

COVERS AND THE CURVE COMPLEX

KASRA RAFI AND SAUL SCHLEIMER

ABSTRACT. We provide the first non-trivial examples of quasi-isometric embeddings between curve complexes. These are induced either by puncturing a closed surface or via orbifold coverings. As a corollary, we give new quasi-isometric embeddings between mapping class groups.

1. INTRODUCTION

The complex of curves [Har81] arises in the study of mapping class groups, Teichmüller spaces, and three-manifolds. We follow Masur and Minsky [MM99, MM00] in studying the coarse geometry of the curve complex.

Since the curve complex is locally infinite many of the standard quasi-isometry invariants are of questionable utility. Instead, we concentrate on a different family of invariants: metrically natural subspaces. Note that the well-known subspaces of the curve complex, such as the complex of separating curves, the disk complex of a handlebody and so on, are *not* quasi-isometrically embedded and so do not give invariants in any obvious way. We therefore restrict our attention to:

Problem 1.1. Classify all quasi-isometric embeddings between curve complexes.

A special case of this question, answered in our forthcoming paper [RS07], is the computation the quasi-isometry group of the curve complex. More generally, one may ask for a theory of quasi-isometric embeddings between combinatorial moduli spaces.

Problem 1.2. Classify all quasi-isometric embeddings between mapping class groups (respectively pants complexes, Hatcher-Thurston complexes, and so on).

Again, an important special case of Problem 1.2 is the computation of the quasi-isometry group of the mapping class group; this has recently

Date: August 29, 2018.

This work is in the public domain.

been claimed by Behrstock, Kleiner, Minsky, and Mosher as well as by Hamenstädt [Hamb].

This paper discusses the first non-trivial examples of one curve complex being quasi-isometrically embedded in another. These arise geometrically, either by puncturing a closed surface (Theorem 2.3) or from orbifold covering maps (Theorem 7.1).

The puncturing construction, discussed in Section 2, is inspired by Harer’s paper [Har86, Lemma 3.6]. This construction is straight-forward but, surprisingly, gives an uncountable number of *isometric* embeddings of between curve complexes. It seems unlikely that the puncturing map gives rise to a quasi-isometric embedding of mapping class groups.

The second construction, based on coverings, is more difficult and relies crucially on the fact that a covering induces an isometric embedding of Teichmüller spaces. As an application, we prove Theorem 8.1: any orbifold covering map induces a quasi-isometric embedding of the associated mapping class groups. We then have Corollary 8.8: there is a quasi-isometric embedding of the spherical braid group on $2g + 2$ strands into the mapping class group of genus g ; this answers a question of Luis Paris.

Acknowledgments. We thank Jason Behrstock, Jason Manning, Dan Margalit and Mahan Mj. for their comments on an early version of this paper.

2. STATEMENTS

Suppose that Σ is a compact orientable orbifold of dimension two. For definitions and discussion of orbifolds we refer the reader to Scott’s excellent article [Sco83]. Note that we always assume that Σ admits an orbifold cover that is a surface. Let Σ° denote the surface obtained by removing an open neighborhood of the orbifold points from Σ . In most respects there is no difference between Σ and Σ° ; we will use whichever is convenient and remark on the few subtle points as they arise.

A simple closed curve $\alpha \subset \Sigma$, avoiding the orbifold points, is *inessential* if α bounds a disk in Σ containing one or zero orbifold points. The curve α is *peripheral* if α is isotopic to a boundary component. Note that isotopies of curves are not allowed to cross orbifold points.

Definition 2.1. The *complex of curves* $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ has isotopy classes of essential, non-peripheral curves as its vertices. A collection of $k + 1$ distinct vertices spans a k -simplex if every pair of vertices has disjoint representatives.

Remark 2.2. Note that the inclusion $\Sigma^\circ \subset \Sigma$ induces an isomorphism between $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ and $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma^\circ)$.

The definition of $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ is slightly altered when Σ is an annulus and also when Σ° is a once-holed torus or a four-holed sphere. In the last two cases the curve complex of Σ is the well-known *Farey graph*; since all curves intersect, edges are instead placed between curves that intersect exactly once or exactly twice, respectively. The curve complex of an annulus is more delicate and is defined below.

To obtain a metric, give all edges of $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ length one and denote distance between vertices by $d_\Sigma(\cdot, \cdot)$. It will be enough to study only the one-skeleton of $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$, for which we use the same notation. This is because the one-skeleton and the entire complex are quasi-isometric.

We begin with a simple example.

Puncturing. Let S be the closed surface of genus $g \geq 2$ and Σ be the surface of genus g with one puncture.

Theorem 2.3. $\mathcal{C}(S)$ embeds isometrically into $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$.

As we shall see, there are uncountably many such embeddings.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Pick a hyperbolic metric on S . By the Baire category theorem, the union of geodesic representatives of simple closed curves does not cover S . (In fact, this union has Hausdorff dimension one. See Birman and Series [BS85].) Let $*$ be a point in the complement and identify Σ with $S \setminus \{*\}$. A vertex of $\mathcal{C}(S)$ is then taken to its geodesic representative, which gives an essential curve in $S \setminus \{*\}$, which is identified with a curve in Σ , and which gives a vertex of $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$. This defines an embedding $\Pi: \mathcal{C}(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ that depends on the choice of metric, point and identification. Let $P: \mathcal{C}(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(S)$ be the map obtained by filling the point $*$. Note that $P \circ \Pi$ is the identity map.

We observe, for $a, b \in \mathcal{C}(S)$ and $\alpha = \Pi(a)$, $\beta = \Pi(b)$ that

$$d_S(a, b) = d_\Sigma(\alpha, \beta).$$

This is because P and Π send disjoint curves to disjoint curves. Therefore, if $L \subset \mathcal{C}(S)$ is a geodesic connecting a and b , then $\Pi(L)$ is a path in $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ of the same length connecting α to β . Conversely, if $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ is a geodesic connecting α to β , then $P(\Lambda)$ is a path in $\mathcal{C}(S)$ of the same length connecting a to b . \square

We now turn to the main topic of the paper.

