ABSTRACT. In view of classical results of Masur and Veech almost every element in the moduli space of compact translation surfaces is recurrent. In this paper we focus on the problem of recurrence for elements of smooth curves in the moduli space. We give an effective criterion for the recurrence of almost every element of a smooth curve. The criterion relies on results developed by Minsky-Weiss in [9]. Next we apply the criterion to the billiard flow on planar tables confined by arcs of confocal conics. The phase space of such billiard flow splits into invariant subsets determined by caustics. We prove that for almost every caustic the billiard flow restricted to the corresponding invariant set is uniquely ergodic. This answers affirmatively to a question raised by Zorich.

1. Billiards on elliptical-hyperbolic nibbled tables

We consider a class of pseudo-integrable billiards with piecewise elliptic and hyperbolic boundary introduced by Dragović and Radnović in [2]. Let $0 < b < a$ and denote by $\{C_\lambda : \lambda \leq a\}$ the family of confocal conics

$$\frac{x^2}{a-\lambda} + \frac{y^2}{b-\lambda} = 1.$$ 

If $\lambda < b$ then $C_\lambda$ is an ellipse and if $b < \lambda < a$ then $C_\lambda$ is a hyperbola. Moreover, $C_b$ is the horizontal and $C_a$ is the vertical line through the origin.

Denote by $\Theta$ the set of sequences $(\alpha, \beta) = ((\alpha_i)_{i=1}^k, (\beta_i)_{i=1}^k)$ such that

$$a = \alpha_0 > \alpha_1 > \alpha_2 > \ldots > \alpha_{k-1} > \alpha_k = b > \beta_k > \beta_{k-1} > \ldots > \beta_2 > \beta_1 \geq \beta_0 = 0.$$ 

Let $k(\alpha, \beta) := k$. For every $(\alpha, \beta) \in \Theta$ let $D_{\alpha, \beta}$ be the billiard table in the ellipse $C_0$ so that the boundary of $D_{\alpha, \beta}$ contained in the positive quadrant is piecewise smooth and consists of a chain of arcs of ellipses $C_{\beta_1}, \ldots, C_{\beta_k}$, hyperbolae $C_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, C_{\alpha_{k-1}}$ and lines $C_a, C_b$. More precisely, the consecutive corners are intersections of the following pair of conics:

$$(C_a, C_{\beta_1}), (C_{\alpha_1}, C_{\beta_1}), (C_{\alpha_1}, C_{\beta_2}), (C_{\alpha_2}, C_{\beta_2}), \ldots, (C_{\alpha_{k-1}}, C_{\beta_{k-1}}), (C_{\alpha_k}, C_{\beta_k}), (C_b, C_{\beta_k}).$$

The positive quadrant of $D_{\alpha, \beta}$ looks like stairs whose steps are elliptical-hyperbolic, see Figure [1].

Let $(\alpha^{++}, \beta^{++}), (\alpha^{+-}, \beta^{+-}), (\alpha^{-+}, \beta^{-+}), (\alpha^{--}, \beta^{--})$ be sequences in $\Theta$ such that

$$\beta^{++}_1 = \beta^{-+}_1, \quad \beta^{+-}_1 = \beta^{--}_1, \quad \beta^{++}_{k(\alpha^{++}, \beta^{++})} = \beta^{+-}_{k(\alpha^{+-}, \beta^{+-})}, \quad \beta^{--}_{k(\alpha^{--}, \beta^{--})} = \beta^{--}_{k(\alpha^{--}, \beta^{--})}.$$
Let

\[ \beta^t := \beta_1^{++} = \beta_1^{-+}, \quad \beta^b := \beta_1^{+-} = \beta_1^{-}, \]
\[ \beta^r := \beta_1^{++} + k(\alpha^{++}, \beta^{++}) = \beta_1^{-+}, \quad \beta^l := \beta_1^{+-} + k(\alpha^{+-}, \beta^{+-}) = \beta_1^{-}. \]

Denote by \( \gamma_v, \gamma_h : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2 \) the reflections across the vertical and the horizontal coordinate axis respectively. For every such quadruple set

\[ \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}(\pi^{++}, \beta^{++}) \cup \mathcal{D}(\pi^{-+}, \beta^{-+}) \]
\[ \cup \mathcal{D}(\pi^{-}, \beta^{-}) \cup \mathcal{D}(\pi^{--}, \beta^{--}) \]

Then every quadrant of \( \mathcal{D} \) looks like stairs whose steps are elliptical-hyperbolic, see Figure 2. We call the table \( \mathcal{D} \) a nibbled ellipse. Dragović and Radnović observed in

\[ [2] \]

that the phase space \( \mathcal{S}^1 \mathcal{D} \) of the billiard flow on \( \mathcal{D} \) splits into invariant subsets \( \mathcal{S}_s \), \( s \in (\min\{\beta^t, \beta^b\}, a) \) so that the ellipse \( \mathcal{C}_s \), for \( \min\{\beta^t, \beta^b\} < s < b \) or the hyperbola \( \mathcal{C}_s \), for \( b < s < a \) is a caustic of all billiard trajectories in \( \mathcal{S}_s \) (see Figure 3).

For every \( s \in (0, b) \) denote by \( \mathcal{E}_s \) the set of external points of the ellipse \( \mathcal{C}_s \) and for every \( s \in (b, a) \) denote by \( \mathcal{H}_s \) the area between two branches of the hyperbola \( \mathcal{C}_s \). Then the invariant set \( \mathcal{S}_s \) can be identified with \( \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{E}_s \) for \( \min\{\beta^t, \beta^b\} < s < b \) and with \( \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{H}_s \) for \( b < s < a \). Moreover, if \( \max\{\beta^t, \beta^b\} < s < \min\{\beta^t, \beta^r\} \) then the set \( \mathcal{S}_s \) splits into two connected sets: the upper one \( \mathcal{S}_s^+ \) and the lower one \( \mathcal{S}_s^- \), see Figure 3.

The aim of the paper is to answer affirmatively to the conjecture, raised by Zorich, that for almost all parameters \( s \) all billiard orbits in \( \mathcal{S}_s \) (or to \( \mathcal{S}_s^\pm \)) are equidistributed in \( \mathcal{S}_s \).
Theorem 1.1. For every nibbled ellipse $D$ of the form (1.1) and for almost all $s \in (\min\{\beta^r, \beta^b\}, a)$ the billiard flow on $D$ restricted to any connected component of $S_s$ is uniquely ergodic.

Recall that the same result was proved in [4] for a special degenerate family of nibbled ellipses, i.e. for ellipses with a linear obstacle. The first step of the proof (in [4] and in the present paper) is to consider a special change of coordinates $\sigma_s$ (introduced in [2]) leading to a polygonal billiard table with vertical and horizontal sides. After the change of coordinates the billiard flow on $S_s$ becomes the directional billiard flow in directions $\pm \pi/4, \pm 3\pi/4$ on $\sigma_s(S_s)$. Since $\sigma_s(S_s)$ is a rational polygon, the map $s \mapsto \sigma_s(S_s)$ provides (after an unfolding procedure) a curve in the moduli space $M$ of translation surfaces.

Recall that in [4] the unique ergodicity of the directional flows followed from the fact that almost every element of the corresponding curve is Birkhoff ergodic for the Teichmüller flow $(\hat{g}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ restricted to an appropriate $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$-invariant subsets of $M$. In the present paper we apply a different approach developed in [9].

1.1. Change of coordinates $\sigma_s$. First note that each point of the non-negative quadrant $\mathbb{R}^2_{\geq 0}$ except the focus $F_s$ is the intersection point of two conics $C_{\lambda_1}$, $\lambda_1 \in [b, a]$ and $C_{\lambda_2}$, $\lambda_2 \in (-\infty, b]$. This gives a parameterization of $\mathbb{R}^2_{\geq 0} \setminus \{F_s\}$ by elements $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in [b, a] \times [-\infty, b] \setminus \{(b, b)\}$. In these coordinates the elliptic and hyperbolic arcs forming the boundary of the table are horizontal or vertical linear segments.

Set $e(\lambda, s) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{(a-\lambda)(b-\lambda)(s-\lambda)}}$. For any $s \in (-\infty, b)$ let us consider new coordinates of $E_s \cap \mathbb{R}^2_{\geq 0}$ determined by

$$\sigma_s(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \left( \int_{\lambda_1}^{a} e(\lambda, s) \, d\lambda, \int_{\lambda_2}^{s} e(\lambda, s) \, d\lambda \right).$$

The domain of the new coordinates is $[0, \ell(s)] \times [0, \ell(s))$, where

$$\ell(s) := \int_b^a e(\lambda, s) \, d\lambda = \int_{-\infty}^{s} e(\lambda, s) \, d\lambda.$$

The new coordinates extend by symmetry to the whole annulus $E_s$, their domain is the cylinder $\mathbb{R}/4\ell(s)\mathbb{Z} \times [0, \ell(s))$. More precisely, the extended coordinate chart $\sigma_s : E_s \to \mathbb{R}/4\ell(s)\mathbb{Z} \times [0, \ell(s))$ is determined by

$$\sigma_s|_{E_s \cap \mathbb{R}^2_{\geq 0}} = Tr_{-(2\ell(s),0)} \circ \sigma_s \circ \gamma_v, \quad \sigma_s|_{E_s \cap \mathbb{R}^2_{<0}} = Tr_{-(3\ell(s),0)} \circ \sigma_s \circ \gamma_h,$$

FIGURE 3. Invariant subsets of the phase space.
where $Tr_v$ is the translation by the vector $v$.

One can carry out similar construction of coordinates for the sets $H_s$, $s \in (b, a)$ starting from the coordinates of $H_s \cap \mathbb{R}^2_{\geq 0}$ given by

$$
\sigma_s(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \left( \int_{\lambda_1}^{a} e(\lambda, s) d\lambda, \int_{\lambda_2}^{b} e(\lambda, s) d\lambda \right).
$$

Then the domain of the coordinates of $H_s \cap \mathbb{R}^2_{\geq 0}$ is $[0, \ell(s)] \times [0, \ell(s)]$, where

$$
\ell(s) := \int_{s}^{a} e(\lambda, s) d\lambda = \int_{-\infty}^{b} e(\lambda, s) d\lambda.
$$

The domain of the extended coordinated (for $H_s$) is $[-\ell(s), \ell(s)] \times (-\ell(s), \ell(s))$ and the coordinate chart $\sigma_s : H_s \to [-\ell(s), \ell(s)] \times (-\ell(s), \ell(s))$ is determined by

$$
\sigma_s|_{H_s \cap \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} = \gamma_v \circ \sigma_s \circ \gamma_{v^*},
\sigma_s|_{H_s \cap \mathbb{R}_{\leq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\leq 0}} = \gamma_h \circ \gamma_v \circ \sigma_s \circ \gamma_h \circ \gamma_v,
$$

$$
\sigma_s|_{H_s \cap \mathbb{R}_{\leq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} = \gamma_h \circ \sigma_s \circ \gamma_h.
$$

Recall that $S_s = D \cap \mathcal{E}_s$ for $\min\{\beta^c, \beta^b\} < s < b$ and $S_s = D \cap H_s$ for $b < s < a$. Therefore, each set $S_s$ is regarded in separate coordinates given by the coordinate chart $\sigma_s$. Then $\sigma_s(S_s)$ is a polygon with vertical and horizontal sides in $\mathbb{R}^2$ or in the cylinder $\mathbb{R}/4\ell(s)\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, by Proposition 5.2 in [2], we have the following result.

**Proposition 1.2.** For every nibbled ellipse $D$ the billiard flow on $D$ restricted to $S_s$, $s \in (\min\{\beta^c, \beta^b\}, b) \cup (b, a)$ is conjugated by $\sigma_s$ with the directional billiard flow on $\sigma_s(S_s)$ in directions $\pm \pi/4, \pm 3\pi/4$.

A precise description of the polygons $\sigma_s(S_s)$ for $s \in (\min\{\beta^c, \beta^b\}, b) \cup (b, a)$ is presented in Section 5. In Section 5 we supply an appropriate language for this description.

