

GROUPS ACTING ON VEERING PAIRS AND KLEINIAN GROUPS

HYUNGRYUL BAIK, HONGTAEK JUNG, AND KYEONGRO KIM

ABSTRACT. We show that some subgroups of the orientation preserving circle homeomorphism group with invariant veering pairs of laminations are hyperbolic 3-orbifold groups. On the way, we show that from a veering pair of laminations, one can construct a loom space (in the sense of Schleimer-Segerman) as a quotient. Our approach does not assume the existence of any 3-manifold to begin with so this is a geometrization-type result, and supersedes some of the results regarding the relation among veering triangulations, pseudo-Anosov flows, taut foliations in the literature.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background and Motivation. The main theme of geometric group theory is to draw interesting algebraic properties of a group from the geometry of its actions on spaces. In that respect, two fundamental questions for a given group are: whether can this group act on some space nicely and what properties does this group have if it acts on some space nicely.

Let us focus on the fundamental groups of compact orientable 3-manifolds, and ask whether they can act nicely on some space. It turns out that these groups admit various interesting actions on the circle and the sphere. It is classic that the fundamental group of a closed hyperbolic surface always acts on the circle, and this action is known to be convergence, minimal and faithful. The fundamental group of a closed hyperbolic 3-manifold group also admits a convergence action on the sphere. Less obviously, the fundamental group of a closed 3-manifold with a pseudo-Anosov flow admits a convergence action on the sphere as well [Fen12]. On the other hand, the fundamental group of a closed orientable atoroidal 3-manifold with a co-orientable taut foliation, or more generally with a certain type of essential lamination, acts faithfully on the circle [CD03, Thu97]. An interesting feature of this action is that it leaves some structure, called a *circle lamination*, invariant. In some circumstances, these two classes of actions are closely related by some maps, so-called Cannon-Thurston maps. See [CT07] and [Bow07].

Conversely, what can we say about group that admits a nice action on the circle or the sphere? For example, suppose that a group admits a convergence action on the circle and ask whether we can characterize this group. A surprisingly results proven by many authors, Tukia [Tuk88], Gabai [Gab92], and Casson-Jungreis [CJ94] (cf. Hinkkanen [Hin90] for the indiscrete case), show that such a group must be a Fuchsian group (including a hyperbolic surface group). On the other hand, whether a group with a convergence action on the sphere is a (virtually) hyperbolic 3-manifold group, which is one part of Cannon's conjecture, is still open. And much less is known for groups acting on the circle with invariant circle laminations.

This is where the study of *laminar groups*, subgroups of $\text{Homeo}^+(S^1)$ with invariant circle laminations, is initiated [CD03, Cal06b, Cal07]. Perhaps, one of the earliest results on this object is [Bai15], showing that a laminar group preserving three special kind of circle laminations must be a surface group. After this work, many subsequent studies have been published by various authors including [ABS19], [BK20], and [BK20]. One of the implicit goals of these works is to generalize [Bai15] and find decent conditions for a laminar group to become a hyperbolic 3-manifold group.

Behavior of a laminar group is controlled by properties of circle laminations that the group preserves. Therefore, the study of laminar groups boils down to fine-tune the invariant circle laminations so that the laminar group preserving these circle laminations has the desired property.

The concept of veering triangulations, namely, an ideal triangulation on a cusped 3-manifold with extra data that captures combinatorial features of pseudo-Anosov flow, was proposed by Agol [Ago11]. Over the last decade, the theory of veering triangulations has been studied by many authors including

Date: December 15, 2022.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 37E10; Secondary 57R05, 57M07, 57M60.

Key words and phrases. Circle homeomorphisms, Kleinian groups, Circle laminations, Laminar groups, Veering triangulations.

[FG13], [HRS12], [HRST11], [LMT20], [LMT21], [FSS19], [SS20], [SS21], [Lan18], [Lan19], [Lan22], and [AT22]. Recently, the theory of veering triangulations is spotlighted to study the Thurston norm balls and pseudo-Anosov flow theory. Among them, Frankel-Schleimer-Segerman [FSS19] (see also [SS20], [SS21]) show that the fundamental group of a veering triangulated 3-manifold can act faithfully on the circle (so-called the veering circle) and leave a pair of special circle laminations invariant. Moreover, Schleimer-Segerman [FSS19, SS21] also show that one can functorially build a veering triangulated 3-manifold from these circle laminations data. Their results suggest promising candidates of circle laminations such that a laminar group preserving them becomes a hyperbolic 3-manifold group.

1.2. Main Results. In this paper, we will introduce *veering pair* generalizing the pair of circle laminations constructed in [FSS19] and study laminar groups that preserve a veering pair. Our final goal is to show that a veering pair preserving laminar group is the fundamental group of an irreducible 3-orbifold. If, in addition, the action of a laminar group is “cocompact” we can prove that this group is the fundamental group of a hyperbolic 3-orbifold. We also present how to construct a loom space from an abstract veering pair, generalizing the loom space construction of [FSS19].

1.2.1. Circle Laminations and Loom Spaces. In the first half of the paper, we show that one can construct a loom space out of a pair of circle laminations called *veering pair*, generalizing the construction of [FSS19]. This construction is also functorial in a sense that a laminar group that preserves the veering pair acts on the loom space so constructed as loom isomorphisms.

To present our result, we briefly recall and introduce some terminology. Regard the circle S^1 as the ideal boundary of the hyperbolic disk \mathbb{H}^2 . Given a set of unoriented geodesics L in \mathbb{H}^2 , their endpoints $e(L)$ define a subset in $\mathcal{M} := (S^1 \times S^1 \setminus \{(x, x) : x \in S^1\})/\sim$, where $(x, y) \sim (w, z)$ if and only if $x = z$ and $y = w$. A *circle lamination* is a subset λ of \mathcal{M} such that $\lambda = e(\overline{\lambda})$ for some (in fact, unique) geodesic lamination $\overline{\lambda}$ of \mathbb{H}^2 . Connected components of the complement $\mathbb{H}^2 \setminus \overline{\lambda}$ are called *gaps*¹ of λ . As mentioned above, a 3-manifold M with a veering triangulation (e.g., pseudo-Anosov mapping torus with singular orbits removed) gives rise to a pair of circle laminations (λ^+, λ^-) invariant under the $\pi_1(M)$ -action on S^1 . We recall key features of this pair of circle laminations λ^\pm . See [FSS19] for details.

- (Crown gaps) Each gap of λ^\pm is a crown, namely, an infinite polygon with vertices accumulate to a unique point. See Figure 3.10.
- (Loose) Each λ^\pm is *loose*, namely, two complementary crowns of λ^\pm share no vertices.
- (Strongly transverse) λ^+ and λ^- are *strongly transverse*, i.e., end $\ell_1 \cap \ell_2 = \emptyset$ as subsets in S^1 for every pair $(\ell_1, \ell_2) \in \overline{\lambda^+} \times \overline{\lambda^-}$.
- (Interleaving gaps) Given a crown gap C^+ of λ^+ , there is a crown gap C^- of λ^- such that the set of vertices of C^+ and C^- alternate in S^1 .

Motivated from this, we define a *veering pair* to be a pair of circle laminations $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ such that

- \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 are loose.
- \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 are *quite full*, namely, each gap is either an ideal polygon or a crown.
- \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 are strongly transverse.
- For each gap \mathcal{G}_i of \mathcal{L}_i , there is a gap \mathcal{G}_j of \mathcal{L}_j , $j \neq i$, that interleaves with \mathcal{G}_i .

See Section 5.1 for the detailed definition. Note that in the main text, we use slightly different notion, called *lamination system* instead of circle lamination which is more proper to keep track of the circle actions. Although there are some differences in usage of terminology, the key ideas remain the same.

The major difference between veering pairs and pair of circle laminations in [FSS19] is the potential existence of polygon gaps. Having polygon gaps is a more general and natural setting because it allows us to take torsion elements of laminar groups into account.

Our construction of loom spaces is along the similar line with that of [FSS19]. However, a veering pair is just an abstract object and is not necessarily induced from a veering triangulation. This lack of the background geometry of the veering pair makes extra difficulties. We have to exploit the abstract properties of veering pair.

First, we define the *stitch space*

$$S(\mathcal{V}) := \{(\ell_1, \ell_2) : \ell_i \text{ is a leaf of } \overline{\mathcal{L}_i} \text{ such that } \ell_1 \cap \ell_2 \neq \emptyset\},$$

¹For reader’s convenience, we use the traditional definition for gaps at this moment. What we call gaps here will be referred to as *non-leaf gaps* in the main text.

which corresponds to the link space in [FSS19]. Each element of $S(\mathcal{V})$ is called a *stitch*. We introduce the *weaving relation* \sim_ω on $S(\mathcal{V})$ and consider the quotient space $\overline{W}(\mathcal{V}) := S(\mathcal{V})/\sim_\omega$, called the *cusped weaving*. Each equivalence class in $\overline{W}(\mathcal{V})$ consists of a single stitch, two stitches, four stitches, or the set of stitches that forms interleaving polygons or crowns. The equivalence class of interleaving crowns is called a *cuspid class*, which corresponds to a boundary point of $\overline{W}(\mathcal{V})$. The *weaving* $W(\mathcal{V}) := \overline{W}(\mathcal{V}) \setminus \{\text{cuspid classes}\}$ is an intermediate space toward a loom space.

Theorem 11.9. *Let \mathcal{V} be a veering pair. The weaving $W(\mathcal{V})$ is homeomorphic to an open disk with transverse (singular) foliations induced from the circle laminations.*

Singular loci of the foliations, called *singular classes*, come from interleaving pairs of non-leaf ideal polygons. Later, these singular classes turn out to be potential fixed points of finite order elements of a veering pair preserving laminar group. On the other hand, if a laminar group contains 2-torsions, a pair of real leaves may happen to be a fixed point. To capture this information, we introduce a set \mathbf{M} of *markings* on the stitches. The required properties of \mathbf{M} are

- \mathbf{M} is a closed and discrete subspace of $S(\mathcal{V})$.
- Each element of \mathbf{M} consists of a pair of real leaves.
- Each leaf of \mathcal{V} is a component of at most one element of \mathbf{M} .

The corresponding equivalence classes in $W(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ are called *marked classes*. The marked and singular classes are potential fixed points of finite order elements in a laminar group.

Now we simply remove these singular and marked classes to obtain $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ called the *regular weaving*. This space admits a pair of transverse foliations but not homeomorphic to \mathbb{R}^2 . Hence, we take the universal cover $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ to obtain our potential candidates for a loom space. Then we have the following:

Theorem 12.14. *Let \mathcal{V} be a veering pair and let \mathbf{M} be any marking on the stitch $S(\mathcal{V})$. Then $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is a loom space.*

1.2.2. *Veering Pair Preserving Actions on the Circle.* The second half is devoted to studying groups preserving veering pairs. The main question is to understand the structure of these groups and, at the end, we will show that under a ‘‘cocompact’’ assumption they are the fundamental groups of hyperbolic 3-orbifolds.

For a veering pair $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$, we denote by $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$ the group of elements in $\text{Homeo}^+(S^1)$ that preserve \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 individually.

We first need to understand dynamics of individual elements of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$. Recall that a nontrivial element of $\text{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ is elliptic, parabolic or hyperbolic depending on its dynamics on S^1 . Quite similar classification holds for elements of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$. We rephrase our result as follow.

Theorem 15.12. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Let g be a non-trivial element in $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$. Then, g falls into one of the following cases:*

- (1) (Elliptic) g has finite order and there is an interleaving pair of ideal polygons² of \mathcal{V} preserved by g .
- (2) (Parabolic) g has a unique fixed point and there is an interleaving pair of crowns of \mathcal{V} preserved by g .
- (3) (Hyperbolic) g has exactly two fixed points, one is attracting and the other is repelling.
- (4) (Pseudo-Anosov like) g preserves an interleaving pair $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ of ideal polygons.
- (5) (Properly pseudo-Anosov) g preserves an interleaving pair $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ of gaps such that the vertices of one of \mathcal{G}_i are the attracting fixed points of g and the vertices of the other polygon are the repelling fixed points of g .

In fact, we will prove a slightly general result. See Theorem 15.9.

We then classify ‘‘elementary’’ veering pair preserving groups. It is known that elementary Kleinian groups are either a rank 2 abelian group or a virtually cyclic group. Similarly, we have the following classification:

Theorem 15.18. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair and G a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$. If G has an infinite cyclic normal subgroup, G is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} , the infinite dihedral group, $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}_n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n > 1$, or $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$. Furthermore, one of the following cases holds.*

²We always think of geodesics as ideal bi-gons in this paper.

- (1) When $G \cong \mathbb{Z}$,
 - (a) G is generated by a parabolic automorphism,
 - (b) G is generated by a hyperbolic automorphism, or
 - (c) G is generated by a pA -like automorphism.
- (2) When G is isomorphic to the infinite dihedral group, G is generated by an hyperbolic automorphism g and an elliptic automorphism e of order two, and so $G = \langle g, e \mid e^2 = 1, ege = g^{-1} \rangle$.
- (3) When $G \cong \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}_n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n > 1$, G preserves a unique interleaving pair of ideal polygons of \mathcal{C} and there is a pA -like automorphism g and an elliptic automorphism e of order n such that $G = \langle g \rangle \times \langle e \rangle$.
- (4) When $G \cong \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$, G preserves a unique asterisk of crowns of \mathcal{C} and there is a properly pseudo-Anosov g and a parabolic automorphism h such that $G = \langle g \rangle \times \langle h \rangle$.

These two results are primitive evidences that the group $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$ resembles a Kleinian group.

Recall that we defined a marking on the stitch space of a veering pair. A priori, this marking on the stitches is just a random subset of $\mathbf{S}(\mathcal{V})$ satisfying the desired properties. However, there is a canonical choice of a marking that records the internal order two symmetry of the veering pair.

Corollary 15.30. *Given a veering pair $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ and a subgroup $G \leq \text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$,*

$$\mathbf{M}(G) := \{s \in \mathbf{S}(\mathcal{V}) \mid g(s) = s \text{ for some order 2 elliptic element } g \in G\}$$

is a marking.

Now we are ready to prove the main theorem. We first state the theorem and give a sketch of its proof.

Theorem 17.15. *Let \mathcal{V} be a veering pair. Let G be a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$. Then G is the fundamental group of an irreducible 3-orbifold.*

Proof Sketch. In Theorem 12.14, we constructed a loom space $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}(G))$. By work of [SS21], we have a veering triangulated \mathbb{R}^3 where the deck group D for the universal cover $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}(G)) \rightarrow W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}(G))$ acts as taut isomorphisms. Then we can show that $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$ acts properly discontinuously on \mathbb{R}^3/D . Topologically, \mathbb{R}^3/D is a 3-manifold with many cylindrical boundary components. We fill in these cylinder boundary components with solid cylinders to obtain a simply-connected 3-manifold X and extend the G -action to X . Hence X/G is the desired 3-orbifold with $G = \pi_1(X/G)$. To show that X/G is irreducible, we compute the homology group of X and prove that $H_2(X) = \pi_2(X) = 0$. \square

This result is a variation of [Bai15] answering to the question what happens if a laminar group preserves two circle laminations.

Finally, suppose that X/G is compact. This condition can be translated as follow

- The stabilizer of each interleaving non-leaf polygons and each marked class is of the form $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}_n$ or \mathbb{Z} (see Theorem 15.22).
- The stabilizer of each interleaving crowns is of the form $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$.
- There are only finitely many orbit classes of gaps and marked classes.

See Lemma 18.3 and Proposition 18.4. We call the G action is *cofinite* if the above three conditions are satisfied. We can also show that X is homotopically atoroidal. If X/G is a manifold, then Perelman-Thurston hyperbolization theorem applies and X/G is hyperbolic. If X/G has a non-empty singular locus, X/G a geometric orbifold by the (orbifold) geometrization theorem. Since X/G is homotopically atoroidal, X/G supports a hyperbolic geometry. Eventually, we get the following result:

Corollary 18.6. *Let \mathcal{V} be a veering pair. Let G be a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$. Suppose that the G -action is cofinite. Then G is the fundamental group of a hyperbolic 3-orbifold.*

We believe that Corollary 18.6 holds without the cofinite assumption. Because the geometrization theorem does not apply to noncompact 3-orbifolds we need to find a more intrinsic approach.

We know the fundamental group of a closed hyperbolic 3-manifold with a taut foliation acts faithfully on S^1 and preserves a pair of circle laminations [CD03, Thu97, Cal06a]. We record a corollary which is a partial converse of this fact.

Corollary 18.9. *Let \mathcal{V} be a veering pair without polygonal gaps and G be a torsion free subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$. If the G -action is cofinite, then G is the fundamental group of a tautly foliated hyperbolic 3-manifold.*

1.3. Organization. In Part 1, we discuss basic definitions related to lamination systems. Most importantly, the main object of the paper, veering pair, is defined in Section 5.1.

Part 2 is about the construction of loom spaces. The first step, Section 7, is to define stitch spaces, weavings and their relatives. To construct transverse foliations, the notion of threads is introduced in Section 8. In Section 9 we present how to obtain rectangles from a veering pair. Then, in Section 11, we prove that the regular weaving is an open disk with singular transverse foliations (Theorem 11.9). The notion of marking is defined in Section 10. Finally, in Section 12 we show that the universal cover of the regular weaving is a loom space (Theorem 12.14).

Part 3 deals with groups acting on the circle with an invariant veering pair. After a quick review (Section 14) on properties of these groups, we prove various classification results in Section 15, including classification of single elements (Theorem 15.12), elementary groups (Theorem 15.18), and gap stabilizers (Theorem 15.22). In the same section, we also prove that the order two elliptic elements give rise to the canonical marking (Corollary 15.30). In Section 16, we explain that an action on the circle naturally gives an action on frames and rectangles. Then we prove in Section 17 that a veering pair preserving action on the circle induces a properly discontinuous action on an irreducible simply-connected 3-manifold proving Theorem 17.15. Finally, in Section 18, we explain the cofinite property and show Corollary 18.6.

1.4. Acknowledgement. The first author was partially supported by Samsung Science and Technology Foundation under Project Number SSTF-BA1702-01. The second author was supported by the Institute for Basic Science (IBS-R003-D1). The third author was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea Grant funded by the Korean Government (NRF-2022R1C1C2009782). We would like to thank Juan Alonso, Wonyong Jang, Sang-hyun Kim, Saul Schleimer, Samuel Taylor and Maxime Wolff for helpful conversations.

Part 1. Lamination Systems

The first part is a preliminary in nature. We recall relevant notions including circular ordering, lamination systems, and gaps. We also define veering pair in Section 5.1.

We introduce lamination systems which replace the role of circle laminations. The fundamental objects of a lamination system are good intervals in S^1 , rather than leaves. This change of a viewpoint makes it easy to study circle actions.

As we promote circle laminations to lamination systems, some terms have changed in meaning. For instance, leaves are regarded as gaps in a lamination system, and what is traditionally known as a gap is called a non-leaf gap.

2. CIRCULAR ORDERS AND INTERVALS IN S^1

Let S^1 be the unit circle in the complex plane \mathbb{C} . If not mentioned otherwise, S^1 is the unit circle.

2.1. Circular Orders. Let X be a set. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq 2$, we write $\Delta_n(X)$ for the set

$$\{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in X^n : x_i = x_j \text{ for some } i \neq j\}.$$

Then, we say that a function φ_{co} from X^3 to $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ is a *circular order* if the function satisfies the following:

- For any element $x^\circ \in \Delta_3(X)$, $\varphi_{\text{co}}(x^\circ) = 0$.
- For any element (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) in X^4 ,

$$\varphi_{\text{co}}(x_2, x_3, x_4) - \varphi_{\text{co}}(x_1, x_3, x_4) + \varphi_{\text{co}}(x_1, x_2, x_4) - \varphi_{\text{co}}(x_1, x_2, x_3) = 0.$$

Now, we define a circular order φ_{co} for S^1 . Note that the Cayley transformation

$$\psi(z) = i \frac{1+z}{1-z}$$

maps S^1 to $\hat{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$. Fix n in \mathbb{N} with $n \geq 3$. We say that a n -tuple (x_1, \dots, x_n) in $(S^1)^n$ is *counter-clockwise* if $\psi(x_1^{-1}x_i) < \psi(x_1^{-1}x_{i+1})$ for all i in $\{2, \dots, n-1\}$. Similarly, (x_1, \dots, x_n) is said to be *clockwise* if $\psi(x_1^{-1}x_i) > \psi(x_1^{-1}x_{i+1})$ for all i in $\{2, \dots, n-1\}$. We define φ_{co} by

$$\varphi_{\text{co}}(x) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } x \text{ is clockwise,} \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in \Delta_3(S^1), \\ 1 & \text{if } x \text{ is counter-clockwise.} \end{cases}$$

We can see easily that φ_{co} is a circular order for S^1 . In this paper, the circular order of S^1 is φ_{co} .

2.2. Good Open Intervals. We refer to non-empty proper connected open subsets of S^1 as *open intervals* in S^1 . Let I be an open interval in S^1 . If $S^1 - I = \{u\}$ for some u in S^1 , then we denote I by $(u, u)_{S^1}$. In this case, I is said to be *bad*. If not, there are two distinct points u and v such that

$$I = \{z \in S^1 : \varphi_{\text{co}}(u, z, v) = 1\},$$

so we denote I by $(u, v)_{S^1}$, and we say that I is *good*.

Let $(a, b)_{S^1}$ be good. Similarly we define $[a, b)_{S^1}$, $(a, b]_{S^1}$, and $[a, b]_{S^1}$. For convenience, we write $(a, b)_{S^1}^*$ for $(b, a)_{S^1}$.

3. LAMINATION SYSTEMS

3.1. Laminations on \mathbb{H}^2 . Let \mathbf{M} be the set of all geodesics in the hyperbolic plane \mathbb{H}^2 . The set \mathbf{M} has the topology induced by Hausdorff distance. A *geodesic lamination* is a closed subset of \mathbf{M} whose elements are pairwise unlinked. Each element of a geodesic lamination is called a *leaf* of the geodesic lamination.