Coverings. Let Σ and S be compact connected orientable orbifolds with negative orbifold Euler characteristic. Let $P: \Sigma \rightarrow S$ be an orbifold covering map. At a first reading it is simplest to assume that Σ and S are both surfaces.

The covering P defines a relation $\Pi: \mathcal{C}(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ as follows: Suppose that $b \in \mathcal{C}(S)$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$. Then b is related to β if and only if β is a component of $P^{-1}(b)$, the preimage of b .

Lemma 2.4. *The covering relation Π is well-defined.*

Proof. We will show that if a is an essential non-peripheral curve then every component of $P^{-1}(a)$ is essential and non-peripheral. Since S has negative orbifold Euler characteristic, choose a hyperbolic metric of finite area on $S \setminus \partial S$. Replace a by its geodesic representative, a^* . Then a^* is still a simple closed curve, as long a does not bound a disk with exactly two orbifold points of order two. In the latter case, a collapses down to a geodesic arc connecting the points. Now, the lift of a geodesic remains geodesic in the lifted metric. The conclusion follows. \square

We now turn to convenient piece of notation: if A, B, c are non-negative real numbers with $c > 0$ and if $A \leq cB + c$, then we write $A \prec_c B$. If $A \prec_c B$ and $B \prec_c A$, then we write $A \asymp_c B$. Suppose \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are metric spaces and $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is a relation. We say that f is a c -quasi-isometric embedding if for all $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$ and for all $y \in f(x), y' \in f(x')$ we have $d_{\mathcal{X}}(x, x') \asymp_c d_{\mathcal{Y}}(y, y')$. Our goal is:

Theorem 7.1. *The covering relation $\Pi: \mathcal{C}(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$, corresponding to the covering map $P: \Sigma \rightarrow S$, is a Q -quasi-isometric embedding. The constant Q depends only on the topology of S and the degree of the covering map P .*

Remark 2.5. Note that Q does not depend directly on the topology of Σ . When S is an annulus, the degree of covering is not determined by the topology of Σ . Conversely, when S is not an annulus, the topology of Σ can be bounded in terms of the topology of S and the degree of the covering.

Remark 2.6. The constant Q may go to infinity with the degree of the covering. For example, any pair of distinct curves a, b in a surface S may be made disjoint in some cover. In fact a cover of degree at most 2^{d-1} , where $d = d_S(a, b)$, will suffice [Hem01, Lemma 2.3].

Remark 2.7. When Σ is the orientation double cover of a nonorientable surface S , Theorem 7.1 is due to Masur-Schleimer [MS07].

The inequality $d_\Sigma(\alpha, \beta) \leq d_S(a, b)$ can be easily obtained as follows. When S° is not a once-holed torus or a four-holed sphere, two curves in S have distance one when they are disjoint. But disjoint curves in S have disjoint preimages in Σ . Therefore, a path connecting a to b lifts to a path of equal length connecting α to β . This implies the desired inequality in this case. If S° is one of the special surfaces mentioned above then two curves are at distance one when they intersect once or twice respectively. In this case, their lifts intersect at most $2d$ times, where d is the degree of the covering. Thus, the distance between the lifts of these curves is at most $2 \log_2(2d) + 2$. (See [Sch, Lemma 1.21].) Therefore

$$d_\Sigma(\alpha, \beta) \leq (2 \log_2(2d) + 2) \cdot d_S(a, b).$$

The opposite inequality is harder to obtain and occupies the bulk of the paper.

3. SUBSURFACE PROJECTION

Suppose that Σ is a compact connected orientable orbifold. A sub-orbifold Ψ is *cleanly embedded* if every component of $\partial\Psi$ is either a boundary component of Σ or is an essential non-peripheral curve in Σ . All suborbifolds considered will be cleanly embedded.

From [MM99], recall the definition of the *subsurface projection* relation

$$\pi_\Psi: \mathcal{C}(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\Psi),$$

supposing that Ψ° is not an annulus or a thrice-holed sphere. Since Σ has negative orbifold Euler characteristic we may choose a complete finite volume hyperbolic metric on the interior of Σ . Let Σ' be the Gromov compactification of the cover of Σ corresponding to the inclusion $\pi_1^{\text{orb}}(\Psi) \rightarrow \pi_1^{\text{orb}}(\Sigma)$ (defined up to conjugation). Thus Σ' is homeomorphic to Ψ ; this gives a canonical identification of $\mathcal{C}(\Psi)$ with $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma')$. For any $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ let α' be the closure of the preimage of α in Σ' . If every component of α' is properly isotopic into the boundary then α is not related to any vertex of $\mathcal{C}(\Psi)$; in this case we write $\pi_\Psi(\alpha) = \emptyset$. Otherwise, let α'' be a component of α' that is not properly isotopic into the boundary. Let N be a closed regular neighborhood of $\alpha'' \cup \partial\Sigma'$. Since Ψ° is not a thrice-holed sphere, there is a boundary component α''' of N which is essential and non-peripheral. We then write $\pi_\Psi(\alpha) = \alpha'''$.

If Ψ is an annulus, then the definition of $\mathcal{C}(\Psi)$ is altered. Vertices are proper isotopy classes of essential arcs in Ψ . Edges are placed between vertices with representatives having disjoint interiors. The projection map is defined as above, omitting the final steps involving the regular neighborhood N .

