

LIE ALGEBRAS OF CURVES AND LOOP-BUNDLES ON SURFACES

JUAN ALONSO, MIGUEL PATERNAIN, JAVIER PERAZA,
AND MICHAEL REISENBERGER

ABSTRACT. W. Goldman and V. Turaev defined a Lie bialgebra structure on the \mathbb{Z} -module generated by free homotopy classes of loops of an oriented surface (i.e. the conjugacy classes of its fundamental group). We develop a generalization of this construction replacing homotopies by thin homotopies, based on the combinatorial approach given by M. Chas. We use it to give a geometric proof of a characterization of simple curves in terms of the Goldman-Turaev bracket, which was conjectured by Chas.

1. INTRODUCTION

Goldman [Gol86] and Turaev [Tur91] defined a Lie bialgebra structure on the \mathbb{Z} -module generated by the free homotopy classes of loops of an oriented surface M (i.e. the conjugacy classes of $\pi_1(M)$). The bracket is defined by

$$(1) \quad [X, Y]_{\pi_1(M)} = \sum_{p \in \alpha \cap \beta} \epsilon(p; \alpha, \beta) \{\alpha_p \beta_p\}$$

where α and β are representatives of X and Y respectively, intersecting at most at transversal double points, the number $\epsilon(p; \alpha, \beta) = \pm 1$ denotes the oriented intersection number of α and β at p , and $\{\alpha_p \beta_p\}$ is the conjugacy class of the element $\alpha_p \cdot \beta_p \in \pi_1(M, p)$ where α_p and β_p are the elements of $\pi_1(M, p)$ that correspond to reparametrize α and β to start (and end) at p .

Turaev showed in [Tur91] that there is a colagebra structure that gives rise to a Lie bialgebra. Chas in [Cha04] proposed a combinatorial model for this bialgebra structure. The aim of this paper is to develop a generalization of the Goldman-Turaev construction replacing homotopies by thin homotopies.

Key words and phrases. loop spaces, Goldman bracket.

Let M be an oriented surface endowed with any Riemannian metric. We denote by $\mathcal{E}(M)$ the set of classes of piecewise geodesic curves in M modulo endpoint-preserving *thin homotopies*, which we shall define with precision in section 2.1. For each $x \in M$ we define $\mathcal{L}_x(M)$ as the elements of $\mathcal{E}(M)$ that start and end at x . It will be easy to notice that this is a group under concatenation, and $\pi_1(M, x)$ is a quotient of it.

Let $S(M)$, the *space of strings* of M , be the set of conjugacy classes of $\mathcal{L}_x(M)$ in $\mathcal{E}(M)$, i.e. $g, h \in \mathcal{L}_x(M)$ are conjugate if there is $p \in \mathcal{E}(M)$ such that $p^{-1}gp = h$. Let $\mathcal{S}(M)$ be the free abelian group generated by $S(M)$. In this paper we shall define a bracket $[\ , \]$ on $\mathcal{S}(M)$ following the lines of Chas in [Cha04]. Then we shall show

Theorem 1.1. $(\mathcal{S}(M), [\ , \]) \text{ is a Lie algebra.}$

It is also possible to give a coalgebra structure and show that $\mathcal{S}(M)$ is a Lie bi-algebra using the same techniques, though we will not present this construction explicitly. We will see that the Goldman-Turaev structure on M is the quotient of $\mathcal{S}(M)$ obtained by taking regular (non-thin) homotopies. This fact will emerge naturally from our construction of the bracket, and the case for the co-bracket is analogous. The Goldman algebra is relevant in the study of spaces of representations of the fundamental groups of 2-manifolds, which in turn, can be regarded as moduli spaces of flat connections on orientable 2-manifolds ([Jef05]). Our construction may also play a role in the study of the space of all connections but this aspect is not going to be treated here.

Chas and Krongold obtained an algebraic characterization of homotopy classes of simple curves in terms of the bracket ([CK10]) and the cobracket ([CK16]). (See also [CG16] and [CK21]). In the present paper we give a geometric proof of a different characterization of simple curves in terms of the bracket, which was conjectured by Chas in [Cha04]. For other related results see [CP10], [CP12] [Cha15a] [Cha10], [CMP19], [Cha15b].

A string X is *primitive* if every representative $g \in \mathcal{L}_x(M)$ (for any $x \in M$) of X is primitive in the sense of group theory: if there is no $h \in \mathcal{L}_x(M)$ such that $g = h^n$ with $n > 1$. A piecewise geodesic closed curve will be called *simple* if it has no stable self-intersections, i.e. if there is a small perturbation that has no self-intersections (namely, that is simple in the usual sense).

We shall show the following theorem:

Theorem 1.2. *Let M be an oriented surface. A primitive $X \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ has a simple representative if and only if $[X, X^{-1}] = 0$.*

The geometric group theory approach of our proof of Theorem 1.2 may have some independent interest beyond the result itself. The aforementioned proof includes some tools, namely, the notion of α -oriented subgroups (see section 4.3), which could be useful in other contexts.

Theorem 1.2 will allow us to prove a conjecture posed by Chas ([Cha04]):

Corollary 1.3. *Let M be a compact oriented surface with boundary. A primitive free homotopy class X of M has a simple representative if and only if $[X, X^{-1}]_{\pi_1(M)} = 0$.*

Proof. Let $p : \tilde{M} \rightarrow M$ be the universal covering of M . Let $D \subset \tilde{M}$ be a fundamental polygon as in [Cha04]. Since M has boundary we can choose on \tilde{M} a metric of constant non positive curvature.

The fundamental group is freely generated by the set T of those $g \in \pi_1(M)$ such that $gD \cap D \neq \emptyset$. Let $\mathcal{L}_{x,0}(M) \subset \mathcal{L}_x(M)$ be the subgroup of $\mathcal{L}_x(M)$ generated by those elements of the form $h_g = [p \circ \alpha_g]$ where α_g is a geodesic (corresponding to the chosen metric) joining x to gx for each $g \in T$. Denote by $S_0(M)$ the set of strings corresponding to the loops in $\mathcal{L}_{x,0}(M)$. Note that $\pi_1(M)$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{L}_{x,0}(M)$ via the standard quotient, i.e. taking non-thin homotopies. As we mentioned below Theorem 1.1, this quotient is a Lie algebra homomorphism, thus it gives an isomorphism between the subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}(M)$ generated by $S_0(M)$ and the Goldman-Turaev algebra on the free homotopy classes of M . Then we apply Theorem 1.2 to strings in $S_0(M)$ to conclude this proof. \square

2. THE LOOP BUNDLE

2.1. Definitions of thin homotopies and the spaces of loops. Let I be the unit interval and M a Riemannian manifold. We begin by recalling some standard notations. A *path* in M is a continuous function from I to M , and we say that two paths $a, b : I \rightarrow M$ are equivalent modulo reparametrization if there is an orientation preserving homeomorphism $\sigma : I \rightarrow I$ such that $a \circ \sigma = b$. Denote by Ω_0 the quotient set under this equivalence relation. If $a(1) = b(0)$ we define ab and a^{-1} as follows: $ab(t) = a(2t)$ if $t \in [0, 1/2]$ and $ab(t) = b(2t - 1)$ if $t \in [1/2, 1]$; $a^{-1}(t) = a(1 - t)$ for every $t \in [0, 1]$. Let $e_x \in \Omega_0$ be the constant path at x , i.e. $e_x(t) = x$ for every $t \in [0, 1]$.

In order to define what we call *thin homotopy* between piecewise geodesic paths we need to consider another preliminary equivalence, which amounts to collapse constant sub-paths. Let a be a non-constant path in M . We shall define a *minimal form* a_r for a as follows: let $I_i \subset I$ be the maximal subintervals in which a is constant, and let $\sigma : I \rightarrow I$ be a surjective non-decreasing continuous function, constant in each I_i and strictly increasing

in $I = \bigcup_i I_i$. Then there is $a_r : I \rightarrow M$ such that $a = a_r \circ \sigma$, which is non-constant on any subinterval of I (this map is obtained by a universal property of quotients). Different choices of the function σ give rise to minimal forms that are equivalent modulo reparametrization, and moreover, if two paths a and b are equivalent, so are any of their minimal forms a_r and b_r . This allows us to define the *minimal class* of an element of Ω_0 (as the class of any minimal form of any representative), and take a quotient Ω_1 where we identify two elements of Ω_0 if they have the same minimal class (extending the definition to constant paths in the trivial way). The product and inverse are well defined on Ω_1 , and the classes of constant paths are units for the product.

Let $\Omega \subset \Omega_1$ be the set of classes of either constant paths or paths that are *piecewise geodesic*, i.e. a finite concatenation of geodesic segments. Notice that for $\alpha \in \Omega$ there are well defined notions of endpoints $\alpha(0)$ and $\alpha(1)$, of image $\alpha(I)$, and of length $l(\alpha)$. Throughout the paper we will refer to the elements $\alpha \in \Omega$ as *curves*, and say that α is a *closed curve* if $\alpha(0) = \alpha(1)$.

In the set Ω we consider the equivalence relation generated by the identifications $\alpha a a^{-1} \beta \sim \alpha \beta$. This is what we call equivalence under *thin homotopies*. With the formal definition in hand, we recall the concepts from the introduction: Let $\mathcal{E}(M)$ denote the quotient set of Ω under thin homotopies, and let $\mathcal{L}_x(M)$ be the projection onto $\mathcal{E}(M)$ of the set of closed curves starting and ending at x . Note that $\mathcal{L}_x(M)$ is a group under concatenation whose identity element, id_x , is the equivalence class of e_x , the constant path at x .

2.2. Reductions and basic properties. A *reduction* for $\alpha \in \Omega$ is a factorization of the form $\alpha = a c c^{-1} d$ with nontrivial c . We say that α is *reduced* if it admits no such reduction. Since the curves in Ω are classes of piecewise geodesic (or constant) paths, it is easy to show that every element of $\mathcal{E}(M)$ has a unique reduced representative in Ω (though the proof of uniqueness may be a bit cumbersome). The *reduced form* of $\alpha \in \Omega$ is the unique reduced curve that is equivalent to α under thin homotopy.

Next we point out some basic facts that will be used without explicit reference throughout the article. Firstly notice that a curve $\gamma \in \Omega$ satisfies $\gamma = \gamma^{-1}$ only when it is of the form $\gamma = c c^{-1}$, thus for a reduced curve γ it happens only when γ is constant. Next we see that the concept of length in Ω satisfies the expected properties, namely that:

- $l(ab) = l(a) + l(b)$, and
- if $ab = cd$ with $l(a) = l(c)$, then $a = c$ and $b = d$.

For $\gamma, \delta \in \Omega$ we shall write $\gamma \subset \delta$ if we have $\delta = a\gamma b$ for $a, b \in \Omega$. In case a is trivial we say that γ is an *initial segment* of δ , and if b is trivial that γ is a *final segment* of δ . Note that if δ is reduced, so must be γ .

We say that two curves γ and δ *overlap* if an initial segment of one of them agrees with a final segment of the other, i.e. if we can write either $\gamma = ab, \delta = bc$ with b non-constant, or $\gamma = ab, \delta = ca$ with a non-constant. Note that if γ is reduced and non constant, then γ and γ^{-1} cannot overlap: for instance, if $\gamma = ab$ and $\gamma^{-1} = bc$, we get $b = b^{-1}$ where b is reduced, so b must be constant.

2.3. Definitions of loop bundle and horizontal lift. Consider the space $\mathcal{E}(M)$ defined in the previous section, and let $[\alpha] \in \mathcal{E}(M)$ stand for the equivalence class of $\alpha \in \Omega$. Let $\mathcal{E}_x(M)$ be the set of the $[\alpha] \in \mathcal{E}(M)$ such that $\alpha(0) = x$; define $\pi : \mathcal{E}_x(M) \rightarrow M$ by $\pi([\alpha]) = \alpha(1)$, and observe that $\mathcal{L}_x(M) = \pi^{-1}(x)$. The group $\mathcal{L}_x(M)$ acts on $\mathcal{E}_x(M)$ by left multiplication and for all $[\alpha] \in \mathcal{L}_x(M)$ and $[\gamma] \in \mathcal{E}_x(M)$ we have $\pi([\alpha][\gamma]) = \pi([\gamma])$; hence the quadruple $(\mathcal{E}_x(M), \mathcal{L}_x(M), M, \pi)$ is a principal fiber bundle over M , with structure group $\mathcal{L}_x(M)$.

Let γ be a path in M , and take $p \in \mathcal{E}_x(M)$ with $\pi(p) = \gamma(0)$. We define the *horizontal lift* of γ at p to be the path $\tilde{\gamma}$ in $\mathcal{E}_x(M)$ which is obtained in the following way. Take β any representative of p (i.e. $p = [\beta]$), and for each $s \in I$ set γ_s to be the path in M defined by $\gamma_s(t) = \gamma(st)$. Then $\tilde{\gamma}(s) = [\beta\gamma_s]$. This horizontal lift can be seen as a topological connection in the bundle $(\mathcal{E}_x(M), \mathcal{L}_x(M), M, \pi)$. We will say that a path in $\mathcal{E}_x(M)$ is *horizontal* if it can be obtained by horizontal lift (see [Mil56], [Tel60]). Note that the concept of horizontal lift is well defined at the level of curves (i.e. in Ω_1), thus we may speak of *horizontal curves*.

We define the *length of an horizontal curve* as the length of the projection. Observe that the action of $\mathcal{L}_x(M)$ preserves the set of horizontal curves, as well as their lengths (by definition). We should clarify that we are not giving a metric on $\mathcal{E}_x(M)$.

2.4. Conjugacy classes in \mathcal{L}_x and the space of strings. Recall that the *space of strings* $S(M)$ is the set of conjugacy classes of $\mathcal{L}_x(M)$ in $\mathcal{E}(M)$, i.e. $g, h \in \mathcal{L}_x(M)$ are conjugate if there is $p \in \mathcal{E}(M)$ such that $p^{-1}gp = h$. This does not depend on x because of the following remark.

Remark 2.1. (Change of basepoint) If $x, y \in M$ and $\gamma_0 : I \rightarrow M$ has $\gamma_0(0) = x$ and $\gamma_0(1) = y$, let $p_0 = [\gamma_0]$ and define the maps $\psi : \mathcal{E}_x(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_y(M)$ by $\psi(p) = p_0^{-1}p$ and $\phi : \mathcal{L}_x(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_y(M)$ by $\phi(g) = p_0^{-1}gp_0$. Then ϕ is an isomorphism of groups, and (ψ, ϕ) is an isomorphism of fiber bundles over M , commuting with the horizontal lift.

We say that a closed curve α is *cyclically reduced* if α is reduced and it cannot be factorized as cac^{-1} with non trivial c . For a cyclically reduced curve γ , we say that $\beta \in \Omega$ is a *permutation* (or *cyclical permutation*) of γ if there are $r, s \in \Omega$ such that $\gamma = rs$ and $\beta = sr$. If s and r are non constant we say that β is a *non trivial permutation* of γ . Note that permutation is an equivalence relation among the cyclically reduced curves in Ω .

