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Abstract

In this paper, we deal with flat surfaces of finite analytic type with two distinct Jenkins-Strebel directions. We show that such a flat surface is characterized by decomposition into parallelograms which consists of informations of angles, moduli, and neighboring structure similar to origami. The structure similar to origami plays a role of an invariant under affine deformations and we can characterize the Veech group of flat surface of this kind combinatorially.
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1 Introduction

In this paper we consider structures of Riemann surfaces of finite analytic type. Complex structures and quadratic differentials on a surface form the Teichmüller space and its tangent space. A pair of them define a flat structure (Veech’s \( \mathcal{F} \)-structure [13]), under which morphisms are defined to be locally affine. Affine deformations of flat structure form a holomorphic geometric disk embedded in the Teichmüller space, called a Teichmüller disk. Flat structures are extremal in the sense of the Teichmüller theorem which says that every point in Teichmüller space is represented by affine deformation with its dilatation minimal. The Teichmüller space consists of Teichmüller disks which are disjoint except for center. The Veech group of flat structure is a group of derivatives of affine self deformations of the
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surface. It determines how the Teichmüller disk is projected into the moduli space. When such deformations exist enough the projected images form an algebraic curve called a Teichmüller curve.

An (oriented) origami, introduced by Lochak [10], is a combinatorial object defining a Riemann surface with special flat structure. The surface is given by gluing edges of finitely many unit squares in ‘origami rule’ and the flat structure is given by lifting the one of unit square on a plane. Each point in the Teichmüller disk can be seen as the surface given by deforming unit squares of origami by the parameter. Schmithüsen [14] proved that the affine group of an origami can be identified with a subgroup of the automorphism group of the free group $F_2$ and this observation gives a computable characterization of the Veech group as a subgroup of $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ of finite index. So the flat structure of an origami always induces a Teichmüller curve and it is arithmetic by the Belyi theorem. Möller [12] proved that the Teichmüller curves of origamis are geometric components of a Hurwitz space defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ and the action of the absolute Galois group is inherited to origamis. Under this action origamis play a role similar to dessins d’enfants. Origamis have been studied in the context of Teichmüller theory and number theory. (See for instance [6], [7], [8], and [13].)

In this paper we consider more general case, where the quadratic differential is non Abelian like non-oriented origamis [12]. In the cases of non-oriented origamis, we can apply Schmithüsen’s method to calculate certain subgroup of the Veech groups of finite index as we presented them in section 3.1. To obtain the Veech groups themselves, we have to deal with the geometry of the metric induced by a flat structure. Since affine maps preserve the condition of curves being locally line segments, the geodesics are mapped to geodesics. Further variations of the modulus of a parallelogram under affine maps can be seen as a certain scalar multiple. They lead to relations between the Veech group and the cylinders which consist of parallel geodesics for a flat surface.

Two finite Jenkins-Strebel directions of a flat surface induce a unique decomposition of it into finite parallelograms given as intersections of cylinders of those directions. As we will state in section 3.3 there is an action of $F_2$ to the signed parallelograms defined by geodesics of those directions and it gives a structure how the parallelograms neighbor. We call a pair of it and moduli ratio of parallelograms an ‘extended origami’, which plays a role of invariant under affine maps up to translations of the flat structure.

In section 3.4 we will see that the original surface is uniquely determined by P-decomposition (‘P’ means ‘parallelograms’) of surface into two directions which consists of a pair of angles, a modulus of one parallelogram, and an isomorphism class of extended origami. Variations of a P-decomposition of flat surface under affine deformations can be seen as actions of their derivatives to it. The existence of affine maps of certain derivative is determined by the correspondence between initial P-decomposition and terminal one.

For a flat surface $(R, \phi)$ we denote the set of Jenkins-Strebel directions of it by $J(R, \phi)$, the Veech group of it by $\Gamma(R, \phi)$, and the P-decomposition of it into direction $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$ with a set $V$ of marked point by $P(R, \phi, (\theta_1, \theta_2), V)$. With these notations we conclude as follows.
**Theorem.** Let \((R, \phi)\) be a flat surface of finite analytic type with two distinct Jenkins-Strebel directions \(\theta_1, \theta_2 \in J(R, \phi)\). \(A \in \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})\) belongs to \(\Gamma(R, \phi)\) if and only if \(A\theta_1, A\theta_2\) belongs to \(J(R, \phi)\) and \(A \cdot P(R, \phi, (\theta_1, \theta_2), \partial R)\) is isomorphic to \(P(R, \phi, (A\theta_1, A\theta_2), \partial R)\).
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### 2 Flat structures and origamis

#### 2.1 Flat structures and Veech groups

Let \(R\) be a Riemann surface of finite analytic type \((g,n)\) with \(3g - 3 + n > 0\). First we give some definitions related with the flat structures [15] of Riemann surfaces, which are always defined by their quadratic differentials. We present some definitions and properties describing ‘an affine transformation of a flat structure’ in the Teichmüller space. For details, see [2], [5] for instance.

**Definition 2.1.** Let \(R_i\) \((i = 1, 2)\) be Riemann surfaces homeomorphic to \(R\).

(a) A homeomorphism \(f : R \rightarrow R_1\) is quasiconformal mapping if \(f\) has locally integrable distributional derivatives \(f_z, f_{\overline{z}}\) and there exists \(k < 1\) such that \(|f_{\overline{z}}| < k|f_z|\) holds almost everywhere.

(b) We say two quasiconformal mapping \(f_i : R \rightarrow R_i\) \((i = 1, 2)\) are Teichmüller equivalent if there is a conformal map \(h : R_1 \rightarrow R_2\) homotopic to \(f_2 \circ f_1^{-1} : R_1 \rightarrow R_2\).

(c) We define the Teichmüller space \(\mathcal{T}(R)\) of Riemann surface \(R\) as the space of Teichmüller equivalence classes of quasiconformal mappings from \(R\).

(d) We define the mapping class group \(\text{Mod}(R)\) by the group of homotopy classes of quasiconformal self-mapings on \(R\) and the moduli space \(M(R)\) by the quotient space \(\mathcal{T}(R)/\text{Mod}(R)\).

**Definition 2.2.** A Beltrami differential \(\mu\) on \(R\) is a tensor on \(R\) whose restriction to each chart \((U, z)\) on \(R\) is of the form \(\mu(z)dz/dz\) where \(\mu\) is a measurable function on \(z(U)\).

We define a norm of a Beltrami differential \(\mu\) by the essential supremum of \(|\mu(z)|\) where \((U, z)\) runs all charts on \(R\) and \(\mu\) is locally represented as above definition. A Beltrami differential whose norm is less than 1 is called a Beltrami coefficient and we denote the space of Beltrami coefficients on \(R\) by \(B(R)\). From the measurable Riemann mapping theorem we see that for any \(\mu \in B(R)\) there exists a unique quasiconformal mapping from \(R\) whose Beltrami coefficient \(\mu_f\) equals to \(\mu\). So we define \(\Phi : B(R) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(R)\) by \(\Phi(\mu) := [f]\) where \(\mu = \mu_f\).
**Definition 2.3.** A holomorphic quadratic differential $\phi$ on $R$ is a tensor on $R$ whose restriction to each chart $(U, z)$ on $R$ is of the form $\phi(z)dz^2$ where $\phi$ is a holomorphic function on $U$.

Let $p_0 \in R$ be a regular point of $\phi$ and $(U, z)$ be a chart around $p_0$. Then $\phi$ defines a natural coordinate ($\phi$-coordinate) $\zeta(p) = \int_{p_0}^{p} \sqrt{\phi(z)}dz$ on $U$, on which $\phi = d\zeta^2$. $\phi$-coordinates give an atlas on $R^* = R \setminus \text{Crit}(\phi)$ whose any coordinate transformation is of the form $\zeta \mapsto \pm \zeta + c$ ($c \in \mathbb{C}$). Such a structure, which is a maximal atlas whose any coordinate transformation consists of half-turn and translation is called a flat structure on $R^*$. A flat structure (or such an atlas) on $R^*$ determines a holomorphic quadratic differential $\phi = d\zeta^2$ on $R$. We define a norm of a quadratic differential by the surface integral on $R$ with the natural coordinates and denote by $\| \cdot \|$. The space $A(R)$ of quadratic differential of finite norm on $R$ is known to be a vector space of complex dimension $3g - 3 + n$. In the following we take $\phi \in A(R)$ and assume $R = R^*$ by puncturing at the points of the discrete set $\text{Crit}(\phi) \subset R$ if necessary.

**Remark.** For a Riemann surface $R_0$ of type $g, n$ the Teichmüller space $\mathcal{T}(R_0)$ is a complex manifold of dimension $3g - 3 + n$ which is homeomorphic to the unit ball in $\mathbb{C}^{3g - 3 + n}$. For $[R, f] \in \mathcal{T}(R_0)$, $A(R)$ is known to be the tangent space $T_{[R, f]}\mathcal{T}(R_0)$ which is a complex vector space of dimension $3g - 3 + n$.

Fix a holomorphic quadratic differential $\phi$ on $R$ satisfying $\|\phi\| = 1$. It gives the Beltrami differential $\bar{\phi}/|\phi|$ whose restriction to each chart $(U, z)$ is $\phi(z)/|\phi(z)| \cdot dz/dz$. For each $t \in \mathbb{D}$, $t\phi/|\phi| \in B(R)$ and thus the map $\mathbb{D} \owns t \mapsto [f_t] \in \mathcal{T}(R)$ is well-defined. In fact this defines a holomorphic, isometric embedding with respect to the Poincaré metric and the Teichmüller metric (see [4]). We call this embedding $\iota_\phi : \mathbb{D} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{T}(R)$ the Teichmüller embedding and its image $\Delta_\phi = \iota_\phi(\mathbb{D})$ the Teichmüller disk.

**Definition 2.4 ([2]).** Let $R, \phi$ be as above.

(a) For $A = \left( \begin{array}{cc} a & b \\ c & d \end{array} \right) \in SL(2, \mathbb{R})$, we define $T_A : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ by $\zeta = \xi + i\eta \mapsto (a\xi + c\eta) + i(b\xi + d\eta)$. (The derivative of $T_A$ equals $A$.)

(b) A quasiconformal homeomorphism $f : R \to R$ is called an affine map on $(R, \phi)$ if $f$ is locally affine (i.e. of the form $f(\zeta) = T_A(\zeta) + k$) with respect to the $\phi$-coordinates. We denote the group of all affine map on $(R, \phi)$ by $\text{Aff}^+(R, \phi)$.

