigma \setminus (B_N \cup B_S)$. Let $h(N_2, N_1, i_0, S_1, S_2) = (2h, h, 0, -h, -2h)$ where $h = h(N_1)$ is the distance between Z and A with A regarded as a degenerate zoning as in Definition 7.6. Let

$$\xi = \xi_\sigma = \text{mox}(C_\sigma, B, P, h).$$

Let $f_\sigma(t, y)$ scale y on the interval $[-h, h]_{\mathbb{R}}$ by $(1 - t)$, and keep y at $2h, -2h$ fixed, and

interpolate linearly on the rest of $[-2h, 2h]_{\mathbb{R}}$, and let ψ_t be $f(t)$ conjugated by ξ . That is,

$$f = f_{\sigma}(t, y) = \begin{cases} (1-t)y & y \in [-h, h]_{\mathbb{R}} \\ (y-h)2 + (2h-y)(1-t) & y \in [h, 2h]_{\mathbb{R}} \\ (y+h)2 - (2h+y)(1-t) & y \in [-h, -2h]_{\mathbb{R}} \end{cases}$$

$$\psi_{\sigma}(t; p) = \xi^{-1}(x, f(t, y))$$

for $p \in C_{\sigma}$ where $(x, y) = \xi(p)$.

Definition 8.22 (Side columns). We define ψ_{σ} in the western and eastern columns to act similarly, but to taper to the identity on boundary of D_{σ} . We choose one of the vertex covectors v_1 to be west of σ . We just define ψ_{σ} formally in the western column $C_{v_1, \sigma}$; the definition in the eastern column is analogous. Let

$$C_{v_1, \sigma} = Z(\{v_1, \sigma\}) \cup Z(\{v_1, \sigma, \tau_1\}) \cup Z(\{v_1, \sigma, \tau_2\}),$$

$$P = \{S_i(A) \cap Z(v_1, \sigma) : i \in I\} \cup \{P_{N2}, P_{N1}, P_{S1}, P_{S2}\}$$

with I as above.

$$P_{N1} = Z(\{v_1, \sigma\}, \{v_1, \sigma, \tau_1\}), \quad P_{S1} = Z(\{v_1, \sigma\}, \{v_1, \sigma, \tau_2\}),$$

$$P_{N2} = B_N = Z(\tau_1, \{v_1, \sigma, \tau_1\}), \quad P_{S2} = B_S = Z(\tau_2, \{v_1, \sigma, \tau_2\}).$$

Let B_E and B_W be the closure of the components of $\partial C_{\sigma} \setminus (B_N \cup B_S)$, and h be the same as in ξ_{σ} . Let

$$\xi = \xi_{v_1, \sigma} = \text{mox}(C_{v_1, \sigma}, B, P, h),$$

$$f = f_{v_1, \sigma}(t, y) = \xi \psi_{\sigma}(t; \xi^{-1}(1, y)),$$

$$g = g_{v_1, \sigma}(t; x, y) = \begin{cases} (x, f(t, y)) & x \geq 1/2 \\ (x, f(2xt, y)) & x < 1/2 \end{cases}$$

$$\psi_{\sigma}(t; p) = \xi^{-1}g(t; \xi(p))$$

for $p \in C_{v_1, \sigma}$. In the case where $p \in C_{v_2, \sigma}$ replace x with $1 - x$ where appropriate in the definition of g .

Let

$$H_{v_1, \sigma} = \xi_{v_1, \sigma}^{-1}([0, 1/2] \times [-\frac{3h}{2}, \frac{3h}{2}]),$$

$$H_{v_2, \sigma} = \xi_{v_2, \sigma}^{-1}([1/2, 1] \times [-\frac{3h}{2}, \frac{3h}{2}]),$$

$$H_{\sigma} = (D_{\sigma} \cap \text{inner}(Z, i_0, 0)) \setminus (H_{v_1, \sigma} \cup H_{v_2, \sigma})$$

Let $\psi_\sigma(t)$ be defined as above on the columns C_σ and $C_{v,\sigma}$ and be the identity on $\mathbf{S}^2 \setminus D_\sigma$.

Claim 8.23. $\psi_\sigma(0) = \text{id}$.

Proof. Observe that $f_\sigma(0, y) = y$, so we have $\psi_\sigma(0) = \xi_\sigma^{-1} \xi_\sigma = \text{id}$ on C_σ , so $f_{v,\sigma}(0) = \xi_{v,\sigma}^{-1} \xi_{v,\sigma} = \text{id}$, so $g(0) = \text{id}$, so $\psi_\sigma(0) = \text{id}$ on $C_{v,\sigma}$. \square

Claim 8.24. $\psi_\sigma(t) \in \text{hom}^+(\mathbf{S}^2)$ for $t < 1$.