For a string $X \in S(M)$ we can find $x \in M$ and a cyclically reduced curve α based at x , such that X is the conjugacy class of $[\alpha] \in \mathcal{L}_x(M)$. On the other hand, permutation agrees with conjugacy in $\mathcal{E}_x(M)$ among cyclically reduced curves, therefore we have

Remark 2.2. There is a bijection between $S(M)$ and the permutation classes of cyclically reduced curves.

Throughout the paper, when we take representatives of strings we will always assume them to be cyclically reduced. If $X \in S(M)$ and α is a representative of it, we define X^{-1} as the permutation class of α^{-1} . It is straightforward to check that if α is non-constant then α^{-1} is not a permutation of α . Thus $X \neq X^{-1}$ unless X is trivial.

A cyclically reduced curve α is *primitive* if there is no $\gamma \in \Omega$ such that $\alpha = \gamma^n$ with $n > 1$. The following easy result is well known.

Lemma 2.3. *Let α be a cyclically reduced curve. Then α is not primitive if and only if α has a non trivial permutation $\hat{\alpha}$ such that $\alpha = \hat{\alpha}$.*

Note that a string $X \in S(M)$ is primitive, as defined in the introduction, if it has a cyclically reduced representative that is primitive.

3. LIE BIALGEBRA STRUCTURE

3.1. Linked pairs. In order to define the bracket in $\mathcal{S}(M)$ we need a way of encoding the intersections of curves in Ω that are stable under local homotopy. We do this by adapting the notion of *linked pairs* from Chas [Cha04] to our context.

Let α_1, α_2 and γ in Ω be classes of geodesic segments contained in a normal ball such that $\alpha_1(1) = \alpha_2(0) =: y$ and either $\gamma(0) = y$ or $\gamma(1) = y$. Assume that $\alpha = \alpha_1\alpha_2$ is reduced and γ only meets α at y . Take $\rho > 0$ small enough so that $B(y, \rho)$ is a normal ball and α_1, α_2 and γ are not contained in it, and let z_1, z_2, z be the intersection points of α_1, α_2 and γ with $\partial B(y, \rho)$ respectively. Since M is oriented, the orientation of $B(y, \rho)$ induces an orientation of $\partial B(y, \rho) \cong S^1$, which is equivalent to giving a circular order on $\partial B(y, \rho)$.

We write $\text{sign}(\alpha, \gamma) = 1$ if either $\gamma(0) = y$ and the order of the sequence z_2, z, z_1 coincides with the circular order of $\partial B(y, \rho)$, or $\gamma(1) = y$ and the order of the sequence z_2, z_1, z coincides with the circular order of $\partial B(y, \rho)$. Otherwise we write $\text{sign}(\alpha, \gamma) = -1$. Notice that this sign does not depend on the choice of ρ .

Informally one could say that $\text{sign}(\alpha, \gamma) = 1$ if γ is either outgoing at the “left” side of α or incoming at the “right” side of α , while $\text{sign}(\alpha, \gamma) = -1$ if one of the reverse situations happens.

Since elements of Ω are piecewise geodesic curves, the intersections between two elements are either transversal or along an interval. Taking this into account, we discuss the general forms of these intersections and indicate which ones will constitute linked pairs. A factorization of a curve $\alpha \in \Omega$ is a sequence $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ such that $\alpha = \alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_n$ where $\alpha_i \in \Omega$.

Definition 3.1. *Consider the following factorizations (of some curves)*

$$A = (a, \eta, b)$$

$$B = (c, \xi, d)$$

where a, b, c, d are geodesics contained in normal balls. We say that (A, B) is a linked pair if any of the following conditions hold

- (1) $\eta = \xi = \text{point}$, d meets ab only at $d(0)$ and c meets ab only at $c(1)$, and

$$\text{sign}(ab, d) = \text{sign}(ab, c)$$

- (2) $\eta = \xi$ (non constant), if we factorize $\eta = \gamma_1 \eta_1 \gamma_2$ such that γ_1 and γ_2 are contained in normal balls, we have that d meets $\gamma_2 b$ only at $d(0)$ and c meets $a \gamma_1$ only at $c(1)$, and

$$\text{sign}(\gamma_2 b, d) = \text{sign}(a \gamma_1, c)$$

- (3) $\eta = \xi^{-1}$ (non constant), if we factorize $\eta = \gamma_1 \eta_1 \gamma_2$ such that γ_1 and γ_2 are contained in normal balls, we have that c meets $\gamma_2 b$ only at $c(1)$ and d meets $a \gamma_1$ only at $d(0)$, and

$$\text{sign}(a \gamma_1, d) = \text{sign}(\gamma_2 b, c)$$

We define the sign of the linked pair as follows: In case (1) we set $\text{sign}(A, B) = \text{sign}(ab, d)$, in case (2) we set $\text{sign}(A, B) = \text{sign}(\gamma_2 b, d)$ and in case (3) set $\text{sign}(A, B) = \text{sign}(a \gamma_1, d)$.

If all but the orientation (sign) conditions hold we say that (A, B) is an *intersection pair*. Notice that the intersections between two cyclically reduced curves in Ω can locally be written in the form of intersection pairs. The orientation conditions say that an intersection pair (A, B) is a linked

pair exactly when the intersection between the underlying curves is stable under small perturbations. We shall refer to linked pairs of *type* (1), (2) or (3) according to which one of the conditions they satisfy in Definition 3.1, and we do the same for intersection pairs.

Next we turn to the intersections of cyclically reduced curves in Ω in a global sense, i.e. in a way that takes account of multiplicities.

If α is a closed curve, we say that $P = (\xi, \eta)$ is a *cyclic factorization* of α if either $\alpha = \xi_1\eta\xi_2$ with $\xi = \xi_2\xi_1$ or $\alpha = \eta_1\xi\eta_2$ with $\eta = \eta_2\eta_1$. There is a slight abuse of notation here, as the decompositions $\xi = \xi_2\xi_1$ or $\eta = \eta_2\eta_1$ are needed for recovering α , and are indeed intended as part of the definition, though we drop them from the notation to make it less cumbersome. If α is cyclically reduced and β is a permutation of it, then there is a bijection between the cyclic factorizations of α and those of β . Notice though, that in order to talk about cyclic factorizations of a string, we need to choose a curve representative first. The reason for this choice of definition is that we want to keep track of the position of the sub-curves (ξ and η) with respect to a chosen parameter-basepoint (which is well defined in Ω). This detail will make a difference for strings that are not primitive.

Definition 3.2. *Let $\alpha, \beta \in \Omega$ be cyclically reduced closed curves. A linked pair between α and β is a pair (P, Q) of cyclic factorizations $P = (\alpha_1, \eta)$ and $Q = (\beta_1, \xi)$ of α and β respectively, such that if we write*

- $\alpha_1 = b\hat{\alpha}_1a$ and $\beta_1 = d\hat{\beta}_1c$, where a, b, c, d are geodesics contained in normal balls, and
- $A = (a, \eta, b)$ and $B = (c, \xi, d)$,

then (A, B) is a linked pair.

Notice that the concatenations $a\eta b$ and $c\xi d$ are well defined, so the above definition makes sense. Moreover, they are sub-curves of some permutations of α and β respectively, thus saying that (A, B) is a linked pair means that there is a stable intersection between α and β , or the strings they represent. Defining P and Q as cyclic factorizations keeps track of the position of the intersection segments relative to the parameter-basepoints of α and β , so intersections that repeat count as different linked pairs. This amounts to counting multiplicity, just as is usual in differential topology for the intersection between transversal smooth paths. Notice also that taking a permutation of α or β induces a natural bijection between the sets of linked pairs.

We define the *length* of a linked pair as $l(P, Q) = l(\eta) = l(\xi)$, i.e. as the length of the intersection segment. The *type* of (P, Q) shall be the type of (A, B) in Definition 3.2.

3.2. Definition of the string bracket. In this section we define the bracket following closely the presentation in [Cha04]. Since the definition of the co-bracket involves no new ideas we omit it. Recall that $S(M)$, the space of strings, is the set of conjugacy classes of $\mathcal{L}_x(M)$. Also recall that $\mathcal{S}(M)$ is the free abelian group generated by $S(M)$, in which we shall define the bracket.

For $X \in S(M)$ and an integer $n > 0$, let X^n be the conjugacy class of $[\alpha]^n$, where $[\alpha]$ represents X . Define also $l(X) = l(\alpha)$ where α is a cyclically reduced representative of X , noting that different choices of such representative have the same length. Since α is cyclically reduced, we have that $l(X^n) = nl(X)$.

Although we will not present the definition of the co-bracket, we give the main definition in which it is based, for the sake of completeness.

Definition 3.3. *Let X be a string. We define $LP_1(X)$, the set of linked pairs of X , as the set of linked pairs of any two representatives of X .*

By the discussion at the end of the previous section, the choice of representatives of X in Definition 3.3 does not affect $LP_1(X)$. It is possible to show, similarly as in [Cha04], that this definition reflects the stable self-intersections of X , at least when X is primitive, in a 2 to 1 correspondence: each stable self-intersection corresponds to two linked pairs of the form (P, Q) and (Q, P) . Non-primitive closed curves have stable self-intersections, in the sense of the self-intersections of a transversal perturbation, that do not arise from linked pairs. Since we will not focus on the co-bracket, we shall not prove these assertions. Next we turn to the case of linked pairs between two strings, that will be the key for the construction of the bracket.

Definition 3.4. *Let X and Y be strings. Define $LP_2(X, Y)$, the set of linked pairs of X and Y , as the set of linked pairs (P, Q) between representatives of X^n and Y^m for $n, m \geq 1$, where $l(X^{n-1}) \leq l(P, Q) < l(X^n)$ and $l(Y^{m-1}) \leq l(P, Q) < l(Y^m)$. (With the convention that $l(X^0) = l(Y^0) = 0$).*

Again, different choices of representatives for the strings in Definition 3.4 yield sets $LP_2(X, Y)$ that are in natural bijection.

Remark 3.5. The powers are necessary: Consider α and β , closed geodesics starting and ending at the same point x and meeting transversally at x . Let X be the conjugacy class of $[\alpha]$ and Y the conjugacy class of $[\beta][\alpha^2]$. There is no linked pair between X and Y but there is a linked pair between X^3 and Y . Note that the core segment of the linked pair is α^2 .

On the other hand, it can be shown that $LP_2(X, X) = LP_1(X)$, i.e. the powers are not needed in the case $X = Y$. We shall see later, in Lemma 3.13, that $LP_2(X, Y)$ captures the notion of stable intersections between X and Y . It is not immediate from Definition 3.4 that $LP_2(X, Y)$ is finite, the proof of this fact will be based in the following result.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $\mathcal{U} = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$ be a finite set of piecewise geodesic curves. There are factorizations $\alpha_i = a_{i,1} \cdots a_{i,n_i}$ such that whenever $a_{i,j} \cap a_{k,l} \neq \emptyset$, either*

- (1) $a_{i,j}$ and $a_{k,l}$ meet only at one endpoint.
- (2) $a_{i,j} = a_{k,l}$
- (3) $a_{i,j} = a_{k,l}^{-1}$

Proof. Subdivide any factorization of the curves α_i until the desired properties are obtained. This will happen because of the transversality properties of the geodesics. □

Given strings X and Y , Proposition 3.6 allows us to find a finite set of curves that works as an alphabet for writing some representatives of X and Y , as well as all the core curves of the intersection pairs between (powers of) these representatives. Thus we can write the cyclic factorizations that make up the elements of $LP_2(X, Y)$ as words in this alphabet.

Lemma 3.7. *For any strings X and Y , $LP_2(X, Y)$ is finite.*

Proof. Using Proposition 3.6 as indicated above, this becomes a straightforward adaptation of Lemma 2.9 of [Cha04]. □

Definition 3.8. *Let X and Y be strings and $(P, Q) \in LP_2(X, Y)$. Write $P = (\alpha_1, \eta)$ and $Q = (\beta_1, \xi)$ as in the definition of linked pairs, and let α and β be the representatives of X and Y that satisfy the following:*

- *If (P, Q) is of type (1) or (2), then*

$$\alpha^n = \alpha_1 \eta \text{ and } \beta^m = \beta_1 \xi$$

(where $n, m \geq 1$ are the powers of X and Y that correspond to (P, Q) in Definition 3.4).

- *If (P, Q) is of type (3), then*

$$\alpha^n = \alpha_1 \eta \text{ and } \beta^m = \xi \beta_1$$

(for the same $n, m \geq 1$).

In any of the above cases, define $(X \cdot_{(P,Q)} Y)$ to be the conjugacy class of $[\alpha][\beta]$.

We say that $(X \cdot_{(P,Q)} Y)$ is the *dot product* of X and Y at (P, Q) . Notice that α and β are the representatives of X and Y that we get by choosing parameter-basepoints at the “ending” of the linked pair’s core curve. They are indeed loops based at the same point, so the concatenation $[\alpha][\beta]$ is well defined.

Definition 3.9. Let X and Y be strings, we define their bracket as

$$[X, Y] = \sum_{(P,Q) \in LP_2(X,Y)} \text{sign}(P, Q)(X \cdot_{(P,Q)} Y)$$

Then we extend the definition to $\mathcal{S}(M)$ so that the bracket is bilinear.

3.3. Linked pairs and differentiable curves. Our next goal is to show the correspondence between linked pairs and stable intersections, which will lead to the relationship between the bracket in Definition 3.9 and the Goldman-Turaev bracket given by equation (1). This will in turn allow us to prove Theorem 1.1, i.e. that Definition 3.9 gives a Lie algebra.

Let C be a compact one dimensional complex on an oriented Riemannian surface M whose edges are geodesic arcs, and consider a basepoint $x \in C$. Let \tilde{C} be the universal covering of C . Then the following lemma is straightforward.

Lemma 3.10. $\mathcal{L}_x(C) \cong \pi_1(C, x)$ and $\mathcal{E}_x(C) \cong \tilde{C}$.

Moreover, these correspondences give an isomorphism of fiber bundles

$$(\mathcal{E}_x(C), \mathcal{L}_x(C), C, \pi) \cong (\tilde{C}, \pi_1(C, x), C, \pi)$$

where $\pi_1(C, x)$ acts on \tilde{C} by deck transformations.

Let $S(C)$ be the set of strings contained in C , and note that the string bracket of Definition 3.9 can be restricted to $\mathcal{S}(C)$, the free abelian group on $S(C)$. We will denote this bracket by $[\ , \]_C$.

For any set $V \subset M$ let V_ε denote an ε -neighborhood of V . The following lemma is well known, see [Gor81] for a very general construction.

Lemma 3.11. If ε is small enough, there is a retraction $\chi : C_\varepsilon \rightarrow C$. It induces an isomorphism $\chi_* : \pi_1(C_\varepsilon, x) \rightarrow \pi_1(C, x)$ for any $x \in C$.

Let $\mathcal{S}_1(M)$ be the free abelian group generated by the set of conjugacy classes of $\pi_1(M)$, where the Goldman-Turaev bracket is defined. By Lemma 3.10 we see that χ induces an isomorphism of abelian groups $\chi_* : \mathcal{S}_1(C_\varepsilon) \rightarrow$

$S(C)$. We shall prove that χ_* sends the Goldman-Turaev bracket of the surface C_ε to $[\cdot, \cdot]_C$.