(c) For each $f \in \text{Aff}^+(R, \phi)$, the local derivative $A$ is globally defined up to a factor $\{\pm I\}$ independent of coordinates of $u_\phi$. We call the map $D : \text{Aff}^+(R, \phi) \to PSL(2, \mathbb{R}) : f \mapsto A$ the derivative map and its image $\Gamma(R, \phi) := D(\text{Aff}^+(X, \phi))$ the (projective) Veech group.

(d) We call a pair $(R, \phi)$ of Riemann surface $R$ of finite analytic type and an integrable quadratic differential $\phi$ on $R$ a flat surface. We say flat surfaces $(R, \phi), (S, \psi)$ are isomorphic if there is a conformal map $f : R \to S$ which is locally affine with respect to $\phi$-coordinates and $\psi$-coordinates with derivative $[I] \in PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$. 
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Remark. For isomorphic flat surfaces \((R, \phi), (S, \psi)\), \(R\) and \(S\) are biholomorphic and the quadratic differential \(\phi' = f^* \psi \in A(R \setminus \text{Crit}(\phi))\) coincides with the restriction of \(\phi\). \(\phi'\) is extended to \(R\) to be equal with \(\phi\) and thus the critical sets \(\text{Crit}(\phi), \text{Crit}(\psi)\) correspond under the isomorphism.

The moduli space \(M(R)\) of \(R\) is a quotient space of the Teichmüller space \(\mathcal{T}(R)\) under the action of the mapping class group \(\text{Mod}(R)\). The action of \(f \in \text{Mod}(R)\) is defined by \(\rho_f : \mathcal{T}(R) \to \mathcal{T}(R) : [g] \mapsto [gf \circ f^{-1}]\). In fact this action is properly discontinuous and actions which preserve the Teichmüller disk are characterized by following lemma.

Lemma 2.5 ([2, Theorem1]). Let \(R, \phi\) as above and \(f \in \text{Mod}(R)\). \(\rho_f\) maps \(\Delta_\phi\) itself if and only if \(f \in \text{Aff}^+(R, \phi)\). Furthermore in this case, 
\[
\rho_f(\Phi(\tau \phi/|\phi|)) = \Phi(D(f)^*(\tau \phi/|\phi|)) \quad \text{for each } \tau \in \mathbb{H} \cong \mathbb{D}.
\]

Remark. If the Abelian differential \(\sqrt{\phi}\) (whose restriction to a chart \((U, z)\) is \(\sqrt{\phi(z)dz}\)) is well-defined on \(R\) then we can take the subatlas of \(u_\phi\) so that all coordinate transformation is of the form \(\zeta \mapsto \zeta + c\) \((c \in \mathbb{C})\). We call such a structure translation structure and such \(\phi\) Abelian.

In Abelian case the derivative map is well-defined onto \(SL(2, \mathbb{R})\) and the Veech group \(\Gamma(R, \phi)\) is defined to be a subgroup of \(SL(2, \mathbb{R})\). We denote the projected class of each \(A \in SL(2, \mathbb{R})\) by \(\bar{A}\) and the projected Veech group by \(\bar{\Gamma}(R, \phi)\) in Abelian case.

### 2.2 Origamis

Origamis [10] are combinatorial objects which induce "square-tiled" translation structures, whose Veech groups can be characterized as a projected image pf certain subgroup of \(\text{Aut}(F_2)\). We can specify the Veech group by using the characterization and Schmithüsen’s method [13].

They are also studied in the context of the Galois action on combinatorial objects as well as dessins d’enfants, a crucial result is given by Möller [12] and some of study is described in [8].

**Definition 2.6.** An origami-rule for \(d \geq 1\) cells is a pairing for all edges of \(d\) copies of the euclidian unit square cells satisfying following conditions.

(a) Each right edge corresponds to a left edge.

(b) Each upper edge corresponds to a lower edge.

(c) When we identify corresponding edges by translation the resulting surface \(R\) is connected.
Given an origami-rule, we have a covering of a torus since the identifications constructing \( R \) is compatible with the ones constructing a torus \( E \) (the trivial origami). This covering is unramified except over the vertex of \( E \). We denote the branch point of this covering by \( \infty \in E \) and let \( E^* := E \setminus \{ \infty \} \), \( R^* := R \setminus p^{-1}(\infty) \).

**Definition 2.7.** An origami is a topological covering \( p : R \to E \) from a connected oriented surface \( R \) to the torus \( E \) ramified at most over \( \infty \in E \). We say two origamis \( O_j = (p_j : R_j \to E) \) \((j = 1, 2)\) are equivalent if there exists a homeomorphism \( \varphi : R_1 \to R_2 \) such that \( p_1 = p_2 \circ \varphi \).

**Example 2.8.** The origami shown in following figure is called \( L \)-shaped origami \( L(2, 3) \). The surface \( R^* \) is of type \((2, 2)\) and Schmithüsen [14] showed that the Veech group of \( L(2, 3) \) is a non congruence group.

By the general theory of covering maps, we have following characterizations for an origami similar to a dessin d’enfants. See [7] for details.

**Proposition 2.9.** An origami of degree \( d \) is up to equivalence uniquely determined by following.

(a) An origami-rule for \( d \) cells.

(b) A finite oriented graph \((V, E)\) such that \(|V| = d\) and every vertex has precisely two incoming edges and two outgoing edges, with both of them consist of edges labeled with \( x \) and \( y \).

(c) A monodromy map \( m : F_2 \to S_d \) up to conjugation in \( S_d \).

(d) A subgroup \( H \) of \( F_2 \) of index \( d \) up to conjugation in \( F_2 \).

**Remark.** We denote two generators of \( F_2 \) by \( x \) and \( y \). In Proposition 2.9, \( \sigma_x := m(x) \) (resp. \( \sigma_y := m(y) \)) means how cells in the origami are placed in horizontal (resp. vertical) direction and \( H < F_2 \) corresponds to the fundamental group of \( R^* \) embedded into \( F_2 \) which is isomorphic to the fundamental group of \( E^* \).

For an origami \( O = (p : R \to E) \), we have a cell decomposition of \( R \) by squares. The number of faces equals to \( d = \deg(p) \) since \( p \) is unramified on \( \mathcal{F} \), the number of edges equals to \( 2d \), and by Euler’s formula we have the genus \( g \) of \( R \) as \( g = 1 + \frac{d-n}{2} \) where \( n = |p^{-1}(\infty)| \).

By using the natural coordinates given by unit squares we have the Abelian differential \( dz \) on \( E \) and \( \phi = p^*dz \) on \( R \). \( \phi \) is ramified over at most the points in \( p^{-1}(\infty) \) and determines a translation structure on \( R^* \).
Lemma 2.10. For any $f \in \text{Aff}^+(\mathbb{H}, \psi)$ there exists $A \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ and $b \in \Lambda(1, i)$ such that $\text{aff}(f) = (z \mapsto Az + b)$. Now $A = D(f)$ and $\Gamma(R^*, \phi)$ is a subgroup of $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$.

For calculating the Veech group, the next lemma plays main role. We denote the automorphism group of $F_2$ by $\text{Aut}(F_2)$ and let $\text{Inn}(F_2) := \{e^* := (w \mapsto c^{-1}wc) \mid c \in F_2\}(\cong F_2)$.

Lemma 2.11 ([14, Lemma 2.8]). Let $\mathcal{O} = (p : R \to E)$ be an origami and $\mathbb{H}$ be the universal covering space of $E^*$. There exists a subgroup $\text{Aut}^+(F_2)$ of $\text{Aut}(F_2)$ and following exact (in horizontal direction) and commutative diagram.

$$
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & \longrightarrow & \text{Gal}(\mathbb{H}/E^*) & \longrightarrow & \text{Aff}^+(\mathbb{H}, \psi) & \overset{D}{\longrightarrow} & SL_2(\mathbb{Z}) & \longrightarrow & 1 \\
& & \scriptstyle \cong & \scriptstyle (a) & \scriptstyle \ast \scriptstyle \cong & \scriptstyle (b) & \scriptstyle \cong & \\
1 & \longrightarrow & \text{Inn}(F_2) & \longrightarrow & \text{Aut}^+(F_2) & \longrightarrow & \text{Out}^+(F_2) & \longrightarrow & 1
\end{array}
$$

Furthermore, the subgroup $\text{Aff}^+(H) < \text{Aut}^+(F_2)$ which corresponds to $\text{Aff}^+(R^*, \phi) < \text{Aff}^+(\mathbb{H}, \psi)$ in this diagram coincides with $\text{Stab}_{\text{Aut}^+(F_2)}(H)$.

proof. We have $\text{Gal}(\mathbb{H}/E^*) \cong \pi_1(E^*) \cong F_2 \cong \text{Inn}(F_2)$ and each of $x, y \in \text{Gal}(\mathbb{H}/E^*)$ is an affine translation. Each $f \in \text{Aff}^+(\mathbb{H}, \psi)$ has an action to $\text{Gal}(\mathbb{H}/E^*)$ defined by $f_* : w \mapsto f \circ w \circ f^{-1}$. $* : f \mapsto f_*$ defines a homomorphism into $\text{Aut}(F_2)$ and let $\text{Aut}^+(F_2)$ be the image. Then we can see that diagram (a) commutes immediately. For each $w \in F_2$ we define $\#_x w$ (resp. $\#_y w$) by the number of $x$ (resp. $y$) in $w = w(x, y)$, with $x^{-1}$ (resp. $y^{-1}$) counted as $-1$. Then we see that

$$
\hat{\beta}(\sigma) := \begin{pmatrix}
\#_x \sigma(x) \\
\#_y \sigma(x) \\
\#_y \sigma(y)
\end{pmatrix}
\quad (\sigma \in \text{Aut}^+(F_2))
$$

defines a homomorphism from $\text{Aut}^+(F_2)$ onto $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ whose kernel is $\text{Inn}(F_2)$, hence $\text{Out}^+(F_2) := \text{Aut}^+(F_2)/\text{Inn}(F_2) \cong SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$. By simple calculation using fixed developing map on $(\mathbb{H}, \psi)$, the commutativity of (b) follows and we see that $*$ is an isomorphism. For the latter claim, we note that $\text{Aff}^+(R^*, \phi) < \text{Aff}^+(\mathbb{H}, \psi)$ is the subgroup of lifts of affine maps on $(R, \phi)$. Each $f \in \text{Aff}^+(\mathbb{H}, \psi)$ is in $\text{Aff}^+(R^*, \phi)$ if and only if it descends via $u : \mathbb{H} \to R^*$ or equivalently $f$ is invariant under the action of $\text{Gal}(\mathbb{H}/R^*) \cong H$. Hence we have the claim. □

Corollary 2.12 ([14 Corollary 2.9]). $\Gamma(R^*, \phi)$ is a subgroup of $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ of finite index.

proof. We have $\Gamma(R^*, \phi) = \hat{\beta}(\text{Stab}_{\text{Aut}^+(F_2)}(H))$ by Lemma 2.11. There is 1-1 correspondence between representatives of $\text{Aut}^+(F_2)/\text{Stab}_{\text{Aut}^+(F_2)}(H)$ and their images of $H$ in $F_2$. Since an automorphism does not change an
index of subgroup, they are equivalent to subgroups of $F_2$ of same finite index. By proposition 2.9, we see that such subgroups are origamis of same degree and hence they are finite.