## 2. Translation Surfaces

A *translation surface* is a compact connected orientable topological surface $M$ together with a finite set of points $\Sigma$ (singularities) and an atlas of charts $\omega = \{\zeta_\alpha : U_\alpha \to \mathbb{C} : \alpha \in A\}$ on $M \setminus \Sigma$ such that every transition map $\zeta_\alpha \circ \zeta_\beta^{-1} : \zeta_\beta(U_\alpha \cap U_\beta) \to \zeta_\alpha(U_\alpha \cap U_\beta)$ is a translation, i.e. for every connected component $C$ of $U_\alpha \cap U_\beta$ there exists $v_{C, \beta} \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\zeta_\beta \circ \zeta_\alpha^{-1}(z) = z + \bar{v}_{C, \beta}$ for $z \in \zeta_\alpha^{-1}(C)$.

Denote by $\mathcal{M}(M, \Sigma)$ the moduli space of translation structures on $M$ with singularities at $\Sigma$. On this space the Teichmüller flow $(g_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ acts deforming the translation structure $\omega$ in local coordinates by linear maps $\begin{bmatrix} e^{it} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-it} \end{bmatrix}$ and the rotations $(r_\theta)_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}$ acts by linear maps $\begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{bmatrix}$.

A translation surface $(M, \omega) \in \mathcal{M}(M, \Sigma)$ is called *recurrent* if there exists a sequence $(t_n)_{n \geq 1}$ increasing to $+\infty$ and a compact subset $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{M}(M, \Sigma)$ such that $g_{t_n}(M, \omega) \in \mathcal{K}$ for all $n \geq 1$.

One of the main aims of the paper is to formulate and prove an effective criterion for the recurrence of almost every element of a smooth curve in the moduli space $\mathcal{M}(M, \Sigma)$. More precisely, we deal with a $C^\infty$-map $J \ni s \mapsto \omega(s) \in \mathcal{M}(M, \Sigma)$ ($J \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a finite interval) and we want to show that $(M, \omega(s))$ is recurrent for a.e. $s \in J$. An archetypical result of this kind is a classical theorem by Kerekhoff, Masur and Smillie [3] saying that for every compact translation surface $(M, \omega)$ the
rotated translation surface \((M, r_\omega)\) is recurrent for a.e. \(s \in [0, 2\pi]\). Another important step toward understanding the problem was made by Minsky and Weiss in \([8]\) where recurrence is shown for a.e. element of any horocyclic arc in \(\mathcal{M}(M, \Sigma)\). The ideas developed in \([8]\) were further extended in \([9]\) to curves well approximated by horocyclic arcs. In the present paper we base on results of \([9]\).

For every \(\theta \in \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}\) let \(X_\theta\) be a tangent vector field on \(M \setminus \Sigma\) which is the pullback of the unit constant vector field \(e^{i\theta}\) on \(\mathbb{C}\) through the charts of the atlas. Since the derivative of any transition map is the identity, the vector field \(X_\theta\) is well defined on \(M \setminus \Sigma\). Denote by \((\varphi^\theta_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}\) the corresponding flow, called the translation flow on \((M, \omega)\) in the direction \(\theta\). The flow preserves the measure \(\lambda_\omega\) which is the pullback of the Lebesgue measure on \(\mathbb{C}\). We will denote by \((\varphi^\theta_i)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}\) and \((\varphi^\theta_b)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}\) the vertical and horizontal flow respectively.

Recall that this condition holds for any horizontal interval whenever \(\pi^\theta_i\) has no saddle connection in direction \(\theta\) if there exist \(i,j \in \{1, \ldots, d\}\) for \(0 \leq j \leq d\).

**Proposition 2.1** (Masur \([7]\)). If a translation surface \((M, \omega)\) is recurrent, then the vertical flow on \((M, \omega)\) is uniquely ergodic.

Suppose that a horizontal interval \(I \subset M\) is a global transversal for the vertical flow \((\varphi^\theta_i)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}\) on \((M, \omega)\), i.e. its every infinite semiorbit meets \(I\) infinitely many times. Recall that this condition holds for any horizontal interval whenever \((M, \omega)\) has no vertical saddle connection. The interval \(I\) we identify with the real interval \([0, |I|]\).

Denote by \(T_{\omega, I} : I \to I\) the first return map of the flow \((\varphi^\theta_i)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}\) to \(I\). Then \(T_{\omega, I}\) is an interval exchange transformation whose discontinuities belong to incoming separatrices.

Every \(d\)-interval exchange transformation is determined by two parameters: a permutation \(\pi \in S_d\) (\(S_d\) is the group of permutations of the set \(\{1, \ldots, d\}\)) and \(\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d\) as follows. For every \(\Lambda = (\pi, \lambda) \in S_d \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d\) let

\[
\begin{align*}
  b_j(\Lambda) &= \sum_{i \leq j} \lambda_i, \\
  t_j(\Lambda) &= \sum_{\pi(i) \leq j} \lambda_i \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leq j \leq d.
\end{align*}
\]

Then

\[
\begin{align*}
  b_0(\Lambda) &= t_0(\Lambda) = 0, \\
  b_d(\Lambda) &= t_d(\Lambda) = |\lambda| = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i
\end{align*}
\]

and

\[
\begin{align*}
  b_j(\Lambda) - b_{j-1}(\Lambda) &= \lambda_j, \\
  t_j(\Lambda) - t_{j-1}(\Lambda) &= \lambda_{x-1(j)} \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq j \leq d.
\end{align*}
\]

Denote by \(T_\Lambda = T_{\pi, \lambda} : [0, |\lambda|] \to [0, |\lambda|]\) the IET so that each interval \([b_{j-1}(\Lambda), b_j(\Lambda)]\) is translated by \(T_\Lambda\) into \([t_{\pi(j)-1}(\Lambda), t_{\pi(j)}(\Lambda)]\), i.e.

\[
T_\Lambda x = x + t_{\pi(j)}(\Lambda) - b_j(\Lambda) \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in [b_{j-1}(\Lambda), b_j(\Lambda)].
\]

We say that the IET \(T_\Lambda\) has a connection if there exist \(i, j \in \{1, \ldots, d-1\}\) and \(n > 0\) such that \(T_\Lambda^n b_i(\Lambda) = b_j(\Lambda)\). The IET \(T_\Lambda\) is uniquely ergodic if it has no connection and the Lebesgue measure on \([0, |\lambda|]\) is the only \(T_\Lambda\)-invariant measure. For every \(n > 0\) denote by \(\varepsilon_n(\Lambda)\) the minimal distance between the points \(T_\Lambda^n b_i(\Lambda)\).
for $0 \leq k \leq n$ and $1 \leq i < d$. We say that the IET $T_\Lambda$ is of recurrence type if it has no connection and $\liminf n\varepsilon_n(\Lambda) > 0$. Recall that every IET of recurrence type is uniquely ergodic.

**Remark 2.2.** Suppose that a horizontal interval $I \subset M$ is a global transversal for the vertical flow $(\varphi^t_I)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ on $(M, \omega)$. If the flow $(\varphi^t_I)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ has no saddle connection then $T_{\omega,I}$ has no connection. Moreover, in view of [10, Sect. 3.3] (see [9, Proposition 7.2] for a qualitative version), the translation surface $(M, \omega)$ is recurrent if and only if the IET $T_{\omega,I}$ is of recurrent type.

**2.1. Minsky-Weiss approach and its application.** Suppose that for every $s \in J$ there exists a horizontal interval $I_s$ in $(M, \omega(s))$ so that $I_s$ is a global transversal for the vertical flow on $(M, \omega(s))$ and $s \mapsto I_s$ is of class $C^\infty$. Assume that all IETs $T_s := T_{\omega(s),I_s}$ for $s \in J$ exchange $d \geq 2$ interval according to the same permutation $\pi \in S_d$. Then there exists a $C^\infty$-map $J \ni s \mapsto \Lambda(s) = (\pi, \lambda(s)) \in S_d \times \mathbb{R}^d_{\geq 0}$ such that $T_s = T_{\Lambda(s)}$ for every $s \in J$. For every $s \in J$ we define a piecewise constant function $L_s : I_s \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$L_s(x) = \frac{d}{ds}(b_j(\Lambda(s)) - t_{\pi(j)}(\Lambda(s))) \quad \text{if} \quad x \in [b_{j-1}(\Lambda(s)), b_j(\Lambda(s))].$$

In view of (2.1), $t_{\pi(j)}(\Lambda(s)) - b_j(\Lambda(s))$ measures the displacement between $x$ and $T_s x$ if $x \in [b_{j-1}(\Lambda(s)), b_j(\Lambda(s))].$

**Theorem 2.3** (see Theorem 6.2 in [9]). Suppose that for a.e. $s \in J$ the IET $T_s : I_s \to I_s$ has no connection and for every $T_s$-invariant measure $\mu$ on $I_s$ we have $\int_{I_s} L_s(x) \, d\mu(x) > 0$. Then $T_s$ is of recurrence type for a.e. $s \in J$.

**Remark 2.4.** In Theorem 6.2 in [9] the authors deal with any decaying Federer measure $m$ on the interval $J$ instead of the Lebesgue measure on $J$. Recall that a Borel measure $m$ on $J$ is decaying and Federer if there are positive constants $\alpha, C$ and $D$ such that for every $x \in \text{supp}(m)$, $0 < r, \varepsilon < 1$ we have

$$m((x-\varepsilon r, x+\varepsilon r)) \leq C\varepsilon^\alpha m((x-r, x+r)), \quad m((x-3r, x+3r)) \leq D m((x-r, x+r)).$$

Since many singular measures are decaying and Federer, the full version of Theorem 6.2 in [9] gives much more subtle information about the set of all $s \in J$ for which the conclusion of the theorem holds. We should emphasise that also all forthcoming results are true when “for a.e. $s \in J$” is replaced by “for $m$-a.e. $s \in J$”.

**Corollary 2.5.** Suppose that for a.e. $s \in J$ the translation surface $(M, \omega(s))$ has no vertical saddle connection and

$$\frac{d}{ds}(b_j(\Lambda(s)) - t_{\pi(j)}(\Lambda(s))) \geq 0 \quad \text{for every} \quad 1 \leq j \leq d \quad \text{with}$$

(2.2) $$\sum_{j=1}^{d} \frac{d}{ds}(b_j(\Lambda(s)) - t_{\pi(j)}(\Lambda(s))) > 0.$$

Then $(M, \omega(s))$ is recurrent for a.e. $s \in J$.

**Proof.** In view of Theorem 2.3 and Remark 2.2 we only need to show that for a.e. $s \in J$ we have $\int_{I_s} L_s(x) \, d\mu(x) > 0$ for every $T_s$-invariant measure $\mu$ on $I_s$.

Let $s \in J$ be such that $T_s$ has no saddle connection and (2.2) holds. By assumption, a.e. $s \in J$ satisfies both conditions. Since $T_s$ is minimal, the topological support of any $T_s$-invariant measure $\mu$ is $I_s$, i.e. the $\mu$-measure of every non-empty open set is positive. By (2.2), $L_s : I_s \to \mathbb{R}$ is a non-negative function which is positive on an open interval. Therefore, $\int_{I_s} L_s(x) \, d\mu(x) > 0$. 

The final recurrence of Teichmüller orbits follows from Remark 2.2. □

Remark 2.6. Suppose that \( \ell : J \to \mathbb{R}_{>0} \) is a \( C^\infty \)-map. Note that in Corollary 2.5 the condition (2.2) can be replaced by

\[
\frac{d}{ds} b_j(\Lambda(s)) - t_{\pi(j)}(\Lambda(s)) \geq 0 \quad \text{for every} \quad 1 \leq j \leq d \quad \text{with}
\]

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{d} \frac{d}{ds} b_j(\Lambda(s)) - t_{\pi(j)}(\Lambda(s)) > 0.
\]

Indeed, for every \( s \in J \) we rescale the IETs \( T_s : I_s \to I_s \) by dividing the length of each interval \( I_s \) by \( \ell(s) > 0 \). Then the rescaled IET is affine conjugate to \( T_s \) and satisfies the condition (2.2).