Proof. Since $2h$ and $-2h$ are fixed points of $f_\sigma(t)$, and the northern and southern boarders of C_σ are mapped to horizontal segments at height $2h$ and $-2h$ by Lemma 6.2 part 4, so ψ_σ acts trivially on the northern and southern boarders of C_σ . Also, ψ_σ on the eastern and western columns agree with ψ_σ on the central column and acts trivially on the northern and southern boarders by definition. On the western boarder, we have $g(t; 0, y) = (0, f(0, y)) = (0, y)$ for $t < 1$ since $\psi_\sigma(0) = \text{id}$ on the central column C_σ , so ψ_σ acts trivially on the western boarder of D_σ , and similarly on the eastern boarder. Hence, the restriction of ψ_σ to D_σ acts trivially on the boundary and $\psi_\sigma(t)$ keeps points of D_σ in D_σ , so $\psi_\sigma(t)$ is a homeomorphism for $t < 1$ by the gluing lemma. \square

Claim 8.25. ψ_σ varies continuously in the sup-metric as (Ω, Z, A, t) vary, as well as ξ_σ and $\xi_{v,\sigma}$ in the partial map metric and their respective inputs.

Proof. The zones $Z(\Sigma)$ vary continuously in Hausdorff distance and the boarders B vary continuously in Fréchet distance as Z varies by definition of the metric on zonings, so $S_i \cap B_W$ and $S_i \cap B_E$ vary continuously by Lemma 4.5, so the paths of P vary continuously in Fréchet distance, and so h varies continuously. Hence, ξ_σ and $\xi_{v,\sigma}$ vary continuously in the partial map metric by Lemma 6.2. and so ξ_σ^{-1} and $\xi_{v,\sigma}^{-1}$ vary continuously by Lemma 2.4. Also, the maps f and g vary continuously, so ψ_σ varies continuously by Lemma 2.4. \square

Claim 8.26. Let $i \in \sigma^0$ be a nonloop.

1. The restriction of $\psi_\sigma(t)$ to $S_i(A) \cap H_\sigma$ is an isotopy to $S_{i_0}(A) \cap H_\sigma$ that varies continuously in the sup metric as (Ω, Z, A) vary.
2. $\psi_\sigma(1, H_\sigma) = S_{i_0}(A) \cap H_\sigma$.
3. If Z is generic and $t > 0$, then $\psi_\sigma(t, H_\sigma) \subset \text{inner}(Z, i, 0)^\circ$.

Proof. Let us start with the restriction to the central column. There, $\xi_\sigma(P_i)$ varies continuously by Lemma 2.5 since ξ_σ and P_i vary continuously by Claim 8.25, so $\xi_\sigma(P_i)$ is the graph of a function $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by Lemma 6.2 part 5 that varies continuously in the sup metric by Lemma 2.1, and S_i only intersects the central column in $Z(\sigma)$, so $|\gamma| \leq h$, so $f_\sigma(t)\gamma = (1-t)\gamma$ is an isotopy to $[0, 1] \times 0$, and $\xi^{-1}(1-t)\gamma$ varies continuously by Lemma




Figure 5: ζ in the definition of ψ_v where the blue pseudocircle is the greedy choice and the purple pseudocircle is not in N_1 .

2.4, so $\text{rest}(S_i \cap C_\sigma, \psi_\sigma(t))$ is an isotopy to $S_{i_0} \cap C_\sigma$ that varies continuously, which means part 1 holds on the restriction to C_σ . Likewise, parts 2 and 3 hold on the restriction to C_σ by a similar argument. In particular, the restriction of ψ_σ to the border $Z(\sigma, \{v_1, \sigma\})$ between the central and western columns is a deformation retraction to $S_{i_0} \cap Z(\sigma, \{v_1, \sigma\})$, so $g = g_{v_1, \sigma}$ restricted to $[1/2, 1] \times [-h, h]$ is a deformation retraction to $[1/2, 1] \times 0$ that preserves the first coordinate, so the restriction of g to $\xi_{v_1, \sigma}(P_i)$ is an isotopy to $[1/2, 1] \times 0$, so the restriction of ψ_σ to $S_i \cap H_\sigma \cap C_{v_1, \sigma}$ is an isotopy to $S_{i_0} \cap H_\sigma \cap C_{v_1, \sigma}$ that varies continuously like in the case of the central column. Hence, part 1 holds on the restriction to the western column, and a similar argument applies in the eastern column and for parts 2 and 3. \square