The curve $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ *cuts* the suborbifold Ψ if $\pi_\Psi(\alpha) \neq \emptyset$. Otherwise, α *misses* Ψ . Suppose now that $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ both cut Ψ . Define the *projection distance* to be

$$d_\Psi(\alpha, \beta) = d_\Psi(\pi_\Psi(\alpha), \pi_\Psi(\beta)).$$

The Bounded Geodesic Image Theorem states:

Theorem 3.1 (Masur-Minsky [MM00]). *Fix a surface Σ . There is a constant $M = M(\Sigma)$ with the following property. Suppose that $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ are vertices, $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ is a geodesic connecting α to β and $\Omega \subsetneq \Sigma$ is a subsurface. If $d_\Omega(\alpha, \beta) \geq M$ then there is a vertex of Λ which misses Ω . \square*

By Remark 2.2 the Bounded Geodesic Image Theorem applies equally well when Σ is an orbifold.

Antichains. Fix α and β in $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ and *thresholds* $T_0 > 0$ and $T_1 > 0$. We say that a set \mathcal{J} of suborbifolds $\Omega \subsetneq \Sigma$, is a (T_0, T_1) -*antichain* for (Σ, α, β) if \mathcal{J} satisfies the following properties.

- If $\Omega, \Omega' \in \mathcal{J}$ then Ω is not a strict suborbifold of Ω' .
- If $\Omega \in \mathcal{J}$ then $d_\Omega(\alpha, \beta) \geq T_0$.
- For any $\Psi \subsetneq \Sigma$, either Ψ is a suborbifold of some element of \mathcal{J} or $d_\Psi(\alpha, \beta) < T_1$.

Notice that there may be many different antichains for the given data $(\Sigma, \alpha, \beta, T_0, T_1)$. One particularly nice example is when $T_0 = T_1 = T$ and \mathcal{J} is defined to be the maxima of the set

$$\{\Omega \subsetneq \Sigma \mid d_\Omega(\alpha, \beta) \geq T\}$$

as ordered by inclusion. We call this the T -*antichain of maxima* for (Σ, α, β) . By $|\mathcal{J}|$ we mean the number of elements of \mathcal{J} . We may now prove:

Lemma 3.2. *For every orbifold Σ and for every pair of sufficiently large thresholds T_0, T_1 , there is an accumulation constant $A_\Sigma = A(\Sigma, T_0, T_1)$ so that if \mathcal{J} is an (T_0, T_1) -antichain for (Σ, α, β) then*

$$d_\Sigma(\alpha, \beta) \geq |\mathcal{J}|/A_\Sigma.$$

Proof. We proceed via induction: when $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma^\circ)$ is the Farey graph, \mathcal{J} is the set of annuli whose core curves γ have the property that $d_\gamma(\alpha, \beta) \geq T_0$. In this case, assuming $T_0 > 3$, every such curve γ is a vertex of every geodesic connecting α to β (see [Min99, §4]). Therefore the lemma holds for Farey graphs with $A_\Sigma = 1$.

In the general case, let C be a constant so that: if $\Omega \subset \Psi \subset \Sigma$ and α', β' are the projections of α, β to Ψ then

$$|d_\Omega(\alpha, \beta) - d_\Omega(\alpha', \beta')| \leq C.$$

We take the thresholds large enough so that:

- the lemma still applies to any strict suborbifold Ψ with thresholds $T_0 - C, T_1 + C$ and
- $T_0 \geq M(\Sigma)$; thus by Theorem 3.1 for any orbifold in $\Omega \in \mathcal{J}$ and for any geodesic Λ in $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ connecting α and β there is a curve γ in Λ so that γ misses Ω .

For any $\Psi \subsetneq \Sigma$ define $A_\Psi = A(\Psi, T_0 - C, T_1 + C)$.

Claim. Suppose that $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ is a geodesic connecting α to β . Suppose that $\gamma \in \Lambda$ is a vertex and let Ψ be a component of $\Sigma \setminus \gamma$. The number of elements of $\mathcal{J}_\Psi = \{\Omega \in \mathcal{J} \mid \Omega \subsetneq \Psi\}$ is at most $A_\Psi \cdot (T_1 + C)$.

By the claim it will suffice to take $A(\Sigma, T_0, T_1)$ equal to

$$2 \cdot \max\{A_\Psi \mid \Psi \subsetneq \Sigma\} \cdot (T_1 + C) + 3.$$

To see this, fix a vertex $\gamma \in \Lambda$ and note that $\Sigma \setminus \gamma$ has at most two components, say Ψ and Ψ' . Any element of \mathcal{J} not cut by γ is either a strict suborbifold of Ψ or Ψ' , an annular neighborhood of γ , or Ψ or Ψ' itself. Since every orbifold in \mathcal{J} is disjoint from some vertex of Λ , the lemma follows from the pigeonhole principle.

All that remains is to prove the claim. If Ψ is a suborbifold of an element of \mathcal{J} then \mathcal{J}_Ψ is the empty set and the claim holds vacuously. Thus we may assume that

$$d_\Psi(\alpha, \beta) < T_1.$$

Let α' and β' be the projections of α and β to Ψ . From the definition of C , \mathcal{J}_Ψ is a $(T_0 - C, T_1 + C)$ -antichain for Ψ, α' and β' . Thus,

$$T_1 > d_\Psi(\alpha, \beta) \geq d_\Psi(\alpha', \beta') - C \geq |\mathcal{J}_\Psi|/A_\Psi - C,$$

with the last inequality following by induction. Hence,

$$T_1 + C \geq |\mathcal{J}_\Psi|/A_\Psi. \quad \square$$

4. TEICHMÜLLER SPACE

For this section, we take Σ to be a surface. Let $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$ denote the Teichmüller space of Σ : the space of complete hyperbolic metrics on the interior of Σ , up to isotopy. For background, see [Ber60, Gar87].

There is a uniform upper bound on the length of the shortest closed curve in any hyperbolic metric on Σ . For any metric σ on Σ , a curve γ has *bounded length* in σ if the length of γ in σ is less than this

constant. Let $\mathbf{e}_0 > 0$ be a constant such that, for curves γ and δ , if γ has bounded length in σ and δ has a length less than \mathbf{e}_0 then γ and δ have intersection number zero.