For every translation surface \((M, \omega)\) there exists a holomorphic differential on \( M \), also denoted by \( \omega = dz \) in all local coordinates on \( \Sigma \). We also treat \( \omega \) as a cohomology element in \( H^1(M \setminus \Sigma, \mathbb{C}) \) or \( H^1(M, \Sigma, \mathbb{C}) \). We also deal with real cohomology elements \( \text{Re} \omega, \text{Im} \omega \in H^1(M \setminus \Sigma, \mathbb{R}) \) (\( H^1(M, \Sigma, \mathbb{R}) \)).

We denote by \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \) the Kronecker pairing. Suppose that \( \gamma \) is a vertical saddle connection. Then \( \gamma \) can be treated as a relative homology element in \( H_1(M, \Sigma, \mathbb{Z}) \) and we have

\[
\langle \omega, \gamma \rangle = \text{is, in particular, } \langle \text{Re} \omega, \gamma \rangle = 0.
\]

If, for example, \( \langle \text{Re} \omega, \gamma \rangle \neq 0 \) for every \( \gamma \in H_1(M, \Sigma, \mathbb{Z}) \), then this ensures the absence of vertical saddle connections.

Definition 1. Suppose that a horizontal interval \( I \) in \((M, \omega)\) is a global transversal for the vertical flow \((\varphi_t^\nu)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}\). Then \( T_{\omega,I} = T_{\Lambda} \) for some \( \Lambda = (\pi, \lambda) \in S_d \times \mathbb{R}^d_{>0} \). For every \( 1 \leq j \leq d \) we denote by \( \xi_j = \xi_j(\omega, I) \in H_1(M, \Sigma, \mathbb{Z}) \) the homology class of any loop formed by the vertical orbit segment starting at any \( x \in (b_{j-1}(\Lambda), b_j(\Lambda)) \subset I \) and ending at \( T_{\Lambda}x \in I \) closed by the segment of \( I \) that joins \( T_{\Lambda}x \) and \( x \).

Then for every \( 1 \leq j \leq d \) we have

\[
\langle \text{Re} \omega, \xi_j \rangle = b_j(\Lambda) - t_{\pi(j)}(\Lambda).
\]

In view of Corollary 2.5 the formula (2.4) can be useful to prove the recurrence of \((M, \omega)\).

We now give effective formulas to compute \( \langle \omega, \gamma \rangle \) for \( \gamma \in H_1(M \setminus \Sigma, \mathbb{Z}) \) or \( \gamma \in H_1(M, \Sigma, \mathbb{Z}) \) relied on Čech cohomology. Suppose that \( \mathcal{P} = \{P_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\} \) is a finite partition of the translation surface \((M, \omega)\) into polygons, i.e. \( \mathcal{P} = \{P_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\} \) is a finite family of a closed connected and simply connected subsets of \( M \), called polygons, such that

(i) for every \( \alpha \in \mathcal{A} \) there exists a chart \( \zeta_\alpha : U_\alpha \to \mathbb{C} \) such that \( P_\alpha \setminus \Sigma \subset U_\alpha \), \( \zeta_\alpha \)
has a homeomorphic extension \( \tilde{\zeta}_\alpha : P_\alpha \to \mathbb{C} \), \( \tilde{\zeta}_\alpha(P_\alpha) \) is a polygon in \( \mathbb{C} \) and each point from \( \tilde{\zeta}_\alpha(P_\alpha \setminus \Sigma) \) is its corner;

(ii) if \( P_\alpha \cap P_\beta \neq \emptyset \) then it is the union of common sides and corners of the polygons \( P_\alpha, P_\beta \);

(iii) \( \bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} P_\alpha = M \).

We call \( \mathcal{P} \) a partition of \((M, \omega)\) into polygons. Let

\[
\text{int} \mathcal{P} := \bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \text{int} P_\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \partial \mathcal{P} := \bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \partial P_\alpha.
\]
We denote by $\text{dir } \mathcal{P} \subset S^1$ the set of directions of all sides in the partition $\mathcal{P}$.

**Definition 2.** Let $\gamma : [a, b] \to M$ be a simple curve (possibly closed) with $\# \gamma([a, b]) \cap \partial \mathcal{P} < +\infty$ and $x \in M$. We define a pairing $\langle x, \gamma \rangle \in \mathbb{C}$ as follows:

- if $x$ does not belong to the curve then $\langle x, \gamma \rangle := 0$;
- if $x = \gamma(s_0)$ with $s_0 \in (a, b)$ or $x = \gamma(a) = \gamma(b)$ and there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\gamma(s_0, s_0 + \varepsilon) \subset \text{int } P_\alpha$ and $\gamma(s_0 - \varepsilon, s_0) \subset \text{int } P_\beta$ then $\langle x, \gamma \rangle := \overline{\zeta}_\beta(x) - \zeta_\alpha(x)$;
- if $x = \gamma(a) \neq \gamma(b)$ and there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\gamma(a, a + \varepsilon) \subset \text{int } P_\alpha$ then $\langle x, \gamma \rangle := -\zeta_\alpha(x)$;
- if $x = \gamma(b) \neq \gamma(a)$ and there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\gamma(b - \varepsilon, b) \subset \text{int } P_\beta$ then $\langle x, \gamma \rangle := \overline{\zeta}_\beta(x)$.

Suppose that the curve $\gamma$ does not start and does not end in $x \in M$. Note that if $x \in \text{int } \mathcal{P}$ then $\langle x, \gamma \rangle = 0$. If $x \in \partial \mathcal{P} \setminus \Sigma$ and $\gamma$ goes through $x$ then, by definition,

$$
\langle x, \gamma \rangle = \zeta_\beta(x) - \zeta_\alpha(x) = v_{\alpha, \beta}^C,
$$

where $C$ is the connected component of $U_\alpha \cap U_\beta$ containing $x$.

**Theorem 2.7.** Suppose that $\gamma : [a, b] \to M$ is a simple curve with $\# \gamma([a, b]) \cap \partial \mathcal{P} < +\infty$ such that

(i) $\gamma(b) = \gamma(a)$ and $\gamma([a, b]) \cap \Sigma = \emptyset$ (i.e. $[\gamma] \in H_1(M \setminus \Sigma, \mathbb{Z})$), or

(ii) $\gamma(a), \gamma(b) \in \Sigma$ and $\gamma((a, b)) \cap \Sigma = \emptyset$ (i.e. $[\gamma] \in H_1(M, \Sigma, \mathbb{Z})$).

Then

$$
\langle \omega, [\gamma] \rangle = \sum_{x \in \partial \mathcal{P}} \langle x, \gamma \rangle.
$$

Therefore, we can write $\omega = \sum_{x \in \partial \mathcal{P}} x$ and

$$
\langle \text{Re } \omega, [\gamma] \rangle = \sum_{x \in \partial \mathcal{P}} \text{Re} \langle x, \gamma \rangle.
$$

**Proof.** Let $a = t_0 < t_1 < \ldots < t_{n-1} < t_n = b$ be a partition of $[a, b]$ such that for any $1 \leq j \leq n$ there exists $\alpha_j \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\gamma(t_{j-1}, t_j) \subset \text{int } P_{\alpha_j}$. Then

$$
\langle \omega, [\gamma] \rangle = \int_\gamma \omega = \sum_{j=1}^n \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} (\zeta_{\alpha_j} \circ \gamma)'(t) \, dt = \sum_{j=1}^n \left( \zeta_{\alpha_j}(\gamma(t_j)) - \zeta_{\alpha_j}(\gamma(t_{j-1})) \right)
$$

$$
= \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \left( \zeta_{\alpha_j}(\gamma(t_j)) - \zeta_{\alpha_{j+1}}(\gamma(t_j)) \right) + \zeta_{\alpha_n}(\gamma(t_n)) - \zeta_{\alpha_1}(\gamma(t_0))
$$

$$
= \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \langle \gamma(t_j), \gamma \rangle + \zeta_{\alpha_n}(\gamma(b)) - \zeta_{\alpha_1}(\gamma(a)).
$$

In the case (i) we can assume that $\gamma(a) = \gamma(b) \in \text{int } \mathcal{P}$. Then $\alpha_1 = \alpha_n$ and $\zeta_{\alpha_n}(\gamma(b)) = \zeta_{\alpha_1}(\gamma(a))$. Therefore,

$$
\langle \omega, [\gamma] \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \langle \gamma(t_j), \gamma \rangle = \sum_{x \in \partial \mathcal{P}} \langle x, \gamma \rangle.
$$
In the case (ii) we have $\gamma(a), \gamma(b) \in \Sigma \subset \partial \mathcal{P}$. As $\langle \gamma(a), \gamma \rangle = -\tilde{c}_{\alpha_1}(\gamma(a))$ and $\langle \gamma(b), \gamma \rangle = \tilde{c}_{\alpha_\delta}(\gamma(b))$, we have

$$\langle \omega, [\gamma] \rangle = \sum_{j=0}^n \langle \gamma(t_j), \gamma \rangle = \sum_{x \in \partial \mathcal{P}} \langle x, \gamma \rangle,$$

which completes the proof. \hfill \Box

**Definition 3.** Suppose that the vertical direction does not belong to $\text{dir} \mathcal{P}$. Denote by:

- $\hat{D} = \hat{D}(\omega, \mathcal{P})$ the set of triples $(\alpha, \beta, C)$ ($C$ is a connected component of $U_\alpha \cap U_\beta$) for which there is a vertical orbit segment $\{\varphi_t^\alpha x : t \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]\} \subset C$ ($\varepsilon > 0$) such that $\varphi_t^\alpha x \in P_\alpha$ for $t \in [-\varepsilon, 0]$ and $\varphi_t^\alpha x \in P_\alpha$ for $t \in [0, \varepsilon]$;
- $D = D(\omega, \mathcal{P})$ the subset of all triples $(\alpha, \beta, C) \in \hat{D}$ such that the point $x$ belongs to the interior of a common side of $P_\alpha$ and $P_\beta$;
- $B = B(\omega, \mathcal{P})$ the set of pairs $(\sigma, \alpha) \in \Sigma \times \mathcal{A}$ for which $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_\alpha$ and there is a vertical curve $\gamma : [0, \varepsilon] \to \mathcal{P}_\alpha$ with $\gamma(0) = \sigma$ and $\tilde{c}_\alpha(\gamma(t)) = \tilde{c}_\alpha(\sigma) + it$ for $t \in [0, \varepsilon]$;
- $E = E(\omega, \mathcal{P})$ the set of pairs $(\sigma, \beta) \in \Sigma \times \mathcal{A}$ for which $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_\beta$ and there is a vertical curve $\gamma : [-\varepsilon, 0] \to \mathcal{P}_\beta$ with $\gamma(0) = \sigma$ and $\tilde{c}_\beta(\gamma(t)) = \tilde{c}_\beta(\sigma) + it$ for $t \in [-\varepsilon, 0]$.

**Remark 2.8.** Suppose that $\mathcal{P}$ is a partition of $(M, \omega)$ into polygons and $\theta \notin \text{dir} \mathcal{P}$. In a similar way as in Definition 3 we can define the sets $D_\theta$, $B_\theta$ and $E_\theta$ using orbits in direction $\theta$ instead of vertical orbits.

Let us consider the rotated translation surface $(M, r_{\pi/2-\theta} \omega)$. Then the rotated partition $r_{\pi/2-\theta} \mathcal{P}$ is a partition of $(M, r_{\pi/2-\theta} \omega)$ into polygons such that the vertical directions does not belong to $\text{dir} r_{\pi/2-\theta} \mathcal{P}$ and

$$D(r_{\pi/2-\theta} \omega, r_{\pi/2-\theta} \mathcal{P}) = D_\theta(\omega, \mathcal{P}), \quad B(r_{\pi/2-\theta} \omega, r_{\pi/2-\theta} \mathcal{P}) = B_\theta(\omega, \mathcal{P}),$$

$$E(r_{\pi/2-\theta} \omega, r_{\pi/2-\theta} \mathcal{P}) = E_\theta(\omega, \mathcal{P}).$$

**Lemma 2.9.** For every $(\alpha, \beta, C) \in \hat{D} \backslash D$ there exists a sequence $\{(\alpha_{j+1}, \alpha_j, C_j)\}_{j=1}^n$ of elements in $D$ such that $\alpha_1 = \beta$, $\alpha_{n+1} = \alpha$ and

$$v_{\alpha, \beta}^C = \sum_{j=1}^n v_{\alpha_{j+1}, \alpha_j}^C.$$
For $1 \leq j \leq n$ denote by $C_j$ the connected component of $U_{\alpha_j} \cap U_{\alpha_{j+1}}$ that contains $\varphi_{1j}^{\varphi_{2j}} x \in P_{\alpha_j} \cap P_{\alpha_{j+1}}$. Then $(\alpha_{j+1}, \alpha_j, C_j) \in D$ for every $1 \leq j \leq n$.

