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Abstract

Let \( PB_n(S_{g,p}) \) be the pure braid group of a genus \( g > 1 \) surface with \( p \) punctures. In this paper we prove that any surjective homomorphism \( PB_n(S_{g,p}) \to PB_m(S_{g,p}) \) factors through one of the forgetful homomorphisms. We then compute the automorphism group of \( PB_m(S_{g,p}) \), which gives a simpler proof of Irmak–Ivanov–McCarthy [IIM03, Theorem 1]. Surprisingly, in contrast to the \( n = 1 \) case, any automorphism of \( PB_n(S_{g,p}) \) for \( n > 1 \) is geometric.

1 Introduction

Given a surface \( S \) and a positive number \( n \), we denote the pure configuration space of \( S \) by

\[
PConf_n(S) := \{ (x_1, ..., x_n) \in S^n : x_i \neq x_j \text{ for } i \neq j \}.
\]

There is a natural free action of the permutation group \( \Sigma_n \) on \( PConf_n(S) \) given by permuting the coordinates and we refer to the corresponding quotient \( Conf_n(S) := PConf_n(S)/\Sigma_n \) as the configuration space of \( S \). Lastly, denote the \( n \)-strand pure braid group and the \( n \)-strand braid group of \( S \) by

\[
PB_n(S) := \pi_1(PConf_n(S)) \text{ and } B_n(S) := \pi_1(Conf_n(S)).
\]

Our goal in this paper is to understand surjective homomorphisms between surface braid groups on different numbers of strands. For example, when \( n \geq m > 0 \), there are natural maps \( PConf_n(S) \to PConf_m(S) \) forgetting \( n - m \) coordinates, which induce forgetful homomorphisms \( PB_n(S) \to PB_m(S) \). In fact, up to automorphisms, these are the only surjective homomorphisms that arise:

**Theorem 1.1** (surjective homomorphisms \( PB_n(S) \to PB_m(S) \)). Let \( S \) be a (possibly noncompact) hyperbolic surface of finite type of genus at least 2. For \( m, n > 0 \), every surjective homomorphism \( F : PB_n(S) \to PB_m(S) \) factors through some forgetful homomorphism, possibly post-composing with an automorphism of \( PB_m(S) \).

In particular, when \( m > n \), there is no surjective homomorphism \( F : PB_n(S) \to PB_m(S) \). A group \( G \) is called Hopfian if any epimorphism of \( G \) is an isomorphism. Applying Theorem 1.1 in the case \( n = m \) gives a proof of the fact that \( PB_n(S) \) is Hopfian for \( n > 0 \). Another way to show that \( PB_n(S) \) is Hopfian is by showing that \( PB_n(S) \) is a finitely generated residually finite group. This comes from an embedding of \( PB_n(S) \) inside the automorphism group of a finite generated free group, which is residually finite by Baumslag [Bau63]. Another consequence of our theorem is the following:
Corollary 1.2. (surjective homomorphisms $B_n(S) \to PB_m(S)$) Let $S$ be a (possibly noncompact) hyperbolic surface of finite type of genus at least 2. For $m > 0$ and $n > 1$, there is no surjective homomorphism $F : B_n(S) \to PB_m(S)$.

Historically, the first nontrivial surjective homomorphism between braid groups arose from a classical miracle: “resolving the quartic”. Indeed, let $RQ : \text{Conf}_4(\mathbb{C}) \to \text{Conf}_3(\mathbb{C})$ be the map given by

$$RQ(a, b, c, d) = (ab + cd, ac + bd, ad + bc).$$

By computation, the induced homomorphism on fundamental groups $RQ_* : B_4(\mathbb{C}) \to B_3(\mathbb{C})$ is surjective. Theorem 1.1 says that there is no such miracle map between pure surface braid groups.

The readers may be wondering why we refer to $RQ_*$ as a miracle. One of the reasons behind this terminology is a result of Lin [Lin04] saying that there is no surjective homomorphism $B_n(\mathbb{C}) \to B_m(\mathbb{C})$ when $n > m$ and $n \geq 4$. To prove this, Lin classified all homomorphisms from $B_n(\mathbb{C})$ to $\Sigma_m$ when $n > m$ extending Artin’s [Art47] classification of all homomorphisms from $B_n(\mathbb{C})$ to $\Sigma_n$. To get a similar result for surface braid groups, we would need to classify homomorphisms from $B_n(S)$ to $\Sigma_n$, extending Ivanov’s [Iva90, Theorem 1] classification of all homomorphisms from $B_n(S)$ to $\Sigma_n$. Based on Theorem 1.1, we have the following conjecture:

Conjecture 1.3. Let $S$ be a (possibly noncompact) hyperbolic surface of finite type of genus at least two. For $m, n > 0$ and $m \neq n$, there is no surjective homomorphism $F : B_n(S) \to B_m(S)$.

In light of Theorem 1.1, in order to further understand all surjective homomorphisms between surface braid groups, we need to study the automorphism groups of surface braid groups $\text{Aut}(B_n(S))$. To this end, for $g > 1$ let $\text{Diff}^+(S_{g,p,n})$ be the group of diffeomorphisms of $S_g$ fixing two sets of punctures, one with $p$ points and the other with $n$ points including both orientation-preserving and orientation-reversing maps. Let $\text{Mod}^+(S_{g,p,n}) := \pi_0(\text{Diff}^+(S_{g,p,n}))$ be the extended mapping class group of $S_{g,n,p}$. The following theorem computes $\text{Aut}(PB_n(S_{g,p}))$ except when $n = 1$ and $p > 0$.