Suppose that α and β are vertices of $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$. Fix metrics σ and τ in $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$ so that α and β have bounded length at σ and τ respectively. Let $\Gamma: [t_\sigma, t_\tau] \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(S)$ be a geodesic connecting σ to τ . For any curve γ let $l_t(\gamma)$ be the length of its geodesic representative in the hyperbolic metric $\Gamma(t)$. The following theorems are consequences of Theorem 6.2 and Lemma 7.3 in [Raf05].

Theorem 4.1 ([Raf05]). *For \mathbf{e}_0 as above there exists a threshold T_{\min} such that, for a strict subsurface Ω of Σ , if $d_\Omega(\alpha, \beta) \geq \mathsf{T}_{\min}$ then there is a time t_Ω so that the length of each boundary component of Ω in $\Gamma(t_\Omega)$ is less than \mathbf{e}_0 . \square*

Theorem 4.2 ([Raf05]). *For every threshold T_1 , there is a constant \mathbf{e}_1 such that if $l_t(\gamma) \leq \mathbf{e}_1$, for some curve γ and for some time t , then there exists a subsurface Ψ disjoint from γ such that $d_\Psi(\alpha, \beta) \geq \mathsf{T}_1$. \square*

The *shadow* of the Teichmüller geodesic Γ inside of $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ is the set of curves γ so that γ has bounded length in $\Gamma(t)$ for some $t \in [t_\sigma, t_\tau]$. The following is a consequence of the fact that the shadow is an unparameterized quasi-geodesic. (See Theorem 2.6 and then apply Theorem 2.3 in [MM99].)

Theorem 4.3 ([MM99]). *The shadow of a Teichmüller geodesic inside of $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ does not backtrack and so satisfies the reverse triangle inequality. That is, there exists a backtracking constant $\mathsf{B} = \mathsf{B}(\Sigma)$ such that if $t_\sigma \leq t_0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq t_\tau$ and if γ_i has bounded length in $\Gamma(t_i)$, $i = 0, 1, 2$ then*

$$d_\Sigma(\gamma_0, \gamma_2) \geq d_\Sigma(\gamma_0, \gamma_1) + d_\Sigma(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) - \mathsf{B}.$$

We say that $\Gamma(t)$ is \mathbf{e} -*thick* if the shortest closed geodesic γ in $\Gamma(t)$ has a length of at least \mathbf{e} .

Lemma 4.4. *For every $\mathbf{e} > 0$ there is a progress constant $\mathsf{P} > 0$ so that if $t_\sigma \leq t_0 \leq t_1 \leq t_\tau$, if $\Gamma(t)$ is \mathbf{e} -thick at every time $t \in [t_0, t_1]$, and if γ_i has bounded length in $\Gamma(t_i)$ ($i = 0, 1$) then*

$$d_\Sigma(\gamma_0, \gamma_1) \asymp_{\mathsf{P}} t_1 - t_0.$$

Proof. As above, using Theorem 6.2 and Lemma 7.3 in [Raf05] and the fact that $\Gamma(t)$ is \mathbf{e} -thick at every time $t \in [t_0, t_1]$, we can conclude that $d_\Omega(\gamma_0, \gamma_1)$ is uniformly bounded for any strict subsurface Ω of Σ . The lemma is then a consequence of Theorem 1.1 and Remark 5.5

in [Raf06]. (Referring to the statement and notation of [Raf06, Theorem 1.1]: Extend γ_i to a short marking μ_i . Take k large enough such that the only non-zero term in the right hand side of [Raf06, Equation (1)] is $d_\Sigma(\mu_0, \mu_1)$.) \square

In general the geodesic Γ may stray into the thin part of $\mathcal{T}(S)$. We take $\Gamma^{\geq e}$ to be the set of times in the domain of Γ which are e -thick. Notice that $\Gamma^{\geq e}$ is a union of closed intervals. Let $\Gamma(e, L)$ be the union of intervals of $\Gamma^{\geq e}$ which have length at least L . We use $|\Gamma(e, L)|$ to denote the sum of the lengths of the components of $\Gamma(e, L)$.

Lemma 4.5. *For every e there exists L_0 such that if $L \geq L_0$, then*

$$d_\Sigma(\alpha, \beta) \geq |\Gamma(e, L)|/2P.$$

Proof. Pick L_0 large enough so that, for $L \geq L_0$,

$$(L/2P) \geq P + 2B.$$

Let $\Gamma(e, L)$ be the union of intervals $[t_i, s_i]$, $i = 1, \dots, m$. Let γ_i be a curve of bounded length in $\Gamma(t_i)$ and δ_i be a curve of bounded length in $\Gamma(s_i)$.

By Theorem 4.3 we have

$$d_\Sigma(\alpha, \beta) \geq \left(\sum_i d_\Sigma(\gamma_i, \delta_i) \right) - 2mB.$$

From Lemma 4.4 we deduce

$$d_\Sigma(\alpha, \beta) \geq \left(\sum_i \frac{1}{P}(s_i - t_i) - P \right) - 2mB.$$

Rearranging, we find

$$d_\Sigma(\alpha, \beta) \geq \frac{1}{P}|\Gamma(e, L)| - m(P + 2B).$$

Thus, as desired:

$$d_\Sigma(\alpha, \beta) \geq \frac{1}{2P}|\Gamma(e, L)|. \quad \square$$

5. AN ESTIMATE OF DISTANCE

Again, take Σ to be a surface. In this section we provide the main estimate for $d_\Sigma(\alpha, \beta)$. Let e_0 be as before. We choose thresholds $T_0 \geq T_{\min}$ (see Theorem 4.1) and T_1 so that Lemma 3.2 holds. Let e_1 be the constant provided in Lemma 4.4 and let $e > 0$ be any constant smaller than $\min\{e_0, e_1\}$. Finally, we pick L_0 such that Lemma 4.5 holds and that $L_0/2P > 4$. Let L be any length larger than L_0 .