Let $\gamma$ be the boundary (oriented) of the rectangle $R$. As $[\gamma] \in H_1(M \setminus \Sigma)$ is the zero homology element, we have $\langle \omega, [\gamma] \rangle = 0$. Therefore, by Theorem 2.7 and (2.5), we have

$$0 = \langle \omega, [\gamma] \rangle = \langle x, \gamma \rangle + \sum_{j=1}^n \langle \varphi_{1j}^{\varphi_{2j}} x, \gamma \rangle = -v^{C_{\alpha,\beta}}_{1\alpha,\beta} + \sum_{j=1}^n v^{C_j}_{1\alpha_{j+1},\alpha_j},$$

which completes the proof. \hfill \Box

Let us come back to a $C^\infty$-curve of translation surfaces $J \ni s \mapsto \omega(s) \in M(M, \Sigma)$. Suppose that there is a finite open cover $(U_{\alpha})_{\alpha \in A}$ of $M \setminus \Sigma$ and for every $s \in J$ a partition $\mathcal{P}(s) = \{P_{\alpha}(s) : \alpha \in A\}$ of $(M, \omega(s))$ into polygons so that $P_{\alpha}(s) \setminus \Sigma \subset U_{\alpha}$ for every $\alpha \in A$ and $s \in J$. Moreover, assume that for every $\alpha \in A$ the polygon $P_{\alpha}(s)$ and the corresponding chart $\zeta^s_\alpha : U_{\alpha} \to \bar{\mathbb{C}}$ vary $C^\infty$-smoothly with $s \in J$. It follows that for every connected component $C$ of $U_{\alpha} \cap U_{\beta}$ the map $J \ni s \mapsto v^{C}_{\alpha,\beta}(s) \in \mathbb{C}$ is of class $C^\infty$.

Assume that the vertical direction does not belong to $\text{dir} \, \mathcal{P}(s)$ for all $s \in J$. Then the sets $D(\omega(s), \mathcal{P}(s)), B(\omega(s), \mathcal{P}(s)), E(\omega(s), \mathcal{P}(s))$ (see Definition 3) do not depend on $s \in J$. Let us consider three finite subsets of $C^1(J, \mathbb{C})$:

$$\mathcal{D} := \{s \mapsto v^{C}_{\alpha,\beta}(s) : (\alpha, \beta, C) \in D\},$$

$$\mathcal{B} := \{s \mapsto -\zeta^s_\alpha(\sigma) : (\sigma, \alpha) \in B\},$$

$$\mathcal{E} := \{s \mapsto \zeta^s_\beta(\sigma) : (\sigma, \beta) \in E\}.$$

For any pair of $C^1$-maps $f, g : J \to \mathbb{R}$ we define their bracket $[f, g] : J \to \mathbb{R}$ by $[f, g](s) = f'(s)g(s) - f(s)g'(s)$ for $s \in J$.

**Theorem 2.10.** Let $\ell : J \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a $C^\infty$-map. Suppose that

(i) for any $f \in \mathcal{B}$, $g \in \mathcal{E}$ and any sequence $(n_h)_{h \in \mathcal{D}}$ in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that the map $f + g + \sum_{h \in \mathcal{D}} n_h h$ is non-zero we have

$$\Re f(s) + \Re g(s) + \sum_{h \in \mathcal{D}} n_h \Re h(s) \neq 0 \text{ for a.e. } s \in J;$$

(ii+) $|\Re h, \ell|_+(s) \geq 0$ for all $h \in \mathcal{D}$ and $s \in J$ with

$$\sum_{h \in \mathcal{D}} |\Re h, \ell|_+(s) > 0 \text{ for a.e. } s \in J,$$

(ii–) $|\Re h, \ell|_-(s) \leq 0$ for all $h \in \mathcal{D}$ and $s \in J$ with

$$\sum_{h \in \mathcal{D}} |\Re h, \ell|_-(s) < 0 \text{ for a.e. } s \in J.$$

Then $(M, \omega(s))$ is recurrent for a.e. $s \in J$.

**Proof.** The proof relies on using Corollary 2.5 combined with Remark 2.6. First we show that for a.e. $s \in J$ there is no vertical saddle connection on $(M, \omega(s))$. By assumption (i), there exists a subset $J_0 \subset J$ of full Lebesgue measure such that for every $s \in J_0$ if $f \in \mathcal{B}$, $g \in \mathcal{E}$ and $(n_h)_{h \in \mathcal{D}}$ is a sequence in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ with $f + g + \sum_{h \in \mathcal{D}} n_h h$ being non-zero map, then

$$\Re f(s) + \Re g(s) + \sum_{h \in \mathcal{D}} n_h \Re h(s) \neq 0.$$
We show that for every $s \in J_0$ there is no vertical saddle connection on $(M, \omega(s))$. Indeed, suppose contrary to our claim that $\gamma : [0, \tau] \to M$ is a vertical saddle connection on $(M, \omega(s))$, i.e. $\gamma(0), \gamma(\tau) \in \Sigma$, $\gamma(0, \tau) \subset M \setminus \Sigma$ and $\gamma'(t) = i$ for $t \in (0, \tau)$ in local coordinates in $(M, \omega(s))$. Then, by Theorem 2.7,

\[(2.8)\]

\[
i\tau = \langle \omega(s), [\gamma] \rangle = \sum_{x \in \partial P(s)} \langle x, \gamma \rangle.
\]

Let

\[0 = t_0 < t_1 < \ldots < t_n < t_{n+1} = \tau\]

and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}$ be elements of $A$ such that

\[\gamma(t) \in \text{int } P_{\alpha_j}(s) \quad \text{for all} \quad t \in (t_{j-1}, t_j) \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \leq j \leq n + 1.
\]

For every $1 \leq j \leq n$ denote by $C_j$ the connected component of $U_{\alpha_j} \cap U_{\alpha_{j+1}}$ that contains $\gamma(t_j) \in P_{\alpha_j} \cap P_{\alpha_{j+1}}$. Then

\[(\gamma(0), \alpha_0) \in B, \quad (\gamma(\tau), \alpha_{n+1}) \in E, \quad (\alpha_{j+1}, \alpha_j, C_j) \in \hat{D}
\]

for every $1 \leq j \leq n$ and

\[
\sum_{x \in \partial P(s)} \langle x, \gamma \rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{n+1} \langle \gamma(t_j), \gamma \rangle = -\bar{\zeta}_{\alpha_0}^{s}(\gamma(0)) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} V_{C_j, \alpha_{j+1}, \alpha_j}^{s}(s) + \bar{\zeta}_{\alpha_{n+1}}^{s}(\gamma(\tau)).
\]

In view of Lemma 2.9 \[2.8\] and by the definition of sets $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{E}$, there exist $f \in \mathcal{B}$, $g \in \mathcal{E}$ and a sequence $(n_h)_{h \in \mathcal{D}}$ in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that

\[(2.9)\]

\[
i\tau = \sum_{x \in \partial P(s)} \langle x, \gamma \rangle = f(s) + g(s) + \sum_{h \in \mathcal{D}} n_h h(s).
\]

Hence

\[(2.10)\]

\[0 = \text{Re} \langle \omega(s), [\gamma] \rangle = \text{Re } f(s) + \text{Re } g(s) + \sum_{h \in \mathcal{D}} n_h \text{Re } h(s).
\]

By \[2.9\], the map $f + g + \sum_{h \in \mathcal{D}} n_h h$ is non-zero. As $s \in J_0$, \[2.10\] contradicts \[2.7\].

This yields the absence of vertical saddle connections.

Fix an arbitrary $\alpha_0 \in A$ and for every $s \in J$ choose a vertical interval $I_s \subset \text{int } P_{\alpha_0}(s)$ so that the map $s \mapsto I_s$ is of class $C^\infty$. Then for every $s_0 \in J_0$ the interval $I_{s_0}$ is a global transversal for the vertical flow on $(M, \omega(s_0))$. Since $s \mapsto (M, \omega(s))$ is a $C^\infty$-curve in $\mathcal{M}(M, \Sigma)$ and the choice of the interval $I_s$ in $(M, \omega(s))$ is smooth, for every $s_0 \in J_0$ there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for every $s \in (s_0 - \varepsilon, s_0 + \varepsilon)$ the interval $I_s$ is a global transversal for the vertical flow on $(M, \omega(s))$ and the corresponding first return map $T_{\omega(s), J_s} = T_s : I_s \to I_s$ has the same combinatorial data (the number of exchanged intervals and permutation) as $T_{s_0}$. It follows that there exists a countable family $\mathcal{J}$ of pairwise disjoint open subintervals in $J$ such that:

(i) the complement of $\bigcup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{J}} \Delta$ in $J$ has zero Lebesgue measure;

(ii) $I_s \subset \text{int } P_{\alpha_0}(s)$ is a global transversal for every $s \in \bigcup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{J}} \Delta$;

(iii) for every $\Delta \in \mathcal{J}$ all IETs $T_s$, $s \in \Delta$ have the same combinatorial data.

Therefore, it suffices to show that for every $\Delta \in \mathcal{J}$ and for a.e. $s \in \Delta$ the translation surface $(M, \omega(s))$ is recurrent.
Remark 2.6, we need to show that for a.e. \( s \in \Delta \) we have
\[
(2.11) \quad |b_j(\Lambda(s)) - t_{\pi(j)}(\Lambda(s)), \ell(s)| \geq 0 \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq j \leq d \quad \text{and}
\]
\[
(2.12) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{d} [b_j(\Lambda(s)) - t_{\pi(j)}(\Lambda(s)), \ell(s)] > 0.
\]

For every \( s \in \Delta \) and \( 1 \leq j \leq d \) let \( \xi_j(s) = \xi_j(\omega(s), I_s) \in H_1(M, \Sigma, \mathbb{Z}) \) be the homology element defined in Definition 1. Then, by (2.4),
\[
\text{Re}(\omega(s), \xi_j(s)) = b_j(\Lambda(s)) - t_{\pi(j)}(\Lambda(s)) \quad \text{for every} \quad s \in \Delta.
\]
Since \( \xi_j(s) \) is the homology class of a loop \( \gamma^j_s \) formed by the segment of the vertical orbit in \((M, \omega(s))\) starting at any \( x^j_s \in (b_{j-1}(\Lambda(s)), b_j(\Lambda(s))) \subseteq I_s \) and ending at \( T_sx^j_s \in I_s \) closed by the segment of \( I_s \subseteq \text{int} P_{\alpha}(s) \) that joins \( T_sx^j_s \) and \( x^j_s \), by Theorem 2.7 for every \( s \in \Delta \) we have
\[
\text{Re}(\omega(s), \xi_j(s)) = \sum_{x \in \partial P(s)} \text{Re}(x, \gamma^j_s)
\]
(2.13)
\[
= \sum_{(\alpha, \beta, C) \in \mathcal{D}} n^j_{(\alpha, \beta, C)}(s) \text{Re} \nu^C_{\alpha, \beta}(s),
\]
where \( n^j_{(\alpha, \beta, C)}(s) \) is the number of meeting points \( x \in \partial P(s) \) of \( \gamma^j_s \) with \( \partial P(s) \) such that \( \gamma^j_s \) passes from \( \text{int} P_j(s) \) through \( x \) to \( \text{int} P_a(s) \) and \( x \) belongs to the connected component \( C \) of \( U_\alpha \cap U_\beta \).