8.2.2 Vertex covectors

Definition 8.27 (Vertex covector deformation). Consider a vertex covector v of \mathcal{M} . To define ψ_v , we interpolate between two cell decompositions as in Figure 5. let \mathcal{C}_v be the subdivision of D_v by $\partial Z(v)$, Ω , $S_{i_1}(A)$ where i_1 is the greedy choice from v^0 , $\partial Z(\{v, \sigma\})$ for each edge covector $\sigma > v$ and $S_i(A) \cap Z(\{v, \sigma\})$ where $i = i_\sigma$ is the greedy element of σ , and the boundary of a 2-cell $C = C_v$ as follows; $C \subset D_v$ is the region bounded by the paths $E_{v, \sigma} = \partial H_{v, \sigma} \cap D_\sigma^\circ$ as in Definition 8.22 for each edge covector $\sigma > v$ and the hyperbolic geodesic $E_{v, \tau}$ between endpoints of E_{v, σ_k} and $E_{v, \sigma_{k+1}}$ through $Z(\{v, \tau\})$ for each facet covector τ where $\tau > \{\sigma_k, \sigma_{k+1}\} > v$ with addition mod $2K$.

Note that $S_i(A) \cap Z(\{v, \sigma\}) = S_i(\Omega) \cap Z(\{v, \sigma\})$ for i in the ground set of Ω and $S_{i_1}(A) = S_{i_1}(\Omega)$ by the hypotheses of the Lemma 8.9 unless the ground set of Ω is disjoint from v^0 .

Let K be the number of parallel classes in v^0 . Let $\sigma_k, \sigma_{k+K} > v$ be the edge covector where $\sigma_k(i_k) = \sigma_{k+K}(i_k) = 0$ and i_k is a greedy element of (\mathcal{M}, \lesssim) ordered cyclically according to the rank 2 ordered matroid $\mathcal{N} = \text{rest}(v^0, \mathcal{M})$. Let \mathcal{C}_K be the subdivision of the disk $3\mathbf{D}$ by \mathbf{S}^1 , $2\mathbf{S}^1$, and $3K$ evenly spaced diameters $L_{k,j}$ corresponding to $i_{k,+}, i_{k,0}, i_{k,-}$ ordered according to \mathcal{N} , but where only the diameters $L_{1,0}$ and $L_{k,0}$ for $i_k \in N_1$ subdivide the unit disk.

Let λ map each cell of \mathcal{C}_K to the corresponding cell of \mathcal{C}_v . Here we order diameters $L_{k,+}, L_{k,0}, L_{k,-}$ in \mathcal{C}_K so that the arc of $\partial Z(\{v, \sigma_k\})$ corresponding to a segment of $L_{k,+}$ is on the positive side of S_{i_k} , and so the arc of $\partial Z(\{v, \sigma_{k+K}\})$ corresponding to a segment of $L_{k,+}$ is on the negative side of S_{i_k} .

and let $\zeta : 3\mathbf{D} \rightarrow D_v$ by $\zeta = \text{interp}(\lambda)$. Let $f(t, z)$ scale z in $2\mathbf{D}$ by $(1-t)$ and keep the circle of radius 3 fixed and interpolate radially on the rest of $3\mathbf{D}$, and let ψ_v be f conjugated by ζ . That is,

$$f = f_v(t, z) = \begin{cases} (1-t)z & |z| \leq 2 \\ (1-t(3-|z|))z & |z| \geq 2, \end{cases}$$

$$\psi_v(t, p) = \begin{cases} [\zeta f(t) \zeta^{-1}](p) & p \in D_v \\ p & p \notin D_v. \end{cases}$$

Remark 8.28. For a nonloop $i \notin N_1$, we can have vertex covectors v_1 and v_2 where i is the greedy choice from v_1^0 but is not the greedy choice from v_2^0 . In this case, $\zeta_{v_1}^{-1}(S_i \cap D_{v_1})$ is a diameter of $3\mathbf{D}$, but $\zeta_{v_2}^{-1}(S_i \cap D_{v_2})$ need not be, so ψ_{v_1} preserves S_i , but ψ_{v_2} can move S_i .

Claim 8.29. $\psi_v(t) \in \text{hom}^+(\mathbf{S}^2)$ for $t < 1$.

Proof. The restriction of $\psi_v(t)$ to D_v is a homeomorphism of D_v for $t < 1$ by Lemma 2.17 since $f(t)$ is a homeomorphism of $3\mathbf{D}$. Also, $f_v(t, z) = z$ in the case where $|z| = 1$, so on the boundary of D_v we have $\psi_v(t) = \zeta \zeta^{-1} = \text{id}$ so $\psi_v(t)$ is a homeomorphism by the gluing lemma. \square