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\mathbb{T}_0, \mathbb{T}_1, \mathbf{e}$ and \mathbb{L} be constants chosen as above. There is a constant $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{K}(\Sigma, \mathbb{T}_0, \mathbb{T}_1, \mathbf{e}, \mathbb{L})$ such that for any curves α and β , any $(\mathbb{T}_0, \mathbb{T}_1)$ -antichain \mathcal{J} and any Teichmüller geodesic Γ , chosen as above, we have:*

$$d_\Sigma(\alpha, \beta) \asymp_{\mathbb{K}} |\mathcal{J}| + |\Gamma(\mathbf{e}, \mathbb{L})|.$$

Proof. For $\mathbb{K} \geq 2 \cdot \max(\mathbb{A}, 2\mathbb{P})$, the inequality

$$d_\Sigma(\alpha, \beta) \succ_{\mathbb{K}} |\mathcal{J}| + |\Gamma(\mathbf{e}, \mathbb{L})|$$

follows from Lemmas 3.2 and 4.5. It remains to show that

$$d_\Sigma(\alpha, \beta) \prec_{\mathbb{K}} |\mathcal{J}| + |\Gamma(\mathbf{e}, \mathbb{L})|.$$

For each $\Omega \in \mathcal{J}$ fix a time $t_\Omega \in [t_\sigma, t_\tau]$ so that all boundary components of Ω are \mathbf{e}_0 -short in $\Gamma(t_\Omega)$ (see Theorem 4.1). Let \mathcal{E} be the union:

$$\left\{ t_\Omega \mid \Omega \in \mathcal{J}, t_\Omega \notin \Gamma(\mathbf{e}, \mathbb{L}) \right\} \cup \left\{ \partial I \mid I \text{ a component of } \Gamma(\mathbf{e}, \mathbb{L}) \right\}.$$

We write $\mathcal{E} = \{t_0, \dots, t_n\}$, indexed so that $t_i < t_{i+1}$.

Claim. The number of intervals in $\Gamma(\mathbf{e}, \mathbb{L})$ is at most $|\mathcal{J}| + 1$. Hence, $|\mathcal{E}| \leq 3|\mathcal{J}| + 1$.

Proof. There is at least one moment between any two consecutive intervals $I, J \subset \Gamma(\mathbf{e}, \mathbb{L})$ when some curve γ becomes \mathbf{e} -short (and hence \mathbf{e}_1 -short). Therefore, by Theorem 4.2, γ is disjoint from a subsurface Ψ where $d_\Psi(\alpha, \beta) \geq \mathbb{T}_1$. Since \mathcal{J} is an $(\mathbb{T}_0, \mathbb{T}_1)$ -antichain, Ψ is a subsurface of some element $\Omega \in \mathcal{J}$. It follows that $d_\Sigma(\gamma, \partial\Omega) \leq 2$. This defines a one-to-many relation from pairs of consecutive intervals to \mathcal{J} . To see the injectivity consider another such pair of consecutive intervals I' and J' and a corresponding curve γ' and subsurface Ω' . By Lemma 4.4, $d_\Sigma(\gamma, \gamma') \geq \mathbb{L}/2\mathbb{P} > 4$ and therefore Ω is not equal to Ω' . \square

Let γ_i be a curve of bounded length in $\Gamma(t_i)$.

Claim.

$$d_\Sigma(\gamma_i, \gamma_{i+1}) \leq \begin{cases} \mathbb{P}(t_{i+1} - t_i) + \mathbb{P}, & \text{if } [t_i, t_{i+1}] \subset \Gamma(\mathbf{e}, \mathbb{L}) \\ 2\mathbb{B} + \mathbb{P}\mathbb{L} + \mathbb{P} + 2, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. The first case follows from Lemma 4.4. So suppose that the interior of $[t_i, t_{i+1}]$ is disjoint from the interior of $\Gamma(\mathbf{e}, \mathbb{L})$.

We define sets $I_+, I_- \subset [t_i, t_{i+1}]$ as follows: A point $t \in [t_i, t_{i+1}]$ lies in I_- if

- there is a curve γ which is \mathbf{e} -short in $\Gamma(t)$ and
- for some $\Omega \in \mathcal{J}$, so that $d_\Sigma(\partial\Omega, \gamma) \leq 2$, we have $t_\Omega \leq t_i$.

If instead $t_\Omega \geq t_{i+1}$ then we place t in I_+ . Finally, we place t_i in I_- and t_{i+1} in I_+ .

Notice that if $\Omega \in \mathcal{J}$ then t_Ω does not lie in the open interval (t_i, t_{i+1}) . It follows that every \mathbf{e} -thin point of $[t_i, t_{i+1}]$ lies in I_- , I_+ , or both. If $t \in I_-$ and γ is the corresponding \mathbf{e} -short curve then $d_\Sigma(\gamma_i, \gamma) \leq \mathbf{B} + 2$. This is because either $t = t_i$ and so γ and γ_i are in fact disjoint, or there is a surface $\Omega \in \mathcal{J}$ as above with

$$2 \geq d_\Sigma(\partial\Omega, \gamma) \geq d_\Sigma(\gamma_i, \gamma) - \mathbf{B},$$

Similarly if $t \in I_+$ then $d_\Sigma(\gamma_{i+1}, \gamma) \leq \mathbf{B} + 2$.

If I_+ and I_- have non-empty intersection then $d_\Sigma(\gamma_i, \gamma_{i+1}) \leq 2\mathbf{B} + 4$ by the triangle inequality.