**Remark.** A subgroup $\Gamma < SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ of finite index gives a finite covering $\mathbb{H}/\Gamma \to \mathbb{H}/PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ unramified over the cusps of $\mathbb{H}/PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})$. We fill in cusps and get a meromorphic function which is ramified over at most $i, e^{\pi i/3}, \infty \in \hat{C}$. Hence Corollary 2.12 implies that the translation structure for an origami always gives a Teichmüller curve which is a Belyi curve. The complex structure of Teichmüller curve of an origami can be written by its dessin d’enfants.

To find the Veech group of an origami, we calculate a subgroup of $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ of finite index which is characterized by Lemma 2.11. Here we note that $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ is generated by two elements

$$T := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad S := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

in fact such a subgroup can be calculated in general cases. The method for calculation is based on the Reidemeister-Schreier method [11]. It is arranged to inductive algorithm as referred in Schmithüsen’s paper [14].

**Definition 2.13.** Let $G = \langle s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_k \rangle$ be finitely generated group and $G_1 < G$ be a subgroup of index $d$. We take generators $\{ s_i \}$ of $G$ so that for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$ $s_i = s_i'^{-1}$ for some $i'$. We assume that for any element in $G_0$ we can see whether it belongs to $G_1$ or not. We define $g_m, r_n \in G$ for $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ as in the following.

1. Let $g_0 := 1_G, r_1 := 1_G, m_{1,1} = 0$, and $n_{1,1} = 1$.
2. Assume that $m_{i,1}, n_{i,1} \in \mathbb{Z}$ are given. We give definitions inductively on $i, j$ as follows:
   
   (a) Assume that $g_m, r_n \in G$ are given for $0 \leq m \leq m_{i,j}, 1 \leq n \leq n_{i,j}$.
   
   (We start from $j = 1$.)

   (b) Check whether there exists $0 \leq m \leq m_{i,j}$ such that $r_i s_j r_m^{-1} \in G_1$ or not. Remark that if such $m$ exists then it is unique.

   (c) If such $m$ exists, we define $m_{i,j+1} := m_{i,j} + 1$, $n_{i,j+1} := n_{i,j}$, and $g_{m_{i,j+1}} := r_i s_j r_m^{-1}$. Otherwise we define $m_{i,j+1} := m_{i,j}$, $n_{i,j+1} := n_{i,j} + 1$, and $r_{n_{i,j+1}} := r_i s_j$.

   (d) If $j < k$ we go back to (a) for next $j$. Otherwise we quit to go back for $j$ and define $m_{i+1,1} := m_{i,k+1}$, $n_{i+1,1} := n_{i,k+1}$.

   (e) If $i < n_{i+1,1}$ we go back to (a) for next $i$ and restart from $j = 1$.

   Otherwise we finish the definition and let $M := m_{i+1,1}$, $N := n_{i+1,1}$.

3. If $M, N$ as in (e) exist, we define $Gen := \{ g_m \}_{1 \leq m \leq M}, Rep := \{ r_n \}_{1 \leq n \leq N}$.

**Proposition 2.14.** In above definition $M, N$ certainly exist and $Gen, Rep$ are well-defined. Furthermore, $Gen$ generates $G_1$ and $Rep$ gives a complete system of right coset representatives of $G/G_1$. 
The proof is all the same as [14, Remark 3.4] in which $G = PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ and $G_1$ is the Veech group of an origami, given by induction with respect to the number of representable elements in $G$. We note that in this case it is sufficient to take generators as $G = PSL(2, \mathbb{Z}) = \langle \hat{T}, \hat{S} \rangle$ since we have the relation $SS = STSTST = -I$.

For the cases of the Veech group of an origami, we can apply Proposition 2.14 from Corollary 2.12 and the characterization of the Veech group which we give next.

For $T, S \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ we define $\gamma_T, \gamma_S \in \text{Aut}^+(F_2)$ by $\gamma_T : (x, y) \mapsto (x, xy)$, $\gamma_S : (x, y) \mapsto (y, x^{-1})$. Then we have $\hat{\beta}(\gamma_T) = T$ and $\hat{\beta}(\gamma_S) = S$, hence for all $A \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ we can take $\gamma_A \in \text{Aut}^+(F_2)$ satisfying $\hat{\beta}(\gamma_A) = A$. Any $\gamma \in \hat{\beta}^{-1}(A)$ can be written by $\gamma = c^\ast \gamma_A$ for some $c \in F_2$ and to check whether $\gamma$ fixes $H < F_2$ it is sufficient for $c$ to run representatives of $F_2/H$.

Now we have following application of the latter part of Lemma 2.11.

**Corollary 2.15** (to Lemma 2.11). For a subgroup $H < F_2$ of finite index, fix following finite sets: $\text{Gen}^H := \{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_N \mid \langle \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_N \rangle = H \}$ and $\text{Rep}^H := \{c_1, \ldots, c_d \mid \forall w \in F_2 \exists j \text{ s.t. } wc_j^{-1} \in H \}$. 

$A \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ belongs to $\hat{\beta}(\text{Aff}^+(H))$ if and only if there exists $c \in \text{Rep}^H$ such that $c^\ast \gamma_A(\lambda) \in H$ for all $\lambda \in \text{Gen}^H$.

**Remark 2.16.**

(a) Since both of $\text{Rep}^H, \text{Gen}^H$ are finite we can judge in finite time whether each $A \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ satisfies the condition in Corollary 2.15. Finally we can apply Proposition 2.14 to specify $\Gamma(R^*, \phi)$. By checking whether $-A \in \Gamma(R^*, \phi)$ for each $A \in \text{Gen}$ we obtain $\Gamma(R^*, \phi)$.

(b) To get the dessin $D$ of the Teichmüller curve of an origami $\mathcal{O} = (p : R \rightarrow E)$, we calculate the monodromy group $G_D = \langle \sigma_0, \sigma_\infty \rangle$ for the covering $f : \mathbb{H}/\Gamma(R) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}/PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})$. Since there is an 1-1 correspondence between representatives of $\Gamma(R)/PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ and edges of $D$ we can consider $G_D$ to act to indices of $\text{Rep}$. When $r_n T$ are defined to be $r_{n'} \in \text{Rep}$ for some $r_n \in \text{Rep}$, then $n'$ is next to $n$ in a cycle of $\sigma_\infty$, which corresponds to the monodromy around the fixed point of the action $T : z \mapsto z + 1$. On the other hand if $r_n T r_n^{-1}$ is added to $\text{Gen}$ for some $\hat{D} \in \text{Rep}$, then the cycle of $\sigma_\infty$ starting from $n$ ends at $n'$. We can see the same for $S$ and $\sigma_0$. Thus we can calculate $\mathcal{D}$ at the same time.

(c) We can also apply proposition 2.14 for the case of a fundamental group $H < F_2$ of an origami. In this case we only use a monodromy group of an origami. For each element $w \in F_2$ we can see whether $w \in H$ by checking whether the monodromy $m(w) \in S_d$ fixes the base cell labeled with 1. Since any horizontal (resp. vertical) path going right (resp. up) comes back from left (resp. below) for an origami, it is sufficient to take $x$ and $y$ of $F_2$ as generators to specify $H$. 
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3 Extended origamis

3.1 Non-oriented origamis

Consider $d \geq 1$ Euclidian unit squares colored with black or white. Given a pair of such a coloring and an origami of degree $d$, we define the surface $R$ as in the following.

- We pair edges of cells by the origami-rule with “upper” and “lower” for black cells alternated.
- We identify edges paired with opposite side by translation and ones paired with same side by half-turn and translation.

Using natural coordinates given by squares we have a quadratic differential $\phi = dz^2$ on $R$. We see that $R$ is compact, $\phi \in A(R)$, and $\phi$ is ramified over at most the vertices of squares. Unlike origamis the valencies of vertices are not always multiple of 4, hence $(R, \phi)$ could be non-Abelian. We call such a flat surface $(R, \phi)$ a non-oriented origami.

For a non-oriented origami, an analytic configuration of local branch of $\sqrt{\phi}$ gives a double cover $\pi : \hat{R} \to R$ and an Abelian differential $\hat{\phi}$ on $\hat{R}$. $\hat{R}$ can be constructed by taking two copies of $R$ and gluing them as follows.

- right and left edges are glued with their original opponent.
- upper and lower edges whose neighbors have same color are glued with their original opponent.
- upper and lower edges whose neighbors have different colors are glued with the opponent in another copy of $R$.

We see that the difference between the way of gluing to construct $R$ and an origami-rule is canceled by this process, we have $\hat{R}$ as an origami. $\pi$ is defined to map each point in a copy to the original point in $R$, which is unramified except on vertices of squares. Note that the flat structure of $(\hat{R}, \hat{\phi}^2)$ is the lift of the one of $(R, \phi)$ and Gal$(\hat{R}/R)$ is generated by the map $\varphi_0$ sending each point in $\hat{R}$ to the point in another copy of $R$, which is an affine maps on $(R, \phi)$ with derivative $I$.

Let $u : \mathbb{H} \to \hat{R}^*$ be the universal covering and $\psi = (\pi \circ u)^* \phi = (u^* \hat{\phi})^2$. As same as origamis we can take a developing map $\text{dev}$ on $(\mathbb{H}, \psi)$ so that $\text{dev}(\mathbb{H}) = \mathbb{C} \setminus \Lambda(1, i)$ and the following holds.
Lemma 3.1. For any $f \in \text{Aff}^+(\mathbb{H}, \phi)$ there exists $\hat{A} \in PSL(2,\mathbb{Z})$ and $b \in \Lambda(1, i)$ such that $\text{aff}(f)$ is of the form $z \mapsto \pm Az + b$. In particular $\Gamma(R^*, \phi)$ is a subgroup of $PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})$.

To see the Veech group $\Gamma(R^*, \phi)$ more precisely, we define the subgroup of $\text{Aff}^+(\mathbb{H}, \psi)$ which is compatible with the double covering $\pi : \hat{R} \to R$.