Claim 8.30. ψ_σ varies continuously in the sup metric as (Ω, Z, A, t) vary

Proof. The borders between zones of Z vary continuously as Z varies by the definition of the metric on zonings, and $S_i(A)$ and $S_i(\Omega)$ vary continuously in Fréchet distance by the definition of the metric on arrangements, and so the vertices where edge of Z meet pseudocircles of A or Ω vary continuously by Lemma 4.5. Also, $\xi_{v,\sigma}^{-1}$ varies continuously in the partial map metric by Claim 8.25, so $E_{v,\sigma}$ varies continuously in Fréchet distance by Lemma 2.5, and in particular the endpoints of $E_{v,\sigma}$ vary continuously, so the hyperbolic geodesic $E_{v,\tau}$ varies continuously by Radó's theorem (2.13). Therefore, the edges of ∂C_v

vary continuously in Fréchet distance by Lemma 4.6 since the vertices vary continuously and the edges consist of arcs along paths that vary continuously, so the 2-cells vary continuously by Radó's theorem, and \mathcal{C}_K is fixed, so $\zeta = \text{interp}(\lambda)$ varies continuously in the sup metric by Lemma 2.17. Also, f varies continuously in the sup metric, so ψ_v varies continuously in the sup metric. \square

Claim 8.31. ψ_σ does not move points out of D_v or out of C_v .

Proof. If $v < \sigma$, then $D_v \cap D_\sigma$ is a side column of D_σ , and ψ_σ does not move points out of the columns. Otherwise, $D_v \cap D_\sigma = \emptyset$, so ψ_σ is the identity on D_v . Thus, ψ_σ does not move points out of D_v .

If $v < \sigma$, then $\xi_{v,\sigma}(C_v \cap D_\sigma) = H_{v,\sigma}$, which is a coordinate rectangle centered on the x-axis, and $g_{v,\sigma}(t)$ shrinks the vertical component, so $g_{v,\sigma}(t, H_{v,\sigma})$, so ψ_σ does not move points out of $C_v \cap D_\sigma$ and is the identity on the rest of C_v . Otherwise, ψ_σ is the identity on C_v . Thus, ψ_σ does not move points out of C_v . \square

8.2.3 The composition

Definition 8.32 (Zone ebb recursive step). Let

$$\psi_t = \text{step}(\lesssim, \Omega, Z, A, t) = \prod_{v \in \Sigma_0} \psi_v(t) \circ \prod_{\sigma \in \Sigma_1} \psi_\sigma(t)$$

where Σ_0, Σ_1 are the respective sets of vertex and edge covectors of $\text{csph}(\mathcal{M})$.

Claim 8.33. $\text{step}(\lesssim, \Omega, Z, A, t) \rightarrow \text{id}$ in the sup metric as $Z \rightarrow A$ and Ω, A, t converge.

Proof. It suffices to show that the restriction of $\psi_t = \text{sep}(\lesssim, \Omega, Z, A, t)$ to $Z(\Sigma)$ for each chain Σ converges to the identity map on $Z(\Sigma)$ in the partial map topology by Lemma 2.4 (gluing). If $\Sigma = \{\tau\}$ consists of a facet covector, then $Z(\Sigma)$ only intersects regions D_σ along the boundary for a vertex of edge covector σ , so the restriction of ψ_t to $Z(\Sigma)$ is the identity. If $\Sigma \ni v$ contains a vertex covector, then $Z(\Sigma)$ converges to a point, and the map ψ_t converges to the identity map on point. Consider an edge covector σ . Then, $h \rightarrow 0$ as $Z \rightarrow A$, so f_σ converges to the identity on the interval $[0, 1]$ in the partial map topology, and ξ_σ converges to a parameterization of the path $P_i = S_i(A) \cap D_\sigma$ from $[0, 1]$ where i is the greedy element of σ^0 by Lemma 6.2, so ψ_σ converges to the identity map on the path P_i by Lemma 2.4, and likewise for $Z(\{\sigma, \tau\})$. \square

Claim 8.34. $\psi_t(\text{wider}(Z, i, 0)) \subseteq \text{wider}(Z, i, 0)$.

Proof. Consider a point $p \in \text{wider}(Z, i, 0)$, and consider an edge covector σ . Then, $\psi_\sigma(t)$ only moves $p \in D_\sigma$. In the case where $\sigma(i) = 0$, we have $D_\sigma \subset \text{wider}(Z, i, 0)$, so