Now, we consider \mathbb{H}^2 as the Poincaré disk and the boundary $\partial\mathbb{H}^2$ of \mathbb{H}^2 is the unit circle S^1 . As every geodesic connects two boundary points and vice versa, \mathbf{M} is parameterized by the set \mathcal{M} of two points subset of S^1 , namely,

$$\mathcal{M} := (S^1 \times S^1) - \Delta_2(S^1) / (x, y) \sim (y, x).$$

We denote the parametrization from \mathcal{M} to \mathbf{M} by g so that $g(\{x, y\})$ is the geodesic having x and y as endpoints. Also, we can think of a geodesic lamination on \mathbb{H}^2 as a subset of \mathcal{M} .

For any distinct elements ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 in \mathcal{M} , we say that ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 are *linked* if each component of $S^1 - \ell_1$ contains a point of ℓ_2 , and they are *unlinked* otherwise. A *circle lamination* is a closed subset of \mathcal{M} whose elements are pairwise unlinked. Like above, given a circle laminations, there is a corresponding geodesic lamination. Hence, each element of a circle lamination is called a *leaf* of the circle lamination.

Now, we consider the set

$$\mathcal{M} := \{\ell(I) : I \text{ is a good interval}\}$$

where $\ell(I) = \{I, I^*\}$. We define the *endpoint map* ϵ from \mathcal{M} to \mathcal{M} as

$$\epsilon(\ell((x, y)_{S^1})) = \{x, y\}.$$

Via the endpoint map, \mathcal{M} is parameterized by \mathcal{M} . Then, we give \mathcal{M} a topology so that the endpoint map is a homeomorphism.

We introduce the following definition to say the unlinkedness in \mathcal{M} in terms of good intervals. Given an element $\ell(I)$ in \mathcal{M} , we say that $\ell(I)$ *lies* on an open interval J if $I \subseteq J$ or $I^* \subseteq J$.

3.2. Lamination Systems. In many circumstances, intervals in S^1 separated by a leaf of a circle lamination play key roles to understand the dynamics of laminar groups. This suggests that intervals are more fundamental objects than leaves in the study of circle laminations and motivates us to define lamination systems in terms of good open intervals. This lamination systems are equivalent to circle laminations in spirit, but allow us to prove many results more rigorously.

Definition 3.3. A *lamination system* is a nonempty collection \mathcal{L} of good intervals that satisfies the following properties

- (1) If $I \in \mathcal{L}$, then $I^* \in \mathcal{L}$.
- (2) (unlinkedness) Given two elements $I, J \in \mathcal{L}$, $\ell(I)$ lies on J or J^* , that is, $I \subset J$, $I^* \subset J$, $I \subset J^*$, or $I^* \subset J^*$.
- (3) (closedness) Given an ascending family $\{I_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of elements of \mathcal{L} , we have $\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} I_k \in \mathcal{L}$ provided $\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} I_k$ is a good interval.

//

Note that lamination systems are examples of pocsets. The unlinkedness condition in the definition of lamination systems is sometimes called the *nestedness*. A discrete pocset of good intervals in S^1 with all pairs of distinct elements being nested is an example of lamination system.

3.4. Leaf Spaces. Let \mathcal{L} be a lamination system. The subspace $\ell(\mathcal{L})$ of \mathcal{M} is called the *leaf space* of \mathcal{L} and each element of $\ell(\mathcal{L})$ is called a *leaf* of \mathcal{L} . Then, $\epsilon(\ell(\mathcal{L}))$ is a circle lamination and we denote this circle lamination by $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L})$. The unlinkedness of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L})$ is obvious. To see the closedness, we introduce the notion for the convergence of a sequence of leaves in terms of good intervals.

A sequence $\{\ell_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of leaves of \mathcal{L} *converges* to a good interval J if there is a sequence $\{I_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of elements of \mathcal{L} such that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\ell_k = \ell(I_k)$ and

$$J \subseteq \liminf I_k \subseteq \limsup I_k \subseteq \overline{J}.$$

We write $\ell_k \rightarrow J$ when ℓ_k converges to J . Then, $J \in \mathcal{L}$. Moreover, $\ell_k \rightarrow J^*$. Therefore, we can say that a sequence $\{\ell_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of leaves of \mathcal{L} *converges* to an element ℓ of \mathcal{M} if $\ell_k \rightarrow I$ for some $I \in \ell$. This notion of convergence is equivalent to the convergence under the topology of the leaf space. This implies that the closedness of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L})$. For more details, we refer to [BK20, Section 10.7].

Given a good interval I , a sequence $\{\ell_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of leaves in \mathcal{L} is said to be *I-side* if it satisfies the following:

- $\ell_k \rightarrow I$
- $\ell_k \neq \ell(I)$ and ℓ_k lies on I for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

When I in \mathcal{L} has no *I-side* sequence, I is said to be *isolated*. A given leaf is *isolated* if every element of the leaf is isolated.

3.5. Gaps. Given a geodesic lamination on a closed hyperbolic surface, its complementary regions are subsurfaces with geodesic boundary. We can bring this notion into the context of lamination system, leading us to the following definition:

Definition 3.6. Let \mathcal{L} be a lamination system. A *gap* \mathcal{G} of \mathcal{L} is a subset of \mathcal{L} such that

- (1) any two distinct elements of \mathcal{G} are disjoint, and
- (2) each leaf of \mathcal{L} lies on some element of \mathcal{G} .

//

The closed set $S^1 \setminus \cup \mathcal{G}$ is called the *vertex set* of \mathcal{G} and is denoted by $v(\mathcal{G})$. Each element of $v(\mathcal{G})$ is called a *vertex* of \mathcal{G} . A vertex of \mathcal{G} is called a *tip* of \mathcal{G} if it is isolated in $v(\mathcal{G})$. For each $I \in \mathcal{G}$, the leaf $\ell(I)$ of \mathcal{L} is called a *boundary leaf* of \mathcal{G} .

Note that a leaf itself is a gap in our definition. Hence, we say that a gap of \mathcal{L} is *non-leaf* if the gap is not a leaf of \mathcal{L} . We denote the set $\cup_{I \in \mathcal{L}} v(\ell(I))$ by $E(\mathcal{L})$ and call $E(\mathcal{L})$ the *endpoint set* of \mathcal{L} . Also, each element of the endpoint set is called an *endpoint* of \mathcal{L} .

We say that a gap \mathcal{G} in a lamination system *lies on* a good interval I if $J^* \subset I$ for some $J \in \mathcal{G}$. Also, \mathcal{G} *properly lies on* a good interval I if $\overline{J^*} = J^c \subset I$ for some $J \in \mathcal{G}$. Note that the unlinkedness of leaves implies the following proposition. For a detailed proof, we refer to [BK20, Lemma 10.7.13]

Proposition 3.7. *Let \mathcal{L} be a lamination system. Suppose that \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{H} are gap of \mathcal{L} with $|\mathcal{G}|, |\mathcal{H}| \geq 2$. Then $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{H}$ or \mathcal{G} lies on some open interval in \mathcal{H} .*

The following proposition gives a criterion for the existence of a non-leaf gap.

Proposition 3.8 ([BK20]). *Let \mathcal{L} be a lamination system and $I \in \mathcal{L}$. If I is isolated, then there is a non-leaf gap \mathcal{G} containing I^* .*

Let \mathcal{L} be a lamination system. A gap \mathcal{G} is said to be *real* if there is no isolated element in \mathcal{G} . Then, any real leaf is not a boundary leaf of a non-leaf gap. We say that a pair $\{I, J\}$ of elements of \mathcal{L} is a *distinct pair* in \mathcal{L} if $I \not\subset J^*$. Note that a distinct pair is not a leaf. A distinct pair $\{I, J\}$ is said to be *separated* if there is a non-leaf gap \mathcal{G} of \mathcal{L} such that $I \subset M$ and $J \subset N$ for some $\{M, N\} \subset \mathcal{G}$. Here, M and N are not necessarily distinct. Nonetheless, whenever a distinct pair $\{I, J\}$ is separated, we can take a non-leaf gap \mathcal{G} so that \mathcal{G} contains a distinct pair $\{M, N\}$ with $I \subseteq M$ and $J \subseteq N$. Then, \mathcal{L} is said to be *totally disconnected* if every distinct pair is separated. Equivalently, for any two distinct leaves ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 of \mathcal{L} , there is a non-leaf gap \mathcal{G} containing a distinct pair $\{J_1, J_2\}$ such that ℓ_i lies on J_i for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Note that totally disconnectedness guarantees the existence of a non-leaf gap.

There are two important types of gaps. An *ideal polygon* (or simply a polygon) is a gap with finitely many vertices. When \mathcal{G} is a polygon, we can write $\mathcal{G} = \{(t_k, t_{k+1})_{S^1} : k = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ where $n = |v(\mathcal{G})|$ and $v(\mathcal{G}) = \{t_k : k = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ (cyclically indexed). Note that vertices and tips of a polygon are identical.

The other type is a *crown* which is defined as follows. A gap \mathcal{G} is called a *crown* if there is a sequence $\{t_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and a point p in S^1 satisfying the following:

- $p \neq t_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,
- $\mathcal{G} = \{(t_k, t_{k+1})_{S^1} : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$,
- $v(\mathcal{G}) = \{t_k : k \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{p\}$.

In this situation, the point p is called the *pivot* of \mathcal{G} . See Figure 3.10.

Remark 3.9. Note that t_k are tips of \mathcal{G} and that p is the unique limit point of $v(\mathcal{G})$. //




FIGURE 3.10. A crown. The pivot is marked with the dot.

3.11. Stems and Rainbows. Let \mathcal{L} be a lamination system and B a good interval. Also, let E be a non-empty subset of B . Then, the *stem* from B to E in \mathcal{L} is a set

$$S_E^B := \{J \in \mathcal{L} : E \subseteq J \subseteq B\}.$$

which is totally ordered by the set inclusion \subseteq .

Suppose that a stem S_E^B is not empty. Then, $\cup S_E^B$ is the maximal element of S_E^B . We call the maximal element the *base* of S_E^B . We call $\text{Int}(\cap S_E^B)$ the *end* of the stem S_E^B if $\text{Int}(\cap S_E^B) \neq \emptyset$.

Observe that when E has at least two points, $\widehat{S}_E^B := \text{Int}(\cap S_E^B)$ is never empty. To see this, we denote the smallest closed interval containing E and contained in B by m . Then, \widehat{S}_E^B is a good interval containing the interior $\text{Int}(m)$ of m and it is contained in \mathcal{L} . Hence, if $\widehat{S}_E^B = \emptyset$, then E necessarily has only one point.

A descending sequence $\{I_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of elements of \mathcal{L} is called a *rainbow* at p if $\cap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} I_k = \{p\}$. We call p a *rainbow point* of \mathcal{L} . For convenience, when $E = \{p\}$ for some $p \in S^1$, then we write S_p^B for S_E^B . A point $p \in S^1$ is a rainbow point of \mathcal{L} precisely when \widehat{S}_p^B is empty. To see this, observe that \widehat{S}_p^B is not empty, then $\{p\} \subset v(\ell(\widehat{S}_p^B))$ or \widehat{S}_p^B is the minimal element of S_p^B . On the other hand, if $\widehat{S}_p^B = \emptyset$, then one can take a rainbow $\{I_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ at p in S_p^B , namely, $I_k \in S_p^B$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

4. QUITE FULL LOOSE LAMINATION SYSTEMS

Not all lamination systems are interesting. Most lamination systems naturally occurring in the context of geometry and dynamics have a certain degree of complexity. In this, and the forthcoming sections, we introduce quite full, loose lamination systems and ultimately veering pairs by packaging some properties of the stable/unstable pair of laminations associated to a pseudo-Anosov mapping class. Along this, we also define pseudo-fibered pairs which is a weaker version of veering pairs. In fact, pseudo-fiberedness is enough to prove the classification theorems for laminar automorphisms, e.g. Theorem 15.9, Theorem 15.18, and Theorem 15.22. Also, a pseudo-fibered pair is a right generalization of a pair of laminations contained the definition of pseudo-fibered triples defined in [ABS19]. In Section 15.13, it turns out that every pseudo-fibered pair is a pants-like pair studied in [Bai15] and [BK21].

4.1. Quite full. A lamination system \mathcal{L} is said to be *quite full* if every gap of \mathcal{L} is either an ideal polygon or a crown. In particular, we say that \mathcal{L} is *very full* if every gap is an ideal polygon.

The following lemma shows that the local shape of a quite full lamination system is regulated.

Lemma 4.2 (Rainbows are quite abundant). *Let \mathcal{L} be a quite full lamination system. Each point in S^1 is either an endpoint of \mathcal{L} , the pivot of a unique crown, or a rainbow point. These cases are mutually exclusive.*

Proof. Let p be a point in S^1 . As $\mathcal{L} \neq \emptyset$, we may choose an element I . If $p \in v(\ell(I))$, then $p \in E(\mathcal{L})$. If not, there is an element J in $\ell(I)$ containing p .

Now, we consider the stem S_p^J . As $J \in S_p^J$, the stem is not empty. If $\widehat{S_p^J} = \emptyset$, then p is a rainbow point. See Section 3.11. Now suppose that the end E of the stem exists. There are two cases. One is the case where p is an endpoint of $\ell(E)$. This implies the statement. In the other case, since E is the minimal element in S_p^J , there is no E -side sequence of leaves and so E is isolated. Therefore, by Proposition 3.8, there is a non-leaf gap \mathcal{G} of \mathcal{L} containing E^* .

If there is K in \mathcal{G} containing p , then

$$p \in K \not\subset E \subseteq J$$

and $K \in S_p^J$. This contradicts that E is the end of S_p^J . Therefore, $p \in v(\mathcal{G})$. Then, since \mathcal{L} is quite full, \mathcal{G} is either an ideal polygon and a crown. Hence, p is either the pivot of \mathcal{G} or a tip of \mathcal{G} . By Remark 3.9, these cases are mutually exclusive. Thus, p is the pivot of \mathcal{G} or $p \in E(\mathcal{L})$. \square

Corollary 4.3. *The endpoint set of a quite full lamination system is dense in S^1 .*

4.4. Loose. A quite full lamination system \mathcal{L} is *loose* if for any distinct non-leaf gaps \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{H} of \mathcal{L} , $v(\mathcal{G})$ and $v(\mathcal{H})$ are disjoint. In this section, we investigate the topology of loose lamination systems and renew Lemma 4.2 in loose lamination systems.

Proposition 4.5. *Let \mathcal{L} be a quite full lamination system. Suppose that \mathcal{L} is loose and totally disconnected. Then, for three distinct leaves ℓ_1 , ℓ_2 , and ℓ_3 , we have $v(\ell_1) \cap v(\ell_2) \cap v(\ell_3) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Assume that $v(\ell_1) \cap v(\ell_2) \cap v(\ell_3) = \{p\}$ for some $p \in S^1$. For each $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, we write $\ell_i = \ell(I_i)$. We may assume that $I_1 \not\subset I_2 \not\subset I_3$. By totally disconnectedness, there is a non-leaf gap \mathcal{G}_1 containing a distinct pair $\{J_1, K_1\}$ such that $I_1 \subset J_1$ and $I_2^* \subset K_1$ and there is also a non-leaf gap \mathcal{G}_2 containing a distinct pair $\{J_2, K_2\}$ such that $I_2 \subset J_2$ and $I_3^* \subset K_2$. Then, $p \in v(\mathcal{G}_1) \cap v(\mathcal{G}_2)$ and by looseness, $\mathcal{G}_1 = \mathcal{G}_2$. On the other hand, $\mathcal{G}_1 \neq \mathcal{G}_2$ since $v(\mathcal{G}_1) \subset \overline{I_2}$ and $v(\mathcal{G}_2) \subset \overline{I_3^*}$. This is a contradiction. Thus, $v(\ell_1) \cap v(\ell_2) \cap v(\ell_3) = \emptyset$. \square

Proposition 4.6. *Let \mathcal{L} be a quite full lamination system. Suppose that \mathcal{L} is loose and totally disconnected. Given distinct leaves ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 sharing a vertex p , there is a non-leaf gap \mathcal{G} having ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 as boundary leaves, and p as a tip.*

Proof. By totally disconnectedness, there is a non-leaf gap \mathcal{G} having a distinct pair $\{J_1, J_2\}$ such that ℓ_i lies on J_i for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Then, by Proposition 4.5, $\ell_i = \ell(J_i)$ for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$. \square

Proposition 4.7. *Let \mathcal{L} be a quite full lamination system. Suppose that \mathcal{L} is loose and totally disconnected. Then, every leaf is a real leaf or a boundary leaf of a non-leaf gap. In particular, there is no isolated leaf of \mathcal{L} . Moreover, every non-leaf gap is real.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.8, we only need to show that there is no isolated leaf in \mathcal{L} . Assume that $\ell = \ell(I)$ is an isolated leaf. By Proposition 3.8, there are distinct non-leaf gaps \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 such that $I \in \mathcal{G}_1$ and $I^* \in \mathcal{G}_2$. Then, $v(\ell) = v(\mathcal{G}_1) \cap v(\mathcal{G}_2)$ and this contradicts the looseness of \mathcal{L} . \square

Now, we can restate Lemma 4.2 with Proposition 4.7 as follows.

Lemma 4.8. *Let \mathcal{L} be a quite full lamination system. Suppose that \mathcal{L} is loose and totally disconnected. Then each point in S^1 is either a vertex of a unique real leaf, a tip of a unique non-leaf gap, the pivot of a unique crown, or a rainbow point. These cases are mutually exclusive.*

Let \mathcal{L} be a quite full lamination system. Assume that \mathcal{L} is loose and totally disconnected. Let t be an endpoint of \mathcal{L} . Then, by Lemma 4.8, there is a unique real gap \mathcal{G} having t as a tip. We call \mathcal{G} the *tip gap* of t and \mathcal{G} is denoted by $\diamond(t)$. If \mathcal{G} is a non-leaf gap, then there is a distinct pair $\{I, J\}$ in \mathcal{G} such that $\overline{I} \cap \overline{J} = \{t\}$. We call $\{I, J\}$ the *tip pair* at t and denote it by $\vee(t)$.

5. PSEUDO-FIBERED PAIRS AND VEERING PAIRS

As we promised, we define pseudo-fibered pairs and veering pairs in this section. The motivating examples of our definition are the pair of laminations constructed in [FSS19] and a pair of geodesic laminations preserved by a pseudo-Anosov surface mapping class.

5.1. Pseudo-fibered pairs and veering pairs. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a pair of quite full lamination systems. We say that a collection \mathcal{G} of good intervals is a *gap* of \mathcal{C} if \mathcal{G} is a gap of \mathcal{L}_1 or \mathcal{L}_2 .

Let \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 be gaps of \mathcal{C} . When \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 are leaves, we say that \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 are *linked* if $v(\mathcal{G}_1)$ and $v(\mathcal{G}_2)$ are linked, and *unlinked* otherwise. Suppose that \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 are unlinked. We say that \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 are *parallel* if $v(\mathcal{G}_1) \cap v(\mathcal{G}_2)$ is a singleton, and *ultraparallel* if $v(\mathcal{G}_1)$ and $v(\mathcal{G}_2)$ are disjoint.

In general, \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 are *linked* if $\ell(I_1)$ and $\ell(I_2)$ are linked for some $I_1 \in \mathcal{G}_1$ and $I_2 \in \mathcal{G}_2$. Otherwise, \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 are *unlinked*.

We say that \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 *interleave* if for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $I \cap v(\mathcal{G}_{i+1})$ is a singleton for all I in \mathcal{G}_i (indexed cyclically). In this case, we call \mathcal{G}_i an *interleaving gap* of \mathcal{G}_{i+1} , for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$ (cyclically indexed). Consult Figure 15.8 for generic shape of interleaving gaps. Note that if two gaps interleave and one is a leaf then the other is also a leaf. Likewise, the interleaving gap of a polygon or a crown is also a polygon or a crown, respectively. In particular, if two crowns interleave, then the pivots of these crowns coincide.

An ordered pair of interleaving gaps is called an *interleaving pair*, i.e., the ordered pair $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ is called an interleaving pair of \mathcal{C} if \mathcal{G}_i is a gap of \mathcal{L}_i for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 interleave. A *stitch* of \mathcal{C} is an interleaving pair $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ such that each \mathcal{G}_i is a leaf. An *asterisk* of \mathcal{C} is an interleaving pair which is not a stitch.

Definition 5.2. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a pair of lamination system. The pair \mathcal{C} is said to be *pseudo-fibered* if

- each \mathcal{L}_i is quite full and loose, and
- \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 are *strongly transverse*, namely, $E(\mathcal{L}_1) \cap E(\mathcal{L}_2) = \emptyset$.

In particular, a pseudo-fibered pair \mathcal{C} is called a *veering pair* if each non-leaf gap of \mathcal{C} has an interleaving gap. //

Note that the transversality of laminations implies the totally disconnectedness as follows.

Proposition 5.3 ([ABS19], [BK20]). *If lamination systems \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 are strongly transverse and both $E(\mathcal{L}_1)$ and $E(\mathcal{L}_2)$ are dense in S^1 , then each \mathcal{L}_i are totally disconnected.*

Proposition 5.4. *Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a pseudo-fibered pair. Then, each \mathcal{L}_i is totally disconnected.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{L}_i are quite full, by Corollary 4.3, the endpoint sets $E(\mathcal{L}_i)$ are dense in S^1 . As \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 are strongly transverse, by Proposition 5.3, \mathcal{L}_i are totally disconnected. \square

Remark 5.5. By Proposition 5.4, each lamination system \mathcal{L}_i of a pseudo-fibered pair is quite full, loose and totally disconnected. Therefore, each \mathcal{L}_i enjoys the properties shown in Section 4.1. //

5.6. Properties of Veering Pairs. Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. A *singular stitch* of an asterisk $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ of \mathcal{V} is a stitch (ℓ_1, ℓ_2) such that each ℓ_i is a boundary leaf of \mathcal{G}_i for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$. A stitch of \mathcal{V} is *singular* if it is a singular stitch of some asterisk. Otherwise, (ℓ_1, ℓ_2) is *regular*. We say that a stitch (ℓ_1, ℓ_2) is *genuine* if ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 are real.