Proposition 3.11 in [Cha04] can be rephrased as

Lemma 3.12. *Let $[\alpha]$ and $[\beta]$ be representatives of strings in $S(C)$. Then there are differentiable curves γ and δ in C_ε such that*

- γ and δ are ε -perturbations of α and β respectively,
- α and β are the reduced forms of $\chi \circ \gamma$ and $\chi \circ \delta$ respectively, and
- γ and δ intersect transversally, in at most double points, and determine no bigons.

Moreover, γ and δ have minimal intersection among the curves in their homotopy classes.

We remark that in Lemma 3.12 the curves $\chi \circ \gamma$ and $\chi \circ \delta$ need not be reduced, but the curves removed in their reduction have length less than ε , and each one is contained in some geodesic edge of the complex C , assuming ε is small enough. Now we can relate the linked pairs of two strings in $S(C)$ with the intersections that are stable under perturbation in C_ε .

Lemma 3.13. *Let $[\alpha]$ and $[\beta]$ be representatives of strings X and Y in $S(C)$, and let γ and δ be curves given by Lemma 3.12.*

Then for each intersection point p of γ and δ there are $n, m \geq 1$, curves $a \subset \gamma^n$ and $b \subset \delta^m$ meeting at p , and a linked pair (P, Q) between α^n and β^m that satisfy the following:

If $P = (\alpha_1, \xi)$ and $Q = (\beta_1, \eta)$, then the reduced forms of $\chi \circ a$ and $\chi \circ b$ can be written as $a_1 \xi a_2$ and $b_1 \eta b_2$ respectively, where a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 are geodesic segments.

Moreover, this correspondence is a bijection between the intersection points of γ and δ , and $LP_2(X, Y)$.

Proof. This is done with the techniques of [Cha04]. We consider $\pi : \tilde{C}_\varepsilon \rightarrow C_\varepsilon$, the universal cover of C_ε . Then \tilde{C} is embedded in \tilde{C}_ε as a tree, made of piecewise geodesic curves, since C is piecewise geodesic. Consider also $\tilde{\chi} : \tilde{C}_\varepsilon \rightarrow \tilde{C}$ the lift of χ , and for each geodesic arc c in the decomposition of \tilde{C} let $V(c) = \tilde{\chi}^{-1}(c)$. Then the sets $V(c)$ are homeomorphic to closed disks, they cover \tilde{C}_ε , and their interiors are disjoint.

Now, for each p in the intersection between γ and δ , we pick $\hat{p} \in \tilde{C}_\varepsilon$ projecting to p , and consider $\hat{\gamma}$ and $\hat{\delta}$ the infinite lifts of γ and δ that meet only at \hat{p} (recalling that γ and δ have no bigons). Let $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ be the respective reductions of $\tilde{\chi} \circ \hat{\gamma}$ and $\tilde{\chi} \circ \hat{\delta}$, which are infinite lifts of α and β . The

set $\hat{\alpha}(I) \cap \hat{\beta}(I)$ is compact, since $\hat{\gamma}$ and $\hat{\delta}$ meet only once and are lifts of closed curves, and it is an arc, since $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ are reduced. We shall write $\hat{\alpha}(I) \cap \hat{\beta}(I)$ as a curve in two ways, with possibly different orientations: we call $\hat{\xi}$ and $\hat{\eta}$ to the curves spanning $\hat{\alpha}(I) \cap \hat{\beta}(I)$ with the orientations given by $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ respectively. It may be the case that $\hat{\alpha}(I) \cap \hat{\beta}(I)$ is just a point, then $\hat{\xi}$ and $\hat{\eta}$ will be constant (this will result in a linked pair of type (1)).

Let

$$V = \cup \{V(c) : c \cap \hat{\alpha}(I) \cap \hat{\beta}(I) \neq \emptyset\}$$

Then V is, topologically, a closed disk, and we have $\hat{\alpha} \cap V = c_1 \hat{\xi} c_2$ and $\hat{\beta} \cap V = d_1 \hat{\eta} d_2$, where c_1, c_2, d_1, d_2 are pairwise different geodesic segments.

For each geodesic segment c that meets $\hat{\alpha}(I) \cap \hat{\beta}(I)$ but is not contained in it, we define the set $B(c) = \partial V(c) \cap \partial V$. Note that $B(c)$ is a segment in $\partial V \cong S^1$, and that c has an endpoint in $B(c)$ and the other in $\hat{\alpha}(I) \cap \hat{\beta}(I)$. The segments $B(c)$ just defined are pairwise disjoint, and their union is the relative boundary of V in \tilde{C}_ε . Taking ε small enough, we may assume that the ε -neighborhood of $\hat{\alpha}$ only meets the relative boundary of V at the arcs $B(c_1)$ and $B(c_2)$. Thus $\hat{\gamma} \cap V$ is an arc that enters V through $B(c_1)$ and exits through $B(c_2)$, meeting no other segment of the relative boundary of V . Similarly we get that $\hat{\delta} \cap V$ is an arc that traverses V from $B(d_1)$ to $B(d_2)$.

Let $\hat{a} = \hat{\gamma} \cap V$ and $\hat{b} = \hat{\delta} \cap V$. They must intersect at \hat{p} , in particular $\hat{p} \in V$, since the complementary arcs of $\hat{\gamma}$ and $\hat{\delta}$ are in different components of $\tilde{C}_\varepsilon - V$. Note that $\tilde{\chi} \circ \hat{a}$ and $\tilde{\chi} \circ \hat{b}$ can be reduced, respectively, to $\hat{\alpha} \cap V = c_1 \hat{\xi} c_2$ and $\hat{\beta} \cap V = d_1 \hat{\eta} d_2$. We define the curves a, b, ξ, η in the statement as the respective projections of $\hat{a}, \hat{b}, \hat{\xi}, \hat{\eta}$.

By compactness, there are $n, m \geq 1$ such that \hat{a} and \hat{b} are contained in lifts of γ^n and δ^m inside $\hat{\gamma}$ and $\hat{\delta}$ respectively. We choose n, m minimal for these inclusions to be strict. Thus ξ and η induce cyclical factorizations of α^n and β^m respectively, namely P and Q . It only remains to show that

$$(a_1, \xi, a_2) \text{ and } (b_1, \eta, b_2)$$

is a linked pair, where a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 are the respective projections of c_1, c_2, d_1, d_2 . This is because $\hat{\gamma}$ and $\hat{\delta}$ meet transversally, and only once in V , thus $B(c_1) \cup B(c_2)$ separates $B(d_1)$ from $B(d_2)$ in $\partial V \cong S^1$. Using the orientation of V induced by lifting the one of $C_\varepsilon \subset M$, the last fact allows us to verify the sign conditions in the definition of linked pair. It also yields that $\text{sign}(P, Q) = \epsilon(p, \gamma, \delta)$, which will be useful later.

Note that, by the minimality of n and m , we have $(P, Q) \in LP_2(X, Y)$. The reciprocal construction is now straightforward, and so is checking bijectivity. \square




FIGURE 1. Proof of lemma 3.13. We depict the simple case when $\hat{\alpha}(I) \cap \hat{\beta}(I)$ does not contain branching vertices of \tilde{C} in its interior. For this figure, a_1, \dots, a_k denote the geodesic segments in $\hat{\alpha}(I) \cap \hat{\beta}(I)$.

Lemma 3.14. $(\mathcal{S}(C), [\cdot, \cdot]_C)$ is a Lie algebra.

Proof. Let $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}(C)$ and let α, β , and γ, δ be as in Lemma 3.12. We need to show that $\chi_*([\gamma, \delta]_{\pi_1(C_\epsilon)}) = [X, Y]_C$, where $[\gamma, \delta]_{\pi_1(C_\epsilon)}$ stands for the Goldman-Turaev bracket between the free homotopy classes of γ and δ . This is a consequence of Lemma 3.13: If p corresponds to the linked pair (P, Q) , then we have seen that $\text{sign}(P, Q) = \epsilon(p, \gamma, \delta)$ in the proof of Lemma 3.13. On the other hand, $(X \cdot_{(P, Q)} Y)$ is the conjugacy class of the image under χ of $\gamma \cdot_p \delta$, which follows from Definition 3.8 and the properties of the correspondence between p and (P, Q) given by Lemma 3.13. \square

We remark that we have obtained the isomorphism of Lie algebras

$$\chi_* : (\mathcal{S}_1(C_\epsilon), [\cdot, \cdot]_{\pi_1(C_\epsilon)}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{S}(C), [\cdot, \cdot]_C)$$

that we desired.

3.4. Proof of Theorem 1.1. We shall check that the bracket on $\mathcal{S}(M)$ given by Definition 3.9 satisfies the axioms of a Lie algebra. It is bilinear by definition, and we would like to remark that anti-symmetry can be checked directly, showing that the bijection between $LP_2(X, Y)$ and $LP_2(Y, X)$ that sends (P, Q) to (Q, P) verifies that

$$(X \cdot_{(P, Q)} Y) = (Y \cdot_{(Q, P)} X) \text{ and } \text{sign}(P, Q) = -\text{sign}(Q, P)$$

It can also be proved by the same method we use for the Jacobi identity, which we shall check next.

Consider strings $X, Y, Z \in S(M)$, and cyclically reduced representatives α, β, γ of them. Applying Proposition 3.6 to $\mathcal{U} = \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$ we see that the set $C = \alpha(I) \cup \beta(I) \cup \gamma(I)$ is a one dimensional complex with geodesic edges. Recall that the string bracket $[\cdot, \cdot]$ restricts to $\mathcal{S}(C) \subset \mathcal{S}(M)$, where it defines a Lie algebra by Lemma 3.14. By construction we have that X, Y, Z are in $\mathcal{S}(C)$, thus the Jacobi identity between X, Y, Z is obtained.

That shows Theorem 1.1. We would also like to point out that there is a natural quotient $\mathcal{S}(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_1(M)$, since free homotopy of closed curves is a coarser equivalence than the one defining $S(X)$, and we can show that this map is a homomorphism

$$(\mathcal{S}(M), [\cdot, \cdot]) \rightarrow (\mathcal{S}_1(M), [\cdot, \cdot]_{\pi_1(M)})$$

To check this we can consider $X, Y \in S(M)$, take representatives α, β and let γ, δ be the curves given by Lemma 3.12 for $C = \alpha(I) \cup \beta(I)$. Then γ and δ are freely homotopic to α and β , and the same argument for Lemma 3.14 shows that $[X, Y]$ maps to $[\gamma, \delta]_{\pi_1(M)}$ under the natural quotient.

As we commented in the introduction, it is also possible to define a co-bracket in a similar fashion as we did for the bracket in Definition 3.9, this time involving LP_1 . That gives a Lie bi-algebra structure on $\mathcal{S}(M)$, and the axioms can also be verified using one dimensional complexes and results of [Cha04].


4. INFINITE LIFTS AND INTERSECTIONS

With the goal of proving Theorem 1.2 in mind, we will study the intersections of a cyclically reduced curve with its inverse by looking at the horizontal lifts in the loop bundle.

Throughout this section we fix a cyclically reduced, non-trivial closed curve α , and write $x = \alpha(0)$. Let $\tilde{\alpha}$ be the horizontal lift of α to $\mathcal{E}_x(M)$ such that $\tilde{\alpha}(0) = id_x$. We consider the set

$$\Lambda_\alpha = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} [\alpha]^n \tilde{\alpha}(I)$$

which is nothing but the infinite lift of α through id_x . Since α is cyclically reduced, Λ_α is a *line* in $\mathcal{E}_x(M)$, i.e. is an embedding of \mathbb{R} (it has no “spikes”). We give it a standard orientation induced by the orientation of $\tilde{\alpha}$. Note that $\Lambda_{\alpha^{-1}}$ agrees with Λ_α as a set, but has the opposite orientation.

FIGURE 2. The set Λ_α

4.1. Intersections as elements of \mathcal{L}_x . For every $A \subset \mathcal{E}_x(M)$ define

$$T(A) = \{g \in \mathcal{L}_x(M) \text{ such that } gA \cap A \neq \emptyset\}$$

Consider $g \in T(\Lambda_\alpha)$ so that $g\Lambda_\alpha \neq \Lambda_\alpha$. We show that $g\Lambda_\alpha \cap \Lambda_\alpha$ must be a compact arc (or a point): Note that $\mathcal{E}_x(M)$ contains no non-trivial horizontal loops, and if $g\Lambda_\alpha \cap \Lambda_\alpha$ contains a ray, then we note that $g[\alpha]^n \tilde{\alpha}(I) \subset \Lambda_\alpha$ for some n . Thus the projection of $g[\alpha]^n \tilde{\alpha}$ is some permutation of α , which leads to an equation of the form $gw^{n+1} = w^m$ where $[\alpha] = w^k$ (for some such powers), and this implies $g\Lambda_\alpha = \Lambda_\alpha$.

Then to each $g \in T(\Lambda_\alpha)$ with $g\Lambda_\alpha \neq \Lambda_\alpha$ we can associate a horizontal curve $b_g \subset \Lambda_\alpha$, with the same orientation as Λ_α , such that $b_g(I) = g\Lambda_\alpha \cap \Lambda_\alpha$. Let $a_g \subset \Lambda_\alpha$ be the horizontal curve such that $ga_g(I) = b_g(I)$ and a_g has the orientation carried from b_g by the action of g (thus we may write $ga_g = b_g$). Note that the pair (a_g, b_g) determines g , since $\mathcal{L}_x(M)$ acts freely on $\mathcal{E}_x(M)$.

Definition 4.1. Let $g \in T(\Lambda_\alpha)$.

- We say that g preserves orientation if either $g\Lambda_\alpha = \Lambda_\alpha$ or the orientation of a_g agrees with that of Λ_α . Let $T^+(\Lambda_\alpha)$ be the set of orientation preserving elements of $T(\Lambda_\alpha)$.
- We say that g reverses orientation if the orientation of a_g is opposite to that of Λ_α . We denote by $T^-(\Lambda_\alpha)$ the set of orientation reversing elements of $T(\Lambda_\alpha)$.

The case when a_g is constant shall be regarded as both orientation preserving and reversing. When we want to exclude this case we say that g strictly preserves or reverses orientation.

Remark 4.2. The sets $T(\Lambda_\alpha)$, $T^+(\Lambda_\alpha)$ and $T^-(\Lambda_\alpha)$ are closed under taking inverses.

Remark 4.3. If $g \in T(\Lambda_\alpha)$ and $g\Lambda_\alpha \neq \Lambda_\alpha$, then we have $l(a_g) = l(b_g) < l(\alpha)$.

Proof. Assume the contrary, i.e. that $l(b_g) \geq l(\alpha)$. Then if $g \in T^+(\Lambda_\alpha)$ we get a contradiction by showing that $g\Lambda_\alpha = \Lambda_\alpha$, with a similar argument as in the case when $g\Lambda_\alpha \cap \Lambda_\alpha$ contained a ray. On the other hand, if $g \in T^-(\Lambda_\alpha)$

we can deduce that α^{-1} is a permutation of α , which would mean that α is trivial. \square

Next we shall see that each $g \in T(\Lambda_\alpha)$ with $g\Lambda_\alpha \neq \Lambda_\alpha$ defines naturally an intersection pair between α and α^{-1} . Let $t_g = \pi \circ a_g = \pi \circ b_g$ and $\epsilon = \pm 1$ according to whether g preserves or reverses orientation (in case a_g is constant the pick makes no difference). Recalling that $b_g(I) = g\Lambda_\alpha \cap \Lambda_\alpha$ and projecting what we see at a neighborhood of b_g in $g\Lambda_\alpha \cup \Lambda_\alpha$, we can find geodesic curves r, s, u, v such that $(r, t_g, s), (u, t_g^{-\epsilon}, v)$ is an intersection pair with $rt_g s \subset \alpha$ and $ut_g^{-\epsilon} v \subset \alpha^{-1}$, where the inclusions are modulo permutation (we do not have to consider powers of α or α^{-1} because of Remark 4.3). We depict this situation in Figure 3.