$\psi_\sigma(t; p) \in \text{wider}(Z, i, 0)$. Otherwise, there must be some vertex covector $v < \sigma$ such that $v(i) = 0$, so $p \in Z(\{v, \sigma\})$, so $\psi_\sigma(t; p) \in Z(\{v, \sigma\}) \subset \text{wider}(Z, i, 0)$. Hence, $\psi_\sigma(t)$ does not move points out of $\text{wider}(Z, i, 0)$. Also, $\psi_v(t)$ for a vertex covector v only moves $p \in D_v$, in which case $\sigma(i) = 0$ for some chain $\Sigma \supset \{v, \sigma\}$ since $p \in \text{wider}(Z, i, 0)$, and $\sigma \geq v$ since v is a vertex covector, so $v(i) = 0$, so $D_v \subset \text{wider}(Z, i, 0)$. Hence, $\psi_v(t)$ does not move points out of $\text{wider}(Z, i, 0)$. Thus, ψ_t is a composition of maps that do not move points out of $\text{wider}(Z, i, 0)$, so ψ_t does not move points out of $\text{wider}(Z, i, 0)$. \square

Claim 8.35. *Let i be a nonloop of v^0 , and i_k be the greedy element parallel to i . Then, $\psi_t(S_i \cap D_v)$ is a 1-cell that converges to $\zeta^{-1}(L_{k,0})$ in Fréchet distance as $t \rightarrow 1$.*

Proof. $\psi_t(S_i \cap D_v)$ is a 1-cell for $t < 1$ since ψ_t is a homeomorphism for $t < 1$, so we only have to show this is a 1-cell for $t = 1$ and convergence as $t \rightarrow 1$. Let $X_0 = S_i \cap H_{\sigma_k} \cap D_v$ and $X_1 = S_{i_k} \cap H_{\sigma_k} \cap D_v$, and consider the image of X_0 . Then, $\psi_{\tilde{\sigma}}(t)$ is the identity on X_0 unless $\tilde{\sigma} \in \{\sigma_k, v\}$, so $\text{rest}(X_0, \psi_t) = \text{rest}(X_0, \psi_v(t) \circ \psi_{\sigma_k}(t))$ and we can disregard the other compositional factors of ψ_t . The restriction of ψ_{σ_k} to $S_i \cap H_{\sigma_k}$ is an isotopy to $S_{i_k} \cap H_{\sigma_k}$ by Claim 8.26. Also, $H_{\sigma_k} \subset D_{\sigma_k}$ and $D_{\sigma_k} \cap D_v = C_{v, \sigma_k}$, which is a side column of D_{σ_k} , so $X_0 = S_i \cap H_{\sigma_k} \cap C_{v, \sigma_k}$ and $X_1 = S_{i_k} \cap H_{\sigma_k} \cap C_{v, \sigma_k}$, and so the restriction of ψ_{σ_k} to X_0 is an isotopy to X_1 since ψ_{σ_k} preserves columns of D_{σ_k} . Also, $\psi_v(t)$ is 2-Lipschitz for all t , so ψ_t restricted to X_0 is a homotopy to $Y = \psi_v(1, X_1)$, which is the preimage by ζ of the radial segment along $L_{k,0}$ corresponding to σ_k . Also, $\psi_v(t)$ is a homeomorphism except on C_v and $S_{i_k} \cap H_{\sigma_k} \cap C_v$ consists of a single point, so ψ_t restricted to X_0 is an isotopy to Y . Therefore, $\psi_t(X_0)$ is a 1-cell that converges to Y_1 in Fréchet distance as $t \rightarrow 1$. Similarly, $\psi_t(S_i \cap D_v \cap H_{\sigma_{k+K}})$ is a 1-cell that converges to the preimage by ζ of the other radial segment of $L_{k,0}$, and the rest of the path $S_i \cap D_v$ is contained in C_v , and as such converges to the point $\zeta^{-1}(0)$. Thus, $\psi_t(S_i \cap D_v)$ converges in Fréchet distance to $\zeta^{-1}(L_{k,0})$, and $\psi_1(S_i \cap D_v) = \zeta^{-1}(L_{k,0})$ a 1-cell. \square

Proof of Lemma 8.9. Let σ be an edge covector and v be a vertex covector of \mathcal{M} .

For $t < 1$, the maps $\psi_\sigma(t)$ and $\psi_v(t)$ are orientation preserving homeomorphisms by Claims 8.24 and 8.29, so their composition ψ_t is an orientation preserving homeomorphisms, which means part 1 holds.

Each ψ_σ varies continuously in the sup metric by Claim 8.25, and each ψ_v varies continuously in the sup metric by Claim 8.30, so the composition ψ_t varies continuously, which means part 2 holds.

By Claim 8.23, $\psi_\sigma(0) = \text{id}$ and $f_v(0) = \text{id}$ in Definition 8.27, so $\psi_v(0) = \text{id}$, so $\psi_0 = \text{id}$, which means part 3 holds.

We will prove part 4 after part 8.

Suppose Z is degenerate. Then, D_σ is a path, which means that $D_\sigma^\circ = \emptyset$, and ψ_σ is the identity everywhere except possibly in D_σ , so $\psi_\sigma = \text{id}$. Also, D_v is a point, so $\psi_v = \text{id}$, so $\psi_t = \text{id}$, which means part 5 holds.