A tuple (I_1, I_2) in $\mathcal{L}_1 \times \mathcal{L}_2$ is called a *sector* in \mathcal{V} if $(\ell(I_1), \ell(I_2))$ is a stitch. In particular, (I_1, I_2) is a *sector* of an interleaving pair $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ if $I_i \in \mathcal{G}_i$. Also, (I_1, I_2) is said to be *counter-clockwise* if $(u_1, v_1)_{S^1} \cap (u_2, v_2)_{S^1} = (u_2, v_1)_{S^1}$ where $I_i = (u_i, v_i)_{S^1}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Otherwise, the sector is *clockwise*. We say that a stitch (ℓ_1, ℓ_2) *lies* on a sector (I_1, I_2) if for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, ℓ_i properly lies on I_i and ℓ_i is linked with $\ell(I_j)$, $j \neq i$.

Lemma 5.7. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Then, each point p in S^1 falls into one of the following cases:*

- (1) p is a rainbow point of both \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 .
- (2) p is a rainbow point of \mathcal{L}_i for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and p is a tip of a unique real gap of \mathcal{L}_j , $j \neq i$.
- (3) p is the pivot of some asterisk of crowns.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 4.8. \square

Let t be an endpoint of \mathcal{L}_1 or \mathcal{L}_2 . By Lemma 5.7, there is a unique real gap of \mathcal{V} having t as a tip. Hence, the notions of tip pairs and tip gaps in \mathcal{V} are well-defined. Now, we abuse the notions of tip pairs and tip gaps for \mathcal{V} .

We say that an element I in $\mathcal{L}_1 \cup \mathcal{L}_2$ *crosses over* t if $I \cap v(\diamond(t)) = \{t\}$. Note that if $t \in E(\mathcal{L}_i)$ for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$, then $I \in \mathcal{L}_{i+1}$ (cyclically indexed). Also, a leaf ℓ of \mathcal{V} *crosses over* t if some element of ℓ crosses over t . Moreover, we say that a tip pair $\vee(t')$ *crosses over* t if $\ell(J)$ crosses over t for all $J \in \vee(t')$. Note that if $\vee(t') = \{J_1, J_2\}$, then J_i crosses over t for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and so J_{i+1}^* crosses over t (cyclically indexed). Therefore, $J_{i+1} \cap v(\diamond(t)) = v(\diamond(t)) - \{t\}$.

5.8. Linkedness and Crossing. Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. We say that gaps \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 in \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 , respectively, *cross* if there are distinct pairs $\{I_1, J_1\}$ and $\{I_2, J_2\}$ in \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 , respectively, such that for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $v(\mathcal{G}_{i+1}) \subset (I_i \cup J_i)$ and $|v(\mathcal{G}_{i+1}) \cap I_i| = 1$ (cyclically indexed). One purpose of this section is to show that, in veering pairs, the concept of crossing coincide with the concept of crossing over in some sense. See Proposition 5.11 and Proposition 5.12. Eventually, we show Proposition 5.14 which describes the possible configurations of linked gaps of \mathcal{V} .

Remark 5.9. If \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 are unlinked, we can take K_1 and K_2 in \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 , respectively, so that $K_1^c \subset K_2$. Therefore, for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, \mathcal{G}_i lies on K_{i+1} (cyclically indexed). Compare with Proposition 3.7. \square

Proposition 5.10. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair and \mathcal{G} be a gap in \mathcal{L}_1 . Then for every leaf ℓ in \mathcal{L}_2 , either \mathcal{G} and ℓ are unlinked or they cross.*

Proof. First, we consider the case where \mathcal{G} is a leaf. Then \mathcal{G} and ℓ are either unlinked or linked. If they are linked, then they cross. Therefore, this case is obvious.

Now, we assume that \mathcal{G} is a non-leaf gap. Since \mathcal{V} is a veering pair, there is the interleaving gap \mathcal{H} of \mathcal{G} and ℓ lies on a unique good interval I in \mathcal{H} . Then, we can take a good interval J in ℓ contained in I .

Note that $I \cap v(\mathcal{G}) = \{v\}$ for some tip v of \mathcal{G} . If J does not contain v , then $v(\mathcal{G}) \subset J^c = \overline{J^*}$ and so \mathcal{G} lies on J^* since $E(\mathcal{L}_1) \cap E(\mathcal{L}_2) = \emptyset$. Therefore, \mathcal{G} and ℓ are unlinked. Assume that J contains v . As $I^* \cap v(\mathcal{G}) = v(\mathcal{G}) - \{v\}$ and $J \subseteq I$,

$$v(\mathcal{G}) - \{v\} = I^* \cap v(\mathcal{G}) \subseteq I^* \subseteq J^*.$$

Moreover, endpoints of ℓ belong to different elements of \mathcal{G} since \mathcal{G} and ℓ is linked. Therefore, \mathcal{G} and ℓ cross. \square

Proposition 5.11. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Suppose that there are non-leaf gaps \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 in \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 , respectively, such that \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 cross. Then there are tips t_1 and t_2 of \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 , respectively, such that for each $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$, $i \neq j$, the tip pair $\vee(t_i)$ crosses over t_j .*

Proof. Since \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 cross, there are distinct pairs $\{I_1, J_1\}$ and $\{I_2, J_2\}$ in \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 , respectively, such that for each $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$, $i \neq j$, $v(\mathcal{G}_j) \subset I_i \cup J_i$ and $|I_i \cap v(\mathcal{G}_j)| = 1$. Now we say that for each $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$, $i \neq j$, the point in $I_i \cap v(\mathcal{G}_j)$ is t_j .

For each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $t_j \in I_i \subset J_i^*$ and

$$v(\mathcal{G}_j) - \{t_j\} \subset J_i \subset I_i^*.$$

Therefore, for each $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$, $i \neq j$, I_i and J_i^* cross over the tip t_j .

If $t_2 \notin v(\ell(I_2))$, then $v(\ell(I_2)) \subset J_1$. This implies that $\ell(I_2)$ lies on J_1 . This is a contradiction, because I_2 crosses over t_1 . Hence, $t_2 \in v(\ell(I_2))$. Similarly, we can see that $t_2 \in v(\ell(J_2))$. Therefore, $\{I_2, J_2\} = \vee(t_2)$ and we can conclude that $\vee(t_2)$ crosses over t_1 . In a similar way, we can see that $\vee(t_1)$ crosses over t_2 . \square

Proposition 5.12. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Suppose that there are non-leaf gaps \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 in \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 , respectively. If there is a tip pair $\vee(t)$ in \mathcal{G}_1 crossing over a tip t' of \mathcal{G}_2 , Then \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 cross.*

Proof. With $\vee(t_1)$ and $\vee(t_2)$, \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 cross. \square

Proposition 5.13. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Suppose that for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, \mathcal{G}_i is a gap in \mathcal{L}_i . If \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 are linked, then \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 interleave or cross.*

Proof. If both \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 are leaves, then they obviously interleave and cross. Also, the case where one of \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 is a leaf and the other is a non-leaf gap follows from Proposition 5.10.

Now, we assume that \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 are non-leaf gaps and that they do not interleave. Then, the interleaving gap \mathcal{H}_1 of \mathcal{G}_1 is not \mathcal{G}_2 . Therefore, by Proposition 3.7, \mathcal{G}_2 lies on a good open interval K in \mathcal{H}_1 . Then, $J_2^* \subset K$ for some $J_2 \in \mathcal{G}_2$.

Now, we say that the tip of \mathcal{G}_1 over which K crosses is t_1 . If $t_1 \in J_2$, then $v(\mathcal{G}_1) \subset J_2$ since $v(\mathcal{G}_1) - \{t_1\} \subset K$. This implies that \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 are unlinked and so it is a contradiction. Hence, $t_1 \in J_2^*$.

If t_1 is a pivot with respect to \mathcal{L}_2 , then t_1 is also a pivot in \mathcal{L}_1 , but, by Lemma 5.7, it is a contradiction since t_1 is a tip of \mathcal{G}_1 . Therefore, there is an element I_2 in \mathcal{G}_2 containing t_1 by Lemma 5.7.

Now, we consider distinct pairs $\vee(t_1)$ and $\{I_2, J_2\}$ to show that \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 cross. Note that

$$v(\mathcal{G}_2) \subset \overline{J_2^*} - \{t_1\} \subset \overline{K} - \{t_1\} \subset \bigcup \vee(t_1).$$

We write $\{M, N\}$ for $\vee(t_1)$. Since I_2 is crossing over t_1 , $\ell(I_2)$ and $\ell(M)$ are linked and so $\ell(M)$ and \mathcal{G}_2 are linked. Therefore, by Proposition 5.10, $\ell(M)$ and \mathcal{G}_2 cross. Therefore, one of M and M^* contains only one tip t_2 of $v(\mathcal{G}_2)$. This implies that one of M and N contains only one tip t_2 of $v(\mathcal{G}_2)$ since

$$v(\mathcal{G}_2) \subset M \cup N \subset M \cup M^*.$$

Therefore, $\{I_2, J_2\} = \vee(t_2)$ and so $\vee(t_2)$ crosses over t_1 . Thus, by Proposition 5.12, \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 cross. \square

Now, we may summarize as follows.

Proposition 5.14. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Suppose that a non-leaf gap \mathcal{G}_1 and a gap \mathcal{G}_2 of \mathcal{V} are linked. Then, one of the following cases holds.*

- \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 interleave.
- \mathcal{G}_2 is a leaf and \mathcal{G}_2 crosses over a tip of \mathcal{G}_1 .
- \mathcal{G}_2 is also a non-leaf gap and there are tips t_1 and t_2 of \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 , respectively, such that $\vee(t_i)$ crosses over t_j for all $i \neq j$.

Part 2. From Veering Pairs to Loom Spaces

The major theme of Part 2 is to construct a loom space from a given veering pair. This construction is functorial.

Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. The main idea is to consider the stitch space $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{V})$ analogous to the link space in [FSS19]. Then, define the *weaving relation* \sim_ω on $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{V})$. Let λ_1 and λ_2 be geodesic laminations on \mathbb{H}^2 associated with \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 , respectively. We do doubling $\overline{\mathbb{H}^2}$ to obtain the Riemann sphere $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ where each hemisphere has a copy of a pair of laminations λ_1 and λ_2 . Then, we collapse each component of the complement of the four geodesic laminations in $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ to a point and use Moore's theorem (see Theorem 6.2) to show that the resulting space is still the sphere. Next, by showing that $\partial\mathbb{H}$ is still alive after collapsing, we cut the sphere along $\partial\mathbb{H}$ to get a transversely (singular) foliated disk. Furthermore, we show that the foliated disk is exactly the manifold part of the quotient space $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{V})/\sim_\omega$. After removing all singular points from $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{V})/\sim_\omega$, we show that the universal cover of the resulting space is a loom space in the sense of [SS21].

6. THE COMPRESSING RELATION ON $\overline{\mathbb{H}^2}$

6.1. Moore's Theorem. Let X be a topological space. Suppose that P is a partition of X . Then we call P a *decomposition* of X if every element of P is closed in X . Let \sim_P be the equivalence relation on X induced by P . Then there is a quotient map

$$\pi_P : X \rightarrow X/\sim_P$$

defined by $x \mapsto [x]$ where $[x]$ is the equivalence class of x . Then, X/\sim_P is a topological space with the quotient topology induced by π_P . We call the topological space X/\sim_P the *decomposition space* of P and denote it by $\mathcal{D}(P)$.

A decomposition $P = \{C_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Gamma}$ of X is said to be *upper semicontinuous* if for each α in Γ , C_α is compact in X and for any open set U of X containing C_α , we can take an open set V so that it satisfies the following:

- $C_\alpha \subset V \subset U$ and
- if $C_\beta \cap V \neq \emptyset$ for some $\beta \in \Gamma$, then $C_\beta \subset U$.

See [HY88, Section 3-6, Chapter 3] for more detailed introduction to upper semicontinuous decompositions. See also [Cal07].

Now, we assume that X is a 2-manifold without boundary and P is an upper semicontinuous decomposition of X . Then we say that P is *cellular* if for each $p \in P$, there is an embedding i in \mathbb{R}^2 such that $\mathbb{R}^2 - i(p)$ is connected.

Theorem 6.2 (Moore [Moo29]). *Let S be either S^2 or \mathbb{R}^2 . Let P be a cellular decomposition of S . Then, the quotient map $\pi_P : S \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(P)$ can be approximated by homeomorphisms. In particular, S and $\mathcal{D}(P)$ are homeomorphic.*

6.3. Cellular Decompositions on $\overline{\mathbb{H}^2}$. In this section, we think of \mathbb{H}^2 as the upper half plane of \mathbb{C} and so our circle S^1 is the extended real number $\hat{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$. Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Fix $i \in \{1, 2\}$. We define an equivalence relation \sim_i on S^1 as follows: For any u and v in S^1 , $u \sim_i v$ if and only if either $u = v$ or there is a gap \mathcal{G} in \mathcal{L}_i such that $\{u, v\} \subset v(\mathcal{G})$. We denote the partition induced by \sim_i by P_i .

Lemma 6.4. *P_i is upper semicontinuous.*

Proof. We first show that each equivalence class of \sim_i is compact subset of S^1 . Let v be a point in S^1 . If v is a rainbow point in \mathcal{L}_i , the equivalence class $[v]$ is the one point set $\{v\}$. If $v \in E(\mathcal{L}_i)$, then there is a real gap \mathcal{G} such that $[v] = v(\mathcal{G})$ by Lemma 5.7. By Lemma 4.2, the remaining case is that v is the pivot of some crown \mathcal{G} . In this case, $[v] = v(\mathcal{G})$. Therefore, for each v in S^1 , $[v]$ is either $\{v\}$ or $v(\mathcal{G})$ for some real gap \mathcal{G} by Proposition 4.7 and so $[v]$ is compact.

Let U be an open set in S^1 containing an equivalence class $[v]$. We split the cases according to Lemma 5.7.

Suppose that v is a rainbow point in \mathcal{L}_i . In this case, we know that $[v] = \{v\}$. Let $\{I_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a rainbow at v in \mathcal{L}_i . Choose a large enough $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\overline{I_{n_0}} \subset U$. Let $V = I_{n_0} \in \mathcal{L}_i$. Then, we have $[v] \subset V \subset U$. Assume that $[w] \cap V \neq \emptyset$ for some $w \in S^1$. We need to show that $[w] \subset U$. If $[w] = \{w\}$, then $[w] \subset V$ and so $[w] \subset U$. If $[w] = v(\mathcal{G})$ for some real gap \mathcal{G} , then $v(\mathcal{G}) \subset \overline{V} \subset U$, so that $[w] \subset U$ as we wanted.

Suppose that v is a vertex of a real gap \mathcal{G} . Then we have $[v] = v(\mathcal{G})$. First, consider the case where $\mathcal{G} = \{I_1, \dots, I_n\}$ is an ideal polygon. Let U be an open set of S^1 containing $[v]$. For each $x \in v(\mathcal{G})$, choose an open interval U_x containing x in such a way that $\overline{U_x} \cap \overline{U_y} = \emptyset$ for all $x \neq y$ and that $\overline{U_x} \subset U$ for all $x \in v(\mathcal{G})$. Let $U' = \bigcup_{x \in v(\mathcal{G})} U_x$. Then, U' is again a neighborhood of $[v]$ and $\overline{U'} \subset U$. Since \mathcal{G} is a real gap (Proposition 4.7), we know that there is $J_j \in \mathcal{L}_i$ such that $\overline{I_j} \setminus \overline{U'} \subset J_j \subset \overline{J_j} \subset I_j$ for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$. We define $V = U' \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^n \overline{J_j}$. From the construction, we know that $\overline{V} \subset \overline{U'} \subset U$. Assume that w is a point in S^1 such that $[w] \cap V \neq \emptyset$. If $[w] = \{w\}$, then $[w] \subset V \subset U$. Otherwise, there is a real gap \mathcal{G}' such that $[w] = v(\mathcal{G}')$. Again we know that $v(\mathcal{G}') \subset \overline{V} \subset U$. Hence, $[w] \subset U$ as desired.

Finally, suppose that v is a vertex of a crown \mathcal{G} . Let U be an open set of S^1 such that $[v] = v(\mathcal{G}) \subset U$. We write $\mathcal{G} = \{(t_n, t_{n+1})_{S^1} : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ as in the definition of crowns and p for the pivot. Since p is the accumulation point of $\{t_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (t_{n+1}, t_{-n})_{S^1} = \{p\}$, there is a number $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $p \in U_\infty = [t_{N+1}, t_{-N}]_{S^1} \subset U$. We choose disjoint open intervals U_n at each t_k , $|k| \leq N$, such that $\overline{U_k} \subset U$. Let $U' = \bigcup_{|k| \leq N} U_k \cup U_\infty$. Then, $[v] \subset U' \subset \overline{U'} \subset U$. Since each $(t_k, t_{k+1})_{S^1} \in \mathcal{L}_i$ is not isolated, we can find $J_k \in \mathcal{L}_i$ for $|k| \leq N$ such that $\overline{(t_k, t_{k+1})_{S^1}} \setminus \overline{U'} \subset J_k \subset \overline{J_k} \subset (t_k, t_{k+1})_{S^1}$. Define $V = U' \setminus \bigcup_{|k| \leq N} \overline{J_k}$ so that $[v] \subset V \subset \overline{V} \subset \overline{U'} \subset U$. By the same argument as before, we show that any equivalence class $[w]$ with $[w] \cap V \neq \emptyset$ is contained in \overline{V} and so is in U .

This shows that P_i is upper semicontinuous. \square

Now, we extend the equivalence relation \sim_i to $\overline{\mathbb{H}^2}$ as follows. For x and $y \in \overline{\mathbb{H}^2}$, $x \approx_i y$ if and only if $\{x, y\} \subset H(v)$ for some $v \in P_i$ where $H(K)$ is the Euclidean convex hull in the Klein model of $\overline{\mathbb{H}^2}$. Let Q_i be the partition on $\overline{\mathbb{H}^2}$ induced by \approx_i . Observe that $Q_i = \{H(v) : v \in P_i\}$. As P_i is an upper semicontinuous decomposition on S^1 , Q_i is an upper semicontinuous decomposition on $\overline{\mathbb{H}^2}$ by elementary hyperbolic geometry.

Finally, we define a partition P on $\overline{\mathbb{H}^2}$ to be the set

$$\{c_1 \cap c_2 : c_i \in Q_i \text{ and } c_1 \cap c_2 \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Also, we denote the equivalence relation induced from P by \approx . Then for x and y in $\overline{\mathbb{H}^2}$, $x \approx y$ if and only if $x \approx_i y$ for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Since Q_1 and Q_2 are upper semicontinuous decompositions, P is also an upper semicontinuous decompositions.

Let v be a point in S^1 . We claim that the intersection of S^1 and the equivalence class $\langle v \rangle$ under \approx is $\{v\}$. By Lemma 5.7, if v is not the pivot of some crown, then v is a rainbow point of \mathcal{L}_i for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Then the equivalence class $\langle v \rangle_i$ under \approx_i is $\{v\}$. Therefore, $\langle v \rangle = \{v\}$. Otherwise, there is an asterisk $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ such that \mathcal{G}_i is a crown having v as the pivot for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Then,

$$\langle v \rangle = H(v(\mathcal{G}_1)) \cap H(v(\mathcal{G}_2)).$$

Hence, $\langle v \rangle \cap S^1 = \{v\}$.

Let P^* be the upper semi-continuous decomposition

$$\{J(c) : c \in P\}$$

on $\overline{\mathbb{H}^*}$ where J is the complex conjugation given by $z \mapsto \bar{z}$, and \approx^* denotes the equivalence relation defined by P^* . Now, we construct an upper semi-continuous decomposition on the Riemann sphere $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$.

First, we define a relation \cong on $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ as follows. For any x and y in $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$, $x \cong y$ if and only if either $x \approx y$ or $x \approx^* y$. Then, we denote the equivalence relation on $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ generated by \cong by \approx . Also, we denote the partition defined by \approx by Q .

Let v be a point in $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$. If the equivalence class $\llbracket v \rrbracket$ of v under \approx does not intersect $\hat{\mathbb{R}}$, then $\llbracket v \rrbracket$ is in P or P^* . Otherwise, there is a unique point w in $\llbracket v \rrbracket \cap S^1$ and so

$$\llbracket v \rrbracket = \langle w \rangle \cup J(\langle w \rangle).$$

More precisely, if w is not the pivot of some gap, then $\llbracket v \rrbracket = \{w\}$. If w is the pivot point of an asterisk $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$, then

$$\llbracket v \rrbracket = (H(v(\mathcal{G}_1)) \cap H(v(\mathcal{G}_2))) \cup J(H(v(\mathcal{G}_1)) \cap H(v(\mathcal{G}_2))).$$

Then, we can see that Q is also upper semi-continuous as P and P^* are upper semi-continuous. Moreover, Q is cellular since every element of Q intersects $\hat{\mathbb{R}}$ in at most one point. Thus, by Theorem 6.2, the quotient map

$$\pi_Q : \hat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(Q)$$

can be approximated by homeomorphisms and $\mathcal{D}(Q)$ is homeomorphic to the Riemann sphere $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$.