Theorem 1.4. (The automorphism groups of $PB_n(S_{g,p})$) Assume that $g > 1$ and that either $n > 1$ and $p > 0$ or that $n = 1$ and $p = 0$. Then

$$\text{Mod}^+(S_{g,p,n}) \cong \text{Aut}(PB_n(S_{g,p})) \cong \text{Aut}(B_n(S_{g,p})).$$

Remark. When $n = 1$ and $p > 0$, the statement of Theorem 1.4 is simply false. The group $PB_1(S_{g,p})$ is a free group and there are many isomorphisms of $PB_1(S_{g,p})$ that are not induced from diffeomorphisms. But as Theorem 1.4 shows, as long as $n > 1$, every automorphism of $PB_n(S_{g,p})$ is induced from a diffeomorphism of $S_{g,p}$.

It should be mentioned at this point that Theorem 1.4 has some predecessors: Irmak–Ivanov–McCarthy [IM03, Theorem 1] first computed the automorphism group of $PB_n(S_g)$ and showed that every element is geometric in the sense that it comes from a diffeomorphism of $S_g$. After this work was completed, we also found out that An [An16] obtained Theorem 1.4 through a similar method as [IM03, Theorem 1]. Moreover, Kida–Yamagata [KY11] [KY13] showed that every injective homomorphism from a finite index subgroup of $PB_n(S_g)$ to itself is geometric. Nevertheless our method is new and appears to be much simpler than all
Lemma 2.1. Denote the following composition of maps by $F$.

In this section, we will use the computations of $H^*(\text{PConf}_m(S_{g,p});\mathbb{Z})$ to prove Theorem 1.1. Most computations here are similar to the computations in Chen [Che16, Lemma 3.4]. Consider the real codimensional two subspace $\triangle_{ij}$ of $S^m_{g,p}$, defined as

$$\triangle_{ij} := \{(x_1, \ldots, x_m) \in S^m_{g,p} : x_i = x_j\}.$$ 

By Poincaré duality, the subspace $\triangle_{ij}$ determines a class $[\triangle_{ij}] \in H^2(S^m_{g,p};\mathbb{Z})$.

Let $\{a_k, b_k\}_{k=1}^n$ be a symplectic basis for $H^1(S_g,\mathbb{Z})$ and $[S_g]' \in H^2(S_{g,p},\mathbb{Z})$ be the fundamental class. Fix a natural embedding $e : S_{g,p} \to S_g$. We define $a_k := e^*(a_k)$ and $b_k := e^*(b_k)$ for $k \in \{1, \ldots, g\}$. Let $[S_{g,p}] = e^*([S_g]') \in H^2(S_{g,p};\mathbb{Q})$ be the generator of the fundamental class; when $p > 0$, we have that $[S_{g,p}] = 0$. Let $p_i : S^m_{g,p} \to S_{g,p}$ be the projection onto the $i$th coordinate.

Define $H_i := p^*_i(H^1(S_{g,p};\mathbb{Z})) \subset H^1(S^m_{g,p};\mathbb{Z})$. There is a natural embedding $E : \text{PConf}_m(S_{g,p}) \to S^m_{g,p}$. By the Künneth formula, we have

$$H^2(S^m_{g,p};\mathbb{Z}) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbb{Z}p^*_i[S_{g,p}] \oplus \bigoplus_{i \not= j} H_i \otimes H_j.$$ 

Denote the following composition of maps by $F$:

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbb{Z}p^*_i[S_{g,p}] \oplus \bigoplus_{i \not= j} H_i \otimes H_j \xrightarrow{\text{Künneth}} H^2(S^m_{g,p};\mathbb{Z}) \xrightarrow{E^*} H^2(\text{PConf}_m(S_{g,p});\mathbb{Z})$$

We have the following computations of $H^1(\text{PConf}_m(S_{g,p});\mathbb{Z})$ and $H^2(\text{PConf}_m(S_{g,p});\mathbb{Z})$.

**Lemma 2.1.** Let $g > 1$ and $p, m > 0$ be integers.

1. We have the following isomorphisms:

$$H^1(\text{PConf}_m(S_{g,p});\mathbb{Z}) \xrightarrow{E^*} H^1(S^m_{g,p};\mathbb{Q}) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^m H_i$$

2. We have the following exact sequence

$$0 \to \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} \mathbb{Z}[G_{ij}] \xrightarrow{d} \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbb{Z}p^*_i[S_{g,p}] \oplus \bigoplus_{i \not= j} H_i \otimes H_j \xrightarrow{E} H^2(\text{PConf}_m(S_{g,p});\mathbb{Z}),$$

where $d[G_{ij}] = p^*_i[S_{g,p}] + p^*_j[S_{g,p}] + \sum_{k=1}^g (p^*_i a_k \otimes p^*_j b_k - p^*_i b_k \otimes p^*_j a_k)$. 
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Proof. By Totaro [Tot96, Theorem 1], there is a spectral sequence converging to $H^*(\text{PConf}_m(S_{g,p}); \mathbb{Q})$ whose $E_2$ term is a bigraded algebra

$$H^*(S^m_{g,p}; \mathbb{Z})[G_{ij}],$$

where $H^r(S^m_{g,p}; \mathbb{Z})$ has degree $(r,0)$ and $G_{ij}$ are generators of degree $(0,1)$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq m$ and $i \neq j$, modulo the following relations:

- $G_{ij} = G_{ji}, (G_{ij})^2 = 0,$
- $G_{ij}G_{ik} + G_{jk}G_{ji} + G_{ki}G_{kj} = 0$ for $i, j, k$ distinct,
- $p^*_i(x)G_{ij} = p^*_i(x)G_{ji}$ for $x \in H^*(S_{g,p}; \mathbb{Z}).$