FIGURE 3. A schematic example of $g\Lambda_\alpha \cup \Lambda_\alpha$ for $g \in T(\Lambda_\alpha)$. All shown curves are horizontal. We assume $\alpha = abc = ecaf$ and $g = [c^{-1}e^{-1}]$, note that $t_g = ca$.

Then we can give cyclic factorizations $P_g = (\alpha_1, t_g)$ of α and $Q_g = (\beta_1, t_g^{-\epsilon})$ of α^{-1} so that:

- the horizontal lift of $t_g\alpha_1$ at $b_g(0)$ is contained in Λ_α , and
- the horizontal lift of $t_g^{-\epsilon}\beta_1$ at $a_g^{-\epsilon}(0)$ is contained in Λ_α .

In other words, α_1 can be obtained by projecting a curve spanning a component of

$$\Lambda_\alpha - \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} [\alpha]^n b_g(I)$$

with the orientation given by Λ_α , while β_1 is the analog for the translates of $a_g(I)$ and the reverse orientation to that of Λ_α .

Notice that if g is orientation preserving, i.e. when $\epsilon = 1$, we get an intersection pair of type either (3) or (1) between α and α^{-1} . In the orientation reversing case, when $\epsilon = -1$, we get an intersection pair of type either (2) or (1). In Figure 3 we depict a situation where g is orientation preserving.

Observe that an element of the form $h = [\alpha]^n g [\alpha]^m$ induces the same intersection pair as g , since $b_h = [\alpha]^n b_g$ and $a_h = [\alpha]^{-m} a_g$ induce the same cyclic factorizations of α and α^{-1} . With this in mind we define

$$T_1(\alpha) = \{g \in T(\tilde{\alpha}(I)) : g\Lambda_\alpha \neq \Lambda_\alpha \text{ and } \tilde{\alpha}(1) \notin a_g(I) \cup b_g(I)\}$$

noting that the conditions amount to ask that a_g and b_g meet $\tilde{\alpha}(I)$ but not $\tilde{\alpha}(1)$. Since $\tilde{\alpha}([0, 1))$ is a fundamental domain for Λ_α under translations by powers of $[\alpha]$, we get the following:

Remark 4.4. Let $g \in T(\Lambda_\alpha)$ such that $g\Lambda_\alpha \neq \Lambda_\alpha$. Then there is a unique $g_1 \in T_1(\alpha)$ and integers m, n such that

$$g = [\alpha]^n g_1 [\alpha]^m.$$

The next result describes the intersections of a string with its inverse in terms of elements of the loop group. Let $\mathcal{J}(\alpha, \alpha^{-1})$ denote the set of intersection pairs between α and α^{-1} .

Lemma 4.5. *The map*

$$T_1(\alpha) \rightarrow \mathcal{J}(\alpha, \alpha^{-1})$$

that takes $g \rightarrow (P_g, Q_g)$ is a bijection.

Proof. For injectivity, consider the way in which an horizontal curve $\nu \subset \Lambda_\alpha$ with $l(\nu) < l(\alpha)$ defines a cyclic factorization of α or α^{-1} , as was used in the construction of the map $g \rightarrow (P_g, Q_g)$. Then observe that two such curves ν_1 and ν_2 yield the same cyclic factorization iff $\nu_1 = [\alpha]^n \nu_2$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Combining this fact with Remark 4.4 gives injectivity.

To show surjectivity consider $(P, Q) \in \mathcal{J}(\alpha, \alpha^{-1})$ and write $P = (\alpha_1, \xi)$, $Q = (\beta_1, \eta)$ as in Definition 3.2. Let $\epsilon = \pm 1$ so that $\eta = \xi^{-\epsilon}$, i.e. $\epsilon = 1$ for (P, Q) of type (3), while $\epsilon = -1$ for type (2), and either one for type (1). Since $\xi\alpha_1$ is a permutation of α , there are horizontal curves $\tilde{\xi}$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_1$, projecting to ξ and α_1 respectively, such that the concatenation $\tilde{\xi}\tilde{\alpha}_1$ is well defined and contained in Λ_α . Note that $\tilde{\xi}$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_1$ have the orientation of Λ_α , and that Λ_α is the infinite lift of $\xi\alpha_1$ that continues $\tilde{\xi}\tilde{\alpha}_1$. Now we consider the infinite horizontal lift of $\eta\beta_1$ starting at $\tilde{\xi}^{-\epsilon}(0)$. Since $\eta\beta_1$ is a permutation of α^{-1} , this infinite lift must be of the form $g\Lambda_\alpha$ for some $g \in T(\Lambda_\alpha)$. Notice that the definition of intersection pair implies, by taking

the appropriate horizontal lifts, that $\Lambda_\alpha \cap g\Lambda_\alpha = \tilde{\xi}(I)$. Thus it becomes direct to verify that $(P_g, Q_g) = (P, Q)$, and we can use Remark 4.4 to finish the proof. \square

Through the proof of Lemma 4.5 we see that $T_1(\alpha)$ is a choice of a restriction of domain, in order to obtain a bijection from the construction that associates $g \rightarrow (P_g, Q_g)$. This choice satisfies the following nice property:

Remark 4.6. $g \in T_1(\alpha)$ iff $g^{-1} \in T_1(\alpha)$. Moreover,

$$b_{g^{-1}} = a_g^\epsilon \text{ and } a_{g^{-1}} = b_g^\epsilon$$

where $\epsilon = \pm 1$ according to whether g is orientation preserving or reversing.

In later sections we shall focus on the linked pairs, i.e. the intersection pairs that are relevant for the bracket.

Definition 4.7. We define $T_0(\alpha) \subseteq T_1(\alpha)$ as the set of elements that correspond to linked pairs under the bijection of Lemma 4.5.

Note that by Remark 4.3 and Lemma 4.5, the set $T_0(\alpha)$ is in bijection with $LP_2(X, X^{-1})$, where X is the conjugacy class of $[\alpha]$. From these same results we also get that $LP_1(X) = LP_2(X, X)$, which is in natural bijection with $LP_2(X, X^{-1})$. Observe also that by Lemma 3.13 a string X is simple, as defined in the introduction, iff $LP_1(X) = \emptyset$, or equivalently, iff $LP_2(X, X^{-1}) = \emptyset$.

4.2. Orientation reversing elements and unique intersections. The orientation properties of the elements of $T_0(\alpha)$, which correspond to the type of their associated linked pairs, will play a major role in proving Theorem 1.2. Next we study the key properties of the orientation reversing case.

Lemma 4.8. Let ξ and η be non-constant segments of Λ_α going in the positive orientation. Then if $\pi \circ \xi = (\pi \circ \eta)^{-1}$ we have $\xi(I) \cap \eta(I) = \emptyset$ and $l(\alpha) > 2l(\xi)$.

Proof. Write $\gamma = \pi \circ \xi$. Then an overlap between ξ and η would project to an overlap between γ and γ^{-1} , and if ξ and η meet at an endpoint, that would project to a reduction of α , of the form $\gamma\gamma^{-1}$ or $\gamma^{-1}\gamma$. Thus we get the first claim. The second one comes from considering a permutation α_0 of α so that its horizontal lift starting at $\xi(0)$ is contained in Λ_α . Note that such lift ends at $[\alpha]\xi(0)$, which is not in $\eta(I)$ by the first claim applied to η and $[\alpha]\xi$. Thus we obtain $\alpha_0 = \gamma a \gamma^{-1} b$ with a and b non-constant, so

$$l(\alpha) = l(\alpha_0) > 2l(\gamma) = 2l(\xi).$$

□

Lemma 4.9. *Let $g \in T^-(\Lambda_\alpha)$. Then $[\alpha^n]a_g(I) \cap [\alpha^m]b_g(I) = \emptyset$ for all $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof. If g reverses orientation strictly, we apply lemma 4.8 to the curves $[\alpha^n]a_g^{-1}$ and $[\alpha^m]b_g$. In case a_g is constant, say $a_g = e_p$ for $p \in \Lambda_\alpha$, we get that $[\alpha^n]g[\alpha^{-m}]p = p$ which is absurd because the action of $\mathcal{L}_x(M)$ is free and g , being orientation reversing, is not a power of α . □

Remark 4.10. Note that for $g \in T^-(\Lambda_\alpha)$ we have $l(t_g) < l(\alpha)/2$.

We say that α has *unique intersection* if $T_1(\alpha)$ consists of only two elements, g and g^{-1} (by Remark 4.6). By Lemma 4.5 this is equivalent to say that $\mathcal{I}(\alpha, \alpha^{-1})$ has two elements. Observe that the definition of intersection pair makes sense for a curve in a general one dimensional complex, i.e. not necessarily embedded in a surface. Thus we may speak of unique intersection for curves in this more general setting.

Given a subgroup $G \subseteq \mathcal{L}_x(M)$ we can consider Λ_α/G , the image of Λ_α in the quotient $\mathcal{E}_x(M)/G$, which is a one dimensional complex since $\Lambda_\alpha/\mathcal{L}_x(M) = \alpha(I)$ and α is piecewise geodesic. For $g \in \mathcal{L}_x(M)$, let G_g be the subgroup generated by g and $[\alpha]$.

Lemma 4.11. *Let $g \in T^-(\Lambda_\alpha)$ and $\bar{\alpha}$ be the projection of $\tilde{\alpha}$ onto Λ_α/G_g . Then $\bar{\alpha}$ has a unique intersection.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.9 we have that all the translates $[\alpha]^n a_g(I)$ and $[\alpha]^m b_g(I)$, for $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$, are pairwise disjoint. Consider first the quotient $\Lambda_\alpha/\langle[\alpha]\rangle$, which is a circle that can be parametrized by the projection of $\tilde{\alpha}$. Then $a_g(I)$ and $b_g(I)$ project to $\Lambda_\alpha/\langle[\alpha]\rangle$ as two disjoint intervals, and Λ_α/G_g is the further quotient obtained by identifying these two intervals (with the appropriate orientation). The interval resulting from this identification is the core of the only self-intersection pairs of $\bar{\alpha}$, which are only two (of the form (P, Q) and (Q, P)), and this shows the lemma. □

4.3. α -oriented subgroups. Now we turn our attention to the orientation preserving elements of $T(\Lambda_\alpha)$. We will be showing that they generate subgroups with the following property.

Definition 4.12. *Let $G \subset \mathcal{L}_x(M)$ be a subgroup. We say that G is α -oriented if for every $g, h \in G$ with $g^{-1}h \in T(\Lambda_\alpha)$ we have $g^{-1}h \in T^+(\Lambda_\alpha)$.*

Let us explain this definition in geometric terms. First note that each $g \in \mathcal{L}_x(M)$ induces an orientation on $g\Lambda_\alpha$ by carrying the standard orientation of Λ_α through the action of g . For two elements $g, h \in \mathcal{L}_x(M)$, the

condition that $g^{-1}h \in T(\Lambda_\alpha)$ is equivalent to saying that $g\Lambda_\alpha \cap h\Lambda_\alpha \neq \emptyset$, and we have $g^{-1}h \in T^+(\Lambda_\alpha)$ exactly when the orientations of $g\Lambda_\alpha$ and $h\Lambda_\alpha$ agree on their (non-empty) intersection. If $G \subset \mathcal{L}_x(M)$ is a subgroup we have that

$$G\Lambda_\alpha = \bigcup_{g \in G} g\Lambda_\alpha$$

is a one dimensional complex whose connected components are simplicial trees, recalling the form of the intersections between translates of Λ_α by elements of $\mathcal{L}_x(M)$. Then we have:

Remark 4.13. If G is α -oriented we can give $G\Lambda_\alpha$ a G -invariant orientation that extends the standard orientation of Λ_α .

If a subgroup $G \subset \mathcal{L}_x(M)$ is generated by some elements of $T(\Lambda_\alpha)$ then $G\Lambda_\alpha$ is connected, thus is a simplicial tree. The following technical result will be useful in this context.

Lemma 4.14. *Suppose $g, h_1, \dots, h_n \in \mathcal{L}_x(M)$ satisfy that:*

- $g^{-1}h_1, g^{-1}h_n \in T(\Lambda_\alpha)$,
- $g^{-1}h_i \notin T(\Lambda_\alpha)$ for $i = 2, \dots, n-1$,
- $h_{i-1}^{-1}h_i \in T(\Lambda_\alpha)$ for $i = 2, \dots, n$.

Then $h_1^{-1}h_n \in T(\Lambda_\alpha)$.

Proof. Interpreting the hypotheses in terms of intersections of translates of Λ_α , we can find a curve $\beta \subset h_1\Lambda_\alpha \cup \dots \cup h_n\Lambda_\alpha$ that only meets $g\Lambda_\alpha$ at its endpoints, with $\beta(0) \in h_1\Lambda_\alpha \cap g\Lambda_\alpha$ and $\beta(1) \in h_n\Lambda_\alpha \cap g\Lambda_\alpha$. Since $g\Lambda_\alpha \cup h_1\Lambda_\alpha \cup \dots \cup h_n\Lambda_\alpha$ has no non-trivial loops, we must have $\beta(0) = \beta(1)$ (and β must be a trivial loop), which provides a point in $h_1\Lambda_\alpha \cap h_n\Lambda_\alpha$ as desired. \square

The following is a straightforward observation.

Lemma 4.15. *If $g, h \in T^+(\Lambda_\alpha)$ and $g^{-1}h \in T(\Lambda_\alpha)$, then $g^{-1}h \in T^+(\Lambda_\alpha)$.*

Next we present the main result of this subsection, concerning the subgroups generated by orientation preserving elements.

Lemma 4.16. *Let $G \subset \mathcal{L}_x(M)$ be a finitely generated subgroup whose generators belong to $T^+(\Lambda_\alpha)$. Then G is α -oriented.*

Proof. By hypothesis we can write

$$G = \bigcup_i G_i, \text{ where } G_0 = \{id_x\}, \text{ and } G_{i+1} = G_i \cup \{h_{i+1}\},$$

such that there is $h'_i \in G_i$ with $h_{i+1}^{-1}h'_i \in T^+(\Lambda_\alpha)$ for every $i \geq 0$. We are going to show the lemma by induction on i : assuming that $g^{-1}h \in T(\Lambda_\alpha)$ implies $g^{-1}h \in T^+(\Lambda_\alpha)$ for $g, h \in G_i$, we shall show that this same property holds for $g, h \in G_{i+1}$. The base case of this induction is trivial.