Observe that

$$\pi_Q|_{\overline{\mathbb{H}^2}} = \pi_P$$

and $\pi_Q|_{\hat{\mathbb{R}}} = \pi_P|_{\hat{\mathbb{R}}}$ is an injective continuous map from $\hat{\mathbb{R}}$ to $\mathcal{D}(Q)$. As $\mathcal{D}(Q)$ is homeomorphic to S^2 , by applying the Jordan-Schoenflies theorem to the Jordan curve $\pi_Q(\hat{\mathbb{R}})$ on $\mathcal{D}(Q)$, we can conclude that $\pi_Q(\overline{\mathbb{H}^2})$ is homeomorphic to the closed disk whose boundary is the Jordan curve $\pi_Q(\hat{\mathbb{R}})$. Therefore, since

$$\pi_Q(\overline{\mathbb{H}^2}) = \pi_P(\overline{\mathbb{H}^2}) = \mathcal{D}(P),$$

the decomposition space $\mathcal{D}(P)$ of P is homeomorphic to the closed disk. Thus, $\mathcal{D}(P) \setminus \pi_P(\hat{\mathbb{R}})$ is homeomorphic to \mathbb{R}^2 .

From now on, we denote the upper semi-continuous decomposition P on $\overline{\mathbb{H}^2}$ by $C(\mathcal{V})$ where $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$. We refer to the decomposition $C(\mathcal{V})$ as the *compressing decomposition*. Also, we call the equivalence relation $\sim_{C(\mathcal{V})}$ the *compressing relation* of \mathcal{V} . Then, we can summarize the result of this section as follows.

Lemma 6.5. *Let \mathcal{V} be a veering pair. Then, the quotient space $\mathcal{D}(C(\mathcal{V}))$ is the closed disk. Moreover, the restriction map $\pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}|_{S^1}$ is a Jordan curve which is the boundary of $\mathcal{D}(C(\mathcal{V}))$.*

7. STITCH SPACES AND WEAVINGS

As the first step toward loom spaces, we consider stitch spaces and weavings. The stitch space plays the role of the link space in [FSS19].

7.1. Stitch Spaces. Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. We define the *stitch spaces* $\mathsf{S}(\mathcal{V})$ of \mathcal{V} be the set of all stitches of \mathcal{V} . Then, $\mathsf{S}(\mathcal{V})$ is a subspace of $\ell(\mathcal{L}_1) \times \ell(\mathcal{L}_2)$. For each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, we define a projection map η_i from $\mathsf{S}(\mathcal{V})$ to $\ell(\mathcal{L}_i)$ by $\eta_i(\ell_1, \ell_2) = \ell_i$.

We define the *endpoint map* ϵ_2 from $\mathsf{S}(\mathcal{V})$ to $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L}_1) \times \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L}_2)$ by

$$\epsilon_2(s) := (\epsilon(\eta_1(s)), \epsilon(\eta_2(s))).$$

We call the image of ϵ_2 the *pair spaces* of \mathcal{V} and denote it by $\mathsf{P}(\mathcal{V})$. Note that $\mathsf{P}(\mathcal{V})$ is a subspace of $\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M}$. We define the *link map* g_2 from the pair space $\mathsf{P}(\mathcal{V})$ to $\overline{\mathbb{H}^2}$ by sending (μ, ν) to the intersection point of geodesics $g(\mu)$ and $g(\nu)$. We can see that g_2 is an injective continuous map and the image is contained in \mathbb{H}^2 . Hence, we can get an injective continuous map

$$g_2 \circ \epsilon_2 : \mathsf{S}(\mathcal{V}) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{H}^2}.$$

7.2. Warp and Weft threads. In preparation for the construction of transverse foliations, we introduce warps and wefts, each will play the role of leaves of the forthcoming foliations.

Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. For each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let ℓ_i be a leaf of \mathcal{L}_i . We call the set $\eta_1^{-1}(\ell_1)$ the *warp thread* on ℓ_1 and denote it by $\mathfrak{O}(\ell_1)$. Likewise, $\eta_2^{-1}(\ell_2)$ is called the *weft thread* on ℓ_2 and is denoted by $\mathfrak{O}(\ell_2)$. We say that a subset \mathcal{T} of $\mathsf{S}(\mathcal{V})$ is called a *thread* on a leaf ℓ of \mathcal{V} if $\mathcal{T} = \eta_i^{-1}(\ell)$ for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Also, we denote \mathcal{T} by $\mathfrak{O}(\ell)$.

Remark 7.3. If the thread $\mathfrak{O}(\ell)$ on a leaf ℓ has a singular stitch, then ℓ is a boundary leaf of a non-leaf gap. Moreover, in this case, since every leaf in \mathcal{L}_1 or \mathcal{L}_2 is not isolated, there are exactly two singular stitches in $\mathfrak{O}(\ell)$ which is of the same asterisk. //

Given a vertex e_1 of ℓ_1 and a stitch s_1 in $\mathfrak{O}(\ell_1)$, the *half warp thread* $\mathfrak{O}(\ell_1, s_1, e_1)$ on ℓ emanating from s_1 to e_1 is the set of all stitches s in $\mathfrak{O}(\ell_1)$ such that $\eta_2(s)$ lie on the element of $\eta_2(s_1)$ containing e_1 . Likewise, given a vertex e_2 of ℓ_2 and a stitch s_2 in $\mathfrak{O}(\ell_2)$, we define the *half weft thread* on ℓ_2 emanating from s_2 to e_2 . For a leaf ℓ of \mathcal{V} , a vertex e of ℓ , and a stitch s in $\mathfrak{O}(\ell)$, we define the *half thread* $\mathfrak{O}(\ell, s, e)$ on ℓ emanating from s to e in the same fashion.

Let \mathcal{L} be a lamination system. A leaf ℓ of \mathcal{L} *lies between* distinct leaves m_1 and m_2 of \mathcal{L} if $m_i \neq \ell$ and m_i lies on I_i for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ where $\ell = \{I_1, I_2\}$. We say that ℓ *properly lies between* m_1 and m_2 if m_i properly lies on I_i for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ where $\ell = \{I_1, I_2\}$.

Let s_1 and s_2 be distinct stitches of \mathcal{V} . We say that a stitch s is *between* s_1 and s_2 if $\eta_i(s_1) = \eta_i(s_2) = \eta_i(s)$ and $\eta_{i+1}(s)$ lies between $\eta_{i+1}(s_1)$ and $\eta_{i+1}(s_2)$ for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Also, we denote the set of all stitches lying between s_1 and s_2 by $\mathcal{I}(s_1, s_2)$ and call $\mathcal{I}(s_1, s_2)$ the *interval* between s_1 and s_2 . The *closure* $\overline{\mathcal{I}}(s_1, s_2)$ of $\mathcal{I}(s_1, s_2)$ is $\mathcal{I}(s_1, s_2) \cup \{s_1, s_2\}$ and it is called the *closed interval* between s_1 and s_2 .

Proposition 7.4. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. We take a leaf ℓ of \mathcal{L}_1 . Suppose that there are distinct stitches s_1 and s_2 in the thread $\mathfrak{O}(\ell)$ on ℓ . If the interval $\mathcal{I}(s_1, s_2)$ on $\mathfrak{O}(\ell)$ is empty, then there is a tip v such that $\{s_j\} = \mathfrak{O}(\ell) \cap \mathfrak{O}(\ell(I_j))$ for all $j \in \{1, 2\}$ where $\vee(v) = \{I_1, I_2\}$. Hence, ℓ crosses over the tip v . The same is true when ℓ is a leaf of \mathcal{L}_2 .*

Proof. When ℓ is a leaf of \mathcal{L}_1 , we have $\mathfrak{O}(\ell) = \mathfrak{O}(\ell)$. We write $s_1 = (\ell, m_1)$ and $s_2 = (\ell, m_2)$. We can take I_1 and I_2 in \mathcal{L}_2 so that $\ell(I_j) = m_j$ for all $j \in \{1, 2\}$ and $I_1 \subset I_2$. By assumption, the stem $S_{I_1}^{I_2}$ in \mathcal{L}_2 is exactly $\{I_1, I_2\}$. This implies that I_2 is isolated.

Since I_2 is isolated, there is a non-leaf gap \mathcal{G} in \mathcal{L}_2 containing I_2^* . since $I_1 \subset I_2$, there is an element I_3 in \mathcal{G} such that $I_2 \subset I_3$. If $I_2 \neq I_3$, then $I_2 \not\subset I_3 \not\subset I_1$ and so $I_3 \in S_{I_1}^{I_2}$. This is a contradiction. Therefore, $I_2 = I_3 \in \mathcal{G}$. Hence \mathcal{G} and ℓ cross. Then, by Proposition 5.10, $\{I_1, I_2^*\}$ is the tip pair at an end point v of \mathcal{G} , and so ℓ crosses over the tip v . \square

Remark 7.5. Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair and ℓ a leaf of \mathcal{V} . Suppose that there is a singular stitch s_1 in $\mathfrak{O}(\ell)$. By Remark 7.3, there is another singular stitch s_2 in $\mathfrak{O}(\ell)$ and the interval $\mathcal{I}(s_1, s_2)$ on $\mathfrak{O}(\ell)$ is empty. Therefore, by Proposition 7.4, there is a tip v such that $\{s_i\} = \mathfrak{O}(\ell) \cap \mathfrak{O}(\ell(I_j))$ for all $j \in \{1, 2\}$ where $\vee(v) = \{I_1, I_2\}$. //

7.6. Weaving Stitches. Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Now, we define an relation \sim on the stitch space $\mathsf{S}(\mathcal{V})$ as follows. For any distinct stitches s_1 and s_2 in $\mathsf{S}(\mathcal{V})$, $s_1 \sim s_2$ if and only if $\{s_1, s_2\} \subset \mathfrak{O}(\ell)$ for some leaf ℓ of \mathcal{V} and $\mathcal{I}(s_1, s_2) = \emptyset$. Then, we denote the equivalence relation generated by the relation \sim by \sim_ω . We refer to the equivalence relation \sim_ω as the *weaving relation* of \mathcal{V} . The map $\#$ denotes the quotient map from $\mathsf{S}(\mathcal{V})$ to $\mathsf{S}(\mathcal{V})/\sim_\omega$.

Remark 7.7. Let v be a tip of \mathcal{L}_1 . Assume that ℓ is a leaf crossing over v . Then for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $s_i = (\ell(I_i), \ell)$ is a stitch where $\vee(v) = \{I_1, I_2\}$. Note that since I_1^* and I_2^* are isolated, there is no I in \mathcal{L}_1 such that $I_1 \not\subseteq I \not\subseteq I_2^*$. Therefore, $\mathcal{I}(s_1, s_2)$ is empty. Thus, $s_1 \sim s_2$. The converse follows from Proposition 7.4. Compare with the equivalence relation defined on the pair space in [FSS19]. $\quad \quad \quad //$

Now, we define ω from the stitch space $\mathbf{S}(\mathcal{V})$ to the decomposition space $\mathcal{D}(C(\mathcal{V}))$ of the compressing decomposition by

$$\omega = \pi_{C(\mathcal{V})} \circ g_2 \circ \epsilon_2$$

where ϵ_2 is the end point map and g_2 is the link map. We call ω the *weaving map* of \mathcal{V} .

Proposition 7.8. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Then for stitches $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbf{S}(\mathcal{V})$, $s_1 \sim_\omega s_2$ if and only if $\omega(s_1) = \omega(s_2)$.*

Proof. Let s_1 and s_2 be stitches such that $s_1 \sim s_2$. Then, there is a thread $\emptyset(\ell)$ containing s_1 and s_2 . Since $\mathcal{I}(s_1, s_2)$ is empty, by Proposition 7.4, there is a tip t such that $\{s_i\} = \emptyset(\ell) \cap \emptyset(\ell(I_i))$ for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ where $\vee(t) = \{I_1, I_2\}$. Then $g_2 \circ \epsilon_2(s_i) \in H(v(\diamond(t)))$ for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ as $g(v(\ell(I_i))) \subset H(v(\diamond(t)))$ for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Meanwhile, $g_2 \circ \epsilon_2(s_i) \in H(v(\ell))$ for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Since there is an element C in $C(\mathcal{V})$ containing $H(v(\diamond(t))) \cap H(v(\ell))$, $g_2 \circ \epsilon_2(s_1) \sim_{C(\mathcal{V})} g_2 \circ \epsilon_2(s_2)$. See Section 6.3. Therefore, $\omega(s_1) = \omega(s_2)$.

Conversely, suppose that $\omega(s_1) = \omega(s_2)$ for stitches s_1 and s_2 . Then there is an element $D \in C(\mathcal{V})$ such that $g_2 \circ \epsilon_2(s_i) \in D$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$. There are real gaps \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 such that each gap \mathcal{G}_i is in \mathcal{L}_i and $D = H(v(\mathcal{G}_1)) \cap H(v(\mathcal{G}_2))$.

Claim 7.9. For any stitch s' with $g_2 \circ \epsilon_2(s') \in D$, there are boundary leaves $\eta_1(s')$ and $\eta_2(s')$ of \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 , respectively such that $s' = (\eta_1(s'), \eta_2(s'))$.

Proof. See Section 6.3 and observe the following. Let \mathcal{L} be a quite full lamination system and \mathcal{G} be a gap in \mathcal{L} . Then the boundary of $H(v(\mathcal{G}))$ consists of convex hulls of boundaries of elements of \mathcal{G} . Namely,

$$\partial H(v(\mathcal{G})) = \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{G}} H(v(\ell(I))).$$

□

Note that \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 are linked. If $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ is a stitch, then $s_1 = s_2 = (\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$. Therefore, $s_1 \sim_\omega s_2$.

Now we consider the case where $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ is an asterisk of \mathcal{V} . By Claim 7.9, each element of $\#(s_1)$ is a singular stitches of $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$. For each boundary leaf ℓ of \mathcal{G}_1 or \mathcal{G}_2 , the thread $\emptyset(\ell)$ has exactly two singular stitches and the interval between these stitches is empty. See Remark 7.5 and Remark 7.7. This implies that $\#(s_1)$ contains the set of all singular stitches of $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$. Therefore, $(g_2 \circ \epsilon_2)^{-1}(D) = \#(s_1)$. The same argument shows that $(g_2 \circ \epsilon_2)^{-1}(D) = \#(s_2)$. Therefore, $\#(s_1) = \#(s_2)$ and $s_1 \sim_\omega s_2$.

Now we assume that \mathcal{G}_1 is a non-leaf gap and \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 are not interleaving. If \mathcal{G}_2 is a leaf, then by Proposition 5.10, there is a tip v of \mathcal{G}_1 over which \mathcal{G}_2 crosses. Then we can see that $(g_2 \circ \epsilon_2)^{-1}(D)$ has exactly two points, namely, $(g_2 \circ \epsilon_2)^{-1}(D) = \{(\ell(I_1), \mathcal{G}_2), (\ell(I_2), \mathcal{G}_2)\}$ where $\vee(v) = \{I_1, I_2\}$. By Remark 7.7, $(\ell(I_1), \mathcal{G}_2) \sim (\ell(I_2), \mathcal{G}_2)$. Thus, $(g_2 \circ \epsilon_2)^{-1}(D) = \#(s_1) = \#(s_2)$.

Then we consider the case where \mathcal{G}_2 is also a non-leaf gap. Since \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 are not interleaving, by Proposition 5.13, \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 cross. Then by Proposition 5.11, there are tips t_1 and t_2 of \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 , respectively, such that for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, the tip pair $\vee(t_i)$ crosses over t_{i+1} . Then $(g_2 \circ \epsilon_2)^{-1}(D)$ has exactly four elements, namely,

$$(g_2 \circ \epsilon_2)^{-1}(D) = \{(\ell(I_1), \ell(I_2)) : I_i \in \vee(t_i) \text{ for all } i \in \{1, 2\}\}.$$

Note that for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and for any $I \in \vee(t_i)$, $\ell(I)$ crosses over t_{i+1} . By Remark 7.7, $(g_2 \circ \epsilon_2)^{-1}(D)$ is an equivalence class under the compression relation. Therefore, $(g_2 \circ \epsilon_2)^{-1}(D) = \#(s_1) = \#(s_2)$.

The case where \mathcal{G}_2 is a non-leaf gap can be proven similarly. Thus,

$$\omega^{-1}(\omega(s_1)) = (g_2 \circ \epsilon_2)^{-1}(D) = \#(s_2).$$

□

Remark 7.10. Let \mathcal{V} be a veering pair. For stitches s_1 and s_2 in $\mathbf{S}(\mathcal{V})$, by Proposition 7.8, $s_1 \sim_\omega s_2$ if and only if $g_2 \circ \epsilon_2(s_1) \sim_{C(\mathcal{V})} g_2 \circ \epsilon_2(s_2)$. Moreover, from the proof of Proposition 7.8, we can see that if s_1 is a singular stitch of some asterisk $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ and $s_1 \sim_\omega s_2$, then s_2 is also a singular stitch of $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$. Also, $\#(s_1) = \#(s_2)$ is the set of all singular stitches of $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$. $\quad \quad \quad //$

7.11. **Weavings.** Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. we denote the quotient space of $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{V})$ under \sim_ω by $\overline{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{V})$ and call it the *cusped weaving* of \mathcal{V} . Now, we may summarize the results in the proof of Proposition 7.8 as the following propositions. Compare with [FSS19, Lemma 10.5].

Proposition 7.12. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. For each w in $\overline{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{V})$, there are real gaps \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 of \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 , respectively, such that*

$$\#^{-1}(w) = \{s \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{V}) : \eta_i(s) \text{ is a boundary leaf of } \mathcal{G}_i \text{ for all } i \in \{1, 2\}\}.$$

More precisely, we can restate Proposition 7.12 with Proposition 5.14 as follows.

Proposition 7.13. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair and w an element in the cusped weaving. Then, one of the following cases holds.*

- $\#^{-1}(w)$ is a singleton whose element is a genuine stitch.
- $\#^{-1}(w)$ consists of two regular stitches s_1 and s_2 such that
 - $\ell_1 = \eta_i(s_1) = \eta_i(s_2)$ for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$,
 - ℓ_1 is real, and
 - $\eta_{i+1}(s_1)$ and $\eta_{i+1}(s_2)$ are parallel.
- There are points t_1 and t_2 in $E(\mathcal{L}_1)$ and $E(\mathcal{L}_2)$, respectively, such that
 - t_i is a tip of a non-leaf gap \mathcal{G}_i of \mathcal{L}_i for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$,
 - $\vee(t_i)$ crosses over t_j for all $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$, $i \neq j$, and
 - $\#^{-1}(w) = \{(\ell(I), \ell(J)) : I \in \vee(t_1) \text{ and } J \in \vee(t_2)\}$.
- $\#^{-1}(w)$ is the set of all singular stitches of an asterisk.

By Proposition 7.13, each element of the cusped weaving has only regular stitches or singular stitches. We say that $w \in \overline{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{V})$ is a *singular class* (*cuspid class*, respectively) associated with an asterisk $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ if \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 are ideal polygons (crowns, respectively) and $\#^{-1}(w)$ is the set of singular stitches of $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$. We say w is a *regular class* if w is neither a singular class nor a cuspid class.

For convenience, we denote the class w in $\overline{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{V})$ associated with an interleaving pair $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ of real gaps by $w(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$, that is,

$$w = w(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2) = \{s \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{V}) : \eta_i(s) \text{ is a boundary leaf of } \mathcal{G}_i \text{ for all } i \in \{1, 2\}\}.$$

We define the *order* $\text{ord}(w)$ of $w = w(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ by

$$\text{ord}(w) := \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } (\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2) \text{ is a genuine stitch} \\ |v(\mathcal{G}_1)| & \text{if } w \text{ is a singular class} \\ \infty & \text{if } w \text{ is a cuspid class} \end{cases}.$$

Now we define the *weaving* $\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{V})$ of \mathcal{V} to be

$$\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{V}) := \overline{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{V}) \setminus \{\text{cuspid classes}\}$$

and the *regular weaving* $\mathcal{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V})$ of \mathcal{V} to be

$$\mathcal{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}) := \overline{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{V}) \setminus \{\text{cuspid and singular classes}\}.$$

Lemma 7.14. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Then the weaving $\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{V})$ of \mathcal{V} is homeomorphic to the Euclidean plane \mathbb{R}^2 . More precisely, there is a unique homeomorphism $\hat{\omega}$ such that the following diagram commutes:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{V}) \setminus \{\text{stitches associated with cuspid classes}\} & \xrightarrow{\omega} & \text{Int}(\mathcal{D}(C(\mathcal{V}))) \\ & \searrow \# & \uparrow \hat{\omega} \\ & & \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{V}) \end{array}$$

where $\text{Int}(\mathcal{D}(C(\mathcal{V}))) = \mathcal{D}(C(\mathcal{V})) \setminus \partial\mathcal{D}(C(\mathcal{V}))$ and $\#$ is the quotient map defined by the weaving relation \sim_ω . We call the map $\hat{\omega}$ the *trivialization of the weaving*.

Proof. By Lemma 6.5, the decomposition space $\mathcal{D}(C(\mathcal{V}))$ of the compressing decomposition is homeomorphic to the closed disk. We know that $\pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}|_{\partial\mathbb{H}^2}$ is an injective continuous map and $\partial\mathcal{D}(C(\mathcal{V})) = \pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}(\partial\mathbb{H}^2)$.

Now, for each point p in $\overline{\mathbb{H}^2}$, we denote the equivalence class of p under the compressing relation $\sim_{C(\mathcal{V})}$ by $\llbracket p \rrbracket$ as in Section 6.3. Then we can see that

$$\pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}^{-1}(\text{Int}(\mathcal{D}(C(\mathcal{V})))) = \overline{\mathbb{H}^2} - \bigcup_{p \in \partial \mathbb{H}^2} \llbracket p \rrbracket.$$

Recall that if p in $\partial \mathbb{H}^2$ is not a pivot, then $\llbracket p \rrbracket = \{p\}$ and if p is the pivot of an asterisk $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$, then $\llbracket p \rrbracket = H(v(\mathcal{G}_1)) \cap H(v(\mathcal{G}_2))$. See Section 6.3. Therefore, if s is a stitch in $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{V})$ such that $g_2 \circ \epsilon_2(s) \in \bigcup_{p \in \partial \mathbb{H}^2} \llbracket p \rrbracket$, then s is a singular stitch of an asterisk of crowns and so $\#(s)$ is a cusp class by Claim 7.9 and Remark 7.10. This implies that

$$\omega^{-1}(\text{Int}(\mathcal{D}(C(\mathcal{V})))) = \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{V}) \setminus \{\text{stitches associated with cusp classes}\}.$$

Then, by Proposition 7.8 and the universal property of quotient maps, there is a unique homeomorphism $\hat{\omega}$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{V}) \setminus \{\text{stitches associated with cusp classes}\} & \xrightarrow{\omega} & \text{Int}(\mathcal{D}(C(\mathcal{V}))) \\ & \searrow \# & \uparrow \exists! \hat{\omega} \\ & & \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{V}) \end{array}$$

Thus, $\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{V})$ is homeomorphic to \mathbb{R}^2 as $\text{Int}(\mathcal{D}(C(\mathcal{V})))$ is homeomorphic to \mathbb{R}^2 . \square

Similarly, we can get the following lemma for the cusped weavings.