The maps ξ_σ and $\xi_{v,\sigma}$ in Definitions 8.21 and 8.22 are equivariant by Lemma 6.2 part 2, and ζ_v is equivariant by Lemma 2.17 part 3, so ψ_t is equivariant, which means that part 6 holds.

If τ is a facet covector of \mathcal{M} , then $Z(\tau)$ is disjoint from each region D_σ and D_v , so each map $\psi_\sigma(t)$ and $\psi_v(t)$ is trivial on $Z(\tau)$, so ψ_t is trivial on $Z(\tau)$, which means that part 7 holds.

Consider a chain $\Sigma \subset \text{csph}(\mathcal{M})$ and $i \in \bigcap \Sigma^0$ that is either a greedy element in N_1 or is the greedy choice from $\bigcap \Sigma^0$. Let $S_i = S_i(A)$ when i is the greedy choice and $S_i = S_i(\Omega)$ when $i \in N_1$. Note that this is consistent since the hypotheses of the lemma require $S_i(A) = S_i(\Omega)$ if the greedy choice is in N_1 . If $\sigma \in \Sigma$, then ξ_σ and $\xi_{v,\sigma}$ send $S_i \cap D_\sigma$ to the x-axis, which is preserved by $f_\sigma(t)$ and $g_{v,\sigma}(t)$, so ψ_σ does not deform S_i . If $v \in \Sigma$, then ζ_v^{-1} sends $S_i \cap D_v$ to a diameter of $3\mathbf{D}$, which is preserved by $f_v(t)$, so ψ_v does not deform S_i . If $i \in N_1$, then $S_j(\Omega) = S_i$ for $j \in N_1$ parallel to i since $\Omega \in \text{PsV}(\mathcal{N}_1)$, and S_i only intersects $D_{\bar{\sigma}}$ for $i \in \bar{\sigma}^0$ since Z accommodates Ω , and $\psi_{\bar{\sigma}}$ is trivial on the complement of $D_{\bar{\sigma}}$. Hence, ψ_t does not deform Ω , which means part 8 holds. Also, $Z(\Sigma) = \bigcap_{\bar{\sigma} \in \Sigma} D_{\bar{\sigma}}$, so ψ_t does not deform $S_i \cap Z(\Sigma)$, which means part 10 holds.

For each parallel class I of nonloops, each path $\psi_t(S_i \cap D_v)$ for $i \in I \cap v^0$ converges as $t \rightarrow 1$ to the same path in Fréchet distance by Claim 8.35. Also, each path $\psi_t(S_i \cap D_\sigma \setminus \bigcup \{D_v : v < \sigma\})$ for $i \in I \cap \sigma^0$ converges to the same path by Claim 8.26, so the pseudocircles $\psi_t(S_i)$ for $i \in I$ converge to a common pseudocircle as $t \rightarrow 1$. Furthermore, the pseudocircles $\psi_1(S_i)$ for $i \in v^0$ all intersect at the common point $\zeta_v^{-1}(0)$ by Claim 8.35. Also, the top elements of $\text{csph}(\mathcal{M})$ appear among $\text{cov}(\psi_1 * A)$ by part 7, so $\psi_1 * A \geq_w \mathcal{M}$, and we have just seen that $\psi_1 * A$ has the same dependencies as \mathcal{M} , so $\text{om}(\psi_1 * A) = \mathcal{M}$. Also, $\text{rest}(N_1, \psi_1 * A) = \Omega$ by part 8. Hence, $\psi_t * A \rightarrow \psi_1 * A \in \text{PsV}(\mathcal{M}) \cap \text{ext}(\Omega)$, which means part 4 holds.

Next we show part 9. Consider D_σ that intersects $\text{inner}(Z, i, 0)$ for $i \in N_1$, and let $X_\sigma = \text{inner}(Z, i, 0) \cap C_\sigma$ where C_σ is the central column in Definition 8.21. Then, the support N_1 of Ω intersects σ^0 , so $i_0 \in N_1$ since i_0 in Subsubsection 8.2.1 is the greedy choice from σ^0 , so

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_\sigma(1, H_\sigma) &= S_{i_0}(A) \cap H_\sigma && \text{by Claim 8.26 part 2} \\ &= \psi_\sigma(1, S_{i_0}(A)) \cap H_\sigma && \text{by Claim 8.26 part 1} \\ &= S_{i_0}(\Omega) \cap H_\sigma && \text{by part 4 of the lemma.} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\psi_1(X_\sigma) = \psi_\sigma(1, X_\sigma) = S_{i_0}(\Omega) \cap X_\sigma$ since all other compositional factors in the definition of ψ_t are the identity on $X_\sigma \subseteq H_\sigma$.