The differential is given by $d_2(G_{ij}) = [\triangle_{ij}]$. The following graph is a part of this spectral sequence:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\mathbb{Z}[G_{ij}] \\
\downarrow d_2 \\
\mathbb{Z} \\
\downarrow \\
H^1(S^m_{g,p}; \mathbb{Z}) \\
\downarrow \\
H^2(S^m_{g,p}; \mathbb{Z})
\end{array}$$

By Milnor–Stasheff [MS74, Section 11],

$[\triangle_{ij}] = p^*_i[S_{g,p}] + p^*_j[S_{g,p}] + \sum_{k=1}^{g} (p^*_i a_k \otimes p^*_j b_k - p^*_i b_k \otimes p^*_j a_k) \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{Z}p^*_i[S_{g,p}] \oplus \bigoplus_{i \neq j} H_i \otimes H_j \xrightarrow{\text{K"unneth}} H^2(S^m_{g,p}; \mathbb{Z})$

When $g > 1$, elements of the finite set

$$\{ \sum_{k=1}^{g} (p^*_i a_k \otimes p^*_j b_k - p^*_i b_k \otimes p^*_j a_k) : 1 \leq i, j \leq m \text{ and } i \neq j \}$$

are linearly independent by the independence of direct sums. Thus $[\triangle_{ij}]$ are linearly independent; i.e. $d_2$ is injective. Then this lemma follows from the convergence of the above spectral sequence.

We have the following property about the cup product structure of $H^*(\text{PConf}_m(S_{g,p}); \mathbb{Z})$.

**Lemma 2.2.** For two independent elements $x, y \in H^1(\text{PConf}_m(S_{g,p}); \mathbb{Z})$, if $x \sim y = 0$, then there exists $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ such that either $x \in E^r(H_i)$ or $y \in E^r(H_i)$.

**Proof.** Since $E^r : \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m} H_i \rightarrow H^1(\text{PConf}_m(S_{g,p}); \mathbb{Z})$ is an isomorphism by Lemma 2.1, we can find $x^i, y^i \in H_i$ for each $1 \leq i \leq m$ such that $x = E^*(x^1 + \ldots + x^m)$ and $y = E^*(y^1 + \ldots + y^m)$. The multiplication of $x$ and $y$ satisfies the following:

$$x \sim y = F(x^1 \sim y^1 + \ldots + x^n \sim y^n + \sum_{i \neq j} (x^i \otimes y^j - y^i \otimes x^j)) \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{Z}p^*_i[S_{g,p}] \oplus \bigoplus_{i \neq j} H_i \otimes H_j \xrightarrow{\text{F}} H^2(\text{PConf}_m(S_{g,p}); \mathbb{Z}).$$

By $x \sim y = 0 \in H^2(\text{PConf}_m(S_{g,p}); \mathbb{Z})$ and Lemma 2.1 there exists integers $\{k_{i,j}\}$ such that

$$x^1 \sim y^1 + \ldots + x^n \sim y^n + \sum_{i \neq j} (x^i \otimes y^j - y^i \otimes x^j) = \sum_{i \neq j} k_{i,j} d[G_{ij}] \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{Z}p^*_i[S_{g,p}] \oplus \bigoplus_{i \neq j} H_i \otimes H_j.$$

By the independence of all the terms in $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{Z}p^*_i[S_{g,p}] \oplus \bigoplus_{i \neq j} H_i \otimes H_j$, we have

$$x^i \otimes y^j - y^i \otimes x^j = k_{i,j} (\sum_{k} (p^*_i a_k \otimes p^*_j b_k - p^*_i b_k \otimes p^*_j a_k)) \text{ for all } i, j.$$  \hfill (1)
Claim 2.3. We have that $k_{i,j} = 0$ for all $i \neq j$.

Proof. We will prove this claim by contradiction. Assume that $k_{i,j} \neq 0$. In $H_i$, elements $p_i^*a_1, ..., p_i^*a_g$ span a subspace $A_i$ and $p_i^*b_1, ..., p_i^*b_g$ span a subspace $B_i$. Since $H_i$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-free module, there is a projection $s_i : H_i \to A_i \oplus B_i$. Let $s_i(x^i) = x_A^i + x_B^i \in A_i \oplus B_i$ and $s_i(y^i) = y_A^i + y_B^i \in A_i \oplus B_i$. By equation (c) and the fact that $s_i$ is a projection by $s_i \circ s_j$, we have that

$$(x_A^i + x_B^i) \otimes (y_A^i + y_B^i) - (y_A^i + y_B^i) \otimes (x_A^i + x_B^i) = k_{i,j} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{g} (p_i^*a_k \otimes p_j^*b_k - p_i^*b_k \otimes p_j^*a_k) \right) \in (A_i \oplus B_i) \otimes (A_j \oplus B_j).$$

Since $(A_i \oplus B_i) \otimes (A_j \oplus B_j) = A_i \otimes A_j \oplus A_i \otimes B_j \oplus B_i \otimes A_j \oplus B_i \otimes B_j$, we have

- (a) $x_A^i \otimes y_A^j - y_A^i \otimes x_A^j = 0$
- (b) $x_B^i \otimes y_B^j - y_B^i \otimes x_B^j = 0$
- (c) $x_A^i \otimes y_B^j - y_A^i \otimes x_B^j = k_{i,j} (\sum_k p_i^*a_k \otimes p_j^*b_k)$
- (d) $x_B^i \otimes y_A^j - y_B^i \otimes x_A^j = k_{i,j} (\sum_k p_i^*b_k \otimes p_j^*a_k)$.