Lemma 7.15. *Let \mathcal{V} be a veering pair. Then, there is a unique map $\hat{\omega}$ from $\overline{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{V})$ to $\mathcal{D}(C(\mathcal{V}))$ such that it makes the following diagram commute.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{V}) & \xrightarrow{\#} & \overline{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{V}) \\ g_2 \circ \epsilon_2 \downarrow & \searrow \omega & \downarrow \exists! \hat{\omega} \\ \overline{\mathbb{H}^2} & \xrightarrow{\pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}} & \mathcal{D}(C(\mathcal{V})) \end{array}$$

For clarity, we make the following remarks.

Remark 7.16. Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Assume that \mathcal{G}_i is a real gap of \mathcal{L}_i for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and that \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 are linked. Now, we set

$$w = \{s \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{V}) : \eta_i(s) \text{ is a boundary leaf of } \mathcal{G}_i \text{ for all } i \in \{1, 2\}\}$$

and

$$c = H(v(\mathcal{G}_1)) \cap H(v(\mathcal{G}_2)).$$

By Proposition 7.13, $w \in \overline{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{V})$ and so $c = \hat{\omega}(w) \in \mathcal{D}(C(\mathcal{V}))$. Furthermore, c is the convex hull $H(g_2 \circ \epsilon_2(w))$ except the case where \mathcal{G}_i are crowns. When $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ is an asterisk of crowns, c is the union of $H(g_2 \circ \epsilon_2(w))$ and the pivot point of \mathcal{G}_i . //

Remark 7.17. Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. By Lemma 7.15, we can identify $\partial \mathbb{H}^2$ with $\partial \mathcal{D}(C(\mathcal{V}))$ via $\pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}|_{\partial \mathbb{H}^2}$. Moreover, by Remark 7.16, each point in $\text{Im}(\hat{\omega}) \cap S^1$ is the image of a cusp class w under $\hat{\omega}$ and so it is the pivot point of the asterisk associated with w . See Lemma 5.7. //

8. THREADS ON WEAVINGS

Even though we have shown that a weaving is a disk, this does not tell us that each leaf of a veering pair is realized as a foliation line in the weaving.

In this section, we show that each thread gives a foliation line in the weaving.

8.1. Leaves on Weavings. Let S be a topological space. Then S is an *arc* if there is a homeomorphism ϕ_S from the closed interval $[0, 1]$ on the real line \mathbb{R} to S . We say that S is an *arc from a to b* if $\phi_S(0) = a$ and $\phi_S(1) = b$. In this case, a and b are the *end points* of S .

Let x be a point in X . Assume that X is connected. Then we call x a *cut point* of X if $X \setminus \{x\}$ is disconnected. Otherwise, x is called a *non-cut point* of S .

The following theorem provides a topological characterization of arcs.

Theorem 8.2 (See [Wil49]). *Let S be a compact, connected, separable and metrizable space. If there is a two elements subset $\{a, b\}$ of S such that every element in S is a cut point of S , then S is an arc from a to b .*

Proposition 8.3. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair and ℓ be a leaf of \mathcal{L}_1 or \mathcal{L}_2 . Then $\pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}(H(v(\ell)))$ is an arc in $\mathcal{D}(C(\mathcal{V}))$ whose end point set is $v(\ell)$.*

Proof. We assume that ℓ is a leaf of \mathcal{L}_1 . The convex hull $h = H(v(\ell))$ is an arc which is properly embedded in $\overline{\mathbb{H}^2}$. Since h is compact, connected, and separable, the continuous image $\pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}(h)$ is also compact, connected, and separable. Moreover, $\mathcal{D}(C(\mathcal{V}))$ is the closed disk and so $\pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}(h)$ is metrizable.

Now, we write $\{a, b\}$ for $v(\ell)$. By Lemma 5.7, a and b are not pivots. Therefore, the equivalence classes $\llbracket a \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket b \rrbracket$ of a and b , respectively, under the compressing relation, are $\{a\}$ and $\{b\}$. See Section 6.3.

Choose a point x in $\pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}(h) \setminus \{\llbracket a \rrbracket, \llbracket b \rrbracket\}$. Then there is a gap \mathcal{G} in \mathcal{L}_2 such that

$$H(v(\ell)) \cap x = H(v(\ell)) \cap H(v(\mathcal{G})).$$

If \mathcal{G} is a leaf of \mathcal{L}_2 , then $H(v(\ell)) \cap x = \{s\}$ where $s = g_2 \circ \epsilon_2((\ell, \mathcal{G}))$. Then $h \setminus \{s\}$ has two connected components. We denote the component containing a by h_a and the component containing b by h_b .

Now, we write $\mathcal{G} = \ell(I)$ for some $I \in \mathcal{L}_2$ with $a \in I$. Then observe that

$$\{H(I^c)^c, H(v(\ell)), H((I^*)^c)^c\}$$

is a partition on $\overline{\mathbb{H}^2}$ and that $\pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}(H(I^c)^c)$ and $\pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}(H((I^*)^c)^c)$ are open in $\mathcal{D}(C(\mathcal{V}))$ since \mathcal{G} is a real leaf by Remark 7.16. See Section 6.3.

Note that $h_a \subset H(I^c)^c$ and $h_b \subset H((I^*)^c)^c$. Since

$$\pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}(h \setminus \{s\}) = \pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}(h) \setminus \{x\} \subset \pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}(H(I^c)^c) \cup \pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}(H((I^*)^c)^c),$$

$\pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}(h) \setminus \{x\}$ is disconnected. Hence, x is a cut point of $\pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}(h)$.

If \mathcal{G} is a non-leaf gap, then by Proposition 5.10, there is a tip t of \mathcal{G} over which ℓ crosses. Now we write $\{I_1, I_2\}$ for $\vee(t)$ and assume that $a \in I_1$ and $b \in I_2$. Then $H(v(\ell)) \cap x$ is the geodesic arc g from $g_2 \circ \epsilon_2((\ell, \ell(I_1)))$ to $g_2 \circ \epsilon_2((\ell, \ell(I_2)))$. See Remark 7.16. Then $h \setminus g$ has two connected components. Again, we denote the component containing a by h_a and the component containing b by h_b .

We consider the partition

$$\{H(I_1^c)^c, H((I_1 \cup I_2)^c), H(I_2^c)^c\}$$

on $\overline{\mathbb{H}^2}$. Then, $\pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}(H(I_1^c)^c)$ and $\pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}(H(I_2^c)^c)$ are open in $\mathcal{D}(C(\mathcal{V}))$. See Section 6.3.

Note that $h_a \subset H(I_1^c)^c$ and $h_b \subset H(I_2^c)^c$. Since

$$\pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}(h \setminus g) = \pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}(h) \setminus \{x\} \subset \pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}(H(I_1^c)^c) \cup \pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}(H(I_2^c)^c),$$

x is a cut point of $\pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}(h)$. By Theorem 8.2, $\pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}(h)$ is an arc from $\llbracket a \rrbracket$ to $\llbracket b \rrbracket$. Similarly, we can show the case where ℓ is a leaf of \mathcal{L}_2 . \square

Now we show that the image of a thread in cusped weaving is homeomorphic to a real line.

Lemma 8.4. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair and ℓ be a leaf of \mathcal{V} . Then $\#(\mathcal{O}(\ell))$ is homeomorphic to the real line \mathbb{R} in the cusped weaving $\overline{\mathbb{W}}(\mathcal{V})$. Moreover, $\overline{\omega(\mathcal{O}(\ell))}$ is an arc whose end point set is $v(\ell)$.*

Proof. We assume that ℓ is a leaf of \mathcal{L}_1 . Choose a point x in $\omega(\mathcal{O}(\ell))$. Then there are real gaps \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 in \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 such that

$$\pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}^{-1}(x) = H(v(\mathcal{G}_1)) \cap H(v(\mathcal{G}_2)).$$

See Remark 7.16. Note that $g_2 \circ \epsilon_2(\mathcal{O}(\ell)) \subset H(v(\ell))$ and ℓ is a boundary leaf of \mathcal{G}_1 . Then

$$g_2 \circ \epsilon_2(\mathcal{O}(\ell)) \cap \pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}^{-1}(x) \subset H(v(\ell)) \cap H(v(\mathcal{G}_2))$$

by Remark 7.16. Therefore,

$$g_2 \circ \epsilon_2(\mathcal{O}(\ell)) \subset H(v(\ell)) \setminus v(\ell) \subset \pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}^{-1}(\omega(\mathcal{O}(\ell))),$$

and we also have that

$$\hat{\omega}(\#(\mathbb{O}(\ell))) = \omega(\mathbb{O}(\ell)) = \pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}(H(v(\ell)) \setminus (\ell)).$$

Meanwhile, by Proposition 8.3, $\pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}(H(v(\ell)))$ is an arc whose end point set is $v(\ell)$ and so $\pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}(H(v(\ell)) \setminus v(\ell))$ is the interior of the arc. Therefore, $\hat{\omega}(\#(\mathbb{O}(\ell)))$ is the interior of the arc. Thus, $\#(\mathbb{O}(\ell))$ is homeomorphic to the real line \mathbb{R} . \square

By the similar argument of Lemma 8.4 and by Proposition 8.3, we can also get the following lemma.

Lemma 8.5. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Choose $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Suppose that ℓ is a leaf of \mathcal{L}_i and s is a stitch in $\mathbb{O}(\ell)$. For any e in $v(\ell)$, $\overline{\omega(\mathbb{O}(\ell, s, e))}$ is the subarc of $\overline{\omega(\mathbb{O}(\ell))}$ whose end points are $\omega(s)$ and e .*

Then, we can show the following lemma.

Lemma 8.6. *Let ℓ be a leaf of \mathcal{L}_1 or \mathcal{L}_2 . Assume that s_1 and s_2 are stitches in $\mathbb{O}(\ell)$ and that $\mathcal{I}(s_1, s_2) \neq \emptyset$. Then $\#(\overline{\mathcal{I}(s_1, s_2)})$ is the subarc of $\#(\mathbb{O}(\ell))$ whose end point set is $\{\#(s_1), \#(s_2)\}$.*

Proof. Observe that we can write $v(\ell) = \{e_1, e_2\}$ so that

$$\overline{\mathcal{I}(s_1, s_2)} = \mathbb{O}(\ell, s_1, e_1) \cap \mathbb{O}(\ell, s_2, e_2).$$

Then, by Lemma 8.4, $\overline{\omega(\mathbb{O}(\ell))}$ is an arc whose end point set is $v(\ell)$, and, for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, by Lemma 8.5, $\overline{\omega(\mathbb{O}(\ell, s_i, e_i))}$ is the subarc of $\overline{\omega(\mathbb{O}(\ell))}$ whose end point set is $\{e_i, \omega(s_i)\}$. Therefore, $\omega(\overline{\mathcal{I}(s_1, s_2)})$ is the subarc of $\overline{\omega(\mathbb{O}(\ell))}$ whose end point set is $\{\omega(s_1), \omega(s_2)\}$. Thus, $\#(\overline{\mathcal{I}(s_1, s_2)})$ is the subarc of $\#(\mathbb{O}(\ell))$ whose end point set is $\{\#(s_1), \#(s_2)\}$. \square

From now on, we discuss the possible configurations of the images of threads.

Lemma 8.7. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Choose $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Suppose that leaves μ and ν of \mathcal{L}_i are ultraparallel. Then the intersection $\#(\mathbb{O}(\mu)) \cap \#(\mathbb{O}(\nu))$ in the cusped weaving $\mathbb{W}(\mathcal{V})$ is empty or a singleton whose element is a cusp class or a singular class $w(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ associated with the asterisk $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ such that \mathcal{G}_i has μ and ν as boundary leaves.*

Proof. We assume that μ and ν are leaves of \mathcal{L}_1 and that $\#(\mathbb{O}(\mu)) \cap \#(\mathbb{O}(\nu))$ is not empty. Then, $(\mu, l) \sim_\omega (\nu, m)$ for some leaves l and m of \mathcal{L}_2 . Because μ and ν are ultraparallel, the last case of Proposition 7.13 is the only possible case. Now, the result follows from Proposition 7.13 and Remark 7.16. \square

Lemma 8.8. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Suppose that ℓ_1 is a leaf of \mathcal{L}_1 and ℓ_2 is a leaf of \mathcal{L}_2 . Then, the intersection of $\#(\mathbb{O}(\ell_1))$ and $\#(\mathbb{O}(\ell_2))$ has at most one point.*

Proof. Assume that there are distinct elements c^1 and c^2 in $\omega(\mathbb{O}(\ell_1)) \cap \omega(\mathbb{O}(\ell_2))$. For each $i \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$\pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}^{-1}(c^i) = H(v(\mathcal{G}_1^i)) \cap H(v(\mathcal{G}_2^i))$$

for some real gaps \mathcal{G}_1^i and \mathcal{G}_2^i of \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 , respectively, by Remark 7.16. Since \mathcal{G}_1^1 and \mathcal{G}_2^2 have ℓ_1 as a boundary leaf for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$, by Lemma 4.8, $\mathcal{G}_1^1 = \mathcal{G}_1^2$ for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$. This implies that $c^1 = c^2$ and it is a contradiction. Thus, $\omega(\mathbb{O}(\ell_1)) \cap \omega(\mathbb{O}(\ell_2))$ has at most one element. \square

Lemma 8.9. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Choose $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Suppose that μ_1 and μ_2 are leaves of \mathcal{L}_i that are parallel and ν is a leaf of \mathcal{L}_{i+1} (cyclically indexed). If $\#(\mathbb{O}(\nu)) \cap \#(\mathbb{O}(\mu_1)) = \{c_1\}$ and $\#(\mathbb{O}(\nu)) \cap \#(\mathbb{O}(\mu_2)) = \{c_2\}$, then $c_1 = c_2$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $i = 1$. Since μ_1 and μ_2 are parallel, there is a point t in S^1 such that $\{t\} = v(\mu_1) \cap v(\mu_2)$. Note that t is a tip and μ_j is a boundary leaf of $\diamond(t)$ for all $j \in \{1, 2\}$. By Remark 7.16, for each $j \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$\hat{\omega}(c_j) = H(v(\diamond(t))) \cap H(v(\mathcal{G}_j))$$

for some real gap \mathcal{G}_j of \mathcal{L}_j . Then, μ is a boundary leaf of \mathcal{G}_j for all $j \in \{1, 2\}$ and so $\mathcal{G}_1 = \mathcal{G}_2$. Thus, $\hat{\omega}(c_1) = \hat{\omega}(c_2)$ and $c_1 = c_2$. \square

Lemma 8.10. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Choose $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Suppose that leaves μ and ν of \mathcal{L}_i are parallel, namely, $v(\mu) \cap v(\nu) = \{p\}$ for some p in S^1 . Then, there are singular stitches s_μ and s_ν in $\mathbb{O}(\mu)$ and $\mathbb{O}(\nu)$, respectively, such that*

$$\#(\mathbb{O}(\mu)) \cap \#(\mathbb{O}(\nu)) = \#(\mathbb{O}(\mu, s_\mu, p)) = \#(\mathbb{O}(\nu, s_\nu, p))$$

and $\eta_{i+1}(s_\mu) = \eta_{i+1}(s_\nu)$ (cyclically indexed).

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that μ and ν are leaves of \mathcal{L}_1 . Then, $\diamond(p)$ has μ and ν as boundary leaves. Now, consider the interleaving gap \mathcal{G} of $\diamond(p)$. There is a unique boundary leaf ℓ of \mathcal{G} crossing over p . Let $s_\mu = (\mu, \ell)$ and $s_\nu = (\nu, \ell)$. Since μ and ν are parallel, each class c in $\#(\mathbb{O}(\mu)) \cap \#(\mathbb{O}(\nu))$, except the class $w(\diamond(p), \mathcal{G})$, falls into either the second or third case of Proposition 7.13. Thus, c is given by $(\diamond(p), \mathcal{G}')$ for some real gap \mathcal{G}' crossing over p . Moreover, \mathcal{G}' lies on the element of ℓ containing p . Thus, $\#(\mathbb{O}(\mu)) \cap \#(\mathbb{O}(\nu))$ is a subset of both $\#(\mathbb{O}(\mu, s_\mu, p))$ and $\#(\mathbb{O}(\nu, s_\nu, p))$. Because $\#(\mathbb{O}(\mu, s_\mu, p))$ and $\#(\mathbb{O}(\nu, s_\nu, p))$ are clearly contained in $\#(\mathbb{O}(\mu)) \cap \#(\mathbb{O}(\nu))$, the result follows. \square

From the proofs of the above, we can see the following fact.

Remark 8.11. Let \mathcal{V} be a veering pair and ℓ is a leaf of \mathcal{V} . Then, $\alpha = \pi_{C(\mathcal{V})}(H(v(\ell)))$ is equal to $\omega(\mathbb{O}(\ell)) \sqcup v(\ell)$ and one of the following cases holds.

- If ℓ is a boundary leaf of a crown, then $\alpha \cap S^1 = v(\ell) \cup \{p\}$ where p is the pivot of the crown.
- Otherwise, $\alpha \cap S^1 = v(\ell)$.

//

9. FRAMES AND SCRAPS

In this section, we introduce and study frames and scraps in veering pairs. Eventually, the scraps give rise to foliated charts for the weavings and rectangles on weavings. See Section 12.4 for the definition of rectangles.

9.1. Frames and Scraps. Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. A *frame* in \mathcal{V} is a quadruple $F = (I_1, J_1, I_2, J_2)$ in $\mathcal{L}_1 \times \mathcal{L}_2 \times \mathcal{L}_1 \times \mathcal{L}_2$ that satisfies the following:

- $s_i = (\ell(I_i), \ell(J_i))$ is a stitch for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$.
- The sector (I_i, J_i) is counter-clockwise for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$.
- s_i lies on the sector (I_{i+1}^*, J_{i+1}^*) for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

A stitch s of \mathcal{V} lies on the frame F if $\eta_1(s)$ properly lies between $\ell(I_1)$ and $\ell(I_2)$ and $\eta_2(s)$ properly lies between $\ell(J_1)$ and $\ell(J_2)$. We define the *scrap* $\mathcal{S}(F)$ framed by F to be the set of all stitches lying on F . The *closure* $\overline{\mathcal{S}}(F)$ of $\mathcal{S}(F)$ is defined as

$$\overline{\mathcal{S}}(F) := \{(\ell(N), \ell(M)) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{V}) : N \in S_{I_1}^{I_2^*} \text{ and } M \in S_{J_1}^{J_2^*}\}.$$

For convenience, we write

$$\begin{aligned} c_1(F) &= (\ell(I_1), \ell(J_1)), \\ c_2(F) &= (\ell(I_2), \ell(J_1)), \\ c_3(F) &= (\ell(I_2), \ell(J_2)), \text{ and} \\ c_4(F) &= (\ell(I_1), \ell(J_2)). \end{aligned}$$

Also, for each $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, we call the stitch $c_i(F)$ the *i-th corner* of the frame F .

9.2. Maximal Extension. Let $F_I = (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$ and $F_J = (J_1, J_2, J_3, J_4)$ be frames in \mathcal{V} . Each I_i is called the *ith-side* of F_I . For each $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, the frame F_J is an *I_i-side extension* of F_I if $I_j = J_j$ for all $j \neq i$, and $J_i \not\subseteq I_i$. For each $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, the frame F_I is *I_i-side maximal* if there is no *I_i-side extension*. A frame F_I is a *tetrahedron frame* if F_I is *I_i-side*. We say that F_J *covers* F_I if $J_i \subseteq I_i$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.

Now, for each $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, we write $(u_i, v_i)_{S^1}$ for I_i . Then I_i contains $\{v_{i-1}, u_{i+1}\}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ (cyclically indexed). We define the *I_i-side rail* of F_I to be the stem from I_i to $\{v_{i-1}, u_{i+1}\}$ in \mathcal{L} where \mathcal{L} is the lamination system in the veering pair containing I_i .

Lemma 9.3. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Suppose that there is a frame $F = (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$ and that F is *I_j-side maximal* for some $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Then there is a non-leaf gap \mathcal{G} containing I_j^* , and I_{j-1} and I_{j+1} cross over u_j and v_j respectively, where $I_i = (u_i, v_i)_{S^1}$ (cyclically indexed).*

Proof. First, we consider the case where $j = 1$. Let R_1 be the *I₁-side rail* of F . If there is an element J in $R_1 - \{I_1\}$, then (J, I_2, I_3, I_4) is a *I₁-side extension* of F . This is a contradiction by assumption. Therefore, $R_1 = \{I_1\}$. This implies that I_1 is isolated. Hence, there is a non-leaf gap \mathcal{G} in \mathcal{L}_1 containing I_1^* .

Now we want to show that I_2 crosses over v_1 . Since \mathcal{G} and $\ell(I_2)$ are linked, by Proposition 5.10, $\ell(I_2)$ cross over u_1 or v_1 . Assume that $\ell(I_2)$ crosses over u_1 . Then I_2^* crosses over u_1 . Since $\ell(I_4)$ lies properly on I_2^* and \mathcal{G} and $\ell(I_4)$ are linked, $\ell(I_4)$ also crosses over u_1 . Now, we write $\{I_1^*, K\}$ for the tip pair $\vee(u_1)$.