Take any \( s_0 \in \Delta \). Since the partition \( \mathcal{P}(s_0) \) into polygons have finitely many corners, for every \( 1 \leq j \leq d \) we can find \( x^j_{s_0} \in (b_{j-1}(\Lambda(s_0)), b_j(\Lambda(s_0))) \) such that the corresponding loops \( \gamma^j_{s_0}, 1 \leq j \leq d \) do not meet the corners of \( \mathcal{P}(s_0) \). Then we choose other points \( x^j_s \) for \( s \in \Delta \setminus \{s_0\} \) such that the map
\[
\Delta \ni s \mapsto x^j_s \in (b_{j-1}(\Lambda(s)), b_j(\Lambda(s)))
\]
is of class \( C^\infty \) for every \( 1 \leq j \leq d \). We deal with the family of corresponding loops \( \gamma^j_s \) for \( s \in \Delta \) and \( 1 \leq j \leq d \). By the continuity of the maps \( s \mapsto \gamma^j_s \), we can find \( \varepsilon > 0 \) such that \( (s_0 - \varepsilon, s_0 + \varepsilon) \subset \Delta \) and for every \( s \in (s_0 - \varepsilon, s_0 + \varepsilon) \) the loops \( \gamma^j_s, 1 \leq j \leq d \) do not meet the corners of \( \mathcal{P}(s) \). It follows that each map \( n^j_{(\alpha, \beta, C)} \) is constant on \((s_0 - \varepsilon, s_0 + \varepsilon)\) and the range of the second sum in (2.13) is \( D \). Therefore for every \( 1 \leq j \leq d \) there exists a sequence \((n^j_h)_{h \in D}\) in \( \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \) such that
\[
(2.14) \quad b_j(\Lambda(s)) - t_{\pi(j)}(\Lambda(s)) = \text{Re}(\omega(s), \xi_j(s)) = \sum_{h \in D} n^j_h \text{Re} h(s)
\]
for all \( s \in (s_0 - \varepsilon, s_0 + \varepsilon) \). It follows that
\[
(2.15) \quad [b_j(\Lambda(s)) - t_{\pi(j)}(\Lambda(s)), \ell(s)] = \sum_{h \in D} n^j_h \text{Re} h(s), \ell(s)
\]
for all \( s \in (s_0 - \varepsilon, s_0 + \varepsilon) \) and \( 1 \leq j \leq d \).

Now assume that the condition \((ii_+)\) holds. In view of \((ii_+)\), \( [\text{Re} h(s), \ell(s)] \geq 0 \) for all \( h \in D \) and \( s \in (s_0 - \varepsilon, s_0 + \varepsilon) \). Therefore, by (2.15), \( [b_j(\Lambda(s)) - t_{\pi(j)}(\Lambda(s)), \ell(s)] \geq 0 \) for all \( s \in (s_0 - \varepsilon, s_0 + \varepsilon) \) and \( 1 \leq j \leq d \). As \( s_0 \) is an arbitrary element of \( \Delta \), it follows that \( [b_j(\Lambda(s)) - t_{\pi(j)}(\Lambda(s)), \ell(s)] \geq 0 \) for every \( s \in \Delta \). It gives (2.11) under the assumption \((ii_+)\).
To complete the proof in this case we need to show (2.12). Suppose, contrary to our claim, that the subset $J_1 \subset J$ of all $s \in J$ such that

$$[b_j(\Lambda(s)) - t_{\pi(j)}(\Lambda(s)), \ell(s)] = 0 \text{ for every } 1 \leq j \leq d$$

has positive Lebesgue measure. By the assumption $(\text{ii}_\circ)$, there exist $s_0 \in J_0 \cap J_1$ and $h_0 \in \mathcal{D}$ such that

(2.16) \hspace{1cm} [\text{Re} \, h_0(s_0), \ell(s_0)] > 0 \text{ and } [\text{Re} \, h(s_0), \ell(s_0)] \geq 0 \text{ for all } h \in \mathcal{D}.

Let $(\alpha_0, \beta_0, C_0) \in D$ be a triple such that $h_0(s) = v_{\alpha_0, \beta_0}^0(s)$ for all $s \in J$. For every $s \in J$ choose a common side $e^0_s$ (without the ends) of $P_{\alpha_0}(s)$ and $P_{\beta_0}(s)$ contained in $C_0$ so that the map $s \mapsto e^0_s$ is smooth.

Since the flow $(\varphi^t_i)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ on $(M, \omega(s_0))$ is minimal, there exists $1 \leq j \leq d$ and $x^j_{s_0} \in (b_{j-1}(\Lambda(s_0)), b_j(\Lambda(s_0)))$ such that the corresponding loop $\gamma^j_{s_0}$ has an intersection with $e^0_{s_0}$ and does not meet any corner of $\mathcal{P}(s_0)$. As in the first part of the proof, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and a smooth map $(s_0 - \varepsilon, s_0 + \varepsilon) \ni s \mapsto x^j_s \in I_s$ such that for every $s \in (s_0 - \varepsilon, s_0 + \varepsilon)$ the corresponding loop $\gamma^j_s$ does not meet any corner of $\mathcal{P}(s)$. It follows that the map $n^j_{(\alpha_0, \beta_0, C_0)}$ is constant on $(s_0 - \varepsilon, s_0 + \varepsilon)$ and takes a positive value. Therefore there exists a sequence $(n_h)_{h \in \mathbb{D}}$ in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $n_{h_0} > 0$ and

$$b_j(\Lambda(s)) - t_{\pi(j)}(\Lambda(s)) = \text{Re} \langle \omega(s), \xi_j(s) \rangle = \sum_{h \in \mathcal{D}} n_h \text{Re} \, h(s)$$

for all $s \in (s_0 - \varepsilon, s_0 + \varepsilon)$. In view of (2.16), it follows that

$$[b_j(\Lambda(s_0)) - t_{\pi(j)}(\Lambda(s_0)), \ell(s_0)] = \sum_{h \in \mathcal{D}} n_h [\text{Re} \, h(s_0), \ell(s_0)]$$

$$\geq n_{h_0} [\text{Re} \, h_0(s_0), \ell(s_0)] > 0.$$

This contradicts the fact that $s_0 \in J_1$ and finishes the proof of (2.12). This completes the proof under the assumption $(\text{ii}_\circ)$.

Now assume that the condition $(\text{ii}_\circ)$ holds. Then let us consider the reverse curve $-J \ni s \mapsto (M, \omega(-s)) \in \mathcal{M}(M, \Sigma)$. Since the reverse curve satisfies $(\text{i})$ and $(\text{ii}_\circ)$, the assertion of the theorem follows from the previous part of the proof. \hfill $\square$

3. BILLIARDS ON TABLES WITH VERTICAL AND HORIZONTAL SIDES

In the next two sections we deal with the billiard flow in directions $\pm \pi/4$, $\pm 3\pi/4$ on tables with vertical and horizontal sides. More precisely, we consider smooth curves of such tables. The aim of this part of the paper is to formulate and prove a criterion (Theorem 4.2) for unique ergodicity of the billiard flow on almost every table in the curve. The proof of Theorem 4.2 relies on Theorem 2.10.

Denote by $\Xi$ the set of sequences $((x, y)) = (x_i, y_i)_{i=1}^k$ in $\mathbb{R}^2_{>0}$ such that

$$0 < x_1 < x_2 < \ldots < x_{k-1} < x_k \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < y_k < y_{k-1} < \ldots < y_2 < y_1.$$

Let $k((x, y)) := k$. For every $((x, y)) \in \Xi$ denote by $P((x, y))$ the right-angle polygon on $\mathbb{R}^2$ (i.e. with angles $\pi/2$ or $3\pi/2$ with consecutive vertices:

$$(0,0), (0, y_1), (x_1, y_1), (x_1, y_2), \ldots, (x_{k-1}, y_{k-1}), (x_k, y_k), (x_k, 0),$$

see Figure 4.
Denote by \( \Gamma \) the four element group generated by the vertical and the horizontal reflections \( \gamma_v, \gamma_h : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2 \). We extend the action of \( \Gamma \) to the space of finite sequences in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \). The polygons of the form
\[
P(-x, y) = P(\gamma_v(x, y)), \\
P(x, -y) = P(\gamma_h(x, y)), \\
P(-x, -y) = P(\gamma_v \circ \gamma_h(x, y)) = \gamma_v \circ \gamma_h P(x, y)
\]
are called basic polygons, see Figure 4. We say that:

- \( \gamma([(0, 0), (0, y_1)]) \) is the long vertical side;
- \( \gamma([(0, 0), (x_k, 0)]) \) is the long horizontal side;
- \( \gamma([(x_k, 0), (x_k, y_k)]) \) is the short vertical side;
- \( \gamma([(0, y_1), (x_1, y_1)]) \) is the short horizontal side

of the basic polygon \( P(\gamma(x, y)) \).

We deal with billiard flows on right angle connected generalized polygons which are a finite union of basic polygons \( P(\gamma(x, y)) \) for \( (x, y) \in \Xi, \gamma \in \Gamma \) so that some sides of basic polygons are glued by translations.

Denote by \( \mathcal{P} \) the collection of such generalized polygons for which the sides of the basic polygons can be glued only in the following four cases:

- \((V)\) we can glue \( P(x, \pm y) \) with \( P(-x, \pm y) \) along the long vertical sides if their lengths are the same;
- \((H)\) we can glue \( P(\pm x, y) \) with \( P(\pm x', -y) \) along the long horizontal sides if their lengths are the same;
- \((v)\) we can glue \( P(x, \pm y) \) with \( P(-x', \pm y) \) along the short vertical sides if their lengths are the same;
- \((h)\) we can glue \( P(\pm x, y) \) with \( P(\pm x', -y) \) along the short horizontal sides if their lengths are the same.

Note that a generalized polygon \( P \in \mathcal{P} \) is not necessary a polygon in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \), \( P \) should be treated rather as a translation surface with boundary. Translation surface of this type, called parking garages, and the corresponding billiard flows were already studied in [1] in the context of Veech dichotomy.
Suppose that a generalized polygon $P \in \mathcal{P}$ formed by gluing $M \geq 1$ basic polygons $\{\gamma_m P_m(\vec{x}^m, \vec{y}^m) : m \in I\}$ with $I$ an $M$-element set of indices of basic polygons. Then we write

$$P = \biguplus_{m \in I} \gamma_m P_m(\vec{x}^m, \vec{y}^m).$$

We label the $m$-th basic polygon $P(\gamma_m(\vec{x}^m, \vec{y}^m))$ by the additional subscript $m$ because many copies of the polygon $P(\gamma_m(\vec{x}^m, \vec{y}^m))$ can be used to create the generalized polygon $P$. The additional subscript helps us to distinguish them.

In order to describe the generalized polygon $P$ fully we define four symmetric relations $\sim_V$, $\sim_H$, $\sim_v$, $\sim_h$ on $I$ which reflect the gluing rules of basic polygons in $P$. We let $m \sim_a m'$ if the polygons $\gamma_m P_m(\vec{x}^m, \vec{y}^m)$ and $\gamma_{m'} P_{m'}(\vec{x}^{m'}, \vec{y}^{m'})$ are glued in accordance with the scenario (a), for $a = V, H, v, h$. Moreover, if $m \in I$ is not $\sim_a$-related to any other element of $I$ then we adopt the convention that $m \sim_a m$.

For every $m \in I$ let $k_m := k(\vec{x}^m, \vec{y}^m)$. We refer to the collection

$$\{I, (\gamma_m)_{m \in I}, (k_m)_{m \in I}, \sim_V, \sim_H, \sim_v, \sim_h\}$$

as the combinatorial data of the generalized polygon $P \in \mathcal{P}$.

**Remark 3.1.** Suppose that $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and consider the directional billiard flow on $P$ in directions $\Gamma(\pi/4) = \{\pm \pi/4, \pm 3\pi/4\}$. After an unfolding procedure emulating the standard procedure (for rational polygons on $\mathbb{R}^2$) coming from [3] and [4] we obtain a translation surface $M(P) \in \mathcal{M}$. Then the billiard flow is isomorphic to the directional flow $(\varphi^\pi_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ on $M(P)$. The translation surface $M(P)$ has a natural partition into basic polygons

$$\mathcal{P}_P = \{P_m(\gamma(\vec{x}^m, \vec{y}^m)) : (m, \gamma) \in I \times \Gamma\}.$$  

The sides of the basic polygons are identified by translations in the following way:

(i) for $1 \leq i < k_m$ the vertical side $[\pm x_i, \pm y_i, \pm x_{i+1}, \pm y_{i+1}]$ of $P_m(\vec{x}^m, \pm \vec{y}^m)$ is identified with the side $[\pm x_i, \pm y_i, \pm x_{i+1}, \pm y_{i+1}]$ of $P_m(-\vec{x}^m, \pm \vec{y}^m)$.