We claim that $k_{i,j} (\sum_k p_i^*a_k \otimes p_j^*b_k) \in A_i \otimes B_j$ is not a simple tensor of two elements. Assume the contrary that there exists $\lambda_d, \mu_d$ for all $d \in \{1, ..., m\}$ such that $z = \sum_d \lambda_d p_i^*a_d$ and $w = \sum_d \mu_d p_i^*b_d$ satisfies that $z \otimes w = k_{i,j} (\sum_k p_i^*a_k \otimes p_j^*b_k)$. Comparing the coefficient of $p_i^*a_k \otimes p_j^*b_k$, we know that $\lambda_k \neq 0$ and $\mu_k \neq 0$ for any $k$. Since $g > 1$, the coefficient of $p_i^*a_1 \otimes p_j^*b_2$ is nonzero, which is a contradiction.

By equation (c) and the fact that $\sum_k p_i^*a_k \otimes p_j^*b_k \in A_i \otimes B_j$ is not a simple tensor, we know that $x_A^i, y_B^j, y_A^j$ and $x_B^i$ are all nonzero. For the same reason, $x_B^i, y_A^j, y_B^j$ and $x_A^j$ are also all nonzero. Equation (a) says that there exists $\mu$ such that $x_A^i = \mu y_A^i$ and $\mu y_A^i = x_A^j$; equation (b) says that there exists $\mu'$ such that $x_B^i = \mu' y_B^j$ and $\mu' y_B^j = x_B^j$. Therefore

$$x_A^i \otimes y_B^j - y_A^i \otimes x_B^j = \mu y_A^i \otimes y_B^j - y_A^i \otimes \mu' y_B^j = (\mu - \mu') y_A^i \otimes y_B^j,$$

which contradicts the fact that $\sum_k p_i^*a_k \otimes p_j^*b_k \in A_i \otimes B_j$ is not a simple tensor. Thus the claim holds. \(\square\)

Therefore $x^i \otimes y^j - y^i \otimes x^j = 0 \in H_i \otimes H_j$. Assume that $x \notin H_i$ for any $i$; i.e. two coordinates of $x$ are nonzero. Without loss of generality, we assume that $x^1 \neq 0$ and $x^2 \neq 0$. We break the proof into the following cases.

- Case 1) $y^1 \neq 0$ and $y^1$ is not proportional to $x^1$. Then $x^1 \otimes y^j = y^1 \otimes x^j \in H_1 \otimes H_j$ implies that $y^j = 0$ and $x^j = 0$ for all $j \neq 1$, which contradicts to the assumption that $x_2 \neq 0$.

- Case 2) $y^1 \neq 0$ and $x^1 = \mu y^1$ for $\mu \neq 0$. Then $x^1 \otimes y^j = y^1 \otimes x^j \in H_1 \otimes H_j$ implies that $x^j = \mu y^j$ for all $j$. Therefore

$$x = x^1 + ... + x^m = \mu y^1 + ... + \mu y^m = \mu y,$$

which contradicts the fact that $x$ and $y$ are independent.

- Case 3) $y^1 = 0$. Then $x^1 \otimes y^j = y^1 \otimes x^j \in H_1 \otimes H_j$ implies that $y^j = 0$ for all $j$, which contradicts to the fact that $x$ and $y$ are independent. \(\square\)

We define $PB_n(S_{g,p}) := \pi_1(\text{PConf}_n(S_{g,p}))$ and let $P_i := (p_i \circ E)_* : PB_n(S_{g,p}) \to \pi_1(S_{g,p})$ be the induced map on the fundamental groups of the projection to the $i$th coordinate.
Proposition 2.4. For $g > 0$ and $p, n \geq 0$, the space $PConf_n(S_{g,p})$ is a $K(\pi, 1)$-space and $\text{Ker}(P_i)$ is finitely generated.

Proof. We will prove that $PConf_n(S_{g,p})$ is a $K(\pi, 1)$-space for any $p \geq 0$ by induction on $n$. For $n = 1$, the space $PConf_n(S_{g,p}) = S_{g,p}$ is a $K(\pi, 1)$-space for any $p$. Assume that $PConf_{n-1}(S_{g,p})$ is a $K(\pi, 1)$-space for any $p$ for $n > 1$. The forgetful map $p_1 \circ E$ gives the following fiber bundle

$$PConf_{n-1}(S_{g,p+1}) \rightarrow PConf_n(S_{g,p}) \xrightarrow{p_1 \circ E} S_{g,p}. \quad (2)$$

Since both $PConf_{n-1}(S_{g,p+1})$ and $S_{g,p}$ are $K(\pi, 1)$-spaces, we have that $PConf_n(S_{g,p})$ is a $K(\pi, 1)$-space. Then the induction axiom implies that $PConf_n(S_{g,p})$ is a $K(\pi, 1)$-space for any $n$. Fiber bundle (2) induces the following short exact sequence on fundamental groups:

$$1 \rightarrow \text{PB}_{n-1}(S_{g,p+1}) \rightarrow \text{PB}_n(S_{g,p}) \xrightarrow{P_1} \pi_1(S_{g,p}) \rightarrow 1. \quad (3)$$

By the short exact sequence (3), we obtain $\text{Ker}(P_i) = \text{PB}_{n-1}(S_{g,p+1})$. Using (3), it is straightforward to prove that $\text{PB}_n(S_{g,p})$ is finitely generated by induction on $n$. Therefore $\text{Ker}(P_i)$ is finitely generated. \qed

Now, we proceed to the key lemma.

Lemma 2.5. For $g > 1$ and $p, n \geq 0$, a homomorphism

$$R : \text{PB}_n(S_{g,p}) \rightarrow \pi_1(S_{g,p})$$

either factors through $P_i$ for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ or has cyclic image.