Then, $\{v_4, u_1\} \subset K \subset I_1$ and so $K \in R_1$. This is in contradiction with that $R_1 = \{I_1\}$. Therefore, $\ell(I_2)$ crosses over v_1 and so I_2 crosses over v_1 . Likewise, we can show that I_4 crosses over u_1 . Similarly, we can show the cases where $j \in \{2, 3, 4\}$. \square

Remark 9.4. If the I -side rail of a frame F has at least two elements, then there is an I -side extension of F that is I -side maximal. Otherwise, F is I -side maximal. \square

The following lemma follows from Lemma 9.3.

Lemma 9.5. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair and $F = (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$ be a frame. Assume that F is I_i -maximal for some $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Then there are exactly two singular stitches in $\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_{i-1}(F), c_i(F))$ (cyclically indexed). In particular, $\mathcal{I}(c_{i-1}(F), c_i(F))$ contains at least one singular stitch.*

Lemma 9.5 says that if a frame F is i^{th} -side maximal, then the arc $\#(\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_{i-1}(F), c_i(F)))$ contains a singular or cusp class.

Lemma 9.6. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Then every frame is covered by a tetrahedron frame.*

Proof. Assume that $F = (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$ is a frame in $\{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$. First, if F is I_1 -side maximal, then we set $F_1 = F$. Otherwise, by Remark 9.4, there is a I_1 -side extension F' of F that is I_1 -side maximal. Then, we set $F_1 = F'$. Now, we write $F_1 = (J_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$. Then, we apply the same argument to F_1 to take the second side maximal frame $F_2 = (J_1, J_2, I_3, I_4)$ that is the second side extension of F_1 . By repeating the same argument in consecutive order, we can get a tetrahedron frame $F_4 = (J_1, J_2, J_3, J_4)$ covering F . \square

Now, given a frame F , we show the natural one-to-one correspondence between opposite sides $\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_i(F), c_{i+1}(F))$ and $\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_{i+3}(F), c_{i+2}(F))$.

Let $F = (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$. For $i = 1$, we define a map $\varphi_{2 \rightarrow 4}$ from $\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_1(F), c_2(F))$ to $\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_4(F), c_3(F))$ by

$$\varphi_{2 \rightarrow 4}(s) = (\eta_1(s), \ell(I_4)).$$

Then, we can observe the following lemma.

Lemma 9.7. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Suppose that there is a frame $F = (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$. Then $\varphi_{2 \rightarrow 4}$ is a bijection from $\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_1(F), c_2(F))$ to $\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_4(F), c_3(F))$ with the following properties:*

- $\varphi_{2 \rightarrow 4}(c_1(F)) = c_4(F)$ and $\varphi_{2 \rightarrow 4}(c_2(F)) = c_3(F)$.
- For any $s \in \mathcal{I}(c_1(F), c_2(F))$, s and $\varphi_{2 \rightarrow 4}(s)$ are in a same thread.
- For any distinct stitches r_1 and r_2 in $\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_1(F), c_2(F))$, if $s \in \mathcal{I}(r_1, r_2)$, then $\varphi_{2 \rightarrow 4}(s) \in \mathcal{I}(\varphi_{2 \rightarrow 4}(r_1), \varphi_{2 \rightarrow 4}(r_2))$.

We define $\varphi_{4 \rightarrow 2}$ by $\varphi_{4 \rightarrow 2} = \varphi_{2 \rightarrow 4}^{-1}$. Similarly, we can find $\varphi_{1 \rightarrow 3}$, and $\varphi_{3 \rightarrow 1}$ between $\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_4(F), c_1(F))$ and $\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_2(F), c_3(F))$ and they enjoy the same properties in Lemma 9.7 with an appropriate re-indexing.

Remark 9.8. Assume that a stitch (ℓ_1, ℓ_2) lies on a frame $F = (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$. Then, the stitch $(\ell_1, \ell(I_2))$ is in $\mathcal{I}(c_1(F), c_2(F))$. Now, observe from Proposition 7.13 that no three distinct stitches in a thread are equivalent under the weaving relation. Hence, $c_1(F)$ and $c_2(F)$ are not equivalent as ℓ_1 properly lies between $\ell(I_1)$ and $\ell(I_3)$. Likewise, we can see that $c_i(F) \not\sim_\omega c_{i+1}(F)$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ (cyclically indexed). \square

9.9. Stitches Lying on Frames. In this section, we study the topology of scraps. First of all, we show that every scarp is not empty.

Proposition 9.10. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Let $F = (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$ be a frame in \mathcal{V} . Then, the scarp $\mathcal{S}(F)$ framed by F is not empty.*

Proof. Assume that $\mathcal{S}(F)$ is empty. If $\mathcal{I}(c_1(F), c_2(F))$ is empty, then, by Proposition 7.4, $\ell(I_1)$ and $\ell(I_3)$ are parallel. This is a contradiction. Therefore, $\mathcal{I}(c_1(F), c_2(F))$ is not empty. Similarly, we can show that $\mathcal{I}(c_i(F), c_{i+1}(F))$ is not empty for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ (cyclically indexed). Then by Lemma 9.7, there are J_1 and J_2 in \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 , respectively, such that $I_1 \not\subset J_1 \not\subset I_3^*$ and $I_2 \not\subset J_2 \not\subset I_4^*$. Note that $(\ell(J_1), \ell(J_2))$ is a stitch.

If $\ell(J_1)$ is parallel with both $\ell(I_1)$ and $\ell(I_3)$, then $\ell(J_1)$ is isolated as $I_1 \not\subset J_1 \not\subset I_3^*$. This is a contradiction by Proposition 4.7. Hence, $\ell(J_1)$ is ultraparallel with $\ell(I_1)$ or $\ell(I_3)$.

First, if $\ell(J_1)$ is ultraparallel with both $\ell(I_1)$ and $\ell(I_3)$, then we set L_1 to be J_1 . Then, $\overline{L_1} \subset L_1 \subset \overline{L_1} \subset I_3^*$. If not, $\ell(J_1)$ is parallel with one of $\ell(I_1)$ and $\ell(I_3)$ and is ultraparallel with the other.

If $\ell(J_1)$ and $\ell(I_1)$ are ultraparallel and so $\ell(J_1)$ and $\ell(I_3)$ are parallel, then we set $K_1 = J_1$. If $\ell(J_1)$ and $\ell(I_3)$ are ultraparallel and so $\ell(J_1)$ and $\ell(I_1)$ are parallel, then we set $K_1 = J_1^*$. By the choice of K_1 ,

Proposition 4.6, and Proposition 4.7, K_1 is not isolated. Then there is a K_1 -side sequence in \mathcal{L}_1 and we can take an element L_1 in \mathcal{L}_1 so that $\overline{I_1} \subset L_1 \subset \overline{L_1} \subset I_3^*$. Similarly, we can take an element L_2 in \mathcal{L}_2 so that $\overline{I_2} \subset L_2 \subset \overline{L_2} \subset I_4^*$. Then, the stitch $(\ell(L_1), \ell(L_2))$ lies on the scrap $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{F})$. This is a contradiction. Thus, $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{F})$ is not empty. \square

Then, in the following proposition, we can observe that the image of each scrap in the weaving consists of regular classes.

Proposition 9.11. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Let $\mathbf{F} = (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$ be a frame. If a stitch s lies on \mathbf{F} , then s is a regular stitch. Thus, the scrap $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{F})$ framed by \mathbf{F} consists of regular stitches*

Proof. We write $s = (\ell_1, \ell_2)$. Assume that s is a singular stitch of an asterisk $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$. Since ℓ_1 is linked with $\ell(I_2)$ and $\ell(I_4)$, there is a unique tip t of \mathcal{G}_1 over which $\ell(I_2)$ and $\ell(I_4)$ cross. Then, ℓ_2 crosses over t . Since an element I of \mathcal{G}_2 crossing over t is unique, $\ell(I) = \ell_2$. Also, as $\ell(I_2)$ and $\ell(I_4)$ cross over t , they lie on I . It contradicts to the fact that ℓ_2 properly lies between $\ell(I_2)$ and $\ell(I_4)$. \square

Conversely, we can also get the following proposition.

Proposition 9.12. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Every regular stitch lies on a frame.*

Proof. Let $s = (\ell(I), \ell(J))$ be a regular stitch of \mathcal{V} . Without loss of generality, we may assume that the sector (I, J) is counter-clockwise. As s is regular, $\#(s)$ is a regular class by Proposition 7.13. Also, there are two pairs $\{I_1, I_2\}$ and $\{J_1, J_2\}$ in \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 , respectively, so that $I_1 \subset I \subset I_2^*$, $J_1 \subset J \subset J_2^*$, and $\#(s) = \{(\ell(I_i), \ell(J_j)) : i, j \in \{1, 2\}\}$. Then, I_i and J_j are not isolated. Therefore, for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, we can take M_i in \mathcal{L}_1 so that $\ell(M_i)$ are linked with both $\ell(J_1)$ and $\ell(J_2)$, and $\overline{M_i} \subset I_i$. Again, for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, we can take N_i in \mathcal{L}_2 so that $\ell(N_i)$ are linked with both $\ell(M_1)$ and $\ell(M_2)$, and $\overline{N_i} \subset J_i$. As the sector (I, J) is counter-clockwise, so are the sectors (M_i, N_i) . Therefore, (M_1, N_1, M_2, N_2) is a frame. Thus, by the choices of M_i and N_i , the stitch s lies on the frame. \square

So far, we have shown the following.

Lemma 9.13. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair.*

- (1) *Every regular stitch lies on a frame.*
- (2) *Any stitch lying in a frame is regular.*
- (3) *The scrap framed by a frame is not empty.*
- (4) *Every frame is covered by a tetrahedron frame.*

10. MARKINGS

In Lemma 14.6, we will show that if an orientation preserving homeomorphism of the weaving is of finite order, i.e. elliptic, then it fixes a point in the weaving. These fixed points of elliptic elements of order ≥ 3 are represented by singular stitches. On the other hand, an elliptic element of order two may fixes a point in the weaving represented by a regular stitch. In this section, we introduce the markings to deal with such fixed points in the weaving of order two elliptic elements. We also discuss the extensions of frames with marking.

10.1. Markings on Stitch Spaces.

Definition 10.2. Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. A *marking* on \mathcal{V} is a subset \mathbf{M} of stitches subject to the following properties:

- (1) Each stitch in \mathbf{M} is genuine;
- (2) \mathbf{M} is discrete and closed in $\mathbf{S}(\mathcal{V})$;
- (3) For each $i = 1, 2$, $\eta_i|_{\mathbf{M}}$ is injective.

A stitch s in $\mathbf{S}(\mathcal{V})$ is said to be *marked* if $s \in \mathbf{M}$ and *unmarked* otherwise. Also, the pair $(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is called a *marked veering pair*. \parallel

Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair and \mathbf{M} a marking on \mathcal{V} . A leaf ℓ_i of \mathcal{L}_i is said to be *marked* if $\ell_i \in \eta_i(\mathbf{M})$ and *unmarked* otherwise. Note that by the definition, every marked leaf of \mathcal{V} is real. A frame \mathbf{F} in \mathcal{V} is said to be *marked* if there is a marked stitch lying \mathbf{F} and *unmarked* otherwise.

Let $\mathbf{F}_I = (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$ be frames in \mathcal{V} . Now, we assume that \mathbf{F}_I is unmarked. We say that \mathbf{F}_I is *I_i -side full* if there is no unmarked I_i -side extension. The frame \mathbf{F}_I is called a *tetrahedron frame* under \mathbf{M} if \mathbf{F}_I is I_i -side full for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.

Lemma 10.3. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair with marking \mathbf{M} . Then, for each frame F in \mathcal{V} , there are only finitely many marked stitches lying on F .*

Proof. It follows from the fact that a marking is discrete and closed in the stitch space. \square

10.4. **Full Extensions.** Now, we study the full extensions of unmarked frame.

Lemma 10.5. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair with marking \mathbf{M} . Assume that $F = (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$ is an unmarked frame. If $\mathcal{I}(c_{i-1}(F), c_i(F))$ has no marked stitch and no singular stitch, then there is an unmarked I_i -side extension of F . Thus, if F is I_i -side full for some $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, then $\mathcal{I}(c_{i-1}(F), c_i(F))$ contains a unique marked stitch or at least one singular stitch (cyclically indexed).*

Proof. Assume that $i = 1$. We write $I_i = (u_i, v_i)_{S^1}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. By Lemma 9.5, F is not a I_1 -side maximal. Therefore, there is a I_1 -side extension of F . This implies that the stem $S = S_{(v_4, u_2)_{S^1}}^{I_1}$ in \mathcal{L}_1 has at least one element that is not I_1 . Let E be the end of the stem S . Since \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 are strongly transverse, $E \in S$ and $[v_4, u_2]_{S^1} \subset E \not\subset I_1$.

If I_1 is isolated, then there is a non-leaf gap \mathcal{G} containing I_1^* . Then, since $E \not\subset I_1$ there is an element I_1' in \mathcal{G} containing E . Then, $I_1' \in S$ and so $F' = (I_1', I_2, I_3, I_4)$ is an I_1 -side extension of F . Since $\ell(I_1)$ and $\ell(I_1')$ are linked with $\ell(I_2)$ and $\ell(I_4)$, by Proposition 5.14, $\{I_1', I_1^*\}$ is a tip pair $\vee(t)$ for some $t \in v(\ell(I_1))$ and so both $\ell(I_2)$ and $\ell(I_4)$ cross over t . For simplicity, we may assume that $t = v_1$. Then, I_4^* and I_2 cross over v_1 .

Suppose that there is a marked stitch $s = (\ell_1, \ell_2)$ lying on F' . Then, ℓ_1 properly lies between $\ell(I_1')$ and $\ell(I_3)$. This implies that ℓ_1 properly lies between $\ell(I_1)$ and $\ell(I_3)$ since ℓ_1 is real. Hence, s lies on F . It is a contradiction. Therefore, there is no marked stitch in F' . Thus, F' is a unmarked I_1 -side extension of F .

Now, we consider the case where I_1 is not isolated. The quadruple $F_E = (E, I_2, I_3, I_4)$ is an I_1 -side extension of F which is E -side maximal. If F_E is unmarked, then we are done. Assume that F_E is marked. By Lemma 10.3, $\mathcal{S}(F_E)$ has an only finite number of marked stitches. Therefore, since I_1 is not isolated, we can take I_1' in S so that $I_1' \not\subset I_1$ and the frame $F' = (I_1', I_2, I_3, I_4)$ is unmarked. Then, F' is an unmarked I_1 -side extension of F . \square

The combination of the two following lemmas is the converse of Lemma 10.5 in nature.

Lemma 10.6. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair and \mathbf{M} a marking on \mathcal{V} . Let $F = (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$ be an unmarked frame. If $\mathcal{I}(c_{i-1}(F), c_i(F))$ has a marked stitch $s = (\ell_1, \ell_2)$, then F is not I_i -side maximal but it is I_i -side full.*

Proof. Without loss, we may assume that $\mathcal{I}(c_4(F), c_1(F))$ has a marked stitch $s = (\ell_1, \ell_2)$. Then, $\ell(I_1) = \ell_1$. If F is I_1 -side maximal, then I_1 is isolated and so $\ell(I_1)$ is a boundary leaf of a non-leaf gap. However, it is a contradiction as ℓ_1 is real. See Proposition 4.7. Therefore, F is not I_1 -side maximal.

Suppose that there is an I_1 -side extension $F' = (I_1', I_2, I_3, I_4)$ of F . Then, $I_1' \not\subset I_1$ and by Lemma 4.8, $\ell(I_1')$ and $\ell(I_1)$ are ultraparallel. Therefore, $\ell(I_1)$ properly lies between $\ell(I_1')$ and $\ell(I_3)$. As $s \in \mathcal{I}(c_4(F), c_1(F))$, by Lemma 4.8, ℓ_2 properly lies between $\ell(I_2)$ and $\ell(I_4)$. Hence, s lies on F' and so F' is marked. Thus, there is no unmarked I_1 -side extension of F and F is I_1 -side full. \square

Lemma 10.7. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Let $F = (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$ be a frame. If $\mathcal{I}(c_{i-1}(F), c_i(F))$ has a singular stitch $s = (\ell_1, \ell_2)$, then F is I_i -side maximal.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $i = 1$. Assume that F is not I_1 -side maximal. Then, there is an I_1 -side extension $F' = (J_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$ of F . Note that $J_1 \not\subset I_1$. Then, if $\ell(J_1)$ and $\ell(I_1)$ are ultraparallel, then s properly lies between $\ell(J_1)$ and $\ell(I_3)$. Therefore, s lies on F' . However, by Lemma 9.13, there is no singular stitch lying on F' . Therefore, $\ell(J_1)$ and $\ell(I_1)$ are parallel, namely, $v(\ell(J_1)) \cap v(\ell(I_1)) = \{t\}$ for some $t \in S^1$. Then, by Lemma 4.8, t is a tip of a non-leaf gap \mathcal{G}_1 of \mathcal{L}_1 . Hence, $\vee(t) = \{J_1, I_1^*\}$ and $I_1^* \in \mathcal{G}_1$.

Since ℓ_2 properly lies between $\ell(I_2)$ and $\ell(I_4)$, ℓ_2 is linked with $\ell(J_1)$. Therefore, by Proposition 5.14, ℓ_2 crosses over t . Also note that by Proposition 5.14, $\ell(I_2)$ and $\ell(I_4)$ cross over t .

Let \mathcal{G}_2 be the non-leaf gap of \mathcal{L}_2 interleaving with \mathcal{G}_1 . There is a unique element K in \mathcal{G}_2 crossing over t . Since s is a singular stitch of the asterisk $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ and ℓ_2 crosses over t , $\ell(K) = \ell_2$. On the other hands, $\ell(I_2)$ and $\ell(I_4)$ properly lie on K since $\ell(I_2)$ and $\ell(I_4)$ cross over t and are ultraparallel with ℓ_2 . This implies that ℓ_2 does not lie between $\ell(I_2)$ and $\ell(I_4)$, a contradiction. Thus, F is I_1 -side maximal. \square

Now, we show the existence of the full extensions.

Lemma 10.8. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair and \mathbf{M} a marking on \mathcal{V} . Assume that $\mathbf{F} = (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$ is an unmarked frame. If \mathbf{F} is not I_i -side full for some $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, then there is an unmarked I_i -side extension of \mathbf{F} that is i^{th} -side full.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $i = 1$. We write $I_i = (u_i, v_i)_{S^1}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Now, we consider the stem $S = S_{(v_4, u_2)_{S^1}}^{I_1}$ in \mathcal{L}_1 . The stem S has the end E which contains $(v_4, u_2)_{S^1}$ and so $E \in S$. Note that E is the minimal element of S .

Let \mathbf{F}' be the quadruple (E, I_2, I_3, I_4) . As \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 are strongly transverse, $[v_4, u_2]_{S^1} \subset E$ and so \mathbf{F}' is a frame in \mathcal{V} . By construction, \mathbf{F}' covers \mathbf{F} and since \mathbf{F} is not first-side full, \mathbf{F}' is a first-side extension of \mathbf{F} . By the minimality of E , \mathbf{F}' is first-side maximal. Hence, if \mathbf{F}' is unmarked, we are done.

Assume that \mathbf{F}' is marked. By Lemma 10.3, there are only finitely many marked stitches in $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{F}')$, that is, $\mathbf{m} := \mathbf{M} \cap \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{F}')$ is finite. We define the set

$$R := \{I \in S : \ell(I) \in \eta_1(\mathbf{m})\}.$$

Then, R is a finite subset of S and there is a maximal element M in R .

Let \mathbf{F}'' be the frame (M, I_2, I_3, I_4) which is an I_1 -side extension of \mathbf{F} . By the construction, \mathbf{F}'' is unmarked and $\mathcal{I}(c_4(\mathbf{F}''), c_1(\mathbf{F}''))$ has a marked stitch. By Lemma 10.6, \mathbf{F}'' is first-side full. Thus, \mathbf{F}'' is a frame that we want. \square

Finally, we extend Lemma 9.13 to the marked case.

Lemma 10.9. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair and \mathbf{M} a marking on \mathcal{V} . Assume that $\mathbf{F} = (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$ is an unmarked frame. Then there is an tetrahedron frame under \mathbf{M} covering \mathbf{F} .*

Proof. If \mathbf{F} is first-side full, then we set $\mathbf{F}_1 = \mathbf{F}$. If not, then by Lemma 10.8, there is an unmarked first-side extension \mathbf{F}' of \mathbf{F} that is first-side full. Then, we set $\mathbf{F}_1 = \mathbf{F}'$. By Lemma 10.5, $\mathcal{I}(c_4(\mathbf{F}_1), c_1(\mathbf{F}_1))$ has a marked or singular stitch.

Then, if \mathbf{F}_1 is second-side full, then we set $\mathbf{F}_2 = \mathbf{F}_1$. Otherwise, by Lemma 10.8, there is an unmarked second-side extension \mathbf{F}'_1 of \mathbf{F}_1 that is second-side full. Then, we set $\mathbf{F}_2 = \mathbf{F}'_1$. By Lemma 10.5, $\mathcal{I}(c_1(\mathbf{F}_2), c_2(\mathbf{F}_2))$ has a marked or singular stitch. Also, as

$$\mathcal{I}(c_4(\mathbf{F}_1), c_1(\mathbf{F}_1)) \subset \mathcal{I}(c_4(\mathbf{F}_2), c_1(\mathbf{F}_2)),$$

$\mathcal{I}(c_4(\mathbf{F}_2), c_1(\mathbf{F}_2))$ has a marked or singular stitch.