Definition 3.2.

$$\text{Aff}^+_\pi(R^*, \phi) := \{ f \in \text{Aff}^+(R^*, \phi) \mid f \text{ can be lifted via } \pi \} < \text{Aff}^+(\mathbb{H}, \psi)$$

$$\text{Aff}^+_{\pi} (\hat{R}^*, \hat{\phi}) := \{ f \in \text{Aff}^+(\hat{R}^*, \hat{\phi}) \mid f \text{ descends via } \pi \} < \text{Aff}^+(\mathbb{H}, \psi)$$

$$\Gamma_\pi(R^*, \phi) := D(\text{Aff}^+_\pi (R^*, \phi)) = D(\text{Aff}^+_{\pi} (\hat{R}^*, \hat{\phi})) < PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})$$

$$\text{Aff}^+_{\pi} (H) := \Omega(\text{Aff}^+_\pi (R^*, \phi)) = \{ f_\ast \in \text{Aut}^+(F_2) \mid f \in \text{Aff}^+_{\pi} (\hat{R}^*, \hat{\phi}) \}$$

Lemma 3.3. Fix $p \in \hat{R}$ and let $H < F_2$ be a subgroup of finite index isomorphic to $\pi_1(\hat{R}^*, p)$. Let $p' \in \hat{R}$ be the element with $p' \neq p$ and $\pi(p') = \pi(p)$ and $c_0 \in F_2$ be an element corresponding to a path on $\hat{R}$ joining $p, p'$. Then $f \in \text{Aff}^+(\hat{R}, \hat{\phi})$ descends via $\pi$ if and only if $[f_\ast(c_0)] = [c_0]$ and $[\sigma \circ \gamma_{-1}] = [\gamma_{-1} \circ f_\ast]$ on $F_2/H$. In particular,

$$\text{Aff}^+_{\pi} (H) = \{ \sigma \in \text{Aff}^+(H) \mid [f_\ast(c_0)] = [c_0], [\sigma \circ \gamma_{-1}] = [\gamma_{-1} \circ \sigma] \text{ on } F_2/H \}.$$ 

**proof.** $f \in \text{Aff}^+(\hat{R}, \hat{\phi})$ descends via $\pi$ if and only if there is an isomorphism $\Phi$ of $\text{Gal}(\hat{R}/R)$ such that $f \circ \varphi = \Phi(\varphi) \circ f$ for any $\varphi \in \text{Gal}(\hat{R}/R)$. Since $\text{Gal}(\hat{R}/R) = \langle \varphi_0 \rangle$ and $\varphi_0^{-1} = \varphi_0$ it suffices to show that $f \circ \varphi_0 = \varphi_0 \circ f \cdots (\ast)$. The map $\varphi_0 \ast \text{Aut}^+(F_2)$ has the form $F_2 \ni w \mapsto c_0^\ast \gamma_{-1}(w)$ and it stabilizes $H$. So $\varphi_0 \ast \text{Aut}^+(H)$ and $\varphi_0 \ast \text{projects to an automorphism of}$ $F_2/H$. Now $(\ast)$ is characterized as the condition $[f_\ast \circ \varphi_0 \ast] = [\varphi_0 \circ f_\ast]$ on $F_2/H \cdots (\ast')$.

With $[1_{F_2}] \in F_2/H$ we see $[f_\ast(c_0)] = [c_0]$. For any $w \in F_2$, we have $[f_\ast(c_0^\ast \gamma_{-1}(w))] = ([f_\ast(c_0)]^\ast f_\ast(\gamma_{-1}(w))) = [c_0^\ast f_\ast(\gamma_{-1}(w))]$ and $(\ast')$ implies that $[f_\ast \circ \gamma_{-1}(w)] = [\gamma_{-1} \circ f_\ast(w)]$. Conversely if $[f_\ast(c_0)] = [c_0]$ and $[\sigma \circ \gamma_{-1}] = [\gamma_{-1} \circ \sigma]$ on $F_2/H$ we see $(\ast')$. So we have the claim. \[ \square \]

We want to know about the index of $\Gamma(R^*, \phi)$ in $PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})$. By above lemma elements in $\Gamma_\pi(R^*, \phi)$ are characterized by two conditions, to stabilize $[c_0] \in F_2/H$ and to commute with $\gamma_{-1} \in \text{Aut}^+(F_2)$.

Definition 3.4. Let $C_\sigma := \sigma^{-1} \circ \gamma_{-1} \circ \sigma \circ \gamma_{-1}$ for each $\sigma \in \text{Aut}^+(F_2)$. For each subgroup $H < F_2$ of finite index we define

$$\text{Aff}^+_0(H) := \{ \sigma \in \text{Aff}^+(H) \mid C_\sigma(H) = H \}, \text{Aff}^+_{1}(H) := \{ \sigma \in \text{Aff}^+_0(H) \mid C_\sigma = \text{id} \text{ on } F_2/H \}, \text{and } \text{Aff}^+_{2}(H) := \{ \sigma \in \text{Aff}^+(H) \mid C_\sigma = \text{id} \text{ on } F_2 \}.$$ 

We denote by $\text{Stab}([c_0])$ the stabilizer of $[c_0] \in F_2/H$ in $\text{Aff}^+_0(H)$.

Now we have $\text{Aff}^+_{0}(H) = \text{Aff}^+_{1}(H) \cap \text{Stab}([c_0])$ and following diagram.

$$\text{Aut}^+(F_2) \overset{(a)}{>} \text{Aff}^+(H) \overset{(b)}{>} \text{Aff}^+_0(H) \overset{(c)}{>} \text{Aff}^+_1(H) \overset{(d)}{>} \text{Aff}^+_2(H)$$

$$\text{Stab}([c_0]) \overset{(e)}{>} \text{Aff}^+_\pi(H)$$
We have already seen that the inclusion (a) is finite index in the proof of Corollary 2.12. If \( \sigma \in \text{Aff}^+_0(H) \) then \( C_\sigma \in \text{Aut}^+(F_2) \) defines a bijection \( F_2 / H \to F_2 / H \) which stabilizes \( [1_{F_2}] \). With the assumption that \( H > F_2 \) is finite index we will see that the inclusions (c)(d) are finite index. We point on the inclusion (b) to claim that \( \text{Aff}^+_2(H) < \text{Aut}^+(F_2) \) is finite index.

For each \( \sigma \in \text{Aut}^+(F_2) \) we have \( \beta(C_\sigma) = I \). So Lemma 2.11 says that \( C_\sigma = c_\sigma^* \in \text{Inn}(F_2) \) for some unique \( c_\sigma \in F_2 \). In these notations we have following property.

**Lemma 3.5.** For each \( \sigma, \tau \in \text{Aut}^+(F_2) \) we have following.

(a) \( c_{\rho \sigma} = \sigma^{-1}(c_\rho) \cdot c_\sigma \)

(b) \( c_{\sigma^{-1}} = \sigma(c_{\sigma^{-1}}) \)

(c) \( C_{\rho \sigma^{-1}} = \sigma^{-1} \circ (c_\rho \cdot c_{\sigma^{-1}})^* \circ \sigma \)

**proof.** (a) \( C_{\rho \sigma} = (\tau \circ \sigma)^{-1} \circ \gamma^{-1} \circ (\tau \circ \sigma) \circ \gamma \)

\[ = \sigma^{-1} \circ \tau^{-1} \circ \gamma^{-1} \circ \tau \circ \sigma \circ \gamma \]

\[ = \sigma^{-1} \circ (\tau^{-1} \circ \gamma^{-1} \circ \tau \circ \gamma^{-1}) \circ \sigma \circ (\sigma^{-1} \circ \gamma^{-1} \circ \sigma \circ \gamma^{-1}) \]

\[ = \sigma^{-1} \circ C_\tau \circ \sigma \circ C_\sigma \]

For each \( w \in F_2 \sigma^{-1} \circ C_\tau \circ \sigma \circ C_\sigma \) \( (w) = \sigma^{-1}(c_\tau^{-1} \cdot \sigma(c_\sigma^* w) \cdot c_\tau) \)

\[ = (\sigma^{-1}(c_\tau))^{-1} \cdot (c_\sigma^* w) \cdot \sigma^{-1}(c_\tau) \]

\[ = (\sigma^{-1}(c_\tau)^* \circ c_\sigma)(w) \]

\[ = (\sigma^{-1}(c_\tau) \cdot c_\sigma)^* w. \]

(b) We can see easily from \( c_{\sigma \rho^{-1}} = \sigma(c_\sigma) \cdot c_{\rho^{-1}} \) and \( c_{\rho \sigma^{-1}} = c_{\text{id}} = 1_{F_2} \).

(c) For each \( w \in F_2 \Gamma_{\rho \sigma^{-1}} \)

\[ = (\sigma^{-1}(c_\tau) \cdot c_{\rho^{-1}})^* \]

\[ = (\sigma^{-1}(c_\tau) \cdot c_{\rho^{-1}})^* \]

\[ = (\sigma^{-1}(c_\tau) \cdot c_{\rho^{-1}})^* \]

\[ = (\sigma^{-1}(c_\tau) \cdot c_{\rho^{-1}})^* \]

\[ = (\sigma^{-1}(c_\tau) \cdot c_{\rho^{-1}})^* \]

\[ = \sigma^{-1} \circ (c_\tau \cdot c_{\rho^{-1}})^* \circ \sigma w. \]

**Proposition 3.6.** Let \( H \) be a subgroup of \( F_2 \) of finite index and \( [F_2 : H] = d < \infty. \) Then \( [\text{Aff}^+(H) : \text{Aff}^+_0(H)] \leq 2d \) and in particular \( \Gamma_n(R^*, \phi) \) is a subgroup of \( \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{Z}) \) of finite index.

**proof.** We consider the inclusion between quotient groups \( \text{Aff}^+(H) / \text{Aff}^+_0(H) \) and \( \text{Aff}^+_2(H) / \text{Aff}^+_2(H). \)

By Lemma 3.5 we can define \( \Psi : \text{Aff}^+(H) / \text{Aff}^+_2(H) \to F_2 \) by \( [\sigma] \mapsto c_\sigma \) with the formula \( \sigma^{-1} \circ \Psi([\tau][\sigma^{-1}] = \Psi([\tau]) \Psi([\sigma])^{-1}, \) which implies the injectivity of \( \Psi. \) If we take distinct \( (2d + 1) \) elements in \( \text{Aff}^+(H) / \text{Aff}^+_2(H) \) then so do their \( \Psi \)-images in \( F_2. \) Now some two of them, we denote \( c_\sigma, c_\tau, \) coincide modulo \( H. \) Again by Lemma 3.5 we have \( C_{\rho \sigma^{-1}} = \sigma^{-1} \circ (c_\tau c_{\rho^{-1}})^* \circ \sigma. \)
Thus $C_{\tau\sigma^{-1}}(H) = H$, $[\sigma]$ and $[\tau]$ coincide modulo $\text{Aff}_2^+(H)/\text{Aff}_2^+(H)$, and finally we have the conclusion.