Proof. The proof of this lemma uses the same idea as F.E.A. Johnson [Joh99]. The method can also be found in Salter [Sal15, Lemma 3.3 and 3.4]. We use group cohomology in what follows. Since all spaces we consider are $K(\pi, 1)$-spaces, we freely use the computation of the cohomology of the spaces as the cohomology of the corresponding groups. By the classification of subgroups of $\pi_1(S_{g,p})$, if $\text{Image}(R) \not\cong \mathbb{Z}$, then $\text{Image}(R)$ is either a free group $F_k$ with $k > 1$ or a surface group $\pi(h)$ such that $h \geq g > 1$. In both cases, there are independent elements $x, y \in H^1(\text{Image}(R); \mathbb{Z})$ such that $x \sim y = 0$. Denote by $S : \text{PB}_n(S_{g,p}) \rightarrow \text{Image}(R)$ the map to the image of $R$, which is surjective by definition. Then $S^*(x), S^*(y) \in H^1(\text{PB}_n(S_{g,p}); \mathbb{Q})$ are independent and $S^*(x) \sim S^*(y) = 0$. By Lemma 2.2, we have either $S^*(x) \in P_i^*(H^1(\pi_1(S_{g,p}); \mathbb{Z}))$ or $S^*(y) \in P_i^*(H^1(\pi_1(S_{g,p}); \mathbb{Z}))$ for some $i$. Without loss of generality, assume that $S^*(x) = P_i^*(x')$. We have the following commutative diagram by the identification $H^1(\pi_1; \mathbb{Z}) \cong \text{Hom}(\pi_1, \mathbb{Z})$,

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{PB}_n(S_{g,p}) & \xrightarrow{S} & \text{Image}(R) \\
\downarrow{P_i} & & \downarrow{x} \\
\pi_1(S_{g,p}) & \xrightarrow{x'} & \mathbb{Z}.
\end{array}$$

By Proposition 2.4, the group $\text{Ker}(P_i)$ is a finitely generated normal subgroup of $\text{PB}_n(S_{g,p})$. Since $S$ is surjective, the image $S(\text{Ker}(P_i))$ is also a finite generated normal subgroup of $\text{Image}(R)$. However every finitely generated normal subgroup of $\text{Image}(R)$ is either of finite index or trivial; see e.g. F.E.A. Johnson [Joh99, Property (D6)]. If $S(\text{Ker}(P_i)) < \text{Image}(R)$ is of finite index, then after composing with $x$, the image $x \circ S(\text{Ker}(P_i))$ will be of finite index in $\mathbb{Z}$. This is a contradiction because $x \circ S(\text{Ker}(P_i)) = x' \circ P_i(\text{Ker}(P_i)) = \{1\}$. Therefore $S(\text{Ker}(P_i)) = 1$; i.e. $S$ factors through $P_i$. \qed
Now we are ready to prove Theorem \[1.1\] saying that for \( m, n > 0 \) and \( g > 1 \), every surjective homomorphism \( F : PB_n(S_{g,p}) \to PB_m(S_{g,p}) \) factors through some forgetful homomorphism, possibly post-composing with an automorphism of \( PB_m(S_{g,p}) \).

**Proof of Theorem \[1.1\]** We will prove Theorem \[1.1\] by induction on \( m \). There are two things to be proved: every surjective homomorphism \( F : PB_n(S_{g,p}) \to PB_m(S_{g,p}) \) factors through a forgetful homomorphism for any \( m \) and \( n \) and that \( PB_m(S_g) \) is Hopfian for any \( m \). The case \( m = 1 \) is a result of Lemma \[2.5\] and the classical fact that \( \pi_1(S) \) is Hopfian; see e.g. Hempel [Hem72]. We assume that when \( m < k \), Theorem \[1.1\] is true. For \( m = k \), let \( f : PB_n(S_{g,p}) \to PB_k(S_{g,p}) \) be a surjective homomorphism. By post-composing with a projection \( pr : PB_k(S_{g,p}) \to PB_{k-1}(S_{g,p}) \), we obtain a new surjective homomorphism \( pr \circ f : PB_n(S_{g,p}) \to PB_{k-1}(S_{g,p}) \). By the inductive hypothesis, \( pr \circ f \) factors through some forgetful map, possibly post-composing with an automorphism of \( PB_{k-1}(S_{g,p}) \). Therefore we have the following commutative diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & \longrightarrow & PB_{n-k+1}(S_{g,p+k-1}) \\
\downarrow f & & \downarrow f \\
1 & \longrightarrow & PB_{k}(S_{g,p+k-1})
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
PB_{n}(S_{g,p}) & \longrightarrow & PB_{k-1}(S_{g,p}) \\
\downarrow pr & & \downarrow pr \\
PB_{k}(S_{g,p}) & \longrightarrow & PB_{k-1}(S_{g,p})
\end{array}
\]

Since \( PB_{n-k+1}(S_{g,p+k-1}) \to PB_{k}(S_{g,p+k-1}) \) factors through a forgetful homomorphism, which is the \( m = 1 \) case of the theorem, we show that \( f \) factors through a forgetful homomorphism. When \( n = k \), both \( r \) and \( p \) are isomorphisms because of the inductive hypothesis. Therefore \( f \) is an isomorphism by the five lemma. We finish the proof by the induction axiom.

Define \( B_n(S) := \pi_1(PConf_n(S)/\Sigma_n) \), where \( \Sigma_n \) acts on \( PConf_n(S) \) by permuting coordinates. Now we are ready to prove Corollary \[1.2\] saying that there is no surjective homomorphism from \( B_n(S_{g,p}) \) to \( PB_m(S_{g,p}) \) when \( g > 1, n > 1 \) and \( m > 0 \).