Next, if \mathbf{F}_2 is third-side full, then we set $\mathbf{F}_3 = \mathbf{F}_2$. Otherwise, by Lemma 10.8, there is an unmarked third-side extension \mathbf{F}'_2 of \mathbf{F}_2 that is third-side full. Then, we set $\mathbf{F}_3 = \mathbf{F}'_2$. By Lemma 10.5, $\mathcal{I}(c_2(\mathbf{F}_3), c_3(\mathbf{F}_3))$ has a marked or singular stitch. Also, both $\mathcal{I}(c_4(\mathbf{F}_3), c_1(\mathbf{F}_3))$ and $\mathcal{I}(c_1(\mathbf{F}_3), c_2(\mathbf{F}_3))$ have marked or singular stitches. Therefore, by Lemma 10.6 and Lemma 10.7, \mathbf{F}_4 is i^{th} -side full for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Thus, \mathbf{F}_4 is an tetrahedron frame under \mathbf{M} covering \mathbf{F} .

Finally, if \mathbf{F}_3 is fourth-side full, then we set $\mathbf{F}_4 = \mathbf{F}_3$. Otherwise, by Lemma 10.8, there is an unmarked fourth-side extension \mathbf{F}'_3 of \mathbf{F}_3 that is fourth-side full. Then, we set $\mathbf{F}_4 = \mathbf{F}'_3$. By Lemma 10.5, $\mathcal{I}(c_3(\mathbf{F}_4), c_4(\mathbf{F}_4))$ has a marked or singular stitch. Moreover, $\mathcal{I}(c_{i-1}(\mathbf{F}_4), c_i(\mathbf{F}_4))$ has a marked or singular stitch for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ (cyclically indexed). \square

Lemma 10.10. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair and \mathbf{M} a marking on \mathcal{V} . Every unmarked regular stitch lies on an unmarked frame.*

Proof. Let $s = (\ell_1, \ell_2)$ be an unmarked regular stitch. By Lemma 9.13, there is a frame $\mathbf{F} = (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$ on which s lies. If \mathbf{F} is unmarked, then we are done. Assume that \mathbf{F} is marked. By Lemma 10.3, the scrap $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{F})$ has only finitely many marked stitches, that is, $\mathbf{m} := \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{F}) \cap \mathbf{M}$ is a finite subset of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{F})$.

Now, we write $I_i = (u_i, v_i)_{S^1}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, and $\ell_1 = \{J_1, J_3\}$ and $\ell_2 = \{J_2, J_4\}$ so that $I_i \subset J_i$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Then, we define

$$R_1 := \{K \in \mathcal{L}_1 : K \not\subset J_1 \text{ and } \ell(K) \in \eta_1(\mathbf{m})\}$$

$$R_2 := \{K \in \mathcal{L}_2 : K \not\subset J_2 \text{ and } \ell(K) \in \eta_2(\mathbf{m})\}$$

$$R_3 := \{K \in \mathcal{L}_1 : K \not\subset J_3 \text{ and } \ell(K) \in \eta_1(\mathbf{m})\},$$

and

$$R_4 := \{K \in \mathcal{L}_2 : K \not\subset J_4 \text{ and } \ell(K) \in \eta_2(\mathbf{m})\}.$$

Then, R_i are finite as \mathbf{m} is finite. Note that R_1 is totally ordered as R_1 is a finite subset of the stem $S_{I_1}^{J_1}$ in \mathcal{L}_1 . Likewise, R_i are finite and totally ordered. Now, for each $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, we define M_i to be the maximal element of R_i if R_i is not empty and to be I_i otherwise. For each $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, by Lemma 4.8,

$$I_i \subset M_i \subset \overline{M_i} \subset J_i.$$

This implies that the quadruple $\mathbf{F}' = (M_1, M_2, M_3, M_4)$ is a frame on which s lies. Moreover, by the choice of M_i , \mathbf{F}' is unmarked. \square

10.11. Scraps on Weavings. The following lemma is the key lemma in the next section where we prove that weavings are transversely foliated. The following says that the scarps give rise to the transversely foliated charts for weavings.

Lemma 10.12. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair and \mathbf{F} a frame in \mathcal{V} . Then, we can take a homeomorphism $\rho_{\mathbf{F}}$ from $[0, 1]^2$ to $\#(\overline{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{F}))$ so that the following hold.*

- For each $s \in [0, 1]$, $\rho_{\mathbf{F}}(\{s\} \times [0, 1]) \subset \#(\Phi(\ell))$ for some leaf ℓ of \mathcal{L}_1 .
- For each $t \in [0, 1]$, $\rho_{\mathbf{F}}([0, 1] \times \{t\}) \subset \#(\Theta(\ell))$ for some leaf ℓ of \mathcal{L}_2 .
-

$$\rho_{\mathbf{F}}(\{0\} \times [0, 1]) = \#(\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_1(\mathbf{F}), c_4(\mathbf{F}))),$$

$$\rho_{\mathbf{F}}(\{1\} \times [0, 1]) = \#(\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_2(\mathbf{F}), c_3(\mathbf{F}))),$$

$$\rho_{\mathbf{F}}([0, 1] \times \{0\}) = \#(\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_1(\mathbf{F}), c_2(\mathbf{F}))),$$

and

$$\rho_{\mathbf{F}}([0, 1] \times \{1\}) = \#(\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_4(\mathbf{F}), c_3(\mathbf{F}))).$$

Therefore, $\#^{-1}(\rho_{\mathbf{F}}([0, 1]^2)) = \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{F})$.

Proof. We define a map $\sigma_{\mathbf{F}}$ from $\mathbf{C} := \overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_1(\mathbf{F}), c_2(\mathbf{F})) \times \overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_1(\mathbf{F}), c_4(\mathbf{F}))$ to $\overline{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{F})$ by $\sigma_{\mathbf{F}}(s_1, s_2) = (\eta_1(s_1), \eta_2(s_2))$. By Lemma 9.7 and the definition of the closure of the scarp, $\sigma_{\mathbf{F}}$ is a homeomorphism.

Let $\mathbf{F} = (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$. We claim that for any elements (s_1, t_1) and (s_2, t_2) in \mathbf{C} , $s_1 \sim_{\omega} s_2$ and $t_1 \sim_{\omega} t_2$ if and only if $\sigma_{\mathbf{F}}(s_1, t_1) \sim_{\omega} \sigma_{\mathbf{F}}(s_2, t_2)$. The case where $(s_1, t_1) = (s_2, t_2)$ is obvious.

First, we consider the case where $s_1 \neq s_2$ and $t_1 = t_2$. Assume that $s_1 \sim_{\omega} s_2$ and $t_1 \sim_{\omega} t_2$. As s_1 and s_2 are in the same thread and $s_1 \sim_{\omega} s_2$, by Proposition 7.13, $\mathcal{I}(s_1, s_2) = \emptyset$. By Proposition 7.4, $\ell(I_2)$ crosses over a tip t in $\mathbf{E}(\mathcal{L}_1)$ such that $\{s_1, s_2\} = \{(\ell(J), \ell(I_2)) : J \in \vee(t)\}$. By Lemma 9.7, $\ell(I_4)$ also crosses over t . Hence, $\eta_2(t_1)$ crosses over t as $\eta_2(t_1)$ properly lies between $\ell(I_2)$ and $\ell(I_4)$. Therefore, by Remark 7.7, $\sigma_{\mathbf{F}}(s_1, t_1) = \sigma_{\mathbf{F}}(s_2, t_2)$.

Conversely, if $\sigma_{\mathbf{F}}(s_1, t_1) \sim_{\omega} \sigma_{\mathbf{F}}(s_2, t_2)$, then $\mu_1 = \sigma_{\mathbf{F}}(s_1, t_1)$ and $\mu_2 = \sigma_{\mathbf{F}}(s_2, t_2)$ are stitches in the same thread $\Theta(\eta_2(t_1))$ with $\mathcal{I}(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \emptyset$. By Proposition 7.4, $\eta_2(t_1)$ crosses over a tip t in $\mathbf{E}(\mathcal{L}_1)$ such that $\{\mu_1, \mu_2\} = \{(\ell(J), \eta_2(t_1)) : J \in \vee(t)\}$. Then, $\ell(I_2)$ also crosses over t . Hence, as $\mu_i = \eta_1(s_i)$, by Remark 7.7, $s_1 \sim_{\omega} s_2$.

Likewise, we can show the claim in the cases where $s_1 = s_2$ and $t_1 \neq t_2$, or $s_1 \neq s_2$ and $t_1 \neq t_2$. Thus, the claim follows.

Now, we consider the continuous map $\# \circ \sigma_{\mathbf{F}}$ from \mathbf{C} to $\#(\overline{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{F}))$. We define a continuous map $\#^2$ from $\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_1(\mathbf{F}), c_2(\mathbf{F})) \times \overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_1(\mathbf{F}), c_4(\mathbf{F}))$ to $\#(\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_1(\mathbf{F}), c_2(\mathbf{F}))) \times \#(\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_1(\mathbf{F}), c_4(\mathbf{F})))$ by

$$\#^2(s_1, s_2) = (\#(s_1), \#(s_2)).$$

Then, by the previous claim, there is a unique homeomorphism

$$\delta_{\mathbf{F}} : \#(\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_1(\mathbf{F}), c_2(\mathbf{F}))) \times \#(\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_1(\mathbf{F}), c_4(\mathbf{F}))) \rightarrow \#(\overline{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{F}))$$

that makes the following diagram commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_1(\mathbf{F}), c_2(\mathbf{F})) \times \overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_1(\mathbf{F}), c_4(\mathbf{F})) & \xrightarrow{\sigma_{\mathbf{F}}} & \overline{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{F}) \\ \downarrow \#^2 & \searrow \# \circ \sigma_{\mathbf{F}} & \downarrow \# \\ \#(\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_1(\mathbf{F}), c_2(\mathbf{F}))) \times \#(\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_1(\mathbf{F}), c_4(\mathbf{F}))) & \xrightarrow{\exists! \delta_{\mathbf{F}}} & \#(\overline{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{F})) \end{array}$$

Note that by Proposition 9.10 and Remark 9.8, $\mathcal{I}(c_i(\mathbb{F}), c_{i+1}(\mathbb{F})) \neq \emptyset$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ (cyclically indexed). By Lemma 8.6, we can take a homeomorphism α from $[0, 1]^2$ to $\#(\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_1(\mathbb{F}), c_2(\mathbb{F}))) \times \#(\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_1(\mathbb{F}), c_4(\mathbb{F})))$ so that $\rho_{\mathbb{F}} = \delta_{\mathbb{F}} \circ \alpha$ satisfies the properties that we wanted. Then, it follows from construction that $\#^{-1}(\rho_{\mathbb{F}}((0, 1)^2)) = \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{F})$. \square

Remark 10.13. Let \mathbb{F} be a frame. Let s be a stitch lying on \mathbb{F} . Then, by Remark 9.8, we can see that $\#(s)$ is contained in $\rho_{\mathbb{F}}((0, 1)^2)$ where $\rho_{\mathbb{F}}$ is from Lemma 10.12. Thus, $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{F}) = \#^{-1}(\rho_{\mathbb{F}}((0, 1)^2))$ and so $\#(\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{F}))$ is homeomorphic to $(0, 1)^2$. \parallel

11. TRANSVERSE FOLIATIONS ON WEAVINGS

In this section, we show that weavings are transversely foliated. First of all, we review the basic terminology for the singular foliations.

11.1. Singular Foliations. Let P_2 be the open set

$$\{z \in \mathbb{C} : \max\{|\operatorname{Re} z|, |\operatorname{Im} z|\} < 1\}$$

of the complex plane \mathbb{C} . We define transverse foliations \mathcal{F}^2 and \mathcal{F}_2 on P_2 as the sets of vertical lines and horizontal lines, respectively.

For each integer k with $k > 1$, the map on \mathbb{C} defined by $z \mapsto z^k$ is denoted by φ_k . Then, we set $P_1 = \varphi_2(P_2)$. Observe that P_1 is also an open neighborhood of the origin. Now, we define decompositions \mathcal{F}^1 and \mathcal{F}_1 for P_1 as $\mathcal{F}^1 = \{\varphi_2(l) : l \in \mathcal{F}^2\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_1 = \{\varphi_2(l) : l \in \mathcal{F}_2\}$.

For each element p of \mathcal{F}^1 , we say that p is a *plaque*. In particular, we say p to be *regular* if p is homeomorphic to \mathbb{R} . Otherwise, p is *singular*. Similarly, for each element t of \mathcal{F}_1 , we say that t is a *transversal*. In particular, t is *regular* if t is homeomorphic to \mathbb{R} . Otherwise, t is *singular*.

Fix an integer k with $k > 1$. We define P_k as $P_k = \varphi_k^{-1}(P_1)$. For each l in \mathcal{F}^1 , each connected component c of $\varphi_k^{-1}(l)$ is called a *plaque* in P_k . In particular, c is said to be *regular* if $k = 2$ or l is regular. Otherwise, c is singular. Then, we define a foliation \mathcal{F}^k on P_k to be the set of all plaques in P_k . Likewise, we can define a singular/regular transversal in P_k and \mathcal{F}_k .

Let S be a surface. We define a *singular foliation* \mathcal{F} on the surface S to be a partition of S , whose elements are called the *leaves* of \mathcal{F} , satisfying the following:

- For each point x in S , there is an open neighborhood U of x and an embedding ϕ_U from U to \mathbb{C} such that $\phi_U(U) = P_k$ for some integer k with $k > 1$, $\phi_U(x) = 0$ and for any plaque p in \mathcal{F}^k , $\phi_U^{-1}(p)$ is a connected component of $U \cap l$ for some leaf l in \mathcal{F} .

We call (U, ϕ_U) a *foliated chart* at x . A foliated chart (U, ϕ_U) is *regular* if $k = 2$. Otherwise, (U, ϕ_U) is *singular*. A point x is a *regular point* of \mathcal{F} if there is a regular foliated chart at x . Non regular points are called *singular*. Note that if \mathcal{F} has no singular point, then \mathcal{F} is just a foliation.

Assume \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 are singular foliations on S . Then, we say that \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 are *transverse* if for each x in S , there is an open neighborhood U of x and an embedding ϕ_U from U to \mathbb{C} satisfying the following:

- $\phi_U(U) = P_k$ and $\phi_U(x) = 0$ for some integer k with $k > 1$.
- For any plaque p in \mathcal{F}^k , $\phi_U^{-1}(p)$ is a connected component of $U \cap l$ for some leaf l in \mathcal{F}_1 .
- For any transversal t in \mathcal{F}_k , $\phi_U^{-1}(t)$ is a connected component of $U \cap l$ for some leaf l in \mathcal{F}_2 .

We call (U, ϕ_U) a *transversely foliated chart* at x . Moreover, (U, ϕ_U) is *regular* if $k = 2$. Otherwise, (U, ϕ_U) is *singular*.

11.2. Polygonal Frames. In this section, we generalize the notion of frames to deal with the singular points in the weavings which are exactly singular classes.

From now on, we sometimes index items over \mathbb{Z}_n to emphasize that they are cyclically indexed.

Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Let $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ be an asterisk of ideal polygons in \mathcal{V} . We write $\mathcal{G}_1 = \{(s_k, s_{k+1})_{S^1} : k \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}$ and $\mathcal{G}_2 = \{(t_k, t_{k+1})_{S^1} : k \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}$ so that $t_k \in (s_k, s_{k+1})_{S^1}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_n$. A *polygonal frame* \mathbb{P} at the asterisk $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ is a pair $(\{I_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_n}, \{J_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_n})$ of finite sequences of good intervals satisfying the following:

- $I_k \in \mathcal{L}_1$ and $J_k \in \mathcal{L}_2$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_n$.
- For each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, $t_k \in I_k \frown (s_k, s_{k+1})_{S^1}$ and $s_{k+1} \in J_k \frown (t_k, t_{k+1})_{S^1}$.
- For each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, $\ell(I_k)$ is linked with both $\ell(J_{k-1})$ and $\ell(J_k)$.

For each $(s_k, s_{k+1})_{S^1} \in \mathcal{G}_1$, observe that $((s_{k+1}, s_k)_{S^1}, J_{k-1}, I_k, J_k)$ is a frame. Hence, it is called the $(s_k, s_{k+1})_{S^1}$ -side frame of P and we denote it by $F(P, (s_k, s_{k+1})_{S^1})$. Similarly, for each $(t_k, t_{k+1})_{S^1} \in \mathcal{G}_2$, $(I_k, J_k, I_{k+1}, (t_{k+1}, t_k)_{S^1})$ is the $(t_k, t_{k+1})_{S^1}$ -side frame of P and we denote it by $F(P, (t_k, t_{k+1})_{S^1})$.

We define the *polygonal scrap* $\mathcal{S}(P)$ framed by P to be

$$\mathcal{S}(P) = \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{G}_1} \mathcal{S}(F(P, I)) \cup \bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{G}_2} \mathcal{S}(F(P, J)) \cup w(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2).$$

Also, the *closure* $\overline{\mathcal{S}}(P)$ of $\mathcal{S}(P)$ is defined as the set $\bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{G}_1} \overline{\mathcal{S}}(F(P, I))$ which is equal to $\bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{G}_2} \overline{\mathcal{S}}(F(P, J))$.

The following lemma is a preliminary result to construct singular foliated charts.

Lemma 11.3. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair and let $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ be an asterisk of ideal polygons of \mathcal{V} . Then, there is a polygonal frame P at the asterisk $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$.*

Proof. We write $\mathcal{G}_1 = \{(s_i, s_{i+1})_{S^1} : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}$ and $\mathcal{G}_2 = \{(t_i, t_{i+1})_{S^1} : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}$ so that $t_i \in (s_i, s_{i+1})_{S^1}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$. By Proposition 4.7, every element of \mathcal{G}_1 or \mathcal{G}_2 is not isolated in \mathcal{L}_1 or \mathcal{L}_2 , respectively. Again, for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, we take an element $I_i = (u_i, v_i)_{S^1}$ in \mathcal{L}_1 so that

$$t_i \in I_i \subset \overline{I_i} \subset (s_i, s_{i+1})_{S^1}.$$

Likewise, for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, we can take an element $J_i = (x_i, y_i)_{S^1}$ in \mathcal{L}_2 so that

$$[v_i, u_{i+1}]_{S^1} \subset J_i \subset \overline{J_i} \subset (t_i, t_{i+1})_{S^1}.$$

Observe that $\ell(I_i)$ is linked with $\ell(J_{i-1})$ and $\ell(J_i)$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$. Thus, $(\{I_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_n}, \{J_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_n})$ is a polygonal frame at $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$. \square

11.4. Weavings with Marking. Let \mathbf{M} be a marking on a veering pair \mathcal{V} . By Proposition 7.13, we can think of each marked stitch as an element in $\overline{W}(\mathcal{V})$. From now on, we also consider \mathbf{M} as a subset of $\overline{W}(\mathcal{V})$. We refer to each element of \mathbf{M} in $\overline{W}(\mathcal{V})$ as a *marked class* and we say that an element w of $\overline{W}(\mathcal{V})$ is a *cone class* if w is a marked class or singular class.

The *regular weaving* of a marked veering pair $(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is defined as

$$W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}) := \overline{W}(\mathcal{V}) \setminus \{\text{cusp and cone classes}\}.$$

Note that $\mathbf{M} \subset W^\circ(\mathcal{V})$ and

$$W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}) = W^\circ(\mathcal{V}) \setminus \mathbf{M}.$$

11.5. Foliations on Weavings. Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. We define partitions $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_1(\mathcal{V})$ and $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_2(\mathcal{V})$ on $\overline{W}(\mathcal{V})$ induced from \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 , respectively as follows. Choose $i \in \{1, 2\}$. The partition $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_i(\mathcal{V})$ is the collection of subsets of $\overline{W}(\mathcal{V})$ that are of the form

$$\#\{s \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{V}) : \eta_i(s) \text{ is a boundary leaf of some real gap } \mathcal{G} \text{ of } \mathcal{L}_i\} = \# \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{G}} \circ(\ell(I)).$$

Note that $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_i(\mathcal{V})$ is a well defined partition by Proposition 7.13.

Then, we define partitions $\mathcal{F}_1(\mathcal{V})$ and $\mathcal{F}_2(\mathcal{V})$ on $W(\mathcal{V})$ as follows. Choose $i \in \{1, 2\}$. The partition $\mathcal{F}_i(\mathcal{V})$ is the collection of the subsets of $W(\mathcal{V})$ each of which is a connected component of $l \cap W(\mathcal{V})$ for some $l \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_i(\mathcal{V})$. Note that if l has a cusp class w , then each associated element in $\mathcal{F}_i(\mathcal{V})$ is a connected component of $l \setminus \{w\}$.

Now, we consider a marked veering pair $(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. Similarly, we define partitions $\mathcal{F}_1^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ and $\mathcal{F}_2^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ on $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ induced by \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 , respectively, as follows. For each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $\mathcal{F}_i^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is the collection of connected components of subsets $l \cap W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$, $l \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_i(\mathcal{V})$. Note that if l has a cusp or cone class w , then each associated element in $\mathcal{F}_i^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is a connected component of $l \setminus \{w\}$. When \mathbf{M} is empty, we briefly denote $\mathcal{F}_i^\circ(\mathcal{V})$ by $\mathcal{F}_i^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$.

11.6. $W(\mathcal{V})$ Is Singularly Foliated by $\mathcal{F}_1(\mathcal{V})$ and $\mathcal{F}_2(\mathcal{V})$. Now, we show that every weaving $W(\mathcal{V})$ is transversely foliated by $\mathcal{F}_1(\mathcal{V})$ and $\mathcal{F}_2(\mathcal{V})$.