**Corollary 3.7.** $\Gamma(R^*, \phi)$ is a subgroup of $\text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ of finite index.

**Remark 3.8.** For calculating $\Gamma_\pi(R^*, \phi)$ in the way similar to Corollary 2.15, it is not sufficient to judge $\gamma_A \in \text{Aut}^+(F_2)$ for each $A \in \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ up to $\text{Inn}(H)$ but $\text{Aff}_\pi(H) \cap \text{Inn}(F_2)$. Proposition 3.6 implies that $K = \{w \in F_2 \mid w^* \in \text{Aff}_\pi(H) \cap \text{Inn}(F_2)\}$ is a subgroup of $F_2$ of finite index. The elements in $\text{Inn}(K)$ is combinatorially characterized by Lemma 3.3 and $K$ can be specified like $H < F_2$ to which we refer in Remark 2.16. As a result we can calculate $\Gamma_\pi(R^*, \phi)$.

### 3.2 Decompositions with the $\phi$-metric

We go back to general cases. Let $R$ be a Riemann surface of finite analytic type and $\phi \in A(R)$.

The Euclidian metric lifts via $\phi$-coordinates to a flat metric $g(\phi)$ on $R$. We call this metric the $\phi$-metric and geodesics of $g(\phi)$ the $\phi$-geodesics. The $\phi$-geodesics are mapped to the geodesics of the complex plane (i.e. line segments) by the $\phi$-coordinates. Since coordinate transformations of a flat structure do not change the slope of line segment, the slopes of the $\phi$-geodesics are well-defined. For any $\alpha \in S^1$ the metrics $g(\phi), g(\alpha \phi)$ coincide and $\alpha \phi$-coordinates are products of $\phi$-coordinates and $\sqrt{\alpha}$. So any $\phi$-geodesic is a horizontal (slope 0) $\alpha \phi$-geodesic for some $\alpha \in S^1$.

**Definition 3.9.**

(a) The **direction** of a $\phi$-geodesic $\gamma$ is $\theta \in [0, \pi)$ where $\gamma$ is horizontal $e^{2\sqrt{-1}\theta} \phi$-geodesic.

(b) The **$\phi$-cylinder** generated by a $\phi$-geodesic $\gamma$ is the union of all $\phi$-geodesics parallel (with same direction) to $\gamma$. We define the direction of a $\phi$-geodesic by the one of its generator.

(c) $\theta \in [0, \pi)$ is **Jenkins-Strebel direction** of $(R, \phi)$ if almost every point in $R$ lies on some closed $\phi$-geodesic of direction $\theta$. We denote the set of Jenkins-Strebel directions by $J(R, \phi)$.

Note that any Jenkins-Strebel direction of flat surface of finite analytic type is finite, namely there are at most finitely many $\phi$-cylinders of that direction in $R$.

By definition an affine map on $(R, \phi)$ maps all $\phi$-geodesics to $\phi$-geodesics. Let $f \in \text{Aff}^+(R, \phi)$ and $D(f) = \hat{A} = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \in \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})$. Then $f$ maps line segments of direction $\theta \in [0, \pi)$ to line segments of direction $A\theta := \text{arg}(T_A(e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta}))$. Using the lemma in [1, p.56] we can see that $f$ maps a $\phi$-cylinder of modulus $M$ to a $\phi$-cylinder of modulus $M \sqrt{\frac{a^2 + c^2}{a^2 + c^2}}$. Since the list of moduli of $\phi$-cylinders of one direction are uniquely determined up to order, we have following.
Lemma 3.10. Let $[M_1^\theta, M_2^\theta, ..., M_n^\theta] \in \mathbb{R}_+ P^n \cap 1$ be the ratio of moduli of the $\phi$-cylinders of each direction $\theta \in J(R, \phi)$ in ascending order. If $\hat{A} \in PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$ belongs to $\Gamma(R, \phi)$, then for any direction $\theta \in J(R, \phi)$ following holds.

1. $A\theta \in J(R, \phi)$
2. $n_{A\theta} = n_\theta$ (if $n$)
3. $[M_1^{A\theta}, M_2^{A\theta}, ..., M_n^{A\theta}] = [M_1^\theta, M_2^\theta, ..., M_n^\theta] \in \mathbb{R}_+ P^{n-1}$

Next we add an assumption that $\phi$ has two finite Jenkins-Strebel directions $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in J(R, \phi)$. We can assume $\theta_1 \leq \theta_2$ without loss of generality. In this case, $R$ is obtained by finite collections of parallelograms in the way presented in [2, Theorem 2] (in which we conclude $R$ is finite analytic type even for more general settings). We review that construction.

For $i = 1, 2$ let $\alpha_i = e^{i \theta_i}$ and $W_i^1, ..., W_i^n$ be the disjoint $\phi$-cylinders of direction $\theta_i$ which almost every point in $R$ lies on. For each $i, j$ by an analytic continuation of local inverse of $\phi$-charts we construct a holomorphic covering $F_j^i : S_j^i \to W_j^i$ so that $S_j^i = \{0 < \text{Im}z < h_j^i\} \subset \mathbb{C}$ and $\text{Deck}(F_j^i) = \langle z \mapsto z + c_j^i \rangle$ for some $h_j^i, c_j^i > 0$. (Now $c_j^i/h_j^i$ is the modulus of $W_j^i$.) By construction $F_j^i(\alpha_i) = d(z_j^i)^2$ holds for any $\phi$-coordinate $z_j^i$ in $W_j^i$.

For any $p \in S_j^1$, there is a neighborhood $U$ in which $F_j^1 = F_j^2 \circ f$ for some $k$ and some holomorphic function $f : U \to S_k^2$. Now $f^*(d(z_j^2)^2) = f^*(F_k^2\phi(\alpha_2\phi)) = F_j^1\phi(\alpha_2\phi) = (\alpha_2/\alpha_1)d(z_j^2)^2$ and this implies that $f$ is of the form $f(z_j^1) = \alpha z_j^1 + \beta$ where $\alpha \in \{\pm \sqrt{\alpha_2/\alpha_1} = \pm e^{i \theta(\theta_2-\theta_1)}\}$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$. Thus $U$ is a subset of $V_k = \{z_j^1 \in S_j^1 | \alpha z_j^1 + \beta \in S_k^2\}$. By analytic continuation we see that $F_j^1 = F_k^2(\alpha z_j^1 + \beta)$ on $V_k$. If we replace $p$ by $p + mc_j^1$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ then $F_j^1 = F_k^2(\alpha z_j^1 + \beta')$ still holds on $V_k + mc_j^1$ where $\beta' = \beta - mc_j^1$. So the condition $F_j^1(z_j^1) = F_k^2(\alpha z_j^1 + \beta')$ on $V_k$ for some $\beta' \in \mathbb{C}$ is preserved by covering transformations of $F_j^1$.
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The parallelogram $V_k$ is mapped into $W_k^2$ and so it does not intersect $V_{k'}$ with $k' \neq k$. Hence the parallelograms on which $F_j^1(z_j^1) = F_k^2(\alpha z_j^1 + \beta)$ fill the strip $S_j^1$ by translations in $c_j^1 \mathbb{Z}$. Similarly we have same statement for those parallelograms with respect to the strips $S_k^2$. By choosing finite collections of those parallelograms and gluing them at the points which are mapped to same point by $F_j^1$ or $F_k^2$, we have a compact surface $\tilde{R}$. Finally we obtain $R$ by removing at most finitely many vertices of the parallelograms from $\tilde{R}$, as of finite analytic type.

We have made a decomposition of $R$ into finite parallelograms $\{V_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$, where for any $\lambda$ there exists $j_\lambda$, $k_\lambda$ such that $F_{j_\lambda}^1(V_\lambda) = F_{k_\lambda}^2(V_\lambda) = W_{j_\lambda}^1 \cap W_{k_\lambda}^2$. Now $V_\lambda$ has an angle $\theta = \theta_2 - \theta_1$ and a modulus $M_\lambda = (h_{j_\lambda} h_{k_\lambda}^2) \sin \theta$ for each $\lambda$. For each $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in J(R, \phi)$ we call these parallelograms the $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$-parallelograms on $(R, \phi)$. We remark that in above construction each embedding $F_{j_\lambda}^1 : V_\lambda \hookrightarrow R$ of $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$-parallelogram is up to inter-decompositions with $z \mapsto \pm z + c$ uniquely determined by $j_\lambda$.

Any $f \in \text{Aff}^+(R, \phi)$ with $D(f) = A \in PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$ maps each $\phi$-cylinder of direction $\theta$ to the one of direction $A\theta$. So for each $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in J(R, \phi)$ the $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$-parallelograms are mapped to $(A\theta_1, A\theta_2)$-parallelograms. On the Euclidian plane, the variation of modulus of $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$-parallelogram under an affine map with derivative $A \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ is described as scalar multiple by $\rho_{A, \theta_1, \theta_2} = |T_A(e^{\sqrt{-1} \theta_2})|/|T_A(e^{\sqrt{-1} \theta_1})|$. The same argument can be said for each of $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$-parallelograms on $(R, \phi)$ and we have following lemma.

**Lemma 3.11.** Let $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in J(R, \phi)$ and $V$ be a $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$-parallelogram on $(R, \phi)$. Then an affine map $f \in \text{Aff}^+(R, \phi)$ with derivative $A \in PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$ varies the modulus $M(V)$ of $V$ by the multiple of scalar $\rho_{A, \theta_1, \theta_2} = |T_A(e^{\sqrt{-1} \theta_2})|/|T_A(e^{\sqrt{-1} \theta_1})|$. In particular, if $(R, \phi)$ is decomposed into $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$-parallelograms $\{V_\lambda\}_{\lambda=1, \ldots, N}$ then $(M(f(V_1)), M(f(V_2)), \ldots, M(f(V_N))) = \rho_{A, \theta_1, \theta_2} \cdot (M(V_1), M(V_2), \ldots, M(V_N))$ holds.

Furthermore the structure how the edges of those parallelograms are glued is preserved by a homeomorphism $f$. In the next section we construct a combinatorial characterization to present this more precisely.

### 3.3 $F_2$-action to parallelograms

We continue the assumptions of $(R, \phi)$ and notations as in last section.
Fix signs of embeddings $F^1_{j\lambda} : V_{\lambda} \hookrightarrow R$ of $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$-parallellograms for each $j\lambda$. Now we construct a group $\hat{G}$ which corresponds to how the $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$-parallellograms $\{V_{\lambda}\}$ are glued.