**Proof of Corollary \[1.2\]** Set \( S = S_{g,p} \). We plan to prove that there is no surjective homomorphism \( f : B_n(S_{g,p}) \to PB_m(S_{g,p}) \) by contradiction. Assume the opposite that there is a surjective homomorphism \( f : B_n(S_{g,p}) \to PB_m(S_{g,p}) \). By projecting to some coordinate, we obtain a surjective homomorphism \( F : B_n(S) \to \pi_1(S) \). By post-composing with the embedding \( p_* : PB_n(S) \to B_n(S) \), which is induced by the projection \( p : PConf_n(S) \to Conf_n(S) \), we obtain a map \( R = F \circ p_* : PB_n(S) \to \pi_1(S) \). Since \( F \) is surjective, \( \text{Im}(R) \) is an index \( n! \) subgroup \( H < \pi_1(S) \), where \( H = \pi_1(S') \) is the fundamental group of an \( n! \) cover \( S' \) of \( S \). We have the following inequalities of the first Betti numbers of \( S \) and \( S' \):

\[
b_1(S') \geq 1 - \chi(S') \]
\[
1 - n! \chi(S) \]
\[
\geq 1 - 2 \chi(S) \]
\[
\geq 3 - \chi(S) \]
\[
\geq 1 + b_1(S) \]

\[
b_1(S') = b_0(S') + b_2(S') - \chi(S') \geq 1 - \chi(S') \]
\[
b_1(S) = b_0(S) + b_2(S) - \chi(S) \leq 2 - \chi(S). \]

Since \( R \) does not have a cyclic image, we know that \( R = Q \circ P_i \) for some \( i \in \{1,...,n\} \) and some map \( Q : \pi_1(S) \to \pi_1(S) \) by Lemma \[2.5\]. Since \( P_i \) is surjective, we know that \( \text{Im}(Q) = \text{Im}(R) = H \). However \( Q \) cannot be surjective onto the image \( \pi_1(S') \) because \( b_1(S) < b_1(S') \), which is a contradiction.

\[\square\]
3 The automorphism group of $\text{PB}_n(S_{g,p})$

In this section, we will compute the automorphism group of $\text{PB}_n(S_{g,p})$. The key point is to use the existence of pseudo-Anosov elements in the point-pushing subgroup. Before the proof of the result, we will introduce 3 classical results we will use in the proof. Firstly, we have the following result of Handel–Thurston [HT85, Lemma 2.2].

**Theorem 3.1** ([HT85]). A pseudo-Anosov element of the mapping class group does not fix any nonperipheral isotopy class of curves (including nonsimple curves).

Another ingredient is Kra’s construction [Kra81]. Let $S$ be a finite type surface possibly with punctures. The **extended mapping class group** $\text{Mod}^\pm(S)$ is defined to be the group of isotopy classes of diffeomorphisms of $S$ fixing the punctures as a set. Later, we will define other types of extended mapping class groups by specifying exactly how they preserve the punctures. Let $b \in S$. Denote by $\text{Mod}^\pm(S, b)$ the extended mapping class group of $S$ fixing a point $b$; in particular $\text{Mod}^\pm(S, b)$ fixes the punctures of $S$ as a set and the point $b$. The following is the Birman exact sequence for $S$ (see e.g. Farb–Margalit [FM12, Section 4.2]):

$$1 \to \pi_1(S, b) \xrightarrow{\text{Push}} \text{Mod}^\pm(S, b) \to \text{Mod}^\pm(S) \to 1.$$ 

We say that a nontrivial element $\gamma \in \pi_1(S, b)$ fills $S$ if the curve representing $\gamma$ intersects every essential simple closed curve on $S$.

**Theorem 3.2** (Kra’s construction [Kra81]). Let $S$ be a finite type surface possibly with punctures. Let $\gamma \in \pi_1(S, b)$. The mapping class $\text{Push}(\gamma) \in \text{Mod}^\pm(S, b)$ is pseudo-Anosov if and only if $\gamma$ fills $S$.

The third ingredient is the following punctured Dehn–Nielsen–Baer theorem; e.g. see e.g. Farb–Margalit [FM12, Theorem 8.8]. For a group $G$, denote by $\text{Out}(G)$ the **outer automorphism group** of $G$; i.e. $\text{Out}(G) = \text{Aut}(G) / \text{Inn}(G)$, where $\text{Aut}(G)$ denotes the automorphism group of $G$ and $\text{Inn}(G)$ denotes the group subgroup of $\text{Aut}(G)$ consisting of conjugations.

**Theorem 3.3** (Punctured Dehn–Nielsen–Baer Theorem). Let $S$ be a finite type surface possibly with punctures. Let $\text{Out}^*(\pi_1(S))$ (resp. $\text{Aut}^*(\pi_1(S))$) be the subgroup of $\text{Out}(\pi_1(S))$ (resp. $\text{Aut}(\pi_1(S))$) consisting of elements that leave invariant the set of conjugacy classes in $\pi_1(S)$ of simple closed curves surrounding individual punctures. Then the natural maps

$$\text{Mod}^\pm(S) \to \text{Out}^*(\pi_1(S)) \text{ and } \text{Mod}^\pm(S, b) \to \text{Aut}^*(\pi_1(S))$$

are isomorphisms.