Otherwise, there is an interval $[s, s']$ that is \mathbf{e} -thick, has length less than \mathbf{L} such that $s \in I_-$ and $s' \in I_+$. Let γ and γ' be the corresponding short curves in $\Gamma(s)$ and $\Gamma(s')$. Thus

$$d_\Sigma(\gamma_i, \gamma) \leq \mathbf{B} + 2 \quad \text{and} \quad d_\Sigma(\gamma', \gamma_{i+1}) \leq \mathbf{B} + 2.$$

We also know from Lemma 4.4 that

$$d_\Sigma(\gamma, \gamma') \leq \mathbf{P}\mathbf{L} + \mathbf{P}.$$

This finishes the proof of our claim. \square

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} d_\Sigma(\alpha, \beta) &\leq d_\Sigma(\gamma_0, \gamma_1) + \dots + d_\Sigma(\gamma_{n-1}, \gamma_n) \\ &\leq |\mathcal{E}|(2\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{P}\mathbf{L} + \mathbf{P} + 2) + \mathbf{P}|\Gamma(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{L})| + |\mathcal{E}|\mathbf{P} \\ &\prec_{\mathbf{K}} |\mathcal{J}| + |\Gamma(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{L})|, \end{aligned}$$

for an appropriate choice of \mathbf{K} . This proves the theorem. \square

6. SYMMETRIC CURVES AND SURFACES

Let $P: \Sigma \rightarrow S$ be an orbifold covering map.

Definition 6.1. A curve $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ is *symmetric* if there is a curve $a \in \mathcal{C}(S)$ so that $P(\alpha) = a$. We make the same definition for a suborbifold $\Omega \subset \Sigma$ lying over a suborbifold $Z \subset S$.

For the rest of this section, fix symmetric curves α and β . Pick $x, y \in \mathcal{T}(S^\circ)$ so that $a = P(\alpha)$ has bounded length in x and $b = P(\beta)$ is bounded in y . Let $G: [t_x, t_y] \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(S^\circ)$ be the Teichmüller geodesic connecting x to y . For every $t \in [t_x, t_y]$ let q_t be the terminal quadratic differential of the Teichmüller map from $G(t_x)$ to $G(t)$. We lift q_t to the surface $P^{-1}(S^\circ)$, fill the punctures not corresponding to orbifold points and so obtain a parameterized family θ_t of quadratic differentials on Σ° . Notice that θ_t is indeed a quadratic differential: suppose that

$p \in S$ is a orbifold point and q_t has a once-pronged singularity at p . For every regular point π in the preimage of p the differential θ_t has at least a twice-pronged singularity at π .

Uniformize the associated flat structures to obtain hyperbolic metrics on Σ° . This gives a path $\Gamma: [t_x, t_y] \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\Sigma^\circ)$. The path Γ is a geodesic in $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma^\circ)$. This is because, for $t, s \in [t_x, t_y]$, the Teichmüller map from $G(t)$ to $G(s)$ has Beltrami coefficient $k|q|/q$ where q is an integrable holomorphic quadratic differential in $G(t)$. This map lifts to a map from $\Gamma(t)$ to $\Gamma(s)$ with Beltrami coefficient $k|\theta|/\theta$, where the quadratic differential θ is the pullback of q to $\Gamma(t)$. That is, the lift of the Teichmüller map from $G(t)$ to $G(s)$ is the Teichmüller map from $\Gamma(t)$ to $\Gamma(s)$ with the same quasi-conformal constant. Therefore, as is well-known, the distance in $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma^\circ)$ between $G(t)$ and $G(s)$ equals the distance in $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma^\circ)$ between $\Gamma(t)$ and $\Gamma(s)$.

Proposition 6.2 (Proposition 3.7 [Raf06]). *For any \mathbf{e} , there is a constant \mathbf{N} such that the following holds. Assume that, for all $t \in [r, s]$, there is a component of $\partial\Omega$ whose length in $\Gamma(t)$ is larger than \mathbf{e} . Suppose γ has bounded length in $\Gamma(r)$ and δ has bounded length in $\Gamma(s)$. Then*

$$d_\Omega(\gamma, \delta) \leq \mathbf{N}.$$

Lemma 6.3. *For \mathbf{e} small enough, \mathbf{N} as above and any suborbifold $\Omega \subset \Sigma$, if $d_\Omega(\alpha, \beta) \geq 2\mathbf{N} + 1$, then Ω is symmetric.*

Proof. Consider the first time t^- and last time t^+ that the boundary of Ω is \mathbf{e} -short. Since every component of $\partial\Omega$ is short in $\Gamma(t^\pm)$, so is the image $P(\partial\Omega)$ in $G(t^\pm)$. Therefore, all components of the image are simple. (This is a version of the Collar Lemma. For example, see [Bus92, Theorem 4.2.2].) It follows that the boundary of Ω is symmetric. This is because choosing \mathbf{e} small enough will ensure that curves in $P^{-1}(P(\Omega))$ have bounded length at both t^- and t^+ . (The length of each is at most the degree of the covering map times \mathbf{e} .) If any such curve γ intersects Ω we have $d_\Omega(\gamma, \alpha) \leq \mathbf{N}$ and $d_\Omega(\gamma, \beta) \leq \mathbf{N}$, contradicting the assumption $d_\Omega(\alpha, \beta) \geq 2\mathbf{N} + 1$. Thus, the suborbifold Ω is symmetric. \square

7. THE QUASI-ISOMETRIC EMBEDDING

We now prove the main theorem:

Theorem 7.1. *The covering relation $\Pi: \mathcal{C}(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$, corresponding to the covering map $P: \Sigma \rightarrow S$, is a \mathbf{Q} -quasi-isometric embedding. The constant \mathbf{Q} depends only on the topology of S and the degree of the covering map P .*

Proof. As mentioned before, we only need to show that

$$d_{\Sigma}(\alpha, \beta) \succ_Q d_S(a, b).$$

Suppose that d is the degree of the covering. We prove the theorem by induction on the complexity of S . In the case where S is an annulus without orbifold points, the cover Σ is also an annulus and the distances in $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ and $\mathcal{C}(S)$ are equal to the intersection number plus one. But, in this case,

$$i(\alpha, \beta) \geq i(a, b)/d.$$

Therefore, the theorem is true with $Q = d$.