For each $\lambda = (\lambda, \varepsilon) \in \Lambda \times \{\pm 1\}$, fix some interior point $p_\lambda \in V_{\lambda}$ and take a segment $\gamma_\lambda$ to the direction $\varepsilon$ (resp. $\varepsilon\varepsilon\sqrt{-1}\theta$) from $p_\lambda$ to the boundary point $p_\lambda' \in \partial V_{\lambda}$. We take unique $\lambda' \in \Lambda$ so that $F^1_{j\lambda}(p_\lambda') = F^1_{j\lambda'}(q)$ (resp. $F^2_{k\lambda}(p_\lambda') = F^2_{k\lambda'}(q)$) for some $q \in \partial V_{\lambda'}$ and $\varepsilon' \in \{\pm 1\}$ so that $\varepsilon = \varepsilon'$ (resp. $F^2_{k\lambda} \circ (F^2_{k\lambda'}|_{U'})^{-1}(z) = \varepsilon\varepsilon'z + c$ on some neighborhood $U$ of $q$ for some $c \in \mathbb{C}$).

Further we define $x(\lambda, \varepsilon)$ (resp. $y(\lambda, \varepsilon)$) by $(\lambda', \varepsilon')$. Then $F_2$, the free group generated by $x, y$ acts on $\hat{\Lambda} := \Lambda \times \{\pm 1\}$.

For instance in the following picture we will see that $x(\lambda_1, 1) = (\lambda_2, 1)$, $y(\lambda_1, 1) = (\mu, 1)$, $x(\nu_1, 1) = (\nu_2, 1)$, and $y(\lambda_1, 1) = (\lambda_2, -1)$. If we choose another sign of embedding of one cylinder of direction $\theta_1$ the signs of elements in the cylinder will be alternated.

**Lemma 3.12.** $x, y : \hat{\Lambda} \to \hat{\Lambda}$ are bijective. $\sigma = x, y$ satisfies that $\sigma(\lambda, \varepsilon) = \sigma^{-1}(\lambda, -\varepsilon)$ for any $(\lambda, \varepsilon) \in \hat{\Lambda}$. Furthermore, $\phi$ is Abelian if and only if $y$ fixes the signs of elements in $\hat{\Lambda}$ or equivalently the action $F_2 \curvearrowright \hat{\Lambda}$ descends via the projection $p_1 : \hat{\Lambda} \to \Lambda$.

**proof.** We define $x^{-1}, y^{-1} : \hat{\Lambda} \to \hat{\Lambda}$ as same as $x, y$ except for the direction of $\gamma_\lambda$ for each $\lambda$, with it reversed. Then they give inverse maps in the sense of $\lambda \in \Lambda$ at least. For each $\lambda = (\lambda, \varepsilon)$, $y(\lambda) = (\lambda', \varepsilon_1)$, and $y^{-1} \circ y(\lambda) = (\lambda, \varepsilon_2)$, $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_1$ if and only if coordinate transformations around the edge between $V_{\lambda}$ and $V_{\lambda'}$ is of the form $z \mapsto -z + c$, thus it is equivalent to $\varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon$. So $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2$, $x^{-1}, y^{-1}$ give inverse maps indeed. We can see easily from the construction that $\sigma = x, y$ satisfies $\sigma(\lambda, \varepsilon) = \sigma^{-1}(\lambda, -\varepsilon) \cdots (\ast)$.

We made $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$-parallellograms $\{V_{\lambda}\}$ to be glued so that there is no edge in the direction $\theta$ where coordinate transformations are of the form $z \mapsto -z + c$. So $\phi$ is Abelian if and only if there is no edge in the direction $\theta_1$ like that, equivalently $y$ fixes the signs of elements in $\hat{\Lambda}$. By the formula $(\ast)$ this is equivalent to that the action $F_2 \curvearrowright \hat{\Lambda}$ descends via $p_1 : \hat{\Lambda} \to \Lambda$. 

We denote the homomorphism which gives the action $F_2 \curvearrowright \hat{\Lambda}$ by $m : F_2 \to \text{Sym}(\hat{\Lambda})$, $m(w) = m_w$ for each $w \in F_2$, and $\hat{G} = \langle m_x, m_y \rangle < \text{Sym}(\hat{\Lambda})$. In the case that $\phi$ is Abelian, we also denote ones of the projected action $F_2 \curvearrowright \Lambda$ by $m : F_2 \to \text{Sym}(\Lambda)$, $m(w) = m_w$, and $G = \langle m_x, m_y \rangle < \text{Sym}(\Lambda)$. 
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Let $R^*$ be the surface obtained by puncturing $R$ at all the points which are vertices of the $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$-parallelograms. Let $\hat{R}$ be the translation surface given by taking a double of $R^*$ like non-oriented origamis. $\hat{R}$ is decomposed into the $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$-parallelograms $\{V_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in \hat{\Lambda}}$ with the action of $F_2$ as above giving $\hat{\Lambda}$ as ‘$\Lambda$’ and $\hat{G}$ as ‘$G$’. If $\phi$ is not Abelian $\hat{R}$ is the surface given by an analytic continuation of locally defined Abelian differential $dz$ on $R^*$.

**Proposition 3.13.** Let $\phi$ be Abelian, $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$, and $p_0 \in V_{\lambda_0}$. Then we have following.

(a) $H = H_G := \text{Stab}_{F_2}(\lambda_0) < F_2$ is isomorphic to $\pi_1(R, p_0)$.

(b) There is a 1-1 correspondence between $F_2/H_G$ and $\Lambda$.

(c) $G$ acts transitively on $\Lambda$.

**Proof.** For any path $C$ in $R^*$, we can take a path $L_C$ which is a product of finite line segments of direction $\theta_1$ or $\theta_2$ joining neighboring parallelograms so that $C, C'$ are homotopic with fixed endpoints. We define $w_C \in F_2$ to correspond to the order of segments in $L_C$, by replacing segments in the direction $\theta_1, \theta_2$ by $x, y$ respectively. For each $w \in F_2$ we take a path $L_w$ in $R^*$ starting from $p_0$ to some point in $V_{m_w(\lambda_0)}$, composed of line segments in the direction $\theta_1, \theta_2$ joining neighboring parallelograms whose order respects the one of $x, y$ in $w$. $L_w$ is uniquely determined up to variation of the end point in the parallelogram and homotopy with fixed endpoints. For each $w \in F_2$ we define a homomorphism $\Phi$ from $F_2$ onto $\Lambda$ by taking $\Phi(w) \in \Lambda$ so that the end point of $L_w$ belongs to $V_{\Phi(w)}$. Now the kernel of $\Phi$ is $H_G$. So we have an isomorphism $H \rightarrow \pi_1(R, p_0)$ by taking $L_w$ for each $w \in H$ so that the endpoint of $L_C$ is $p_0$. So (a),(b) follows.

For any $\lambda, \lambda' \in \Lambda$ there is a path $C$ joining $V_{\lambda}$ and $V_{\lambda'}$ since $R^*$ is connected. We see $w \in F_2$ has an action defined by the segments of $L_C$, sending $\lambda$ to $\lambda'$. Thus (c) holds. $\square$

### 3.4 The combinatorial characterization

We consider what condition is needed for parallelograms $\{V_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ and a permutation group $\hat{G} = \langle \hat{m}_x, \hat{m}_y \rangle < \text{Sym}(\hat{\Lambda})$ to form a flat surface where they are the total $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$-parallelograms and the one given by the action $F_2^* \Lambda$ respectively.

First we continue the assumptions for the decomposition of $(R, \phi)$. For each parallelogram $V_\phi$, we denote the modulus by $M_\phi$ and the area by $S_\phi$. By the construction of $\hat{R}$ the parallelograms $V_\lambda$ in $\hat{R}^*$ and $V_{(\lambda, 1)}, V_{(\lambda, -1)}$ in $\hat{R}$ coincide by translation. In this sense we define $h_{(\lambda, \pm)} := h_{\lambda}$ for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$. We have $M_{\lambda} = (h_k^2/h_j^1) \sin \theta$, $S_{\lambda} = (h_j^1/h_k^2) \sin \theta$, $h_j^1 = h_{\hat{m}_x(j, \varepsilon)}$, $h_k^2 = h_{\hat{m}_y(k, \varepsilon)}$, and in particular following condition for the decomposition of $(R, \phi)$ into $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$-parallelograms.

**Lemma 3.14.** For each $\hat{\lambda} \in \hat{\Lambda}$, $S_{\hat{m}_x(\hat{\lambda})} = \frac{M_{\hat{\lambda}}}{M_{\hat{m}_x(\hat{\lambda})}} S_{\hat{\lambda}}$ and $S_{\hat{m}_y(\hat{\lambda})} = \frac{M_{\hat{m}_y(\hat{\lambda})}}{M_{\hat{\lambda}}} S_{\hat{\lambda}}$. 
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Conversely we consider $\Lambda = \{1, 2, ..., N\}$ for $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\hat{\Lambda} = \Lambda \times \{\pm 1\}$, and an arbitrary pair of $M = [M_1, M_2, ..., M_N] \in \mathbb{R}_+ P^{N-1}$ and $\hat{G} = \langle \hat{m}_x, \hat{m}_y \rangle < \text{Sym}(\hat{\Lambda})$. We assume the symmetry of $\hat{G}$ as the formula in Lemma 3.12. An $N$-tuple of parallelograms $V = (V_1, V_2, ..., V_N)$ with moduli list $M$ is uniquely determined up to congruence by an area list $S = (S_1, S_2, ..., S_N) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^N$. For each $w \in F_2$ and $\hat{\lambda} \in \hat{\Lambda}$, the formula in Lemma 3.14 defines the unique area $S_{\hat{m}_w(\hat{\lambda})}(\hat{\lambda}, w)$ which is necessary for $V_{p_1(\hat{m}_w(\hat{\lambda}))}$ to be glued via the path $L_w$ on the rule given by $\hat{G}$, with a flat structure naturally given. For $V$ to form $(R, \phi)$ with the action of $F_2$ given by $\hat{G}$, the area $S_{\hat{m}_w(\hat{\lambda})}(\hat{\lambda}, w)$ must depend only on $\lambda := p_1(\hat{m}_w(\hat{\lambda}))$ and determine $S_{\hat{\lambda}}$.

Recall that $\gamma_{-I}$ is the automorphism of $F_2$ defined by $\gamma_S \circ \gamma_S : (x, y) \mapsto (x^{-1}, y^{-1})$ (see § 2.2). We denote $-(\lambda, \varepsilon) := (\lambda, \varepsilon)$ for each $(\lambda, \varepsilon) \in \hat{\Lambda}$. Similar to Proposition 2.9 the condition for $\hat{G} = \langle x, y \rangle$ to give an origami which comes from the double cover of some flat surface as we construct is characterized by certain condition for ‘monodromy map’ $\hat{m}$. That is,

(a) (symmetry) $\hat{m}_w(\hat{\lambda}) = -\hat{m}_{\gamma_{-I}(w)}(\hat{\lambda})$ for any $\hat{\lambda} \in \hat{\Lambda}$ and $w \in F_2$,

(b) (non-branching) $y(\hat{\lambda}) \neq -\hat{\lambda}$ for any $\hat{\lambda} \in \hat{\Lambda}$,

(c) (connectivity) the action $\hat{G} \curvearrowright \hat{\Lambda}$ is transitive with respect to first ingredients.