**Figure 5.** An example of a polygons $P \in \mathcal{P}$ with $1 \sim_V 2, 4 \sim_V 5, 6 \sim_H 7, 9 \sim_V 10, 5 \sim_H 8, 6 \sim_H 9, 7 \sim_H 10, 2 \sim_v 3, 5 \sim_v 6, 7 \sim_v 4, 8 \sim_v 9, 1 \sim_h 4, 2 \sim_h 5, 3 \sim_h 6.$
for $1 < i \leq k_m$ the horizontal side $[(\pm x_{i-1}^m, y_i^m), (\pm x_i^m, y_i^m)]$ of $P_m(\pm \overline{x}^m, \overline{y}^m)$ is identified with the side $[(\pm x_{i-1}^m, -y_i^m), (\pm x_i^m, -y_i^m)]$ of $P_m(\pm \overline{x}^m, -\overline{y}^m)$;

(iii) if $m \sim \nu \ m'$ then the long vertical side of $P_m(\overline{x}^m, \pm \overline{y}^m)$ is identified with the long vertical side of $P_m'(\overline{x}^m', \pm \overline{y}^m')$;

(iv) if $m \sim \mu \ m'$ then the long horizontal side of $P_m(\pm \overline{x}^m, \overline{y}^m)$ is identified with the short vertical side of $P_m(\pm \overline{x}^m', \pm \overline{y}^m)$;

(v) if $m \sim \nu \ m'$ then the short vertical side of $P_m(\overline{x}^m, \pm \overline{y}^m)$ is identified with the short horizontal side of $P_m(\pm \overline{x}^m', -\overline{y}^m')$;

(vi) if $m \sim \mu \ m'$ then the short horizontal side of $P_m(\pm \overline{x}^m, \overline{y}^m)$ is identified with the short horizontal side of $P_m(\pm \overline{x}^m', -\overline{y}^m')$.

Let $\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{I} \times \Gamma$ and $P_\alpha := P_m(\gamma(\overline{x}^m, \overline{y}^m))$ if $\alpha = (m, \gamma) \in \mathcal{A}$.

Remark 3.2. Denote by $\Sigma \subset M(\mathcal{P})$ the set of singular points. Singular points arise from some corners of $P_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$. More precisely, for every $\alpha = (m, \gamma) \in \mathcal{A}$

(i) the corner $V_{i+1}^\alpha := \gamma(x_i^m, y_{i+1}^m) \in P_\alpha$ for $1 \leq i < k_m$ is a singular point with the total angle $6\pi$;

(ii) the corner $V_i^\alpha := \gamma(x_i^m, y_i^m) \in P_\alpha$ for $1 \leq i \leq k_m$ is a regular point.

The other corners $\gamma(0,0)$, $\gamma(x_{k_m}^m,0)$, $\gamma(0,y_{k_m}^m)$ in $P_\alpha$ can be singular or regular points. More precisely,

(iii) if $m \sim \nu \ m' \sim \mu \ m'' \sim \nu \ m$ for some $m', m'', m' \in \mathcal{I}$ then $V_{0,0}^\alpha := \gamma(0,0) \in P_\alpha$ is a regular point, otherwise it is singular;

(iv) if $m \sim \nu \ m' \sim \mu \ m'' \sim \nu \ m$ for some $m', m'', m' \in \mathcal{I}$ then $V_{k_m,0}^\alpha := \gamma(x_{k_m}^m,0) \in P_\alpha$ is a regular point, otherwise it is singular;

(v) if $m \sim \nu \ m' \sim \mu \ m'' \sim \nu \ m$ for some $m', m'', m' \in \mathcal{I}$ then $V_{0,1}^\alpha := \gamma(0,y_{k_m}^m) \in P_\alpha$ is a regular point, otherwise it is singular.

For every $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ there is an open set $U_\alpha \subset M(\mathcal{P}) \setminus \Sigma$ such that $P_\alpha \setminus \Sigma \subset U_\alpha$ and a chart $\zeta_\alpha : U_\alpha \to \mathbb{C}$ of the translation atlas of $M(\mathcal{P})$ such that its continues extension $\tilde{\zeta}_\alpha$ is equal to the identity on $P_\alpha$.

Suppose that $e$ is a common side (without ends) of two polygons $P_\alpha$ and $P_\beta$. As $e \subset U_\alpha \cap U_\beta$, there exists a unique connected component $C_{a,\beta}^e$ of $U_\alpha \cap U_\beta$ containing $e$. The following result describes all triples $(\alpha, \beta, C)$ in $D_{\pi/4} = D_{\pi/4}(M(\mathcal{P}), \mathcal{P}_\mathcal{P})$ (see Remark 2.8) and the corresponding translation vectors $v_{a,\beta}^C$.

Lemma 3.3. Every triple $(\alpha, \beta, C) \in D_{\pi/4}$ is of the form $(\alpha, \beta, C_{a,\beta}^e)$, where $e$ a common side of polygons $P_\alpha$ and $P_\beta$. If $C = C_{a,\beta}^e$ and $e$ is:

(ih) the horizontal side joining $V_{j-1}^\alpha$ and $V_j^\alpha$ for $2 \leq j \leq k_m$ with $\alpha = (m, \gamma)$, then $\beta = (m, \gamma_h \circ \gamma)$ and $v_{a,\beta}^C = 2y_j^m i$;

(ii) the horizontal side joining $V_{0,1}^\alpha$ and $V_{1,1}^\alpha$ (the short horizontal side of $P_\alpha$), $\alpha = (m, \gamma)$ and $m \sim \mu \ m'$, then $\beta = (m', \gamma_h \circ \gamma)$ and $v_{a,\beta}^C = (y_{k_m}^m + y_{k_m'}^m) i$;

(iii) the long horizontal side $P_\alpha$, $\alpha = (m, \gamma)$ and $m \sim \mu \ m'$, then $\beta = (m', \gamma_h \circ \gamma)$ and $v_{a,\beta}^C = 0$;

(iv) the vertical side joining $V_{j,1}^\alpha$ and $V_{j+1,1}^\alpha$ for $1 \leq j < k_m$ with $\alpha = (m, \gamma)$, then $\beta = (m', \gamma_v \circ \gamma)$ and $v_{a,\beta}^C = 2x_j^m$;

(vi) the vertical side joining $V_{k_m,k_m}^\alpha$ and $V_{k_m,0}^\alpha$ (the short vertical side of $P_\alpha$), $\alpha = (m, \gamma)$ and $m \sim \nu \ m'$, then $\beta = (m', \gamma_v \circ \gamma)$ and $v_{a,\beta}^C = x_{k_m}^m + x_{k_m'}^m$. 

Proof. The proof consists of a straightforward case-by-case check and we leave it to the reader. □

The following results describes all pairs $(\alpha, \sigma)$ in $B_{1/4} = B_{1/4}(M(P), P_P)$ and $(\beta, \sigma)$ in $E_{1/4} = E_{1/4}(M(P), P_P)$ (see Remark 3.1) and the corresponding vectors $-\tilde{\zeta}_\alpha(\sigma)$ and $\tilde{\zeta}_\beta(\sigma)$ respectively.

Lemma 3.4. Suppose that $\alpha, \sigma \in B_{1/4}$. If the singular point $\sigma \in \Sigma$ is of the form:

- $\alpha_i^\alpha$ for $j \leq i \leq k_m$ with $\alpha = (m, \gamma)$, then $\gamma = \gamma_h$ or $\gamma_v$ or $\gamma_v \circ \gamma_h$ and $-\tilde{\zeta}_\alpha(\sigma) = -x^m_j + y^m_{j+1}i$ or $x^m_j - y^m_{j+1}i$ or $x^m_j + y^m_{j+1}i$ respectively;
- $\beta_j^\alpha$ with $\alpha = (m, \gamma)$, then $\gamma = \gamma_h$ and $-\tilde{\zeta}_\alpha(\sigma) = y^m_i$;
- $\alpha_k^\alpha$ with $\alpha = (m, \gamma)$, then $\gamma = \gamma_v$ and $-\tilde{\zeta}_\alpha(\sigma) = x^m_{km};$
- $\beta_0^\alpha$ with $\alpha = (m, \gamma)$, then $\gamma = id$ and $-\tilde{\zeta}_\alpha(\sigma) = 0.$

Suppose that $(\beta, \sigma) \in E_{1/4}$. If the singular point $\sigma \in \Sigma$ is of the form:

- $\alpha^{\beta}_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq k_m$ with $\beta = (m, \gamma)$, then $\gamma = id$ or $\gamma_h$ or $\gamma_v$ and $\tilde{\zeta}_\beta(\sigma) = x^m_j + y^m_{j+1}i$ or $x^m_j - y^m_{j+1}i$ or $-x^m_j + y^m_{j+1}i$ respectively;
- $\beta^{\alpha}_0$ with $\beta = (m, \gamma)$, then $\gamma = \gamma_v$ and $\tilde{\zeta}_\beta(\sigma) = y^m_i$;
- $\alpha^{\beta}_k$ with $\beta = (m, \gamma)$, then $\gamma = \gamma_h$ and $\tilde{\zeta}_\beta(\sigma) = x^m_{km};$
- $\beta^{\alpha}_0$ with $\beta = (m, \gamma)$, then $\gamma = \gamma_v \circ \gamma_h$ and $\tilde{\zeta}_\beta(\sigma) = 0.$

Proof. The proof also consists of a straightforward case-by-case check and we leave it to the reader. □

4. Smooth curves of billiard tables

Suppose that $J \ni s \mapsto P(s) \in \mathcal{P}$ ($J \subset \mathbb{R}$ is an open interval) is a $C^\infty$-curve of polygonal tables. Assume that all generalized polygons $P(s)$, $s \in J$ have the same combinatorial data $\{I_\gamma, (\gamma_m)_{m \in I}, (k_m)_{m \in I}, \sim_H, \sim_V, \sim_h, \sim_v\}$. Then for every $m \in I$ there exists a $C^\infty$-map

$J \ni s \mapsto (\overline{x}^m(s), \overline{y}^m(s)) \in \Xi$ so that for every $s \in J$ we have

$P(s) = \bigcup_{m \in I} \gamma_m P(\overline{x}^m(s), \overline{y}^m(s))$

with the gluing rules of basic polygons given by the four binary relations $\sim_V, \sim_H, \sim_v, \sim_h$.

The smooth curve of polygons $s \mapsto P(s)$ provides a $C^\infty$ curve $s \mapsto M(P(s))$ in the moduli space of translation surfaces $\mathcal{M}$. Then for every $s \in J$ the surface $M(P(s)) \in \mathcal{M}$ is represented as a union of basic polygons

$\{P_m(\gamma(\overline{x}^m(s), \overline{y}^m(s))): (m, \gamma) \in I \times \Gamma\}$

so that their sides are identified according to the rules described in Remark 3.1.

Let us consider two finite subsets in $C^\infty(J, \mathbb{R}_{>0})$ given by

$\mathcal{X}_P := \{x^m_j : m \in I, 1 \leq j \leq k_m\}$, \hspace{0.5cm} $\mathcal{Y}_P := \{y^m_j : m \in I, 1 \leq j \leq k_m\}.$
For any sequence \((g_k)_{k=1}^n\) in \(C^\infty(J, \mathbb{R})\) denote by \(|W|((g_k)_{k=1}^n)\) the absolute value of its Wronskian, i.e.

\[
|W|((g_k)_{k=1}^n)(s) = \left| \det \left[ \frac{d^{j-1}}{ds^{j-1}} g_k(s) \right]_{j,k=1,\ldots,n} \right|.
\]

The following lemma is a straightforward consequence of Lebesgue’s density theorem.