Let $X_v = \text{inner}(Z, i, 0) \cap D_v$, and suppose X_v is nonempty; otherwise ψ_v is trivial on X_v . Let i_k be the greedy choice from that parallel class of i as in Definition 8.27. Then, $i_k \in N_1$ and $X_v \subset C_v \cup H_{\sigma_k} \cup H_{\sigma_{k+K}}$. Also, $\psi_{\sigma_k}(1, H_{\sigma_k}) \subseteq S_i(\Omega) \cap H_{\sigma_k}$ as above and $\psi_{\sigma_k}(1, C_v) \subseteq C_v$ by Claim 8.31, and $\psi_{\sigma_k}(1)$ is the identity on $H_{\sigma_{k+K}}$, and analogously for σ_{k+K} , so $\psi_1(X_v) \subseteq \psi_v(1, C_v \cup S_i(\Omega))$. Also, $\psi_v(1, S_i(\Omega)) = S_i(\Omega)$ as shown in the proof of part 8, and $\psi_v(1, C_v) = \zeta_v^{-1}(0) \in S_i(\Omega)$, so $\psi_1(X_v) \subseteq S_i(\Omega)$. Hence, $\psi_1(\text{inner}(Z, i, 0)) \subseteq S_i(\Omega)$ since the sets of the form X_σ and X_v cover $\text{inner}(Z, i, 0)$. Also, $\psi_1(\text{inner}(Z, i, 0)) \supseteq \psi_1(S_i(\Omega)) = S_i(\Omega)$ by part 8 of the lemma, so $\psi_1(\text{inner}(Z, i, 0)) = S_i(\Omega)$, which means part 9 holds.

We have already shown part 10 along with part 8, so let us show part 11. Consider $t > 0$ and suppose Z is generic. If D_σ intersects $\text{inner}(Z, i, 0)$, then $\psi_\sigma(t, H_\sigma) \subset \text{inner}(Z, i, 0)^\circ$ by Claim 8.26 part 3, so $\psi_t(X_\sigma) \subset \text{inner}(Z, i, 0)^\circ$. Now consider D_v where X_v is nonempty. Then, $W = \zeta^{-1}(X_v)$ consists of the disk $2\mathbf{D}$ and an opposite pair of cones $C_{v,k}, C_{v,k+K}$, which are bounded by the diameters $L_{k,+}$ and $L_{k,-}$, where $C_{v,k}$ is the non-negative span of $\zeta^{-1}(H_{\sigma_k})$ and $C_{v,k+K}$ likewise. The only compositional factors of ψ_t that are nontrivial on $H_{\sigma_k} \cap D_v$ are ψ_v and ψ_{σ_k} , so

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_t(H_{\sigma_k} \cap D_v) &= [\psi_v(t)\psi_{\sigma_k}(t)](H_{\sigma_k} \cap D_v) \\
&\subseteq \psi_v(t, \text{inner}(Z, i, 0)^\circ \cap D_v) && \text{by Claim 8.31 and the case for } \psi_\sigma \text{ above} \\
&= [\zeta f(t)\zeta^{-1}](X_v^\circ) && \text{in the induced topology on } D_v \\
&= [\zeta f(t)](W_v^\circ) && \text{in the induced topology on } 3\mathbf{D} \\
&\subseteq \zeta(W_v^\circ) \subset \text{inner}(Z, i, 0)^\circ
\end{aligned}$$

since W_v is star shaped and $f(t)$ moves points radially toward 0. Also, $\psi_t(C_v) \subseteq \psi_v(t, C_v)$ by Claim 8.31, so $\psi_t(C_v) \subset C_v^\circ$ since $\zeta(2\mathbf{D}) = C_v$ and $f(t)$ scales points in $2\mathbf{D}$ by $1 - t$. Hence, $\psi_t(X_v) \subset \text{inner}(Z, i, 0)^\circ$, and since $\text{inner}(Z, i, 0)$ is covered by sets of the form X_σ and X_v , we have $\psi_t(\text{inner}(Z, i, 0)) \subset \text{inner}(Z, i, 0)^\circ$, which means part 11 holds.