**Definition 3.15.** Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Lambda = \{1, 2, ..., N\}$, $\hat{\Lambda} = \Lambda \times \{\pm 1\}$, $M = [M_1, M_2, ..., M_N] \in \mathbb{R}_+ P^{N-1}$, and $\hat{m} : F_2 \to \text{Sym}(\hat{\Lambda})$ be a homomorphism with three conditions stated above. We define $K_O = K_{M, \hat{G}} : \hat{\Lambda} \times F_2 \to \mathbb{R}$ by following.

- $K_O(\cdot, 1) = 1$.
- For any $\hat{\lambda} \in \hat{\Lambda}$, $K_O(\hat{\lambda}, x) = \frac{M_{\hat{m}_x(\hat{\lambda})}}{M_{\hat{\lambda}}}$ and $K_O(\hat{\lambda}, y) = \frac{M_{\hat{m}_y(\hat{\lambda})}}{M_{\hat{\lambda}}}$.
- For any $w_1, w_2 \in F_2$ and $\hat{\lambda} \in \hat{\Lambda}$, $K_O(\hat{\lambda}, w_1 w_2) = K_O(\hat{\lambda}, w_1) K_O(\hat{\lambda}, w_2)$

We call $O = (M, \hat{G} = \langle x, y \rangle)$ an *extended origami* of degree $N$ if $M \in \mathbb{R}_+ P^{N-1}$, $\hat{G} < S_{2N}$ with $(x, y) = (\hat{m}(x), \hat{m}(y))$ for some $\hat{m}$ as above, and $K_O(1, w) = 1$ for all $w \in H_{\hat{G}}$. Extended origamis $O_i = (M^i = [M_1^i, M_2^i, ..., M_N^i], G_i = \langle \lambda_i, y_i \rangle)$ $(i = 1, 2)$ of order $N$ are *isomorphic* if there is a pair $(\Phi, \sigma)$ of $\Phi : G_1 \to G_2$ and $\sigma \in S_{2N}$ such that

(a) $\Phi : G_1 \to G_2$ is an isomorphism with $(\Phi(x_1), \Phi(y_1)) = (x_2, y_2),$

(b) $[M_{p_{1\sigma}(1)}, M_{p_{1\sigma}(2)}, ..., M_{p_{1\sigma}(N)}] = [M^1_1, M^2_2, ..., M^N_N], and$

(c) $\sigma(\hat{m}_w(\hat{\lambda})) = \hat{m}_{\Phi(w)}(\sigma(\hat{\lambda}))$ for each $\hat{\lambda} \in \hat{\Lambda}$, $w \in \hat{G}$.

We call $(\Phi, \sigma)$ an *isomorphism* between extended origamis $O_1$ and $O_2$.

By the symmetry of $\hat{G}$, if $g \in \hat{G}$ contains a cycle $(\hat{\lambda}_1 \hat{\lambda}_2 ... \hat{\lambda}_n)$ then it also contains the cycle $(-\hat{\lambda}_1 - \hat{\lambda}_2 ... - \hat{\lambda}_n)$. In later examples we omit half of the cycles in $x, y \in \hat{G}$ and denote $(\lambda, 1), (\lambda, -1) \in \hat{\Lambda}$ by $\lambda, \lambda^ -$ respectively.
Theorem 3.16. A compact flat surface \((R, \phi)\) with a pair of two distinct Jenkins-Strebel directions \((\theta_1, \theta_2)\) \(\in J(R, \phi)^2\) is up to isomorphism uniquely determined by a triple \(P(R, \phi, (\theta_1, \theta_2)) = (\Theta, k, O)\) where \(\Theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2)\) \(\in [0, \pi)^2\) with \(\theta_1 \neq \theta_2, k > 0\), and \(O\) is an extended origami.

proof. We have already seen that the decomposition of \((R, \phi)\) into \((\theta_1, \theta_2)\)-parallelograms determines an extended origami \(O\). The modulus \(k > 0\) of parallelogram labelled with 1 is also determined.

Conversely if an extended origami \(O = (M = [M_1, M_2, ..., M_N], \hat{G} = (x, y))\) of degree \(N \in \mathbb{N}, k > 0\), and \((\theta_1, \theta_2) \in [0, \pi)^2\) with \(\theta_1 \neq \theta_2\) are given, then we can construct a flat surface \((R, \phi)\) with \(O(R, \phi, (\theta_1, \theta_2)) = O_1\) as follows. We take an \(N\)-tuple of Euclidian \((\theta_1, \theta_2)\)-parallelograms with moduli list \(k/\Sigma M\lambda \cdot (M_1, M_2, ..., M_N)\). We glue them by the rule given by \(\hat{G}\), so that \(x, y\) correspond to each segments of direction \(\theta_1, \theta_2\) respectively. Let \(R\) be the resulting surface and \(R^*\) be surface given by puncturing \(R\) at all the vertices. Now natural coordinates \(z\) given by those parallelograms (as well origamis) define the quadratic differential \(\phi = dz^2\) on \(R^*\), for which those parallelograms are \((\theta_1, \theta_2)\)-parallelograms. \(\phi\) is uniquely extended to \(R\). It is clear that the flat surfaces given by same \((\theta_1, \theta_2), k\), and isomorphic extended origamis are isomorphic.

If two extended origamis \(O_1, O_2\) of same order give isomorphic flat surfaces \((R, \phi), (S, \psi)\) under common \((\theta_1, \theta_2)\) and \(k\), then there exists a locally affine quasiconformal homeomorphism \(f : R \rightarrow S\) with derivative \([f]\). \(f\) descends to a map between \((\theta_1, \theta_2)\)-parallelograms on \(R\) and \(S\) of the form \(z \mapsto \eta z + c\). This representation can be extended to each cylinder and \(\eta \in \{\pm 1\}\) is unique for each cylinders of direction \(\theta_1\). We define \(\sigma(\lambda, \varepsilon) = (\lambda', \eta \varepsilon)\) where \(\lambda\)-th parallelogram on \(R\) is mapped to \(\lambda\)-th parallelogram on \(S\), which preserves the ratio of moduli. For each \((\lambda, \varepsilon) \in \Lambda\) geodesics starting from \(\lambda\)-th parallelogram used to define \(m_\varepsilon(\lambda, \varepsilon)\), \(m_{\eta}(\lambda, \varepsilon)\) are mapped to ones for \(\hat{m}_\varepsilon(\sigma(\lambda, \varepsilon \eta)), \hat{m}_{\eta}(\sigma(\lambda, \varepsilon \eta))\) respectively. Thus an isomorphism between permutation groups of \(O_1, O_2\) is induced as \((x_1, y_1) \mapsto (x_2, y_2)\) and to be compatible with \(\sigma\), finally we have an isomorphism between \(O_1\) and \(O_2\). \(\square\)

Definition 3.17. We call a triple \(((\theta_1, \theta_2), k, O)\) as in Theorem 3.16 a \(P\)-decomposition. For a \(P\)-decomposition \(((\theta_1, \theta_2), k, O)\) and \(\hat{A} \in PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})\), we define \(A \cdot ((\theta_1, \theta_2), k, O)\) by the \(P\)-decomposition \(((A\theta_1, A\theta_2), \rho_{A, \theta_1, \theta_2} k, O)\).

We say two \(P\)-decompositions \(((\Theta_1, k_1, O_1)), (\Theta_2, k_2, O_2)\) are isomorphic if \(\Theta_1 = \Theta_2, k_1 = k_2, O_1\) is isomorphic to \(O_2\).

Example 3.18. \(\Theta = \Theta_0 := (0, \frac{7}{2}), k = 1\), and an extended origami with \(M = 1 := [1, 1, ..., 1]\) give a \(P\)-composition which corresponds to an (oriented) origami if it is Abelian, in other words \(y \in \hat{G}\) stabilizes signs in \(\Lambda\), or a non-oriented origami otherwise. With such a \(P\)-composition the Veech group is a subgroup of \(PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})\) of finite index by Corollary 3.7.

Example 3.19. Let us see a non oriented origami as shown in the following figure. This example determines a surface of type \((1, 6)\), the orders of \(\phi\) at vertices are \(-1\) of 3, 0 of 2, and 4 of 1.
It can be seen as an extended origami with $N = 6$, $M = 1$, $x_1 = (1234)(5)(6)$, and $y_1 = (156^-4^-)(23^-)$. Now we take the signs of directions of horizontal cylinders in the way shown as $O_1$ in the following figure.

If we reverse the sign of horizontal cylinder containing the cell labelled with 6 then the extended origami is given by $x_2 = (1234)(5)(6)$ and $y_2 = (156^-4^-)(23^-)$, which is isomorphic to $(M, (x_1, y_1))$ under $6 \leftrightarrow 6^-$. Similarly if we reverse the signs of all horizontal cylinders, as $O_3$ in the figure, we will have an isomorphism given by $\hat{\lambda} \mapsto -\hat{\lambda}$.

An affine map on $(R, \phi)$ with derivative $\bar{A}$ gives a correspondence between the initial decomposition $P(R, \phi, (\theta_1, \theta_2))$ and the terminal decomposition $P(R, \phi, (A\theta_1, A\theta_2))$ stated in Lemma 3.10 and Lemma 3.11. By Theorem 3.16 the existence of such an affine map is described as the possibility of decomposition and the correspondence of those P-decompositions. So we conclude as follows.

**Theorem 3.20.** Let $(R, \phi)$ be a compact flat surface with two distinct Jenkins-Strebel directions $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in J(R, \phi)$. $A \in PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$ belongs to $\Gamma(R, \phi)$ if and only if $A\theta_1, A\theta_2$ belongs to $J(R, \phi)$ and $A \cdot P(R, \phi, (\theta_1, \theta_2))$ is isomorphic to $P(R, \phi, (A\theta_1, A\theta_2))$.

**Remark 3.21.**

(a) Theorem 3.16 also holds for surfaces of finite analytic type with no vertices of $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$-parallelograms contained in $R$. In the proof $R$ is obtained by filling in all the punctures of $R^*$. The same can be said
for Theorem 3.20 which implies that if $A \in \Gamma(R, \phi)$ then the set of vertices of $(A\theta_1, A\theta_2)$-parallelograms on $(R, \phi)$ should coincide with the one of $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$-parallelograms.