Now assume the theorem is true for all strict suborbifolds of S . Let Q' be the largest constant of quasi-isometry necessary for such suborbifolds. Choose the threshold T , constant e and length L such that Theorem 5.1 holds for both the data (S, T, T, e, L) as well as $(\Sigma, (T/Q') - Q', T, e, L)$. We also assume that $T \geq 2N + 1$. All of the constants depend only on the topology of S and the degree d , because these last two bound the topology of Σ .

Let \mathcal{J}_S be the T -antichain of maxima for S, a and b and let \mathcal{J}_{Σ} be the set of components of preimages of elements of \mathcal{J}_S .

Claim. The set \mathcal{J}_{Σ} is a $((T/Q') - Q', T)$ -antichain for (Σ, α, β) .

We check the conditions for being an antichain. Since elements of \mathcal{J}_S are not subsets of each other, the same holds for their preimages. The condition $d_{\Omega}(\alpha, \beta) \geq (T/Q') - Q'$ is the induction hypothesis. Now suppose $\Psi \subset \Sigma$ with $d_{\Psi}(\alpha, \beta) \geq T$. By Lemma 6.3, Ψ is symmetric. That is, it is a component of the preimage of an orbifold $Y \subset S$ and

$$d_Y(a, b) \geq d_{\Psi}(\alpha, \beta) \geq T.$$

This implies that $Y \subset Z$ for some $Z \in \mathcal{J}_S$. Therefore, taking Ω to be the preimage of Z , we have $\Psi \subset \Omega \in \mathcal{J}_{\Sigma}$. This proves the claim.

Hence, there are constants K and K' such that

$$d_S(a, b) \asymp_K |\mathcal{J}_S| + |G(e, L)|,$$

and

$$d_{\Sigma}(\alpha, \beta) \asymp_{K'} |\mathcal{J}_{\Sigma}| + |\Gamma(e, L)|.$$

Note that $|\mathcal{J}_S| \leq d|\mathcal{J}_{\Sigma}|$ as a suborbifold of S has at most d preimages. Note also that $|G(e, L)| \leq |\Gamma(e, L)|$ because $\Gamma(t)$ is at least as thick as $G(t)$. Therefore

$$d_S(a, b) \prec_Q d_{\Sigma}(\alpha, \beta),$$

for $Q = dKK'$. This finishes the proof. \square

8. AN APPLICATION TO MAPPING CLASS GROUPS

Suppose that $P: \Sigma \rightarrow S$ is an orbifold covering map, and $\chi^{\text{orb}}(S) < 0$. Let $\mathcal{MCG}(\Sigma)$ be the orbifold mapping class group of Σ : isotopy classes of homeomorphisms of Σ restricting to the identity on ∂S and respecting the set of orbifold points and their orders. Here all isotopies must fix all boundary components and all orbifold points. As an application of Theorem 7.1 we prove the following theorem:

Theorem 8.1. *The covering P induces a quasi-isometric embedding*

$$\Pi_*: \mathcal{MCG}(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{MCG}(\Sigma).$$

Remark 8.2. Assume that $P: \Sigma \rightarrow S$ is a regular orbifold cover with finite deck group $\Delta < \mathcal{MCG}(\Sigma)$. Let $N(\Delta)$ be the normalizer of Δ inside of $\mathcal{MCG}(\Sigma)$ and let $M < \mathcal{MCG}(S)$ be the finite index subgroup of mapping classes that lift. MacLachlan and Harvey [MH75, Theorem 10]: showed that there is a short exact sequence:

$$1 \rightarrow \Delta \rightarrow N(\Delta) \rightarrow M \rightarrow 1.$$

It is not difficult to show that any set-theoretic section of the MacLachlan-Harvey map is bounded distance from the quasi-isometric embedding constructed by the proof of Theorem 8.1.

Remark 8.3. Theorem 8.1 can also be compared to the following statement: Suppose that a subsurface $Z \subset S$ is cleanly embedded and $S \setminus Z$ has no annuli components. Then the inclusion $Z \rightarrow S$ induces a quasi-isometric embedding on mapping class groups. This follows directly from the summation formula of Masur and Minsky (See [MM00], Theorems 7.1, 6.10, and 6.12) and was independently obtained by Hamenstädt [Hama, Theorem B, Corollary 4.6].

Proof of Theorem 8.1. Choose, for the remainder of the proof, a *marking* of S : a collection, m , of curves which fill S . Let $\mu = \Pi(m)$ be the lift of m to Σ . Since disks and punctured disks lift to disks and punctured disks the curves of μ fill Σ . Hence μ is a marking on Σ .

We construct Π_* as follows: Let x be an element of $\mathcal{MCG}(S)$. Define $\xi = \Pi_*(x)$ to be any element of $\mathcal{MCG}(\Sigma)$ so that $\xi(\mu)$ intersects $\Pi(x(m))$ an *a priori* bounded number of times. Such a map ξ always exists and, for a given bound on intersection, there are only finitely many possibilities for such a map (see [MM00]).

Let T be a generating set for $\mathcal{MCG}(S)$ and Θ be a generating set for $\mathcal{MCG}(\Sigma)$. Let $\|x\|_T$ and $\|\xi\|_\Theta$ denote the word lengths of x and ξ with respect to T and Θ respectively. To prove the proposition it is

sufficient to show that, for $\xi = \Pi_*(x)$,

$$(8.4) \quad \|x\|_T \asymp_W \|\xi\|_\Theta,$$

where W is a constant that does not depend on x .

By [MM00], Theorems 7.1, 6.10, and 6.12, we have

$$(8.5) \quad \|x\|_T \asymp_{W_1} \sum \left[d_Z(m, x(m)) \right]_{k_1}.$$

Here the sum ranges over all sub-orbifolds $Z \subset S$. The constant W_1 depends on k_1 which in turn depends on our choice of the marking m and the generating set T . However, all of the choices are independent of the group element x . Finally, $[r]_k = r$ if $r \geq k$ and $[r]_k = 0$ if $r < k$.