Consider $p \in \text{wider}(Z, i, 0)$ and a map ψ_σ . In the case where $p \notin D_\sigma$, we have $\psi_\sigma(t, p) = p$ is unchanging. In the case where $i \in \sigma^0$, we have $D_\sigma \subset \text{wider}(Z, i, 0)$ so ψ_σ does not move points out of $\text{wider}(Z, i, 0)$ since $\psi_\sigma(t)$ preserves D_σ and is the identity outside D_σ . In the case where $p \in D_\sigma$ and $i \notin \sigma^0$, then $Z(\sigma)$ is not a wider $(i, 0)$ -zone, so $p \in Z(\{v, \sigma\})$ for a vertex covector v with $i \in v^0$, so p is in a side column $C_{v,\sigma} \subset \text{wider}(Z, i, 0)$, so $\psi_\sigma(t, p) \in C_{v,\sigma} \subset \text{wider}(Z, i, 0)$. Hence, the maps ψ_σ do not move points out of $\text{wider}(Z, i, 0)$. If $p \in D_v$, then $i \in v^0$, so $D_v \subset \text{wider}(Z, i, 0)$, so the maps ψ_v also do not move points out of $\text{wider}(Z, i, 0)$. Hence $\psi_t(\text{wider}(Z, i, 0)) \subseteq \text{wider}(Z, i, 0)$, which means part 12 holds. \square

References

- [1] Olakunle Abawonse and Laura Anderson. On Gelfand and MacPherson’s combinatorial formula for Pontrjagin classes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.16903*, 2022.
- [2] Olakunle S Abawonse. Triangulations of Grassmannians and flag manifolds. *Geometriae Dedicata*, 217(5):88, 2023.
- [3] Laura Anderson. Matroid bundles. *New perspectives in algebraic combinatorics*, 38:1–21, 1999.
- [4] Laura Anderson. Representing weak maps of oriented matroids. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 22(5):579–586, 2001.
- [5] Eric Kendall Babson. *A combinatorial flag space*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1993.
- [6] Dmitry Beliaev. *Conformal Maps And Geometry*. World Scientific, 2019.
- [7] Daniel K Biss. The homotopy type of the matroid Grassmannian. *Annals of mathematics*, 158(3):929–952, 2003.
- [8] Daniel K Biss. Erratum to “The homotopy type of the matroid Grassmannian”. *Annals of mathematics*, 170(1):493–493, 2009.
- [9] Anders Björner, Michel Las Vergnas, Bernd Sturmfels, Neil White, and Günter M Ziegler. *Oriented Matroids*. Cambridge University Press, second edition, 1999.
- [10] Constantin Carathéodory. Über die gegenseitige Beziehung der Ränder bei der konformen Abbildung des Inneren einer Jordanschen Kurve auf einen Kreis. *Mathematische Annalen*, 73(2):305–320, 1913.
- [11] Michael Gene Dobbins. Grassmannians and pseudosphere arrangements. *Journal de l’École polytechnique—Mathématiques*, 8:1225–1274, 2021.
- [12] Michael Gene Dobbins. A strong equivariant deformation retraction from the homeomorphism group of the projective plane to the special orthogonal group. 2021. arXiv:2108.02134.
- [13] Michael Gene Dobbins. Continuous dependence of curvature flow on initial conditions. *Journal of Topology and Analysis*, pages 1–17, 2023.
- [14] Adrien Douady and Clifford J Earle. Conformally natural extension of homeomorphisms of the circle. *Acta Mathematica*, 157:23–48, 1986.
- [15] Jon Folkman and Jim Lawrence. Oriented matroids. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 25(2):199–236, 1978.

- [16] Alexander A Gaifullin. Configuration spaces, bistellar moves, and combinatorial formulae for the first Pontryagin class. *Proceedings of the Steklov Institute of Mathematics*, 268(1):70–86, 2010.
- [17] Israel Gelfand and Robert MacPherson. A combinatorial formula for the Pontrjagin classes. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society (NS)*, 26:304–309, 1992.
- [18] Allen Hatcher. *Algebraic Topology*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [19] Gaku Liu. A counterexample to the extension space conjecture for realizable oriented matroids. In *Proceedings of the 29th Conference on Formal Power Series and Algebraic Combinatorics*, pages 31:1–7, 2017.
- [20] Nicolai E Mnev. Varieties of combinatorial types of projective configurations and convex polytopes. *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR*, 283(6):1312–1314, 1985.
- [21] Nicolai E Mnëv and Günter M Ziegler. Combinatorial models for the finite-dimensional grassmannians. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 10:241–250, 1993.
- [22] William F Osgood. A Jordan curve of positive area. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 4(1):107–112, 1903.
- [23] Christian Pommerenke. *Boundary behaviour of conformal maps*, volume 299. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [24] Tibor Radó. Sur la représentation conforme de domaines variables. *Acta Szeged*, 1:180–186, 1923.
- [25] Gerhard Ringel. Teilungen der ebene durch geraden oder topologische geraden. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 64(1):79–102, 1956.
- [26] Peter Shor. Stretchability of pseudolines is NP-hard. *Applied Geometry and Discrete Mathematics - The Victor Klee Festschrift*, 1991.
- [27] Günter M Ziegler, Laura Anderson, and Kolja Knauer. Oriented matroids today. *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, DS4:1–73, 2024.