By Remark 4.2, we only need to consider the case when $g = h_{i+1}$ and $h \in G_i$. So let $h \in G_i$ be such that $h_{i+1}^{-1}h \in T(\Lambda_\alpha)$, and we are going to show that $h_{i+1}^{-1}h \in T^+(\Lambda_\alpha)$. By construction of the set G_i there is a sequence $h'_i = k_1, \dots, k_n = h$ in G_i such that $k_j^{-1}k_{j+1} \in T^+(\Lambda_\alpha)$ for $j = 1, \dots, n-1$. Since $k_j \in G_i$ for every j , the induction hypothesis gives us that $k_j^{-1}k_l \in T^+(\Lambda_\alpha)$ whenever $k_j^{-1}k_l \in T(\Lambda_\alpha)$.

By lemma 4.14 we can assume, maybe after taking a subsequence, that $h_{i+1}^{-1}k_j \in T(\Lambda_\alpha)$ for every j . Now write

$$h_{i+1}^{-1}k_2 = (h_{i+1}^{-1}k_1)(k_1^{-1}k_2)$$

and note that $h_{i+1}^{-1}k_1$ and $k_1^{-1}k_2$ are orientation preserving by construction. Therefore $h_{i+1}^{-1}k_2$ is orientation preserving by Lemma 4.15. Proceeding inductively we conclude that $h_{i+1}^{-1}k_n$ is also orientation preserving, as desired. \square

5. FORMULAS FOR THE TERMS OF THE BRACKET

In this section we study the dot products between a string and its inverse applying what we developed in section 4. Again we fix a cyclically reduced, non-trivial closed curve α , and let $x = \alpha(0)$ and $X \in S(M)$ be the conjugacy class of α .

5.1. Expressions for the dot product. Let $g \in T_1(\alpha)$ and recall the horizontal curves (a_g, b_g) defined in subsection 4.1. We introduce the following curves:

- $\tilde{\alpha}_g$ is the segment of Λ_α starting at $b_g(1)$ and ending at $[\alpha]b_g(1)$. Let $\alpha_g = \pi \circ \tilde{\alpha}_g$.
- $\tilde{\beta}_g$ is the segment of $g\Lambda_\alpha$ starting at $b_g(1)$ and ending at $g[\alpha^{-1}]a_g(1)$. Let $\beta_g = \pi \circ \tilde{\beta}_g$.
- $\tilde{\gamma}_g$ is the segment of Λ_α starting at id_x and ending at $b_g(1)$. Let $\gamma_g = \pi \circ \tilde{\gamma}_g$.

We observe α_g and β_g are permutations of α and α^{-1} respectively, and that $\tilde{\alpha}_g$ and $\tilde{\beta}_g$ are their respective horizontal lifts starting at $b_g(1)$. This is easy to see for α_g , and in the case of β_g note that $\tilde{\beta}_g = g\tilde{\beta}'$ where $\tilde{\beta}'$ is the segment of Λ_α starting at $a_g(1)$ and ending at $[\alpha^{-1}]a_g(1)$. According

to Definition 3.8 (which also makes sense for intersection pairs), the conjugacy class of $\alpha_g\beta_g$ is the dot product $(X \cdot_{(P,Q)} X^{-1})$ where (P, Q) is the intersection pair corresponding to g .

On the other hand, γ_g is the curve that gives the change of basepoint conjugation so that $[\gamma_g\alpha_g\gamma_g^{-1}]$ and $[\gamma_g\beta_g\gamma_g^{-1}]$ belong to $\mathcal{L}_x(M)$. We also have that $\tilde{\gamma}_g$ is the horizontal lift of γ at id_x . For an example of these curves, in figure 3 we have $\alpha_g = bca$, $\beta_g = a^{-1}c^{-1}e^{-1}f^{-1}$ and $\gamma_g = a$.

Remark 5.1. By Remark 4.6 we have

- If g preserves orientation, then $\alpha_{g^{-1}} = \beta_g^{-1}$ and $\beta_{g^{-1}} = \alpha_g^{-1}$.
- If g reverses orientation, $\alpha_{g^{-1}}$ and $\beta_{g^{-1}}$ are the respective reductions of $t_g\beta_g^{-1}t_g^{-1}$ and $t_g\alpha_g^{-1}t_g^{-1}$.

(Note that in the first case $t_{g^{-1}} = t_g$, while in the second case $t_{g^{-1}} = t_g^{-1}$).

This gives a relationship between the dot products between X and X^{-1} associated to g and g^{-1} .

Remark 5.2. Let $(P, Q) \in \mathcal{I}(\alpha, \alpha^{-1})$ correspond to $g \in T_1(\alpha)$, and denote by (Q', P') the intersection pair corresponding to g^{-1} . Then we have

$$(X \cdot_{(Q', P')} X^{-1}) = (X \cdot_{(P, Q)} X^{-1})^{-1}$$

In particular, these dot products cannot be equal, as a non-trivial loop is not conjugate to its inverse. Next we define the curves that will help us write reduced forms for the dot products.

Definition 5.3. Let $g \in T_1(\alpha)$. We define the curves $c_1(\alpha, g)$ and $c_2(\alpha, g)$ according to whether g preserves or reverses orientation:

- If g preserves orientation,

$c_1(\alpha, g)$ is the reduced form of $\alpha_g t_g^{-1}$ and

$c_2(\alpha, g)$ is the reduced form of $t_g \beta_g$

- If g reverses orientation, let

$$c_1(\alpha, g) = \alpha_g \text{ and } c_2(\alpha, g) = \beta_g$$

As an example, in Figure 3 we have $c_1(\alpha, g) = b$ and $c_2(\alpha, g) = e^{-1}f^{-1}$.

Let us interpret this definition in terms of the construction of the intersection pair (P_g, Q_g) given in subsection 4.1. In the orientation preserving case we had $P_g = (\alpha_1, t_g)$ and $Q_g = (\beta_1, t_g^{-1})$, and recalling the construction we get

$$\alpha_g = \alpha_1 t_g \text{ and } \beta_g = t_g^{-1} \beta_1, \text{ thus } c_1(\alpha, g) = \alpha_1 \text{ and } c_2(\alpha, g) = \beta_1$$

In the orientation reversing case we had $P_g = (\alpha_1, t_g)$ and $Q_g = (\beta_1, t_g)$ and we get

$$\alpha_g = \alpha_1 t_g \text{ and } \beta_g = \beta_1 t_g, \text{ and so } c_1(\alpha, g) = \alpha_1 t_g \text{ and } c_2(\alpha, g) = \beta_1 t_g$$

In both cases we have that the concatenation $c_1(\alpha, g)c_2(\alpha, g)$ is the cyclically reduced form of $\alpha_g \beta_g$. Also note that:

Remark 5.4. If $g \in T_1(\alpha)$ is orientation reversing, then $c_1(\alpha, g)$ is a permutation of α and $c_2(\alpha, g)$ is a permutation of α^{-1} . In particular $l(c_1(\alpha, g)) = l(c_2(\alpha, g)) = l(\alpha)$.

Remark 5.5. On the other hand, if $g \in T_1(\alpha)$ is orientation preserving we have $l(c_1(\alpha, g)) = l(c_2(\alpha, g)) = l(\alpha) - l(t_g)$.

So in any case the lengths of $c_1(\alpha, g)$ and $c_2(\alpha, g)$ agree. We can also deduce the length of the dot product (i.e. the length of a cyclically reduced form), as follows:

Remark 5.6. For $g \in T_1(\alpha)$ we have:

- $l(c_1(\alpha, g)c_2(\alpha, g)) = 2l(\alpha) - 2l(t_g)$ if g preserves orientation, and
- $l(c_1(\alpha, g)c_2(\alpha, g)) = 2l(\alpha)$ if g reverses orientation.

Recalling the relationship between orientation and the type of intersection pairs from subsection 4.1, Remark 5.6 implies that if $c_1(\alpha, g)c_2(\alpha, g)$ is a permutation of $c_1(\alpha, h)c_2(\alpha, h)$ for $g, h \in T_1(\alpha)$ then either:

- (P_g, Q_g) and (P_h, Q_h) are both of types (2) or (1) (i.e. g and h are orientation reversing), or
- (P_g, Q_g) and (P_h, Q_h) are both of type (3) (i.e. g and h are strictly orientation preserving), and $l(t_g) = l(t_h)$.

This observation is an example of recovering information about the intersection pair from the corresponding dot product. In the following sections we will be proving stronger results within this same idea, which will ultimately lead us to Theorem 1.2 by showing there can be no cancellations in the formula for $[X, X^{-1}]$.

Next we record the behaviour of the curves from Definition 5.3 under taking inverses in $T_1(\alpha)$, which we can compute from Remark 5.1.

Remark 5.7. Let $g \in T_1(\alpha)$, then

- if g preserves orientation,

$$c_1(\alpha, g^{-1}) = c_2(\alpha, g)^{-1} \text{ and } c_2(\alpha, g^{-1}) = c_1(\alpha, g)^{-1}$$
- if g reverses orientation,

$$c_1(\alpha, g^{-1}) \text{ is the reduced form of } t_g c_2(\alpha, g)^{-1} t_g^{-1} \text{ and}$$

$c_2(\alpha, g^{-1})$ is the reduced form of $t_g c_1(\alpha, g)^{-1} t_g^{-1}$

The next result lets us write the dot products as commutators in $\mathcal{L}_x(M)$.

Lemma 5.8. *Let $g \in T_1(\alpha)$, and put $c_i = c_i(\alpha, g)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then we have*

- (1) $[\alpha]g[\alpha]^{-1}g^{-1} = [\gamma_g c_1 c_2 \gamma_g^{-1}]$, and
- (2) if $(P, Q) \in \mathcal{I}(\alpha, \alpha^{-1})$ corresponds to g by the bijection of Lemma 4.5, then $(X \cdot_{(P,Q)} X^{-1})$ is the conjugacy class of $[\alpha]g[\alpha]^{-1}g^{-1}$.

Proof. The second point follows from the first and the fact that the cyclically reduced form of $[\gamma_g c_1 c_2 \gamma_g^{-1}]$, which is $c_1 c_2$, represents the dot product $(X \cdot_{(P,Q)} X^{-1})$ as discussed previously in this subsection.

We show the first point in the statement for g corresponding to an intersection pair of type (3), as the other cases result from a straightforward adaptation of the same computations. In fact, type (1) can be considered within types either (2) or (3) by allowing constant core curves.

Whithin the case of (P, Q) being of type (3), we distinguish 3 subcases according to whether id_x belongs to both a_g and b_g , to only one of them, or to neither of them. First we assume that id_x is in b_g but not in a_g . This is the situation shown in Figure 3. Then we can write $\alpha = abc = ecaf$ with $g = [c^{-1}e^{-1}]$, noting that it corresponds to an intersection pair of type (3). We have $\gamma_g = a$, $c_1 = b$ and $c_2 = e^{-1}f^{-1}$. Thus we get $[\gamma_g c_1 c_2 \gamma_g^{-1}] = abe^{-1}f^{-1}a^{-1}$. On the other hand we compute

$$(2) \quad g[\alpha]^{-1}g^{-1} = [(c^{-1}e^{-1})(f^{-1}a^{-1}c^{-1}e^{-1})(ec)]$$

Thus

$$[\alpha]g[\alpha]^{-1}g^{-1} = [(abc)(c^{-1}e^{-1})(f^{-1}a^{-1}c^{-1}e^{-1})(ec)] = [\gamma_g c_1 c_2 \gamma_g^{-1}]$$

as desired. The situation is symmetrical for id_x in a_g but not in b_g .

In the second subcase, when id_x is in both a_g and b_g , we have that $g \in b_g(I)$. If g lies before id_x in the orientation of Λ_α we can write $\alpha = abcc' = c'af c$, where $t_g = cc'a$ and $g = [c'^{-1}]$. Now $\gamma_g = a$, $c_1 = b$ and $c_2 = f^{-1}$, and we compute

$$(3) \quad g[\alpha]^{-1}g^{-1} = [c'^{-1}(c^{-1}f^{-1}a^{-1}c'^{-1})c']$$

and

$$[\alpha]g[\alpha]^{-1}g^{-1} = [(abcc')c'^{-1}(c^{-1}f^{-1}a^{-1}c'^{-1})c'] = [abf^{-1}a^{-1}],$$

that is $[\gamma_g c_1 c_2 \gamma_g^{-1}]$. When g lies after id_x in Λ_α we write $\alpha = aa'bc = a'fca$, where $t_g = caa'$ and $g = [a']$, and the computation is similar.

Finally, if id_x is neither in a_g nor b_g , we have $\alpha = abc = ebf$ with $t_g = b$ and $g = [ae^{-1}]$. We see that $\gamma_g = ab$, $c_1 = ca$ and $c_2 = e^{-1}f^{-1}$. On the other hand

$$(4) \quad g[\alpha]^{-1}g^{-1} = [(ae^{-1})(f^{-1}b^{-1}e^{-1})(ea^{-1})]$$

thus we get

$$[\alpha]g[\alpha]^{-1}g^{-1} = [ab(cae^{-1}f^{-1})b^{-1}a^{-1}] = [\gamma_g c_1 c_2 \gamma_g^{-1}]$$

□

5.2. Conjugate dot products. Our strategy for Theorem 1.2 is to show that for a primitive string X there can be no cancellations in the formula for $[X, X^{-1}]$ given in Definition 3.9. This would imply that $[X, X^{-1}] = 0$ only when $LP_2(X, X^{-1}) = \emptyset$, provided that X is primitive, thus proving Theorem 1.2. So we need to study what happens if two linked pairs between X and X^{-1} yield the same dot product. Here we shall focus on what we can achieve for general intersection pairs, leaving the discussion of linked pairs and their signs for the next section.

Assume that $g, h \in T_1(\alpha)$ are such that $c_1(\alpha, g)c_2(\alpha, g)$ is a permutation (maybe trivial) of the curve $c_1(\alpha, h)c_2(\alpha, h)$, which is to say that their corresponding intersection pairs yield the same dot product. So we have

$$[c_1(\alpha, h)c_2(\alpha, h)] = [rc_1(\alpha, g)c_2(\alpha, g)r^{-1}]$$

where $r \in \Omega$ is an initial segment of $c_1(\alpha, h)c_2(\alpha, h)$.

By Remark 5.6 and the discussion preceeding it, the curves $c_1(\alpha, h)$, $c_2(\alpha, h)$, $c_1(\alpha, g)$ and $c_2(\alpha, g)$ have all the same length. Thus we may assume that r is an initial segment of $c_1(\alpha, h)$ (otherwise we exchange the roles of g and h), and find $s, t, u \in \Omega$ such that

$$(5) \quad c_1(\alpha, h) = rs \quad c_2(\alpha, h) = tu$$

$$(6) \quad c_1(\alpha, g) = st \quad c_2(\alpha, g) = ur$$

where $l(r) = l(t)$ and $l(s) = l(u)$. In particular, r is constant iff t is constant (trivial permutation case), and s is constant iff u is constant. (Note: t is not to be confused with t_g nor t_h). Let

$$(7) \quad \phi = [\gamma_h r \gamma_g^{-1}] \in \mathcal{L}_x(M)$$

Then by Lemma 5.8 we have

$$(8) \quad \phi[\alpha]g[\alpha]^{-1}g^{-1}\phi^{-1} = [\alpha]h[\alpha]^{-1}h^{-1}$$

Lemma 5.8 also gives the converse: if $g, h \in T_1(\alpha)$ are so that $[\alpha]g[\alpha]^{-1}g^{-1}$ and $[\alpha]h[\alpha]^{-1}h^{-1}$ are conjugate in $\mathcal{L}_x(M)$, then $c_1(\alpha, g)c_2(\alpha, g)$ is a permutation of $c_1(\alpha, h)c_2(\alpha, h)$.