As above, after fixing a large enough constant k_2 (see below) and an appropriate W_2 , we have

$$(8.6) \quad \|\xi\|_\Theta \asymp_{W_2} \sum \left[d_\Omega(\mu, \xi(\mu)) \right]_{k_2}.$$

But $\xi(\mu)$ and $\Pi(x(m))$ have bounded intersection. Therefore, their projection distance in every subsurface Ω is *a priori* bounded. Hence we can write

$$(8.7) \quad \|\xi\|_\Theta \asymp_{W_3} \sum \left[d_\Omega(\mu, \Pi(x(m))) \right]_{k_2},$$

for a slightly larger constant W_3 .

We prove equation (8.4) by comparing the terms of the the right hand side of (8.5) with those on the right hand side of (8.7). Note that $\mu = \Pi(m)$ is a union of symmetric orbits and the same holds for $\Pi(x(m))$. Therefore, we can choose k_2 large enough such that if $d_\Omega(\mu, g(\mu))$ is larger than k_2 then Ω is itself symmetric (see Lemma 6.3). Taking $Z = P(\Omega)$, it follows from Theorem 7.1 that

$$d_Z(m, x(m)) \asymp d_\Omega(\mu, \Pi(x(\mu))).$$

On the other hand, Theorem 7.1 also tells us that large projection distance in any $Z \subset S$ implies large projection distance in all the components of the pre-image of Z . Therefore, there is a finite-to-one correspondence between the surfaces that appear in (8.7) and in (8.5) and the corresponding projection distances are comparable. We conclude that $\|x\|_T \asymp_W \|\xi\|_\Theta$ for some W . This finishes the proof. \square

As a further application, let Σ be the closed orientable surface of genus g and let $\phi: \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ be a hyperelliptic involution. Let $S = \Sigma/\phi$ and let $P: \Sigma \rightarrow S$ be the induced orbifold cover. Birman and Hilden [BH73] provide a short exact sequence:

$$1 \rightarrow \langle \phi \rangle \rightarrow N(\phi) \rightarrow \mathcal{MCG}(S) \rightarrow 1.$$

Notice that $\mathcal{MCG}(S)$ is the spherical braid group on $2g + 2$ strands. As in Theorem 8.1 we immediately have:

Corollary 8.8. *A section of the Birman-Hilden map induces a quasi-isometric embedding of the spherical braid group on $2g + 2$ strands into the mapping class group of the closed surface of genus g . \square*

REFERENCES

- [Ber60] Lipman Bers. Quasiconformal mappings and Teichmüller’s theorem. In *Analytic functions*, pages 89–119. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N.J., 1960.
- [BH73] Joan S. Birman and Hugh M. Hilden. On isotopies of homeomorphisms of Riemann surfaces. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 97:424–439, 1973.
- [BS85] Joan S. Birman and Caroline Series. Geodesics with bounded intersection number on surfaces are sparsely distributed. *Topology*, 24(2):217–225, 1985.
- [Bus92] Peter Buser. *Geometry and spectra of compact Riemann surfaces*, volume 106 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1992.
- [Gar87] Frederick P. Gardiner. *Teichmüller theory and quadratic differentials*. Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York). John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1987. , A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [Hama] Ursula Hamenstaedt. Geometry of the mapping class groups II: (Quasi)-geodesics. [arXiv:math.GR/0511349](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0511349).
- [Hamb] Ursula Hamenstaedt. Geometry of the mapping class groups III: Quasi-isometric rigidity. [arXiv:math.GT/0512429](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0512429).
- [Har81] Willam J. Harvey. Boundary structure of the modular group. In *Riemann surfaces and related topics: Proceedings of the 1978 Stony Brook Conference (State Univ. New York, Stony Brook, N.Y., 1978)*, pages 245–251, Princeton, N.J., 1981. Princeton Univ. Press.
- [Har86] John L. Harer. The virtual cohomological dimension of the mapping class group of an orientable surface. *Invent. Math.*, 84(1):157–176, 1986.
- [Hem01] John Hempel. 3-manifolds as viewed from the curve complex. *Topology*, 40(3):631–657, 2001. [arXiv:math.GT/9712220](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/9712220).
- [MH75] C. Maclachlan and W. J. Harvey. On mapping-class groups and Teichmüller spaces. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 30(part 4):496–512, 1975.
- [Min99] Yair N. Minsky. The classification of punctured-torus groups. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 149(2):559–626, 1999. [arXiv:math.GT/9807001](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/9807001).
- [MM99] Howard A. Masur and Yair N. Minsky. Geometry of the complex of curves. I. Hyperbolicity. *Invent. Math.*, 138(1):103–149, 1999. [arXiv:math.GT/9804098](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/9804098).
- [MM00] Howard A. Masur and Yair N. Minsky. Geometry of the complex of curves. II. Hierarchical structure. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 10(4):902–974, 2000. [arXiv:math.GT/9807150](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/9807150).
- [MS07] Howard A. Masur and Saul Schleimer. The geometry of the disk complex. 2007.
- [Raf05] Kasra Rafi. A characterization of short curves of a Teichmüller geodesic. *Geom. Topol.*, 9:179–202 (electronic), 2005. [arXiv:math.GT/0404227](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0404227).

- [Raf06] Kasra Rafi. A combinatorial model for the Teichmüller metric. To appear in *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 2006. [arXiv:math.GT/0509584](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0509584).
- [RS07] Kasra Rafi and Saul Schleimer. On quasi-isometric curve complexes, 2007. Preprint.
- [Sch] Saul Schleimer. Notes on the curve complex. <http://math.rutgers.edu/~saulsch/Maths/notes.pdf>.
- [Sco83] Peter Scott. The geometries of 3-manifolds. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 15(5):401–487, 1983.

E-mail address: rafi@math.uconn.edu

URL: <http://www.math.uconn.edu/~rafi>

E-mail address: saulsch@math.rutgers.edu

URL: <http://www.math.rutgers.edu/~saulsch>