**Lemma 4.1.** Suppose that \((g_k)_{k=1}^n\) is a sequence in \(C^\infty(J, \mathbb{R})\) such that

\[
|W|((g_k)_{k=1}^n)(s) > 0 \text{ for a.e. } s \in J.
\]

Then for a.e. \(s \in J\) and for every sequence \((m_k)_{k=1}^n\) of at least one non-zero integer numbers we have \(\sum_{k=1}^n m_k g_k(s) \neq 0\).

Since the absolute value of Wronskian does not depend on the order of the sequence, we can also define the absolute value of Wronskian for finite subsets in \(C^\infty(J, \mathbb{R})\) letting

\[
|W|\{g_k : 1 \leq k \leq n\} : = |W|((g_k)_{k=1}^n),
\]

where \(g_k\) for \(1 \leq k \leq n\) are distinct maps.

**Theorem 4.2.** Let \(\ell : J \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}\) be a \(C^\infty\)-map. Suppose that

(i) \(|W|((\mathcal{X}_P \cup \mathcal{Y}_P \cup \{\ell\})(s)) > 0\) for a.e. \(s \in J\), and

(ii) \(|\mathcal{X}_P\ell(s) \geq 0\) and \(|\mathcal{Y}_P\ell(s) < 0\) for all \(\mathcal{X}_P, \mathcal{Y}_P\) and a.e. \(s \in J\), or

Then for a.e. \(s \in J\) the translation flow \((\varphi_{\ell(s)}^{s/4})_{t \in \mathbb{R}}\) on \(M(P(s))\) is uniquely ergodic.

**Proof.** Since the translation flow \((\varphi_{\ell(s)}^{s/4})_{t \in \mathbb{R}}\) on \(M(P(s))\) coincide with the vertical flow on \(r_{\pi/4}M(P(s))\) and the vertical direction does not belong to \(\text{dir} r_{\pi/4}P_P(s)\) for \(s \in J\), we can apply Theorem 2.10 to the \(C^\infty\)-map \(J \ni s \mapsto r_{\pi/4}M(P(s)) \in \mathcal{M}\) and to the smooth family of polygonal partitions \(r_{\pi/4}P_P(s)\) of the translation surface \(r_{\pi/4}M(P(s))\) for \(s \in J\). We need to verify the conditions (i) and (ii) from Theorem 2.10.

Using Remark 2.8 and Lemmas 3.3.4, we can easily localize the corresponding finite subset \(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}\) in \(C^\infty(J, \mathcal{C})\), More precisely,

\[
(4.1) \quad \mathcal{D} \subset e^{i\pi/4}(\{0\} \cup (\mathcal{X}_P + \mathcal{Y}_P) \cup i(\mathcal{Y}_P + \mathcal{B}_P))
\]

\[
(4.2) \quad \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C} \subset e^{i\pi/4}(\mathcal{X}_P - i\mathcal{B}_P) \cup (\mathcal{X}_P + i\mathcal{B}_P) \cup (\{0\} \cup \mathcal{X}_P + i\mathcal{Y}_P))
\]

Suppose that \(f \in \mathcal{B}, g \in \mathcal{C}\) and \((n_h)_{h \in \mathcal{D}}\) is a sequence of natural numbers such that the map \(f + g + \sum_{h \in \mathcal{D}} n_h h\) is non-zero. By (4.1) and (4.2), there exists integer numbers \(a_x\) for \(x \in \mathcal{X}_P\) and \(b_y\) for \(y \in \mathcal{Y}_P\) such that

\[
f + g + \sum_{h \in \mathcal{D}} n_h h = e^{i\pi/4}\left( \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}_P} a_x x + i \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}_P} b_y y \right).
\]

As the left hand side is a non-zero map, at least one integer number \(a_x\) or \(b_y\) is non-zero. By the assumption (i) and Lemma 4.1 for a.e. \(s \in J\) we have

\[
\text{Re } f(s) + \text{Re } g(s) + \sum_{h \in \mathcal{D}} n_h \text{Re } h(s) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}_P} a_x x(s) - \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}_P} b_y y(s) \right) \neq 0.
\]

Therefore the condition (i) from Theorem 2.10 holds.
In order to verify the conditions \((ii_{\pm})\) in Theorem 2.10 we take any non-zero map \(h \in \mathcal{D}\). In view of \((4.1)\),
\[
\begin{align*}
(h) \quad & e^{i \pi/4}(x_1 + x_2) \quad \text{for some} \quad x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{D}, \quad \text{or} \\
& e^{i \pi/4}(y_1 + y_2) \quad \text{for some} \quad y_1, y_2 \in \mathcal{D}.
\end{align*}
\]
By Lemma 3.3 there are maps in \(\mathcal{D}\) of both types \((4.3)\) and \((4.4)\). Moreover,
\[
\begin{align*}
\Re \ h(s), \ell(s) & = \frac{\left[ x_1 + x_2 \right]}{\sqrt{2}}, \ell(s) = \frac{\left[ x_1, \ell(s) + x_2, \ell(s) \right]}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad \text{or} \\
\Re \ h(s), \ell(s) & = \frac{\left[ - y_1 + y_2 \right]}{\sqrt{2}}, \ell(s) = \frac{\left[ - y_1, \ell(s) + y_2, \ell(s) \right]}{\sqrt{2}}.
\end{align*}
\]
Under the assumption \((ii_{+})\), it follows that for all \(h \in \mathcal{D}\) and \(s \in J\) we have \(\Re \ h(s), \ell(s) \geq 0\), and if \(h\) is of type \((4.4)\) then \(\Re \ h(s), \ell(s) > 0\) for a.e. \(s \in J\). This gives the condition \((ii_{+})\) in Theorem 2.10.

Therefore, by Theorem 2.10 \(r_{\pi/4} \mathcal{P}(s)\) is recurrent for a.e. \(s \in J\). It follows that the translation flow \((\varphi_{V}^{T/4})_{l \in \mathbb{R}}\) on \(\mathcal{P}(s)\) is uniquely ergodic for a.e. \(s \in J\). \(\blacksquare\)

5. Unique ergodicity of the billiard flow on \(\mathcal{D}\) restricted to \(\mathcal{S}_s\).

Let us consider the billiard flow on a table
\[
\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_{\{\alpha^{\pm}, \beta^{+}, \beta^{-}\}}
\]
Without loss of generality we can assume that \(\beta^b \leq \beta^b \leq \beta^b \leq \beta^b\). Recall the phase space \(S^1 \mathcal{D}\) of the billiard flow on \(\mathcal{D}\) splits into invariant subsets \(\mathcal{S}_s, s \in (\beta^b, a)\).

By Proposition 1.2 if \(s \neq b\) then the billiard flow restricted to \(\mathcal{S}_s\) is topologically conjugate to the directional billiard flow in directions \(\pm \pi/4, \pm 3\pi/4\) on \(\mathcal{S}_s \in \mathcal{P}\).

For more precise description of every generalized polygon \(\mathcal{S}_s\) we need to consider the partition \(\mathcal{J}\) of the interval \((\beta^b, a)\) into open intervals by the points \(\alpha^{\pm}, \beta^\pm\) for \(1 \leq i \leq k(\beta_{l_i^{\pm}}, \alpha_{l_i^{\pm}})\). For every open interval \(J \in \mathcal{J}\) the generalized polygons \(\mathcal{S}_s\), \(s \in J\) have the same combinatorial data and the map \(J \ni s \mapsto \mathcal{S}_s \in \mathcal{P}\) is of class \(C^\infty\). For every \(J \in \mathcal{J}\) denote by \(l = l^\pm\) the largest integer number between 0 and \(k(\beta_{l_i^{\pm}}, \alpha_{l_i^{\pm}})\) so that \(J \subseteq (\beta_{l_i^{\pm}}, \alpha_{l_i^{\pm}})\).

A precise description of \(\mathcal{S}_s\) is the following:

**Proposition 5.1.** For every \(J \in \mathcal{J}\) all generalized polygons \(\mathcal{S}_s\), \(s \in J\) belong to the family \(\mathcal{P}\) (introduced in Section 3) and are described as follows:

(i) if \(J \subset (\beta^b, \beta^b)\) then \(\mathcal{S}_s\) for \(s \in J\) consists of two basic polygons
\[
P_{\alpha^+}(\overline{\pi^+}(s), \overline{\pi^-}(s)), \quad P_{-\beta}(\overline{-\pi^-}(s), \overline{-\pi^+}(s))
\]
with \(k(\overline{\pi^\pm}(s), \overline{\pi^\pm}(s)) = l^\pm\) glued according to the rule \(+- \sim_V -+\) and
\[
x^\pm_i(s) = \int_{\alpha^+_i}^{s} e(\lambda, s) d\lambda, \quad y^\pm_i(s) = \int_{\beta^+_i}^{s} e(\lambda, s) d\lambda = \ell(s) - \int_{-\infty}^{\beta^+_i} e(\lambda, s) d\lambda
\]
for \(1 \leq i \leq l^\pm\).
(ii) if $J \subset (\beta^b, b)$ then $\sigma_s(S_s)$ for $s \in J$ consists of four basic polygons 
\[ P_+\left(\overline{x}++(s), \overline{y}++(s)\right), \quad P_+\left(-\overline{x}++(s), \overline{y}++(s)\right), \quad P_+\left(-\overline{x}+(s), \overline{y}+(s)\right), \quad P_+\left(\overline{x}+(s), \overline{y}+(s)\right) \]
glued according to the rules 
\[ ++ \sim_V +-, ++ \sim_V -- \quad \text{if} \quad J \subset (\beta^b, \beta^l) \]
\[ ++ \sim_V --, ++ \sim_V --, -- \sim_V ++ \quad \text{if} \quad J \subset (\beta^l, \beta^r) \]
\[ ++ \sim_V --, ++ \sim_V --, -- \sim_V ++, ++ \sim_V ++ \quad \text{if} \quad J \subset (\beta^r, b), \]
with $k(\overline{x}^\pm(s), \overline{y}^\pm(s)) = I_j^\pm$ and
\[ x_i^\pm(s) = \int_{\alpha_i^\pm}^a e(\lambda, s) \, d\lambda, \quad y_i^\pm(s) = \int_{\beta_i^\pm}^s e(\lambda, s) \, d\lambda = \ell(s) - \int_{-\infty}^{\beta_i^\pm} e(\lambda, s) \, d\lambda \]
for $1 \leq i \leq I_j^\pm$. If $J \subset (\beta^b, \beta^l)$ then $\sigma_s(S_s)$ is not connected and it is the union of two polygons: $\sigma_s(S_s^+) \text{ glued from } P_+ \text{ and } P_-$, and $\sigma_s(S_s^-) \text{ glued from } P_+ \text{ and } P_-;
(iii) if J \subset (b, a) then \sigma_s(S_s) for s \in J consists of four basic polygons
\[ P_+\left(\overline{x}++(s), \overline{y}++(s)\right), \quad P_+\left(-\overline{x}+(s), \overline{y}+(s)\right), \quad P_+\left(-\overline{x}+(s), -\overline{y}+(s)\right), \quad P_+\left(\overline{x}+(s), -\overline{y}+(s)\right) \]
glued according to the rules 
\[ ++ \sim_V --, ++ \sim_V --, -- \sim_V ++, ++ \sim_V ++ \]
with $k(\overline{x}^\pm(s), \overline{y}^\pm(s)) = I_j^\pm$ and
\[ x_i^\pm(s) = \int_{a_i^\pm}^a e(\lambda, s) \, d\lambda \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq i < I_j^\pm, \]
\[ x_{I_j^\pm}^\pm(s) = \int_{a}^a e(\lambda, s) \, d\lambda = \ell(s) = \int_{-\infty}^b e(\lambda, s) \, d\lambda, \]
\[ y_i^\pm(s) = \int_{\beta_i^\pm}^b e(\lambda, s) \, d\lambda \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq i \leq I_j^\pm. \]

For every $s < a$ denote by $\Delta_s \subset \mathbb{R}$ the domain of $\lambda \mapsto e(\lambda, s) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(a-\lambda)(b-\lambda)(s-\lambda)}}$.