Lemma 5.9. *Assume that α is primitive, and that $g, h \in T_1(\alpha)$ are orientation reversing and so that $[\alpha]h[\alpha]^{-1}h^{-1}$ and $[\alpha]g[\alpha]^{-1}g^{-1}$ are conjugate. Then*

$$g = h$$

in particular

$$c_i(\alpha, g) = c_i(\alpha, h) \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2.$$

Proof. Recall that since g and h are orientation reversing we have $c_1(\alpha, g) = \alpha_g$, $c_2(\alpha, g) = \beta_g$, $c_1(\alpha, h) = \alpha_h$ and $c_2(\alpha, h) = \beta_h$, which will be useful through the proof.

Let $\bar{\alpha}$ be the projection of $\tilde{\alpha}$ onto Λ_α/G_h as in Lemma 4.11. Note that $\mathcal{E}_x(M)/G_h$ is an intermediate bundle over M , and has a notion of horizontal lift, by projecting the one in $\mathcal{E}_x(M)$ (which is equivariant). Throughout this proof we shall consider horizontal lifts to $\mathcal{E}_x(M)/G_h$ repeatedly, and refer to them simply as “lifts”.

Let $\bar{\gamma}_h$ be the lift of γ_h starting at $\bar{\gamma}_h(0) = \bar{\alpha}(0)$, which is the same as the projection of $\tilde{\gamma}_h$, thus it is contained in Λ_α/G_h and $\bar{\gamma}_h(1)$ is the projection of $b_h(1)$. Let $\bar{c}_1(\alpha, h)\bar{c}_2(\alpha, h)$ be the lift of $c_1(\alpha, h)c_2(\alpha, h)$ beginning at $\bar{\gamma}_h(1)$. We see that this curve is closed and contained in Λ_α/G_h , by observing that $\bar{c}_1(\alpha, h)$ and $\bar{c}_2(\alpha, h)$ are the respective projections of $\tilde{\alpha}_h \subset \Lambda_\alpha$ and $h^{-1}\tilde{\beta}_h \subset \Lambda_\alpha$, thus each one is a closed curve at $\bar{\gamma}_h(1)$.

Next we take \bar{r} the lift of r starting at $\bar{\gamma}_h(1)$, noting that it is an initial segment of $\bar{c}_1(\alpha, h)$. Consider $\bar{c}_1(\alpha, g)\bar{c}_2(\alpha, g)$ the lift of $c_1(\alpha, g)c_2(\alpha, g)$ that starts at $\bar{r}(1)$ (recalling that $c_1(\alpha, g)$ begins at $r(1)$).

Claim 1: $\bar{c}_1(\alpha, g)\bar{c}_2(\alpha, g)$ is closed and contained in Λ_α/G_h .

To show this claim, write $c_1(\alpha, g)c_2(\alpha, g) = stur$, and start by taking the lift \bar{s} of s starting at $\bar{r}(1)$. Since $rs = c_1(\alpha, h)$ we have that $\bar{r}\bar{s} = \bar{c}_1(\alpha, h)$, and thus $\bar{s} \subset \Lambda_\alpha/G_h$ and $\bar{s}(1) = \bar{\gamma}_h(1)$. We continue lifting $c_1(\alpha, g)c_2(\alpha, g) = stur$ by taking the lift of tu beginning at $\bar{s}(1) = \bar{\gamma}_h(1)$, and we notice that this lift agrees with $\bar{c}_2(\alpha, h)$ since $tu = c_2(\alpha, h)$. In particular it ends at $\bar{\gamma}_h(1)$, so \bar{r} is the lift of r that we need to complete the lifting of $c_1(\alpha, g)c_2(\alpha, g) = stur$. Thus we get that $\bar{c}_1(\alpha, g)\bar{c}_2(\alpha, g) = \bar{s}\bar{c}_2(\alpha, h)\bar{r}$, which is closed at $\bar{r}(1)$ and clearly contained in Λ_α/G_h .

Claim 2: For $i = 1, 2$ we have

$$(9) \quad \bar{c}_i(\alpha, g) = \bar{c}_i(\alpha, h).$$

We can consider $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{\alpha}(0)}(\Lambda_\alpha/G_h)$ as a subgroup of $\mathcal{L}_x(M)$, since projection induces an injective homomorphism, and then Lemma 4.11 implies that $T_1(\bar{\alpha}) = \{h, h^{-1}\}$. By construction we have

$$\bar{c}_i(\alpha, h) = c_i(\bar{\alpha}, h) \text{ for } i = 1, 2.$$

On the other hand, by Claim 1 we have that $\bar{c}_1(\alpha, g)$ and $\bar{c}_2(\alpha, g)$ lie inside Λ_α/G_h , and we recall that they are lifts of α_g and β_g respectively, which are permutations of α and α^{-1} . Therefore $\bar{c}_1(\alpha, g)$ and $\bar{c}_2(\alpha, g)$ are permutations of $\bar{\alpha}$ and $\bar{\alpha}^{-1}$ respectively (in particular they are closed). Then we get that $\bar{c}_1(\alpha, g)\bar{c}_2(\alpha, g)$ represents the dot product for an intersection pair of $\bar{\alpha}$, and since it is cyclically reduced we must have

$$\bar{c}_i(\alpha, g) = c_i(\bar{\alpha}, h^\epsilon) \text{ for } i = 1, 2 \text{ and for some } \epsilon = \pm 1$$

Since we have $\bar{c}_1(\alpha, h)\bar{c}_2(\alpha, h) = \bar{r}\bar{c}_1(\alpha, g)\bar{c}_2(\alpha, g)\bar{r}^{-1}$, we can apply Remark 5.2 to get that $\epsilon = 1$, proving this claim.

To finish the proof of the lemma recall that, since we are in the orientation reversing case, we have $c_1(\alpha, g) = \alpha_g$ and $c_1(\alpha, h) = \alpha_h$, which are permutations of α . Equation (9) implies, by projecting, that $\alpha_g = \alpha_h$, and then Lemma 2.3 gives $g = h$, since α is primitive. □

Putting Lemma 5.9 together with Remark 5.6, we see that a dot product of the form $(X \cdot_{(P,Q)} X^{-1})$ with length $2l(\alpha)$ comes from a unique intersection pair (P, Q) , which is of type either (1) or (3).

One would like to remove the orientation reversal condition from the hypothesis of Lemma 5.9, for that would give a stronger result than Theorem 1.2, namely that the strings in the terms of the formula for $[X, X^{-1}]$ cannot repeat. Unfortunately this remains open. Next is the result we can get when dropping said orientation condition, which will suffice for our purpose.

Lemma 5.10. *Assume that α is primitive, and that $g, h \in T_1(\alpha)$ are such that $[\alpha]h[\alpha]^{-1}h^{-1}$ and $[\alpha]g[\alpha]^{-1}g^{-1}$ are conjugate. Then*

$$c_i(\alpha, g) = c_i(\alpha, h) \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2.$$

Proof. We shall assume g and h preserve orientation strictly, since Remark 5.6 implies that the only other possible case is the one covered by Lemma 5.9.

Recall the notation from Equations (5) and (6), i.e. the curves r, s, t, u and their properties. Notice that we can prove the lemma by showing that t , and hence r , are constant.

Firstly we shall define some horizontal lifts in $\mathcal{E}_x(M)$ that will be useful through the proof: By Equation (6) we can take \bar{s} the lift of s starting at $\tilde{\gamma}_g(1) = b_g(1)$, and \bar{t} the lift of t starting at $\bar{s}(1)$. Note that $\bar{s}\bar{t}$ is the lift of $c_1(\alpha, g)$ that is an initial segment of $\tilde{\alpha}_g$, thus it is contained in Λ_α and ends at $\bar{t}(1) = [\alpha]b_g(0)$, recalling Definition 5.3 in the orientation preserving case. We also see that \bar{s} and \bar{t} are positively oriented in Λ_α .

We also define \tilde{r} as the lift of r starting at $\tilde{\gamma}_h(1) = b_h(1)$, and \tilde{s} as the lift of s starting at $\tilde{r}(1)$, which are well defined by Equation (5). Again we see that $\tilde{r}\tilde{s}$ is the lift of $c_1(\alpha, g)$ which is an initial segment of $\tilde{\alpha}_h$, and so it is contained in Λ_α and ends at $\tilde{s}(1) = [\alpha]b_h(0)$. Also, \tilde{r} and \tilde{s} are positively oriented in Λ_α .

Finally, let \tilde{t} be the lift of t starting at $\tilde{s}(1)$, which is well defined since $t(0) = s(1)$ from Equation (6). We see from Equation (5) that \tilde{t} is an initial segment of a lift of $c_2(\alpha, h)$, namely the one contained in $[\alpha]\tilde{\beta}_h$, since it starts at $[\alpha]b_h(0)$. Thus \tilde{t} is contained in $[\alpha]h\Lambda_\alpha$, meeting Λ_α only at $\tilde{t}(0)$, and it goes in the negative direction with respect to the orientation of $[\alpha]h\Lambda_\alpha$ induced by $[\alpha]h$.

Next we recall Equation (7), defining $\phi = [\gamma_h r \gamma_g^{-1}]$. Notice that, by the above definitions, we have $\phi\tilde{\gamma}_g(1) = \tilde{r}(1)$, in particular $\phi \in T(\Lambda_\alpha)$. Since the action of $\mathcal{L}_x(M)$ preserves horizontal lifting, we also get that $\phi\bar{s} = \tilde{s}$ and $\phi\bar{t} = \tilde{t}$.

Claim 1: If $\phi \in T^+(\Lambda_\alpha)$ then t is constant.

Let G be the subgroup generated by g, h, ϕ and $[\alpha]$. Then G is α -oriented by Lemma 4.16, so there is a G -invariant orientation on $G\Lambda_\alpha$. On the other hand, $\phi\bar{t} = \tilde{t}$ where \bar{t} has positive orientation in Λ_α but \tilde{t} has negative orientation in $[\alpha]h\Lambda_\alpha$. This is a contradiction unless t is constant.

Claim 2: If s is non-constant, then $\phi \in T^+(\Lambda_\alpha)$.

We have $\phi\bar{s} = \tilde{s}$ where both \bar{s} and \tilde{s} are contained in Λ_α , thus $\bar{s} \subset b_\phi(I)$ and $\tilde{s} \subset a_\phi(I)$. Recall that both \bar{s} and \tilde{s} are positively oriented in Λ_α , thus showing that ϕ preserves orientation, if s is non-constant.

Recall that we prove the lemma by showing that t is constant. Thus, in light of these claims, the only case that remains to be considered is when s is constant and ϕ reverses orientation strictly. We shall show that this case is void, which makes sense as s and t cannot be both constant in Equation (6). Thus we assume that s is constant and ϕ strictly reverses orientation, aiming to reach a contradiction.

This case is the most complex part of this proof, the key will be to consider the dot product defined by ϕ . Note that this can be defined even if ϕ is not in $T_1(\alpha)$, through Lemma 4.4, and the same is true for the curves $c_1(\alpha, \phi)$ and $c_2(\alpha, \phi)$ from Definition 5.3. In order to simplify notation we put $c_i(\phi) = c_i(\alpha, \phi)$ for $i = 1, 2$, and define

$$\omega = [\alpha]\phi[\alpha]^{-1}\phi^{-1} = [\gamma_\phi c_1(\phi)c_2(\phi)\gamma_\phi^{-1}]$$

Claim 3: ω is primitive.

By change of basepoint, i.e. Lemma 2.1, this is equivalent to show that $c_1(\phi)c_2(\phi)$ is primitive. Assume the contrary, i.e. that there is a closed curve τ and $k > 1$ so that $\tau^k = c_1(\phi)c_2(\phi)$. Note that τ must be cyclically reduced, since $c_1(\phi)c_2(\phi)$ is, and that $l(c_1(\phi)) = l(c_2(\phi))$ by Remark 5.4.

If k is even, we write $k = 2j$ and get that $c_1(\phi) = \tau^j = c_2(\phi)$, which is absurd by Remark 5.4 and the assumption that ϕ reverses orientation, since a permutation of α cannot agree with a permutation of α^{-1} . If k is odd, we write $k = 2j + 1$ and we get that

$$\tau = vw \text{ with } c_1(\phi) = (vw)^j v \text{ and } c_2(\phi) = w(vw)^j$$

where we also have $l(v) = l(w)$. Again by Remark 5.4, we get that $(w^{-1}v^{-1})^j w^{-1}$ is a permutation of $(vw)^j v$. Since $l(v) = l(w)$ and v cannot overlap v^{-1} (nor w overlap w^{-1}), we must have $v = w^{-1}$, which is absurd since τ cannot be trivial. Thus we have shown Claim 3.

Claim 4: There is a non-trivial $\theta \in T(\Lambda_\alpha)$ such that $\theta\omega\theta^{-1} = \omega$.

To show this claim it will be useful to write Equations (5) and (6) for the case when s is constant:

$$(10) \quad c_1(\alpha, h) = c_2(\alpha, g) = r \text{ and } c_1(\alpha, g) = c_2(\alpha, h) = t,$$

and we also get that $\bar{t}(0) = \tilde{\gamma}_g(1) = b_g(1)$ and $\tilde{r}(1) = \tilde{t}(0) = [\alpha]b_h(0)$. By Remark 5.7 we deduce that

$$(11) \quad c_1(\alpha, h^{-1}) = c_2(\alpha, g^{-1}) = t^{-1} \text{ and } c_1(\alpha, g^{-1}) = c_2(\alpha, h^{-1}) = r^{-1}$$

Define

$$\psi = h^{-1}\phi g.$$

Let us check that $\psi \in T^-(\Lambda_\alpha)$. Note first that, since g preserves orientation, we have $\tilde{\gamma}_{g^{-1}}(1) = b_{g^{-1}}(1) = a_g(1)$ by Remark 4.6. By Equation (11) we may take \hat{r} the lift of r that ends at $\hat{r}(1) = a_g(1)$, i.e. so that \hat{r}^{-1} lifts $c_1(\alpha, g^{-1})$ starting at $a_g(1) = \tilde{\gamma}_{g^{-1}}(1)$. Thus we see that \hat{r}^{-1} is contained in Λ_α and is positively oriented, since it is a segment of $\tilde{\alpha}_{g^{-1}}$. We also see that $\hat{r}(0) = \hat{r}^{-1}(1) = [\alpha]a_g(0)$.

We shall describe the action of $\psi = h^{-1}\phi g$ on \hat{r} . First we notice that $g\hat{r}$ ends at $ga_g(1) = b_g(1) = \tilde{\gamma}_g(1)$. Next we recall that $\phi\tilde{\gamma}_g(1) = \tilde{r}(1)$, so by equivariance of the horizontal lifting we get that $\phi g\hat{r} = \tilde{r}$. Finally we get that $\psi\hat{r} = h^{-1}\tilde{r}$. Recalling Equation (11) we see that this curve lifts $c_2(\alpha, h^{-1})^{-1}$ starting at $h^{-1}\tilde{r}(0) = h^{-1}b_h(1) = a_h(1)$. Thus $\psi\hat{r}$ is contained in $h^{-1}\Lambda_\alpha$ and meets Λ_α exactly at $\psi\hat{r}(0) = a_h(1)$. This shows that $\psi \in T(\Lambda_\alpha)$, and it must reverse orientation strictly by Lemma 4.16 since $\phi = h\psi g^{-1}$.