(b) For two P-decompositions $P(R_i, \phi_i, \Theta_i) = (\Theta_i, k_i, \mathcal{O}_i)$ $(i = 1, 2)$ of flat surfaces, the isomorphism between $\mathcal{O}_1, \mathcal{O}_2$ implies that we can take an affine quasiconformal homeomorphism $g : R_1 \to R_2$ in the way similar to the one stated in the proof of Theorem 3.16. The local derivative of $g$ is the one of affine map on Euclidian plane which maps $\Theta_1$-parallelogram of modulus $k_1$ to $\Theta_2$-parallelogram of modulus $k_2$, which is unique matrix up to signs. $g_*(f) := g \circ f \circ g^{-1}$ defines an isomorphism $g_* : \text{Aff}^+(R_1, \phi_1) \to \text{Aff}^+(R_2, \phi_2)$ and we will see that $\Gamma(R_2, \phi_2) = A\Gamma(R_1, \phi_1)A^{-1}$ for $A \in PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$ is the derivative of $g$, which is defined as same as ones of affine maps.

Example 3.22. We consider the non oriented origami in Example 3.19 which has the P-decomposition $(\Theta_0, 1, (1, (x, y)))$ where $x = (1234)(5)(6)$, $y = (1564^2)(23^2)$. $T = [1 \ 1] \in PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ gives the extended origami defined by $x_T = (1234)(5)(6)$, and $y_T = (123564^{-4})$, which cannot coincide with $x, y$ under any permutation of cells. On the other hand we will see that $T^2 = [1 \ 2] \in PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ gives an extended origami isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}$ as shown in the following figure. We will see that $T \notin \Gamma(R, \phi)$ and $T^2 \in \Gamma(R, \phi)$.

Next we consider a set $V$ of finite marked points in $R$. We assume $R$ is already punctured at all points in $V$. We take the decomposition of $R$ into $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$-parallelograms and obtain $\mathcal{O} = (M, \tilde{G})$. As same as origamis (see e.g. [2]), there is a 1-1 correspondence between cycles in $\tilde{m}_{xy}^{-1}y^{-1} \in \tilde{G}$ and vertices of $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$-parallelograms in $\tilde{R}$. We call a cycle in $\tilde{m}_{xy}^{-1}y^{-1} \in \tilde{G}$ an $\mathcal{O}$-vertex. Two $\mathcal{O}$-vertices $v_1, v_2$ correspond to the same point in $R$ if and only if they coincide under the double cover $\tilde{R} \to R^*$, that is $v_2$ equal to $v_1$ or its sign inversion. We say such $\mathcal{O}$-vertices $v_1, v_2$ are conjugate, and call the conjugacy class of an $\mathcal{O}$-vertex an $\mathcal{O}$-vertex. For each $\sigma \in S_{2N}$ and $\mathcal{O}$-vertex $v$, we denote by $\sigma^* v$ the cycle obtained by applying $\sigma$ to each element in $v$. We call a pair $(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{V})$ of an extended origami $\mathcal{O}$ and a set $\mathcal{V}$ of $\mathcal{O}$-vertices a marked extended origami.

For $(R, \phi), (\theta_1, \theta_2) \in J(R, \phi)$, and a set $V$ of finite marked points in $R$ we have a P-decomposition $P(R, \phi, (\theta_1, \theta_2), V) := (\Theta, k, (\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{V}))$ where $(\Theta, k, \mathcal{O}) = P(R, \phi, (\theta_1, \theta_2))$ and $\mathcal{V}$ is the set of $\mathcal{O}$-vertices corresponding to $V$.  
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Remark. Theorem 3.16 can be extended to the general cases of flat surface of finite analytic type by replacing extended origamis with marked extended origamis. In this sense we also call \( P(R, \phi, (\theta_1, \theta_2), V) \) a P-decomposition (with marked points). We will define isomorphism of marked extended origamis next.

Consider an affine map \( f \in \text{Aff}^+(R, \phi) \) with derivative \( \tilde{A} \). We have \( A\theta_1, A\theta_2 \in J(R, \phi) \) and let \((N, \varphi, (O_A, V_A)) := P(R, \phi, (A\theta_1, A\theta_2), V)\). By Theorem 3.20 there is an isomorphism \((\Phi, \sigma)\) between \( O, O_A \) By the construction given in the proof, \( \sigma \) represents how \( f \) maps each \((\theta_1, \theta_2)\)-parallelograms to \((A\theta_1, A\theta_2)\)-parallelograms. For each \([v] \in V\) by definition \((3.15)(c) [\sigma^*v] \in V_A \) and it corresponds to the image of the point in \( V \) corresponding to \([v] \).

We say two marked extended origamis \((O_i, V_i) \) \((i = 1, 2)\) are isomorphic if there is an isomorphism \((\Phi, \sigma)\) between \( O_1, O_2 \) \([v] \mapsto [\sigma^*v] \) gives a well-defined bijection \( V_1 \mapsto V_2 \). In such a case for each \([v] \in V\) the number of elements in \([v], [\sigma^*v]\) coincide and the corresponding vertices have the same valency even in \( R \). So permutations among marked points and critical points in \((R, \phi)\) happen at most in the classes of same valencies.

With fixed \( \theta_1, \theta_2 \in J(R, \phi) \), an affine map on a flat surface \((R, \phi)\) of finite analytic type is characterized as one of \((R^*, \phi)\) extended to stabilize \( \partial R \subset \partial R^* \) setwise. So we have following.

**Theorem 3.23.** Let \((R, \phi)\) be a flat surface of finite analytic type with two distinct Jenkins-Strebel directions \( \theta_1, \theta_2 \in J(R, \phi) \). \( \tilde{A} \in \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \) belongs to \( \Gamma(R, \phi) \) if and only if \( A\theta_1, A\theta_2 \) belongs to \( J(R, \phi) \) and \( A \cdot \text{P}(R, \phi, (\theta_1, \theta_2), \partial R) \) is isomorphic to \( P(R, \phi, (A\theta_1, A\theta_2), \partial R) \).

**Corollary 3.24.** Let \( R \) be a Riemann surface of finite analytic type, \( V = \partial R \), and \( \phi \in A(\tilde{R}) \). If for any \( p \in V \) all critical points of \( \phi \) of order \( \text{ord}_p(\phi) \) are contained in \( V \), then \( \Gamma(R, \phi) = \Gamma(\tilde{R}, \phi) \). In particular, if there exists a P-decomposition of \((R, \phi)\) such that the moduli ratio of extended origami is rational then \((R, \phi)\) induces a Teichmüller curve which is a Belyi surface.

**Example 3.25.** Let us see the trivial non oriented origami with 4 distinguished marked points \( a, b, c, d \) as shown in the picture. If we decomposed into \( \Theta_0 \) the extended origami \( O = (1, (x, y)) \) is given by \( x = (12) \) and \( y = (12^-) \). Now \( xyx^{-1}yx^{-1} = (1)(2)(1^-)(2^-) \) and points \( a, b, c, d \) correspond to cycles \((1^-), (2^-), (1), (2)\) respectively. (For instance a path \( xyx^{-1}yx^{-1} \) from cell 1 goes around the vertex \( c \).)

For \( T = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, S = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \) in \( \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{Z}) \), decompositions into \( T \Theta_0, S \Theta_0 \) gives extended origamis \( O_T, O_S \) which are isomorphic to \( O \). On the other hand the correspondences between vertices and cycles are described as \((a, b, c, d) \leftrightarrow ((1^-), (2^-), (2), (1)) \) in \( O_T \) and \((a, b, c, d) \leftrightarrow ((1^-), (2), (1), (2^-)) \) in \( O_S \). They cannot be mapped by any isomorphism of extended origami each other and thus they differ as marked extended origamis. Further we can see that the situations in \( O_{T^2}, O_{TS}, O_{ST} \) coincide with \( O_I, O_T, O_S \) respectively.
Example 3.26. For non oriented origamis, we can specify the subgroup $\Gamma_\pi(R, \phi)$ of the Veech group in the way referred in Remark 3.8.

(a) The non oriented origami $O_1$ is given by $x_1 = (123)(4)$, $y_1 = (143^-)(2)$. We will obtain $K = \{ w \in F_2 | w^* \in Aff_+^+(H) \cap \text{Inn}(F_2) \}$ as a subgroup of $F_2$ of index 168 and $\Gamma_\pi(R, \phi)$ as a subgroup of $PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ of index 7. The calculation result for $\Gamma_\pi(R, \phi)$ can be described as $\text{Rep} = \{ I, T, T^2, TS, T^2ST, T^2ST^2 \}$ and $\text{Gen} = \{ S, T^3, TSTST^{-2}, T^2STST^{-2}ST^{-2}, T^2ST^3ST^{-1}, T^2ST^2ST^{-1}ST^{-2} \}$.

The result that $\Gamma_\pi(R, \phi)$ is of prime index implies the Veech group should coincide with $\Gamma_\pi(R, \phi)$ or $PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})$. By comparing decompositions into $\Theta_0$ and $T\Theta_0$ we can conclude as $\Gamma(R, \phi) = \Gamma_\pi(R, \phi)$.

(b) The extended origami $O_2$ is given by $M = [1, \frac{1}{2}, 1]$ and $x_2 = (123)$, $y_2 = (13^-)(2)$. By Corollary 3.24 the Veech group for $O_2$ coincides with the one for the non oriented origami $O_3$, which is given by $x_3 = (1234)$, $y_3 = (14^-)(2)(3)$. We will obtain $K$ as a subgroup of $F_2$ of index 8 and $\Gamma_\pi(R, \phi)$ as a subgroup of $PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ of index 12. The calculation result for $\Gamma_\pi(R, \phi)$ can be described as $\text{Rep} = \{ I, T, S, T^2, TS, ST, T^3, T^2S, TST, T^3S, T^2ST, T^3STS, T^3ST^2S \}$ and $\text{Gen} = \{ ST^2S, STSTST^{-1}ST^{-1}, T^4, TST^2ST^{-3}, T^2ST^2ST^{-2}, T^2ST^2ST^{-1}ST^{-1}, T^3ST^2ST^{-1}, T^3STST^{-1}ST^{-2} \}$.

Further we can see that the decompositions into $R\Theta_0 \ (R \in \text{Rep})$ differ each other and conclude as $\Gamma(R, \phi) = \Gamma_\pi(R, \phi)$.

(c) For the trivial non oriented origami we will obtain $K = \{ 1 \}$, $\text{Rep} = \{ I, T, TS \}$, and $\text{Gen} = \{ S, T^2, TSTST^{-1} \}$.

On the other hand in Example 3.25 we have seen that $\Gamma(R, \phi) = PSL(2, \mathbb{Z}) \neq \Gamma_\pi(R, \phi)$. 
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