Given $f \in \text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p+n})$, there is an induced action $f_*$ on the fundamental group $\pi_1(S_{g,p+n})$ up to conjugation. Therefore we have an injective homomorphism $\rho : \text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p+n}) \to \text{Out}(\pi_1(S_{g,p+n}))$ given by $\rho(f) = f_*$. By post-composing with the embedding of the braid point-pushing subgroup $\text{PB}_n(S_{g,p}) \subset \text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p+n})$, we obtain an embedding

$$\theta : \text{PB}_n(S_{g,p}) \subset \text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p+n}) \to \text{Out}(\pi_1(S_{g,p+n})).$$

Let $\text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p,n})$ be the extended mapping class group that fixes two sets of punctures, one with $p$ points and the other with $n$ points. The following proposition computes the normalizer of $\text{PB}_n(S_{g,p}) \subset \text{Out}(\pi_1(S_{g,p+n}))$, which is the main ingredient in proving Theorem 1.4.
Proposition 3.4. For \( n > 0, g > 1 \) and \( p \geq 0 \), the normalizer of \( \text{PB}_n(S_{g,p}) < \text{Out}(\pi_1(S_{g,p+n})) \) is \( \text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p,n}) \).

Proof. Let \( R \in \text{Out}(\pi_1(S_{g,n+p})) \) be an element in the normalizer of \( \text{PB}_n(S_{g,p}) \). Then \( R \) acts as an automorphism \( A \) on \( \text{PB}_n(S_{g,p}) \) by conjugation; i.e. \( R \theta(e) R^{-1} = \theta(A(e)) \) for \( e \in \text{PB}_n(S_{g,p}) \). This gives the following equation

\[
R \theta(e) = \theta(A(e)) R \in \text{Out}(\pi_1(S_{g,p+n})).
\]

We claim that for any curve \( c \) surrounding a puncture, \( R(c) \) is also a curve surrounding a puncture. This implies that \( R \in \text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p+n}) \) by Theorem 3.3.

Let \( c \) be a simple closed curve surrounding a puncture. Since \( \text{PB}_n(S_{g,p}) \) fixes all punctures, we have \( \theta(e)(c) = c \) and \( \theta(A(e))(c) = c \). By equation (5), we have that \( \theta(A(e))(R(c)) = R(\theta(e)(c)) = R(c) \) for any \( e \in \text{PB}_n(S_{g,p}) \). However, because of Theorem 3.2, we know that there is a pseudo-Anosov element \( e' \) in \( \text{PB}_n(S_{g,p}) \). Set \( e = A^{-1}(e') \). Then \( \theta(A(e))(R(c)) = \theta(e')(R(c)) \). Therefore \( \theta(e')(R(c)) = R(c) \), which implies that \( R(c) \) is peripheral by Theorem 3.1.

What remains to be proven is that \( R \in \text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p,n}) \). By the generalized Birman exact sequence (see e.g. Farb–Margalit [FM12, Theorem 9.1])

\[
1 \to \text{PB}_{n+p}(S_g) \to \text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p+n}) \to \text{Mod}^\pm(S_g) \times \Sigma_n \to 1,
\]

\( R \) induces an automorphism \( A' \) of \( \text{PB}_{n+p}(S_g) \) by conjugation. We have the following exact sequence given by forgetting the \( n \) punctures

\[
1 \to \text{PB}_n(S_{g,p}) \to \text{PB}_{n+p}(S_g) \to \text{PB}_p(S_g) \to 1.
\]

Since \( A' \) preserves the subgroup \( \text{PB}_n(S_{g,p}) \trianglelefteq \text{PB}_{n+p}(S_g) \), it should induce an action on each term of (6). As a result, \( R \) fixes the \( p \) punctures as a set, which implies that \( R \) should also fix the other \( n \) punctures as well. Thus \( R \in \text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p,n}) \). \( \square \)

Let \( \text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p,n-1,1}) \) be the extended mapping class group that fixes three sets of punctures, one with \( p \) points, one with \( n-1 \) points and the last one with one point. Let \( \phi : \text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p+n-1,1}) \to \text{Aut}(\pi_1(S_{g,p+n-1})) \) be the natural embedding induced by conjugation on the normal subgroup \( \pi_1(S_{g,p+n-1}) \trianglelefteq \text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p+n-1,1}) \).

By a similar argument, we obtain the following:

Proposition 3.5. For \( g > 1, n > 1, p \geq 0 \), the normalizer of

\[
\text{PB}_n(S_{g,p}) < \text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p+n-1,1}) \xrightarrow{\phi} \text{Aut}(\pi_1(S_{g,p+n-1})) \text{ is } \text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p,n-1,1}).
\]

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.4 that is \( \text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p,n}) \cong \text{Aut}(\text{PB}_n(S_{g,p})) \).

Proof of Theorem 1.4. First of all, from another version of the generalized Birman exact sequence (see e.g. Farb–Margalit [FM12, Theorem 9.1])

\[
1 \to \text{PB}_n(S_{g,p}) \to \text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p,n}) \to \text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p}) \times \Sigma_n \to 1,
\]

there is a map

\[
C : \text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p,n}) \to \text{Aut}(\text{PB}_n(S_{g,p}))
\]
given by conjugating the subgroup $PB_n(S_{g,p})$. Let $(b_1, \ldots, b_n) \in \text{PConf}_n(S_{g,p})$ be a base point. The mapping class group $\text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,n,p})$ fixes $(b_1, \ldots, b_n)$ as a set. Let $T : \text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p,n}) \to \Sigma_n$ be the homomorphism recording to the permutation of the $n$ points $(b_1, \ldots, b_n)$. Let $f \in \text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,n,p})$. A geometric representation $F \in \text{Diff}^\pm(S_{g,p,n})$ of $f$ induces a map $f_n : \text{PConf}_n(S_{g,p}) \to \text{PConf}_n(S_{g,p})$ by acting on coordinates. Let $\sigma(f) : \text{PConf}_n(S_{g,p}) \to \text{PConf}_n(S_{g,p})$ be the permutation of coordinates according to $T(f)$. We have that the permutation $\sigma(f)^{-1} \circ f_n$ fixes the base point $(b_1, \ldots, b_n)$, which induces a map on the fundamental group $(\sigma(f)^{-1} \circ f_n)_* : PB_n(S_{g,p}) \to PB_n(S_{g,p})$. Geometrically, we have the identification $C(f) = (\sigma(f)^{-1} \circ f_n)_*$.