Now we set $h^* = [\alpha]h[\alpha]^{-1}$, and a simple computation from Equation 8 and the definition of $\psi = h^{-1}\phi g$ gives us

$$(12) \quad h^*[\alpha]\psi[\alpha]^{-1}\psi^{-1}h^{*-1} = [\alpha]\phi[\alpha]^{-1}\phi^{-1}$$

By Remark 4.4 there are integers i, j, k, l such that $[\alpha]^i\phi[\alpha]^j$ and $[\alpha]^k\psi[\alpha]^l$ belong to $T_1(\alpha)$. Now we apply Lemma 5.9 to these elements and Equation (12), hence for $n = i - k, m = k - l$ we obtain

$$\psi = [\alpha]^n\phi[\alpha]^m$$

and Equation (12) becomes

$$(h^*[\alpha]^n)[\alpha]\phi[\alpha]^{-1}\phi^{-1}(h^*[\alpha]^n)^{-1} = [\alpha]\phi[\alpha]^{-1}\phi^{-1}$$

So we set $\theta = h^*[\alpha]^n$ and get that $\theta\omega\theta^{-1} = \omega$. Note that $\theta = [\alpha]h[\alpha]^{n-1}$ is not trivial, since h is not a power of $[\alpha]$, and belongs to $T(\Lambda_\alpha)$, since $\theta\Lambda_\alpha = [\alpha]h\Lambda_\alpha$ intersects Λ_α in the segment $[\alpha]b_h(I)$. Thus we have shown Claim 4.

Putting $C = \alpha(I)$ and recalling Lemma 3.10, we see that $\omega, \theta \in \mathcal{L}_x(C)$ which is a free group, so Claims 3 and 4 imply that

$$(13) \quad \theta = \omega^i \text{ for some } i \in \mathbb{Z}, i \neq 0$$

We shall reach a contradiction by showing that $\theta\Lambda_\alpha$ is disjoint from Λ_α , i.e. that $\theta \notin T(\Lambda_\alpha)$, against Claim 4. Since $T(\Lambda_\alpha)$ is closed under taking inverses (Remark 4.2), we may assume that $i > 0$.

Changing the basepoint if necessary, we may assume that $b_\phi(1) = id_x$. Note that such a change of basepoint amounts to replace α by a permutation of it, and does not change the curves $c_1(\phi)$ and $c_2(\phi)$. By Lemma 2.1 this change of basepoint also preserves Claims 3 and 4, and Equation (13). From $b_\phi(1) = id_x$ we get that γ_ϕ is constant, $c_1(\phi) = \alpha$ and $c_2(\phi)$ is a non-trivial permutation of α^{-1} .

Let $\tilde{c}_2(\phi)$ be the horizontal lift of $c_2(\phi)$ that ends at $b_\phi(1) = id_x$. Since ϕ reverses orientation, the discussion after Definition 5.3 implies that $\tilde{c}_2(\phi)$ intersects Λ_α exactly in the segment $b_\phi(I)$, and in particular $\tilde{c}_2(\phi)(0) \notin \Lambda_\alpha$. On the other hand we take η the horizontal lift of $(c_1(\phi)c_2(\phi))^i$ that begins at id_x , so we have $\eta(1) = \omega^i = \theta$. Note that since $c_1(\phi) = \alpha$, we have a reduced factorization

$$\eta = \tilde{\alpha}\nu$$

where ν meets Λ_α only at $\nu(0)$, since the lift of $c_2(\phi)$ starting at $[\alpha] = [\alpha]b_\phi(1)$ is an initial segment of ν . Observe also that $\theta\tilde{c}_2(\phi)$, being the lift of $c_2(\phi)$ that ends at $\theta = \nu(1)$, is a final segment of ν (if $i = 1$ it agrees with the initial segment just discussed). Since $\mathcal{E}_x(C)$ is a tree, the line $\theta\Lambda_\alpha$ cannot intersect Λ_α without containing $\nu(I)$, but acting by θ we see that $\theta\tilde{c}_2(\phi)$

intersects $\theta\Lambda_\alpha$ only at $\theta b_h(I)$, which does not contain $\theta\tilde{c}_2(\phi)(0) \in \nu(I)$. Therefore $\theta \notin T(\Lambda_\alpha)$ and we have a contradiction, concluding the proof. \square

6. SIGNS OF THE TERMS OF THE BRACKET

Here we shall study the signs of the linked pairs in $LP_2(X, X^{-1})$ for $X \in S(M)$, showing that linked pairs yielding the same dot product have also the same sign, and finally arriving at the proof of Theorem 1.2. In order to do so, we may need to consider a small deformation of a curve α representing X .

6.1. Deformations of 1-complexes. Let C be a one dimensional complex, and consider $p \in C$. Then a small enough neighborhood B of p in C is homeomorphic to a wedge of intervals, each one with an endpoint at p and the other in ∂B . We call the *valence* of p in C to the number of such segments. A point of valence 2 will be called a *regular point* of C . Observe that the set of non-regular points is discrete, while the components of the set of regular points are arcs.

We will be interested in complexes of the form $C = \alpha(I)$ where $\alpha \in \Omega$ is a cyclically reduced, non-constant closed curve. Then C has no points of valence 1, and by compactness, the set of non-regular points (i.e. *branching points*) is finite. The closure of a component of the set of regular points is a segment with endpoints at non-regular points. Note that, replacing α by a permutation if necessary, we can assume that $x = \alpha(0)$ is a regular point.

Before introducing the perturbation of α that we need, it is worth recalling that C_ε is the ε -neighborhood of C in M , and for ε small enough, Lemma 3.11 states that C_ε retracts by deformation onto C . Then the map induced by the inclusion $i_* : \pi_1(C, x) \rightarrow \pi_1(C_\varepsilon, x)$ is an isomorphism, and its inverse is $\chi_* : \pi_1(C_\varepsilon, x) \rightarrow \pi_1(C, x)$, which is induced by a retraction $\chi : C_\varepsilon \rightarrow C$.

Lemma 6.1. *Let α be a cyclically reduced closed curve and $C = \alpha(I)$. Assume that $x = \alpha(0)$ is a regular point of C . Then there are $\varepsilon > 0$ and a closed, cyclically reduced curve $\gamma \subset C_\varepsilon$ such that*

- (1) γ is an ε -perturbation of α , with $\gamma(0) = x$,
- (2) $\Gamma = \gamma(I)$ has no points of valence greater than 3, and
- (3) The map $i_* : \pi_1(\Gamma, x) \rightarrow \pi_1(C_\varepsilon, x)$ induced by the inclusion is an isomorphism.

Moreover, γ only differs from α in an ε -neighborhood of the non-regular points of C .

Proof. Set ε as in Lemma 3.11, though we may need to reduce it further. For each non-regular point p of C we consider B_p a closed ball in M centered at p with radius $\varepsilon/2$. Note that if ε is small enough, then B_p is a normal ball and $B_p \cap C$ is a union of geodesic segments joining p to ∂B_p . Reducing ε if necessary, we can also make the sets B_p pairwise disjoint, and disjoint from x by our assumption.

First we will construct the complex Γ . For each non-regular point p of C , we take a segment $\eta \subset \alpha$ with endpoints in ∂B_p and so that $\eta(I) \subset B_p$, i.e. η is a segment of α that traverses B_p . Then we consider a piecewise geodesic complex Y_p contained in B_p , with $Y_p \cap \partial B_p = C \cap \partial B_p$, and so that Y_p is a finite tree containing $\eta(I)$, whose branching points lie in $\eta(I)$ and have valence 3. Figure 4 shows an example of this construction. It can be interpreted as a deformation of $C \cap B_p$ that spreads out the segments that are not in η , so that their endpoints are spread along η instead of converging at p . Then we define Γ so that it agrees with C in the complement of $B = \bigcup_p B_p$, and that $\Gamma \cap B_p = Y_p$ for every non-regular point p in C .




FIGURE 4. proof of lemma 6.1

By construction, Γ is a connected piecewise geodesic complex and all its non-regular points are of valence 3. Note also that B_p retracts by deformation to Y_p for each p . These maps can be extended to a retraction by deformation $\chi_1 : C_\varepsilon \rightarrow \Gamma$, thus obtaining point (3) in the statement.

Now we describe the curve γ . Write

$$(14) \quad \alpha = \alpha_0 \beta_1 \alpha_1 \cdots \beta_n \alpha_n$$

where α_i is contained in the closure of the complement of B for all $i = 0, \dots, n$, and β_j is contained in B , for $j = 1, \dots, n$. None of these curves is constant since x is outside B . Then for each j there is some p with $\beta_j \subset B_p$, and we have $\beta_j(0), \beta_j(1) \in \partial B_p$. Note that, by construction, there is a unique reduced curve $\bar{\beta}_j$ joining $\beta_j(0)$ to $\beta_j(1)$ in Y_p . Thus $\bar{\beta}_j \subset \Gamma \cap B_p$ with $\bar{\beta}_j(0) = \beta_j(0)$ and $\bar{\beta}_j(1) = \beta_j(1)$. We define

$$(15) \quad \gamma = \alpha_0 \bar{\beta}_1 \alpha_1 \cdots \bar{\beta}_n \alpha_n$$

i.e. we replace each β_j with $\bar{\beta}_j$. This is an ε -perturbation of α , since for each j , β_j and $\bar{\beta}_j$ are in the same ball of radius $\varepsilon/2$. It is also clear that γ admits no reductions, and that $\gamma(0) = \gamma(1) = x$. It only remains to show that $\gamma(I) = \Gamma$. By construction we have $\gamma(I) \subseteq \Gamma$, and it is also clear that the closure of $\Gamma - B$ is contained in $\gamma(I)$, writing this set as $\bigcup_i \alpha_i(I)$. So we must show that $Y_p \subset \gamma(I)$ for each non-regular point p of C . For one such p we note that the curve η used in the construction of Y_p is in $\gamma(I)$: by its definition $\eta = \beta_j$ for some j (maybe more than one), and in that case we also have $\bar{\beta}_j = \eta$. On the other hand, since we have $\partial B_p \cap \Gamma \subset \gamma(I)$, the rest of the segments making up Y_p must also be contained in $\gamma(I)$. \square

6.2. Signs and lifts. Now we shall interpret the signs of linked pairs in terms of horizontal lifting, in the same fashion as we did for intersection pairs and dot products in the previous sections. Let $\alpha \in \Omega$ be a non-trivial cyclically reduced closed curve and $x = \alpha(0)$.

Definition 6.2. For $g \in T_0(\alpha)$ we write

$$\epsilon_g(\alpha) = \text{sign}(P_g, Q_g),$$

i.e. the sign of the linked pair of α corresponding to g . When the curve α is clear from the context, we just write ϵ_g .

Let $C = \alpha(I)$ and recall from Lemma 3.10 that the universal cover \tilde{C} is isomorphic, as a principal fiber bundle, to $\mathcal{E}_x(C)$. We choose such an isomorphism by picking $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{C}$ a lift of x , and setting that id_x corresponds to \tilde{x} . Then we can identify Λ_α with the infinite lift of α to \tilde{C} that starts at \tilde{x} .

Let C_ε be a neighborhood of C satisfying Lemma 3.11. Then its universal cover \tilde{C}_ε contains \tilde{C} , and retracts onto it by lifting the retraction $\chi : C_\varepsilon \rightarrow C$. Note that the complement of Λ_α in \tilde{C}_ε has two connected components. We give \tilde{C}_ε the orientation lifted from that of $C_\varepsilon \subset M$, and let $C^+(\alpha)$ be the *left side* of Λ_α . More precisely, $C^+(\alpha)$ is the component of $\tilde{C}_\varepsilon - \Lambda_\alpha$ so that the standard orientation of Λ_α , given by $\tilde{\alpha}$, agrees with the orientation induced on Λ_α as part of the boundary $\partial C^+(\alpha)$. The other component, i.e. the *right side* of Λ_α , will be denoted by $C^-(\alpha)$.

Let a_1, a_2, ν be small geodesic segments in \tilde{C}_ε , so that $a_1(1) = a_2(0)$ and ν meets $a_1 a_2$ only at this point, which is an endpoint of ν . Note that we have $\text{sign}(a_1 a_2, \nu) = \text{sign}(\pi(a_1 a_2), \pi(\nu))$, by definition of the orientation of \tilde{C}_ε . In case that $a_1 a_2$ is contained in Λ_α with positive orientation, then we have $\text{sign}(a_1 a_2, \nu) = 1$ if either $\nu(0) = a_1(1)$ and $\nu(1) \in C^+(\alpha)$, or $\nu(1) = a_1(1)$ and $\nu(0) \in C^-(\alpha)$. In the reverse cases we have $\text{sign}(a_1 a_2, \nu) = -1$.

Now consider $g \in T_1(\alpha)$. We identify $\mathcal{L}_x(C)$ with $\pi_1(C_\varepsilon, x)$ acting on \tilde{C}_ε by deck transformations, using Lemmas 3.10 and 3.11. Then, by definition of $T_1(\alpha)$, we have that $g[\alpha]\tilde{x}$ and $g[\alpha^{-1}]\tilde{x}$ are not contained in Λ_α . Due to the previous observations, we see that g corresponds to a linked pair, i.e. $g \in T_0(\alpha)$, iff $g[\alpha]\tilde{x}$ and $g[\alpha^{-1}]\tilde{x}$ are in different components of $\tilde{C}_\varepsilon - \Lambda_\alpha$. In that case, we have $\epsilon_g = 1$ if $g[\alpha^{-1}]\tilde{x} \in C^-(\alpha)$, and thus $g[\alpha]\tilde{x} \in C^+(\alpha)$, which is to say that $g\Lambda_\alpha$ crosses Λ_α going from its right side and towards its left side. We have $\epsilon_g = -1$ if the reverse holds. We compile these results for future reference

Remark 6.3. Let $g \in T_1(\alpha)$, then

- $g \in T_0(\alpha)$ iff $g[\alpha]\tilde{x}$ and $g[\alpha^{-1}]\tilde{x}$ are on different sides of Λ_α .
- In that case, $\epsilon_g = 1$ iff $g[\alpha^{-1}]\tilde{x} \in C^-(\alpha)$, i.e. is at the right side of Λ_α .

In a similar manner, we see that for $g \in T_0(\alpha)$ we have $\epsilon_g = 1$ iff $\tilde{\beta}_g(1) \in C^-(\alpha)$. Equivalently, iff $g[\alpha]g^{-1}\tilde{\beta}_g(0) \in C^+(\alpha)$. Noting that $c_2(\alpha, g)$ ends at $t_g(1)$ by Definition 5.3, we have the following.

Remark 6.4. For $g \in T_0(\alpha)$ let $\tilde{c}_2(\alpha, g)$ be the lift of $c_2(\alpha, g)$ that ends at $b_g(1)$ (namely, the one contained in $g[\alpha]g^{-1}\tilde{\beta}_g$). Then $\epsilon_g = 1$ iff $\tilde{c}_2(\alpha, g)$ is at the left of Λ_α (more precisely, is contained in the closure of $C^+(\alpha)$).