If $s < b$ then $\Delta_s = (-\infty, s) \cup (b, a)$ and
\[ \int_{\Delta_s} e(\lambda, s) \, d\lambda = 2 \int_b^a e(\lambda, s) \, d\lambda < +\infty. \]

If $b < s < a$ then $\Delta_s = (-\infty, b) \cup (s, a)$ and
\[ \int_{\Delta_s} e(\lambda, s) \, d\lambda = 2 \int_{-\infty}^b e(\lambda, s) \, d\lambda < +\infty. \]

Take an interval $J \in \mathcal{J}$ and an open interval $D$ such that $D \subset \Delta_s$ for every $s \in J$. Denote by $\xi_D : J \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ the map given by $\xi_D(s) = \int_{D} e(\lambda, s) \, d\lambda$. Then $\xi_D$ is a $C^\infty$-map such that
\[
\frac{d^k}{ds^k} \xi_D(s) = \frac{(2k-1)!!}{2^k} \int_{D} e(\lambda, s) \, d\lambda \quad \text{for all} \quad k \geq 1, \quad s \in J.
\]
Fix an interval $J \in \mathcal{J}$. Then the family of polygons $\sigma_s(S_s)$, $s \in J$ is determined be a $C^\infty$-map $J \ni s \mapsto P(s) \in \mathcal{P}$.

**Corollary 5.2.** For every interval $J \in \mathcal{J}$ there exist $a > \alpha_1 > \alpha_2 > \ldots > \alpha_m > b > \beta_n > \ldots > \beta_2 > \beta_1 \geq 0$ with $J \subset (\beta_n, \alpha_m)$ such that if $J \subset (\beta_1, b)$ then

$$\mathcal{X}_P \cup \{\ell\} = \{\ell = \xi_{(b,a)}, \xi_{(\alpha_i,a)}: 1 \leq i \leq m\}, \; \mathcal{Y}_P = \{\ell = \xi_{(-\infty, \beta_j)}: 1 \leq j \leq n\}$$

and if $J \subset (b, a)$ then

$$\mathcal{X}_P \cup \{\ell\} = \{\ell = \xi_{(-\infty,b)}, \xi_{(\alpha_i,a)}: 1 \leq i \leq m\}, \; \mathcal{Y}_P = \{\xi_{(\beta_j,a)}: 1 \leq j \leq n\}.$$
Corollary 5.4. Suppose that $D_i$, $1 \leq i \leq k$ is a family of pairwise disjoint open intervals such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^{k} D_i \subset \Delta_s$ for all $s \in J$. Then
\[
|W|((\xi_{D_j})_{j=1}^{k})(s) > 0 \quad \text{for all } s \in J.
\]

Lemma 5.5. Suppose that $D_1$, $D_2$ are disjoint open intervals such that $D_1 \cup D_2 \subset \Delta_s$ for all $s \in J$. Then
\[
[\xi_{D_1}, \xi_{D_2}](s) < 0 \quad \text{for all } s \in J \quad \text{if } D_2 \subset D_1 \quad \text{or } J < D_2 < D_1,
\]
\[
[\xi_{D_1}, \xi_{D_2}](s) > 0 \quad \text{for all } s \in J \quad \text{if } D_2 < J < D_1.
\]

Proof. In view of (5.1), we have
\[
[\xi_{D_1}, \xi_{D_2}](s) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{D_1 \times D_2} \frac{e(\lambda_1, s) e(\lambda_2, s)}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} d\lambda_1 d\lambda_2,
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{2} \int_{D_1 \times D_2} \frac{e(\lambda_1, s) e(\lambda_2, s)(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)}{(\lambda_1 - s)(\lambda_2 - s)} d\lambda_1 d\lambda_2.
\]
Since for all $\lambda_1 \in D_1$, $\lambda_2 \in D_2$, $s \in J$ we have $\lambda_2 - \lambda_1 < 0$ and $(\lambda_1 - s)(\lambda_2 - s) > 0$ if $D_2 < D_1 < J$ or $J < D_2 < D_1$ and $(\lambda_1 - s)(\lambda_2 - s) < 0$ if $D_2 < J < D_1$, this implies the required inequalities.

Theorem 5.6. For every $J \in \mathcal{J}$ we have $|W|(\mathcal{X}_P \cup \mathcal{Y}_P \cup \{\ell\})(s) > 0$ for every $s \in J$. Moreover, for all $x \in \mathcal{X}_P$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}_P$ and $s \in J$ we have
\[
[x, \ell](s) \leq 0 \quad \text{and } [y, \ell](s) > 0 \quad \text{if } J \subset (\beta', b),
\]
\[
[x, \ell](s) \geq 0 \quad \text{and } [y, \ell](s) < 0 \quad \text{if } J \subset (b, a).
\]

Proof. The proof relies on Corollary 5.4 and Lemma 5.5 and the fact the both the Wronskian $W$ and the bracket $[\cdot, \cdot]$ are alternating multilinear forms.

Case $J \subset (\beta', b)$. In view of Corollary 5.2, $J \subset (\beta_n, b)$ and for every $s \in J$ we have $\ell = \xi_{(b, a)}$ and
\[
|W|(\mathcal{X}_P \cup \mathcal{Y}_P \cup \{\ell\})(s) = |W|(\xi_{(a_1, a)}, \ldots, \xi_{(a_m, a)}, \ell - \xi_{(-\infty, \beta_1)}, \ldots, \ell - \xi_{(-\infty, \beta_n)}, \ell)(s)
\]
\[
= |W|(\xi_{(a_1, a)}, \ldots, \xi_{(a_m, a)}, \xi_{(b, a)}, \xi_{(-\infty, \beta_1)}, \ldots, \xi_{(-\infty, \beta_n)})(s)
\]
\[
= |W|(\xi_{(a_1, a)}, \xi_{(a_2, a)}, \ldots, \xi_{(a_m, a)}, \xi_{(b, a)}, \xi_{(-\infty, \beta_1)}, \xi_{(-\infty, \beta_2)}, \ldots, \xi_{(-\infty, \beta_n)})(s).
\]
Since the intervals
\[
(-\infty, \beta_1), (\beta_1, \beta_2), \ldots, (\beta_{n-1}, \beta_n), (b, a), \ldots, (a_2, a_1), (a_1, a)
\]
are pairwise disjoint, by Corollary 5.4 we have $|W|(\mathcal{X}_P \cup \mathcal{Y}_P \cup \{\ell\})(s) > 0$ for every $s \in J$.

By Corollary 5.2 if $x \in \mathcal{X}_P$ then $x = \xi_{(a_i, a)}$ for some $1 \leq i \leq m$ or $x = \ell = \xi_{(b, a)}$. Since $J \subset (b, a)$, by Lemma 5.5 for every $s \in J$ we have
\[
[\xi_{(a_i, a)}, \ell](s) = [\xi_{(a_i, a)}, \xi_{(b, a)}](s) < 0.
\]
As $[\ell, \ell] = 0$, we obtain that $[x, \ell](s) \leq 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}_P$ and $s \in J$. 

By Corollary 5.2, if \( y \in \sP \) then \( y = \ell - \xi_{(-\infty, \beta_j)} \) for some \( 1 \leq j \leq n \). Since \((-\infty, \beta_j) < J < (b, a)\), by Lemma 5.5 for every \( s \in J \) we have
\[
[\ell - \xi_{(-\infty, \beta_j)}, \ell](s) = -[\xi_{(-\infty, \beta_j)}, \xi_{(b, a)}](s) = [\xi_{(b, a)}, \xi_{(-\infty, \beta_j)}](s) > 0.
\]
Therefore, \([y, \ell](s) > 0\) for all \( y \in \sP \) and \( s \in J\).

**Case** \( J \subset (b, a) \). In view of Corollary 5.2 \( J \subset (b, a, m) \) and for every \( s \in J \) we have \( \ell = \xi_{(-\infty, b)} \) and
\[
|W|(\sP \cup \sP \cup \{\ell\})(s) = |W|(\xi_{(\alpha_1, \alpha)}), \ldots, \xi_{(\alpha_m, \alpha)}, \xi_{(\beta, \beta)}, \xi_{(-\infty, b)})(s)
= |W|(\xi_{(\alpha_1, \alpha)}, \xi_{(\alpha_2, \alpha)}), \ldots, \xi_{(\alpha_m, \alpha_m)}, \xi_{(-\infty, \beta_1)}, \xi_{(\beta_1, \beta_2)}, \ldots, \xi_{(\beta_n-1, \beta_n)}, \xi_{(\beta_n, \beta)})(s).
\]
Since the intervals
\((-\infty, \beta_1), (\beta_1, \beta_2), \ldots, (\beta_{n-1}, \beta_n), (\beta_n, b), (\alpha_m, \alpha_m), \ldots, (\alpha_2, \alpha_1), (\alpha_1, a)\)
are pairwise disjoint, by Corollary 5.4 we have \( |W|(\sP \cup \sP \cup \{\ell\})(s) > 0 \) for every \( s \in J\).

By Corollary 5.2 if \( x \in \sP \) then \( x = \xi_{(\alpha_1, \alpha)} \) for some \( 1 \leq i \leq m \) or \( x = \ell = \xi_{(-\infty, b)}\).
Since \((-\infty, b) < J < (\alpha_1, a)\), by Lemma 5.5 for every \( s \in J \) we have
\[
[\xi_{(\alpha_1, \alpha)}, \ell](s) = [\xi_{(\alpha_1, \alpha)}, \xi_{(-\infty, b)}](s) > 0.
\]
As \([\ell, \ell] = 0\), we obtain that \([x, \ell](s) \geq 0\) for all \( x \in \sP \) and \( s \in J\).

By Corollary 5.2 if \( y \in \sP \) then \( y = \xi_{(\beta, \beta)} \) for some \( 1 \leq j \leq n \). Since \((-\infty, \beta_j) < (\beta_j, b) < J\), by Lemma 5.5 for every \( s \in J \) we have
\[
[\xi_{(\beta_j, \beta)}, \ell](s) = [\xi_{(\beta_j, \beta)}, \xi_{(-\infty, \beta_j)}](s) < 0.
\]
Therefore, \([y, \ell](s) < 0\) for all \( y \in \sP \) and \( s \in J\).

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** By Proposition 1.2 for every \( s \in (\min \{\beta^t, \beta^t\}, b) \cup (b, a) \) the billiard flow on \( D \) restricted to \( S_s \) is topologically conjugated to the directional billiard flow in the directions \( \pm \pi/4, \pm 3\pi/4 \) on the polygon \( \sigma_s(S_s) \in \sP \). Moreover, for \( s \in (\min \{\beta^t, \beta^t\}, \min \{\beta^t, \beta^t\}) \) the polygon \( \sigma_s(S_s) \) is the union of two connected polygons \( \sigma_s(S_s^+) \) and \( \sigma_s(S_s^-) \). To conclude the proof we need to show that for every open interval \( J \) of the partition \( \mathcal{J} \) and for a.e. \( s \in J \) the flow \( (\phi_s^{t/4})_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \) on \( M(\sigma_s(S_s)) \) (or \( M(\sigma_s(S_s^\pm)) \) if \( J \subset (\min \{\beta^t, \beta^t\}, \min \{\beta^t, \beta^t\}) \)) is uniquely ergodic.

By Theorem 5.6 for every \( J \in \mathcal{J} \) the map \( J \ni s \mapsto \sigma_s(S_s) \in \sP \) (or \( J \ni s \mapsto \sigma_s(S_s^\pm) \in \sP \) if \( J \subset (\min \{\beta^t, \beta^t\}, \min \{\beta^t, \beta^t\}) \)) has the form \( s \mapsto \sP(s) \) with \( |W|(\sP \cup \sP \cup \{\ell\})(s) > 0 \) for every \( s \in J \) and for all \( x \in \sP, y \in \sP \) and \( s \in J \) we have
\[
[x, \ell](s) \leq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad [y, \ell](s) > 0 \quad \text{if} \quad J \subset (\beta^t, b),
[x, \ell](s) \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad [y, \ell](s) < 0 \quad \text{if} \quad J \subset (b, a).
\]
Applying Theorem 4.2 this gives the required conclusion.
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