Let $F_i : PB_n(S_{g,p}) \to PB_{n-1}(S_{g,p})$ be the forgetful map forgetting the $i$th coordinate. By Theorem 1.4, given any automorphism $A : PB_n(S_{g,p}) \to PB_n(S_{g,p})$, we have that $F_i \circ A$ factors through $F_j$ for some $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$.

By the five lemma, to prove that $C$ is an isomorphism, we only need to show that $C' : \text{Ker}(T) \to \text{Ker}(S)$ is isomorphism. Denote by $\text{Aut}^0(PB_n(S_g))$ the subgroup of $\text{Aut}(PB_n(S_g))$ consisting of all $A \in \text{Aut}(PB_n(S_g))$ such that $F_n \circ A$ factors through $F_n$; i.e. $\text{Aut}^0(PB_n(S_g)) = S^{-1}(\Sigma_{n-1} \times 1)$. We have that $T^{-1}(\Sigma_{n-1} \times 1) = \text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p,n-1,1})$. By the five lemma, to show that $C'$ is an isomorphism, we only need to show that $C'' : S^{-1}(\Sigma_{n-1} \times 1) \to T^{-1}(\Sigma_{n-1} \times 1)$ is an isomorphism; i.e. $C'' : \text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p,n-1,1}) \to \text{Aut}^0(PB_n(S_g))$ is an isomorphism. The action $A \in \text{Aut}^0(PB_n(S_g))$ factors through $F_n$, which induces an action of the following commutative diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 & \xrightarrow{\pi_1(S_{g,p+n-1})} & PB_n(S_{g,p}) & \xrightarrow{F_n} & PB_{n-1}(S_{g,p}) & 1 \\
R & \downarrow & A & \downarrow & A & \\
1 & \xrightarrow{\pi_1(S_{g,p+n-1})} & PB_n(S_{g,p}) & \xrightarrow{F_n} & PB_{n-1}(S_{g,p}) & 1.
\end{array}
\]

Using this diagram, we can define a homomorphism $P : \text{Aut}^0(PB_n(S_g)) \to \text{Aut}(\pi_1(S_{g,p+n-1}))$ via the formula $P(A) = R$. We will prove that $C''$ is an isomorphism by showing that $P$ is the inverse of $C''$. This will conclude the proof of Theorem 1.4.

- **Step 1:** $P$ is injective.

Consider $A \in \text{Ker}(P)$. Therefore $R = P(A)$ is the identity. For any $e \in PB_n(S_{g,p})$ and $x \in \pi_1(S_{g,p+n-1})$, we have that

\[
e^{-1} \xrightarrow{R=\text{id}} R(e x e^{-1}) \xrightarrow{R=A} A(e) R(x) A(e)^{-1} \xrightarrow{R=\text{id}} A(e) x A(e)^{-1}
\]

So $e^{-1} A(e) \in PB_n(S_{g,p})$ commutes with $x \in \pi_1(S_{g,p+n-1})$. Since the conjugation action of $PB_n(S_{g,p})$ on $\pi_1(S_{g,p+n-1})$ is faithful, this implies that $e^{-1} A(e) = \text{id}$. So $A(e) = e$, as desired.

- **Step 2:** Image($P$) $< \phi(\text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p,n-1,1}))$.

Consider $A \in \text{Aut}^0(PB_n(S_{g,p}))$ and set $R = P(A)$. For $e \in PB_n(S_{g,p})$, denote by $\sigma_e$ the automorphism of $\pi_1(S_{g,p+n-1})$ induced by $e$ via conjugation. For any $e \in PB_n(S_{g,p})$ and $x \in \pi_1(S_{g,p+n-1})$, we have

\[
R(e x e^{-1}) = A(e) R(x) A(e)^{-1}.
\]

That is to say

\[
R \sigma_e R^{-1} = \sigma_{A(e)} \in \text{Aut}(\pi_1(S_{g,p+n-1}))
\]

By Proposition 3.3, we have that $R \in \text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p,n-1,1})$.  
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• Step 3: Both $\pi_1(S_{g,p+n-1})$ and $PB_n(S_{g,p})$ are normal subgroups of $\text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p+n-1,1})$. For $f \in \text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p,n-1,1})$, the image $\phi(f)$ is the conjugation action of $f$ on $\pi_1(S_{g,p+n-1})$. The image $A = C''(f)$ is the conjugation action of $f$ on $PB_n(S_{g,p})$. The image $P \circ C''(f) \in \text{Aut}^0(\pi_1(S_{g,p+n-1}))$ is the restriction of $C''(f)$ on $\pi_1(S_{g,p+n-1})$, which is equal to the direct conjugation $\phi(f)$. Therefore we have that $\phi = P \circ C''$. Therefore the composition $P \circ C'' : \text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p,n-1,1}) \to \text{Aut}^0(\pi_1(S_{g,p+n-1}))$ is an isomorphism onto the image $\phi(\text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p,n-1,1}))$. By step 2, this means that $P$ is surjective onto $\phi(\text{Mod}^\pm(S_{g,p,n-1,1}))$. By step 1, we know that $P$ is also injective. So $P$ is an isomorphism, as desired. This implies that $C''$ is an isomorphism as well.

The result for $B_n(S)$ follows from a theorem of Ivanov [Iva90, Theorem 2] saying that $PB_n(S)$ is a characteristic subgroup of $B_n(S)$. 

**References**