By the comments after Definition 5.3 we see that the intersection of $\tilde{c}_2(\alpha, g)$ with Λ_α is either the endpoint $b_g(1)$, in case g preserves orientation, or the segment $b_g(I)$, if g reverses orientation. We also point out that the terminology of orientation preserving or reversing elements of Definition 4.1 does not relate to the orientation of \tilde{C}_ε , which is preserved by every deck transformation.

6.3. Signs and deformations. Let $\alpha \in \Omega$ be a cyclically reduced closed curve, and assume that $x = \alpha(0)$ is a regular point of $C = \alpha(I)$. Take ε and γ as given by Lemma 6.1, and let $\Gamma = \gamma(I)$. Then we can identify $\mathcal{E}_x(\Gamma)$ with $\tilde{\Gamma}$, the universal cover of Γ , which is embedded in \tilde{C}_ε . This identifies $\mathcal{L}_x(\Gamma)$ with $\pi_1(C_\varepsilon, x)$, and thus with $\mathcal{L}_x(C)$. We will be assuming these identifications in the sequel, though we should make clear that $\mathcal{L}_x(C)$ and $\mathcal{L}_x(\Gamma)$ are different as subgroups of $\mathcal{L}_x(M)$, and that $\mathcal{E}_x(C) \cup \mathcal{E}_x(\Gamma)$, as a subspace of $\mathcal{E}_x(M)$, is not homeomorphic to $\tilde{C} \cup \tilde{\Gamma}$. In fact, this correspondence identifies $[\gamma] \in \mathcal{L}_x(\Gamma)$ with $[\alpha] \in \mathcal{L}_x(C)$.

We also identify Λ_γ with the infinite lift of γ at \tilde{x} , the lift of x used to define both correspondences $\mathcal{E}_x(C) \cong \tilde{C}$ and $\mathcal{E}_x(\Gamma) \cong \tilde{\Gamma}$. Thus the sets $T(\Lambda_\alpha)$ and $T(\Lambda_\gamma)$ can be considered as subsets of the same group $\pi_1(\tilde{C}_\varepsilon, x)$, which we shall see as the group of deck transformations of \tilde{C}_ε .

Lemma 6.5. *Let α and γ be as in Lemma 6.1, and take $g \in \pi_1(\tilde{C}_\varepsilon, x)$. Then $g \in T_0(\alpha)$ iff $g \in T_0(\gamma)$, in which case $\epsilon_g(\alpha) = \epsilon_g(\gamma)$.*

Proof. Let B be the ε -neighborhood of Λ_α in \tilde{C}_ε , which also contains Λ_γ . Moreover, we have $C^\pm(\alpha) \cap (\tilde{C}_\varepsilon - B) = C^\pm(\gamma) \cap (\tilde{C}_\varepsilon - B)$, i.e. points outside B are in the same side with respect to both Λ_α and Λ_γ . Note that the construction of Lemma 6.1 allows for reducing ε as necessary, so we can assume that the translates of \tilde{x} that do not belong to Λ_α are outside B .

If $g \in T_0(\alpha)$ we observed in Remark 6.3 that $g[\alpha^{-1}]\tilde{x}$ and $g[\alpha]\tilde{x}$ are on different sides of Λ_α , and since they are not in B , they are also on different sides of Λ_γ . Since $[\alpha]$ and $[\gamma]$ agree when seen as elements of $\pi_1(\tilde{C}_\varepsilon, x)$, we see that $g\Lambda_\gamma$ contains both $g[\alpha^{-1}]\tilde{x}$ and $g[\alpha]\tilde{x}$, implying that $g\Lambda_\gamma$ and Λ_γ intersect. This intersection corresponds to a linked pair by Remark 6.3. We get that $g \in T_1(\gamma)$ by recalling the definition of this set, together with the fact that α and γ agree on a neighborhood of their basepoint, so every lift of γ is an ε -perturbation of the corresponding lift of α that agrees with it in a neighborhood of its endpoints. With this we conclude that $g \in T_0(\gamma)$.

The reciprocal argument is analogous. We have that $\epsilon_g(\alpha) = \epsilon_g(\gamma)$ by Remark 6.3, together with the facts that $C^\pm(\alpha) \cap (\tilde{C}_\varepsilon - B) = C^\pm(\gamma) \cap (\tilde{C}_\varepsilon - B)$ and that $g[\alpha^{-1}]\tilde{x}$ and $g[\alpha]\tilde{x}$ lie outside B . □

Let X and Y be the strings represented by α and γ as in Lemma 6.1. Then Lemma 6.5 gives a bijection between $LP_2(X, X^{-1})$ and $LP_2(Y, Y^{-1})$ that preserves the sign. It also preserves the dot product, by the isomorphism between $\mathcal{L}_x(C)$ and $\mathcal{L}_x(\Gamma)$ and Lemma 5.8. Thus proving Theorem 1.2 for Y also implies it for X , i.e. we may replace α with γ whenever necessary in our proof. We will only be doing this replacement at the points of the argument that require it, namely in the next Lemma 6.6.

The proof of Lemma 6.5 clearly does not generalize for intersection pairs that are not linked. It is also possible to show Lemma 6.5 by following what happens to an intersection pair during the construction of γ in Lemma 6.1, though some cases may get cumbersome, as well as the assertion about the signs. That approach would give that intersection pairs of types (2) and (3) of α are also present in γ , maintaining their types. Since Γ has valence 3 at every branching point, γ has no intersection pairs of type (1), so the type (1) linked pairs of α will become linked pairs of type either (2) or (3) in γ . Some of the unlinked intersection pairs of type (1) of α may indeed be removed when passing to γ (e.g. a suitable parametrization of a circle with three points identified). We do not need these assertions to show Theorem 1.2, so we will not prove them.

6.4. Signs and conjugation. Next we show the main lemma that implies there are no cancellations in the formula for $[X, X^{-1}]$ when X is primitive. After that, we shall finish the details of the proof of Theorem 1.2. Let $\alpha \in \Omega$ be a cyclically reduced non-trivial closed curve, and $x = \alpha(0)$. We consider $C = \alpha(I)$ and C_ε as in the rest of this section, identifying $\mathcal{E}_x(C)$ with \tilde{C} embedded in \tilde{C}_ε .

Lemma 6.6. *Assume that α is primitive, and that $g, h \in T_0(\alpha)$ are such that $[\alpha]h[\alpha]^{-1}h^{-1}$ and $[\alpha]g[\alpha]^{-1}g^{-1}$ are conjugate. Then*

$$\epsilon_g = \epsilon_h.$$

Proof. If g and h reverse orientation this is a consequence of Lemma 5.9. So we assume that g and h preserve orientation, since by Remark 5.6 this is the other possible case. Recall the notation of Equations (5) and (6), and let ϕ be the element defined in equation (7). By Lemma 5.10 we have

$$(16) \quad c_i(\alpha, g) = c_i(\alpha, h) \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2,$$

so r and t are constant in Equations (5) and (6), and we have $\phi = [\gamma_h \gamma_g^{-1}]$. Therefore we get that $\phi b_g(1) = b_h(1)$.

Let $\tilde{c}_1(\alpha, g)$ be the lift of $c_1(\alpha, g)$ starting at $b_g(1)$, and $\tilde{c}_2(\alpha, g)$ the lift of $c_2(\alpha, g)$ ending at $b_g(1)$. Then $\tilde{c}_1(\alpha, g)$ is contained in Λ_α with positive orientation, and $\tilde{c}_2(\alpha, g)$ only meets Λ_α at its endpoint $b_g(1)$, since g preserves orientation. By Remark 6.4, the sign ϵ_g is decided by the side of Λ_α that $\tilde{c}_2(\alpha, g)$ is on. We may write

$$(17) \quad \epsilon_g = \text{sign}(b_g \tilde{c}_1(\alpha, g), \tilde{c}_2(\alpha, g))$$

where we understand we are taking the intersections of these curves with a small enough ball centered at $b_g(1)$, as to follow the definition of sign in Subsection 3.1.

Similarly, we take $\tilde{c}_1(\alpha, h)$ as the lift of $c_1(\alpha, h)$ starting at $b_h(1)$, and $\tilde{c}_2(\alpha, h)$ as the lift of $c_2(\alpha, h)$ ending at $b_h(1)$. The same observations hold, in particular

$$(18) \quad \epsilon_h = \text{sign}(b_h \tilde{c}_1(\alpha, h), \tilde{c}_2(\alpha, h))$$

Since $\phi b_g(1) = b_h(1)$ and deck transformations preserve horizontal lifting, Equation (16) implies that

$$(19) \quad \phi \tilde{c}_1(\alpha, g) = \tilde{c}_1(\alpha, h) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi \tilde{c}_2(\alpha, g) = \tilde{c}_2(\alpha, h).$$

The situation is depicted in Figure 5.

First we shall complete the proof assuming the following extra condition:

Assumption 1: There exists η a final segment of b_g so that $\phi\eta$ is a final segment of b_h .




FIGURE 5. Proof of lemma 6.6

Under this assumption, we note that Equation (19) gives that

$$\text{sign}(\eta \tilde{c}_1(\alpha, g), \tilde{c}_2(\alpha, g)) = \text{sign}(\phi \eta \cdot \tilde{c}_1(\alpha, h), \tilde{c}_2(\alpha, h))$$

since ϕ , as a deck transformation, preserves the orientation of \tilde{C}_ε . When we combine this with Equations (17) and (18), Assumption 1 gives us

$$\epsilon_g = \epsilon_h$$

as desired.

Now observe that Assumption 1 holds if $t_g(1) = t_h(1)$ has valence 3 in C : for then $b_g(1)$ and $b_h(1)$ would have valence 3 in \tilde{C} , and since ϕ is bijective and satisfies Equation 19, we get that a small enough final segment of b_g must be mapped by ϕ to a final segment of b_h . Figure 5 depicts this case.

Changing the basepoint of α if necessary, we consider the curve γ in Lemma 6.1. By Lemma 6.5 we may replace α with γ if needed to ensure Assumption 1. □

We finally complete the proof of Theorem 1.2. Let $X \in S(M)$ be non-trivial and primitive, and α be a cyclically reduced representative of X .

Proof of Theorem 1.2: As we pointed out after Definition 4.7, we have that $LP_1(X) = LP_2(X, X) \cong LP_2(X, X^{-1})$ which is in correspondence with $T_0(\alpha)$, recalling Lemma 4.5 and Definition 4.7. We rewrite the formula for $[X, X^{-1}]$ given in Definition 3.9 using this correspondence, Lemma 5.8 and Definition 6.2, to get

$$(20) \quad [X, X^{-1}] = \sum_{g \in T_0(\alpha)} \epsilon_g \{[\alpha]g[\alpha]^{-1}g^{-1}\}$$

where $\{[\alpha]g[\alpha]^{-1}g^{-1}\}$ stands for the conjugacy class of $[\alpha]g[\alpha]^{-1}g^{-1}$.

We must show that if $[X, X^{-1}] = 0$ then $LP_1(X) = \emptyset$, or equivalently, $T_0(\alpha) = \emptyset$. We show it by contradiction: we assume that $[X, X^{-1}] = 0$ and $T_0(\alpha)$ is nonempty. Since $\mathcal{S}(M)$ is a free abelian group of basis $S(M)$, there must be cancellations in the second term of Equation (20), so there must be $g, h \in T_0(\alpha)$ with

$$\{[\alpha]g[\alpha]^{-1}g^{-1}\} = \{[\alpha]h[\alpha]^{-1}h^{-1}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \epsilon_g = -\epsilon_h$$

contradicting Lemma 6.6.

□

REFERENCES

- [CG16] Moira Chas and Siddhartha Gadgil, *The extended goldman bracket determines intersection numbers for surfaces and orbifolds*, Algebraic & Geometric Topology **16** (2016), no. 5, 2813–2838.
- [Cha04] Moira Chas, *Combinatorial Lie bialgebras of curves on surfaces*, Topology **43** (2004), no. 3, 543–568. MR MR2041630 (2005b:57038)
- [Cha10] ———, *Minimal intersection of curves on surfaces*, Geometriae Dedicata **144** (2010), no. 1, 25–60.
- [Cha15a] ———, *The goldman bracket and the intersection of curves on surfaces*, Geometry, Groups and Dynamics: ICTS Program “Groups, Geometry and Dynamics”, December 3–16, 2012, Almora, India (2015), 73–83.
- [Cha15b] ———, *Relations between word length, hyperbolic length and self-intersection number of curves on surfaces*, Recent advances in mathematics **21** (2015), 45–75.
- [CK10] Moira Chas and Fabiana Krongold, *An algebraic characterization of simple closed curves on surfaces with boundary*, Journal of Topology and Analysis **2** (2010), no. 03, 395–417.
- [CK16] ———, *Algebraic characterization of simple closed curves via turaev’s co-bracket*, Journal of Topology **9** (2016), no. 1, 91–104.
- [CK21] Moira Chas and Arpan Kabiraj, *The lie bracket of undirected closed curves on a surface*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society (2021).
- [CMP19] Moira Chas, Curtis T McMullen, and Anthony Phillips, *Almost simple geodesics on the triply-punctured sphere*, Mathematische Zeitschrift **291** (2019), no. 3, 1175–1196.
- [CP10] Moira Chas and Anthony Phillips, *Self-intersection numbers of curves on the punctured torus*, Experimental Mathematics **19** (2010), no. 2, 129–148.
- [CP12] ———, *Self-intersection numbers of curves in the doubly punctured plane*, Experimental Mathematics **21** (2012), no. 1, 26–37.

- [Gol86] William M. Goldman, *Invariant functions on Lie groups and Hamiltonian flows of surface group representations*, Invent. Math. **85** (1986), no. 2, 263–302. MR MR846929 (87j:32069)
- [Gor81] R. Mark Goresky, *Whitney stratified chains and cochains*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **267** (1981), no. 1, 175–196. MR MR621981 (82j:58008)
- [Jef05] Lisa C Jeffrey, *Flat connections on oriented 2-manifolds*, Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society **37** (2005), no. 1, 1–14.
- [Mil56] John Milnor, *Construction of universal bundles. I*, Ann. of Math. (2) **63** (1956), 272–284. MR MR0077122 (17,994b)
- [Tel60] Costake Teleman, *Généralisation du groupe fondamental*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (3) **77** (1960), 195–234. MR MR0124068 (23 #A1385c)
- [Tur91] Vladimir G. Turaev, *Skein quantization of Poisson algebras of loops on surfaces*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **24** (1991), no. 6, 635–704. MR MR1142906 (94a:57023)

, UNIVERSIDAD DE LA REPÚBLICA, CENTRO DE MATEMÁTICA, FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS, IGUÁ 4225, 11400 MONTEVIDEO, URUGUAY

Email address: juan@cmat.edu.uy

Email address: miguel@cmat.edu.uy

Email address: jperaza@cmat.edu.uy

, UNIVERSIDAD DE LA REPÚBLICA, INSTITUTO DE FÍSICA, FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS, IGUÁ 4225, 11400 MONTEVIDEO, URUGUAY

Email address: miguel@fisica.edu.uy