Lemma 11.7. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Then, the regular weaving $W^\circ(\mathcal{V})$ is open in the weaving $W(\mathcal{V})$.*

Proof. Let c be an element of $W^\circ(\mathcal{V})$. Note that c is a regular class. Choose s in c which is a regular stitch. By Proposition 9.12, there is a frame F on which s lies. Then, by Remark 10.13, $\#(\mathcal{S}(F))$ is an open neighborhood of $\#(s) = c$ in $\overline{W}(\mathcal{V})$. Moreover, by Proposition 9.11, $\#(\mathcal{S}(F)) \subset W^\circ(\mathcal{V})$. Thus, $W^\circ(\mathcal{V})$ is open in $W(\mathcal{V})$. \square

Lemma 11.8. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Let $P = (\{I_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_n}, \{J_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_n})$ be a polygonal frame at some asterisk $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$. Then, there is a homeomorphism ρ_P from P_n to $\#(\mathcal{S}(P))$ satisfying the following:*

- *For any plaque p in \mathcal{F}^n , $\rho_P(p) = l \cap \#(\mathcal{S}(P))$ for some $l \in \mathcal{F}_1(\mathcal{V})$.*
- *For any transversal t in \mathcal{F}_n , $\rho_P(t) = l \cap \#(\mathcal{S}(P))$ for some $l \in \mathcal{F}_2(\mathcal{V})$.*
- *$\rho_P(0)$ is the singular class $w(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$.*

Proof. Let c be the singular class in $W(\mathcal{V})$ corresponding the asterisk $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$. We write $\mathcal{G}_1 = \{M_1, \dots, M_n\}$ and $\mathcal{G}_2 = \{N_1, \dots, N_n\}$ so that $I_i \subset M_i \in \mathcal{L}_1$ and $J_i \subset N_i \in \mathcal{L}_2$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Also, we write $M_i = (s_i, s_{i+1})_{S^1}$ and $N_i = (t_i, t_{i+1})_{S^1}$. For each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, we denote the M_i -side frame of P by F_i , namely, $F_i = (M_i^*, J_{i-1}, I_i, J_i)$.

For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, by Lemma 10.12, there is a homeomorphism ρ_{F_i} from $[0, 1]^2$ to $\#(\overline{\mathcal{S}}(F_i))$ satisfying the conditions in the lemma. We also may assume that $\rho_{F_i}(0, \frac{1}{2}) = w(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ since $w(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2) \in \#(\mathcal{I}(c_1(F_i), c_4(F_i)))$.

Observe that $\#(\mathcal{S}(F_i)) \cap \#(\mathcal{S}(F_{i+1})) = \emptyset$ and

$$\#(\overline{\mathcal{S}}(F_i)) \cap \#(\overline{\mathcal{S}}(F_{i+1})) = \#(\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c, c_4(F_i))) = \#(\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_1(F_{i+1}), c))$$

by Lemma 8.10 and Lemma 8.9 as J_i and N_i cross over s_{i+1} . Thus,

$$\rho_{F_i}([0, 1]^2) \cap \rho_{F_{i+1}}([0, 1]^2) = \rho_{F_i}(\{0\} \times [\frac{1}{2}, 1]) = \rho_{F_{i+1}}(\{0\} \times [0, \frac{1}{2}])$$

and the restriction of $\rho_{F_{i+1}}^{-1} \circ \rho_{F_i}$ to $\{0\} \times [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ is strictly decreasing with respect to the second variable.

Now, after reparameterization, we may assume that for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$

$$\rho_{F_{i+1}}^{-1} \circ \rho_{F_i}(0, t) = (0, 1 - t)$$

for all $t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. Then, we consider n -copies of $[0, 1]^2$, namely, $[0, 1]^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_n$. We identify a point (x, y, i) in $[0, 1]^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_n$ with $(0, 1 - y, i + 1)$ and denote the resulting space by Q_n . Now, we define a map δ_P from Q_n to $\overline{\mathcal{S}}(P)$ as $\delta_P(x, y, i) = \rho_{F_i}(x, y)$. By the gluing lemma, δ_P is well defined and is a homeomorphism. Observe that Q_n is homeomorphic to the closed disk and the boundary ∂Q_n , which is homeomorphic to S^1 , is

$$\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_n} (\partial[0, 1]^2 - \{0\} \times (0, 1)) \times \{i\}.$$

Hence, by Remark 10.13, the restriction $\delta_P|_{\text{Int}(Q_n)}$ of δ_P to $\text{Int}(Q_n)$ is a homeomorphism from $\text{Int}(Q_n)$ to $\mathcal{S}(P)$, where $\text{Int}(Q_n) = Q_n - \partial Q_n$.

For each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, $[0, 1]^2 \times \{i\}$ is foliated by transverse foliations \mathcal{Q}^i and \mathcal{Q}_i whose leaves are vertical and horizontal lines, respectively. Hence, there are transverse foliations \mathcal{Q}^+ and \mathcal{Q}^- on $\text{Int}(Q_n)$ induced from $\{\mathcal{Q}^i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_n}$ and $\{\mathcal{Q}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_n}$, respectively. Obviously, there is a foliated chart $\varphi_{\text{Int}(Q_n)}$ from $\text{Int}(Q_n)$ to P_n mapping each leaf of \mathcal{Q}^+ to a plaque in \mathcal{F}^n and each leaf of \mathcal{Q}^- to a transversal in \mathcal{F}_n . Then,

$$\varphi_{\text{Int}(Q_n)}(0, \frac{1}{2}, i) = 0$$

for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$. Thus, we define ρ_P to be $\rho_P = \delta_P \circ \varphi_{\text{Int}(Q_n)}^{-1}$ and the property of ρ_P follows from Lemma 10.12. \square

Theorem 11.9. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. The weaving $W(\mathcal{V})$ is an open disk foliated by transverse 1-dimensional singular foliations $\mathcal{F}_1(\mathcal{V})$ and $\mathcal{F}_2(\mathcal{V})$. Moreover, the singularities of $\mathcal{F}_1(\mathcal{V})$ and $\mathcal{F}_2(\mathcal{V})$ are precisely the singular classes. Finally, each $\mathcal{F}_i(\mathcal{V})$ has exactly $\text{ord}(s)$ prongs at each singular class s .*

Proof. Let c be a point in $W(\mathcal{V})$. First, we consider the case where c is a regular class. Choose a stitch s in c . Note that s is a regular stitch. Then, by Proposition 9.12, there is a frame F on which s lies. By Remark 10.13 and Proposition 9.11, $\#(\mathcal{S}(F))$ is an open neighborhood of c in $W(\mathcal{V})$. Now, we consider the homeomorphism ρ_F given by Lemma 10.12. Then, by Remark 10.13,

$$\psi \circ (\rho_F^{-1}|_{\#(\mathcal{S}(F))})$$

is a transversely foliated chart at c with respect to $\mathcal{F}_1(\mathcal{V})$ and $\mathcal{F}_2(\mathcal{V})$, where $\rho_F^{-1}|_{\#(\mathcal{S}(F))}$ is the restriction of ρ_F^{-1} to $\#(\mathcal{S}(F))$ and ψ is the map from $[0, 1]^2$ to P_2 defined by

$$\psi(x, y) = (2x - 1, 2y - 1).$$

Now, we assume that c is a singular class. Then, by Lemma 11.3, there is a polygonal frame P at the asterisk $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$. We consider the homeomorphism ρ_P given by Lemma 11.8. Then, as $c \in \#(\mathcal{S}(P))$ and Proposition 9.11, $\#(\mathcal{S}(P))$ is an open neighborhood of c in $W(\mathcal{V})$. Hence, ρ_P^{-1} is a transversely foliated chart at c with respect to $\mathcal{F}_1(\mathcal{V})$ and $\mathcal{F}_2(\mathcal{V})$. Thus, $\mathcal{F}_1(\mathcal{V})$ and $\mathcal{F}_2(\mathcal{V})$ are transverse singular foliations on $W(\mathcal{V})$.

The last assertion follows from the construction of $\mathcal{F}_i(\mathcal{V})$ together with Lemma 8.10, Lemma 8.7, and Lemma 8.5. \square

11.10. $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ Is Foliated by $\mathcal{F}_1^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ and $\mathcal{F}_2^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. In this section, we show that given a marked veering pair, the regular weaving associated with the marking is open in the weaving. Therefore, we may conclude that the regular weaving is foliated without singularity.

Lemma 11.11. *Let $(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ be a marked veering pair. Then, $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is open in $\overline{W}(\mathcal{V})$. Therefore, $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is a planar surface as $W^\circ(\mathcal{V})$ is an open disk.*

Proof. Let w be an element in $\overline{W}(\mathcal{V})$. Suppose that w is not a cone nor cusp class. Then, $w = \#(s)$ for some unmarked and regular stitch s . By Lemma 10.10, s lies on an unmarked frame F . By applying Lemma 10.12, $U = \rho_F((0, 1)^2)$ is an open neighborhood of w in $\overline{W}(\mathcal{V})$ and since $\#^{-1}(U) = \mathcal{S}(F)$, each class in U is not a cone and cusp class and so $U \subset W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. Thus, $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is open in $\overline{W}(\mathcal{V})$. \square

Theorem 11.12. *Let $(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ be a marked veering pair. Then, $\mathcal{F}_1^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ and $\mathcal{F}_2^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ are transverse 1-dimensional foliations on $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$.*

Proof. By Lemma 11.11, $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is a surface. Let w be an element in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. Then, $w = \#(s)$ for some stitch s which is unmarked and regular. By Lemma 10.10, s lies on an unmarked frame F . By applying Lemma 10.12, $U = \rho_F((0, 1)^2)$ is an open neighborhood of w in $\overline{W}(\mathcal{V})$ and since $\#^{-1}(U) = \mathcal{S}(F)$, each class in U is not a cone and cusp class and so $U \subset W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. Therefore, $(U, (\rho_F|_{(0, 1)^2})^{-1})$ is a transversely foliated chart at w . This implies that $\mathcal{F}_1^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ and $\mathcal{F}_2^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ are transverse 1-dimensional foliations on $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. \square

Lemma 11.13. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair and \mathbf{M} a marking on \mathcal{V} . Then, every leaf of $\mathcal{F}_i^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is homeomorphic to \mathbb{R} . Moreover, Any leaves l_1 and l_2 of $\mathcal{F}_1^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ and $\mathcal{F}_2^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$, respectively, intersect at most one point.*

Proof. Let l be an element of $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_i(\mathcal{V})$. Then, there is a unique real gap \mathcal{G} in \mathcal{L}_i associated with l . If \mathcal{G} is a leaf, then by Lemma 8.10, Lemma 8.7, and Lemma 8.5, l is a line contained in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V})$. Then, as l and \mathbf{M} intersect in at most one point, the leaves in $\mathcal{F}_i^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ associated with l is homeomorphic to \mathbb{R} .

Now, we consider the case where \mathcal{G} is a non-leaf gap. There is a unique cusp or singular class c in l and, by Lemma 8.10, Lemma 8.7, and Lemma 8.5, there are $\text{ord}(c)$ -many connected components of $l \setminus c$ which is homeomorphic to \mathbb{R} . Note that these components do not intersect with \mathbf{M} and they are contained in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. Therefore, the leaves in $\mathcal{F}_i^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ associated with l is homeomorphic to \mathbb{R} .

Let l_1 and l_2 be leaves in $\mathcal{F}_1^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ and $\mathcal{F}_2^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$, respectively. Assume that l_1 and l_2 intersect in w . Let \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 be the real gaps associated with l_1 and l_2 , respectively. Since w is a unmarked regular class, \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 are linked but they do not interleave. By Proposition 5.14, Lemma 8.10, and Lemma 8.8, $w = l'_1 \cap l'_2$ where l'_i are elements of $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_i(\mathcal{V})$ containing l_i . This implies the second statement. \square

Remark 11.14. A leaf l of $\mathcal{F}_i^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is called a *prong* at a cusp or cone class c if the element of $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_i(\mathcal{V})$ containing l contains c . From the proof of Lemma 11.13, if l is a prong at c , then there is a unique tip t of the real gap \mathcal{G} associated with l such that $\hat{w}(l)$ is an arc whose end point set is $\{\hat{w}(c), t\}$. More precisely, when \mathcal{G} is a non-leaf gap, if $l \subset \#(\mathcal{O}(\ell))$ for some leaf ℓ of \mathcal{L}_i , then $l = \ell(I)$ for some $I \in \nu(t)$. In the case where \mathcal{G} is a leaf, if $l \subset \#(\mathcal{O}(\ell))$ for some leaf ℓ of \mathcal{L}_i , then $l = \mathcal{G}$. If l is not a prong, then there is a unique unmarked leaf ℓ of \mathcal{V} such that $l = \#(\mathcal{O}(\ell))$. \square

12. CONSTRUCTION OF LOOM SPACES

In this section, we recall loom spaces in the sense of [FSS19, SS21] and construct a loom space out of data given by a veering pair.

Our construction is not very different from that of [FSS19]. We have built a regular weaving W° , which is analogous to the link space $L(\mathcal{V})$ in [FSS19]. Unlike to the link space, the regular weaving itself is not

a loom space – it is not even homeomorphic to \mathbb{R}^2 . However, we will show that its universal cover \widetilde{W}° is indeed a loom space.

One element that distinguishes our theorem from previous work is that veering pairs in this paper may have polygonal gaps. Recall that veering laminations in [FSS19] only have crown gaps, mainly because they are induced from cusped 3-manifolds. In fact, the existence of polygonal gaps leads us to a cusped 3-orbifold rather than 3-manifold.

We begin with a bit more general situation; a laminar group with an invariant veering pair. Because veering pairs are just abstract circle laminations, we cannot use arguments that rely on the veering triangulation. Instead, we carefully utilize the abstract properties of a veering pair to build a loom space.

12.1. Orientations on Foliated Planar Surfaces. Let X be a planar surface with C^0 transverse foliations \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 . We say that two transversely foliated charts (U, ϕ_U) and (V, ϕ_V) of X are *positively compatible* if either $U \cap V = \emptyset$ or the *transition map*

$$\phi_V \circ \phi_U^{-1} : \phi_U(U \cap V) \rightarrow \phi_V(U \cap V)$$

is of the form (ϕ, ψ) such that

$$\phi_V \circ \phi_U^{-1}(x, y) = (\phi(x), \psi(y)),$$

and either the interval maps ϕ and ψ are increasing or ϕ and ψ are decreasing.

An atlas \mathcal{O} of X is called an *orientation* of X with respect to \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 if \mathcal{O} consists of transversely foliated charts of S and any two elements of \mathcal{O} are positively compatible. We say that a transversely foliated chart (W, ϕ_W) of S is *positively compatible* with the orientation \mathcal{O} if (W, ϕ_W) is positively compatible with any element of \mathcal{O} .

For each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let X^i be a planar surface with transverse foliations \mathcal{F}_1^i and \mathcal{F}_2^i . Suppose that each X^i has an orientation \mathcal{O}_i . We say that a continuous map f from X^1 to X^2 is *orientation preserving* if for every $p \in S^1$, there exist transversely foliated charts (U_1, ϕ_1) and (U_2, ϕ_2) of X^1 and X^2 , respectively, satisfying the following.

- $p \in U_1$ and $f(U_1) \subset U_2$,
- each (U_i, ϕ_i) is positively compatible with \mathcal{O}_i , and
- $(U_1, \phi_2 \circ f)$ is positively compatible with (U_1, ϕ_1) .

Note that, by definition, for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, an orientation preserving map f maps a leaf l of \mathcal{F}_i^1 into a leaf l' of \mathcal{F}_i^2 , namely, $f(l) \subset l'$.

From now on, the foliations F_1 and F_2 of $(0, 1)^2$ are the sets of vertical lines and of horizontal lines, respectively. Also, we fix the orientation of $(0, 1)^2$ with respect to F_1 and F_2 as the atlas $\{((0, 1)^2, \text{Id}_{(0, 1)^2})\}$.

Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair with marking \mathbf{M} . We can see that the transversely foliated charts given by Lemma 10.12 compose an atlas \mathcal{O} for the planar surface $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ from the proof of Theorem 11.12. Moreover, any two elements of \mathcal{O} are positively compatible since every frame is oriented in the counter-clockwise direction. Hence, \mathcal{O} is an orientation of $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. From now on, we fix the orientation of $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ as \mathcal{O} . Under these orientations, the transversely foliated charts given by Lemma 10.12 are orientation preserving. For convenience, we say that a homeomorphism f on a weaving is *orientation preserving* if f is orientation preserving on the regular weaving.

12.2. Loom Spaces. We recall the definition of loom spaces. A *loom space* \mathcal{L} is a copy of \mathbb{R}^2 together with C^0 transverse foliations \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 . We also assume that \mathcal{L} has an orientation \mathcal{O} .

Since \mathcal{L} is simply-connected, we may take a subatlas \mathcal{O}_+ of \mathcal{O} so that each transition map of \mathcal{O}_+ is of the form (ϕ, ψ) such that both ϕ and ψ are increasing. Hence, we can say that the positive direction of \mathcal{F}_1 is *north* and the negative direction of \mathcal{F}_1 is *south*. Similarly, we refer to the positive and negative direction of \mathcal{F}_2 as *east* and *west*, respectively.

A *rectangle* R is an open subset of \mathbb{R}^2 such that there is a homeomorphism $f_R : (0, 1) \times (0, 1) \rightarrow R$ that maps vertical leaves $x \times (0, 1)$ to a leaf of \mathcal{F}_1 and horizontal leaves $(0, 1) \times y$ to \mathcal{F}_2 . We request that f_R preserves the orientations of the foliations. Here, the orientation of $(0, 1)^2$ is $\{((0, 1)^2, \text{Id}_{(0, 1)^2})\}$ and the orientation of \mathcal{L} is \mathcal{O}_+ .

If f_R admits a homeomorphic extension $\overline{f_R} : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \setminus \{a \times b\} \rightarrow \overline{R}$ for some $a, b \in \{0, 1\}$, we say that R is a *cusped rectangle*. In this case, $\overline{f_R}(a \times (0, 1))$ and $\overline{f_R}((0, 1) \times b)$ are called *cusped sides*.

If f_R has a homeomorphic extension

$$\overline{f_R} : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \setminus \{a \times 0, 1 \times b, c \times 1, 0 \times d\} \rightarrow \overline{R}$$

for some $0 < a, b, c, d < 1$, we call R a *tetrahedron rectangle* with parameters a, b, c and d .

Definition 12.3. A loom space \mathcal{L} is a topological space homeomorphic to \mathbb{R}^2 with two oriented transverse foliations subject to the following properties:

- (1) Every cusp side of a cusp rectangle is contained in a rectangle.
- (2) Every rectangle is contained in a tetrahedron rectangle.
- (3) If a tetrahedron rectangle has parameters a, b, c and d , then we have $a \neq c$ and $b \neq d$.

//

Let \mathcal{L} be a loom space with oriented transverse foliations \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 . A *edge rectangle* R in \mathcal{L} is one such that an associated homeomorphism f_R can be extended to the homeomorphism either of the forms

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{f_R} &: [0, 1]^2 - \{0 \times 0, 1 \times 1\} \rightarrow \overline{R} \text{ or} \\ \overline{f_R} &: [0, 1]^2 - \{0 \times 1, 1 \times 0\} \rightarrow \overline{R}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, R is called a *red edge rectangle* if the first extension happens. R is called a *blue edge rectangle* otherwise.

A *south-west face rectangle* in \mathcal{L} is one whose associated homeomorphism f_R has a continuous extension

$$\overline{f_R} : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \setminus \{0 \times 0, 1 \times a, b \times 1\}$$

for some a and b in $(0, 1)$. Similarly, we define *south-east*, *north-east*, and *north-west face rectangles*.

We need a careful definition for cusps in \mathcal{L} . Let us say that two cusp rectangles P and Q in \mathcal{L} are *equivalent* if there is a finite sequence of cusp rectangles $P = R_1, R_2, \dots, R_n = Q$ such that for each pair (R_i, R_{i+1}) , some cusp side of one is contained in a cusp side of the other. A *cusp* of the loom space is an equivalence class of this equivalent relation. A tetrahedron rectangle *contains* a cusp c if it contains some cusp rectangle in c .

12.4. Rectangles in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. Let P be a planar surface with transverse 1-dimensional foliations \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 . We fix an orientation of P . By abusing language, we call an open subset $R \subset P$ a *rectangle* if there is an orientation preserving homeomorphism $f_R : (0, 1) \times (0, 1) \rightarrow R$ such that f_R maps each vertical leaf $x \times (0, 1)$, $x \in (0, 1)$ to a leaf of \mathcal{F}_1 and each horizontal leaf $(0, 1) \times y$, $y \in (0, 1)$ to a leaf of \mathcal{F}_2 .

We can also define skeletal rectangles similarly. A *cusp rectangle* R is a rectangle such that an associated homeomorphism f_R can be extended to the homeomorphism $\overline{f_R} : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \setminus \{a \times b\} \rightarrow \overline{R}$ for some $a, b \in \{0, 1\}$. In this case, $\overline{f_R}(a \times (0, 1))$ and $\overline{f_R}((0, 1) \times b)$ are again called *cusp sides*.

An *edge rectangle* R is one that f_R admits a homeomorphic extension either of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{f_R} &: [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \setminus \{0 \times 0, 1 \times 1\} \rightarrow \overline{R}, \text{ or} \\ \overline{f_R} &: [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \setminus \{0 \times 1, 1 \times 0\} \rightarrow \overline{R}. \end{aligned}$$

If the first extension happens, we call R a *red edge rectangle*; otherwise R is called a *blue edge rectangle*.

Similarly, a *face rectangle* R is one whose associated homeomorphism f_R admits a homeomorphic extension of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{f_R} &: [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \setminus \{a \times a, (1-a) \times b, c \times (1-a)\} \text{ or} \\ \overline{f_R} &: [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \setminus \{a \times (1-a), b \times a, (1-a) \times c\} \end{aligned}$$

for some $a \in \{0, 1\}$ and for some b and c in $(0, 1)$.

A *tetrahedron rectangle* R with parameters a, b, c and d is one that an associated homeomorphism f_R can be extended to the homeomorphism

$$\overline{f_R} : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \setminus \{a \times 0, 1 \times b, c \times 1, 0 \times d\} \rightarrow \overline{R}$$

for some $0 < a, b, c, d < 1$.

Remark 12.5. Suppose that a planar surface P with transverse foliations \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 has an orientation \mathcal{O} . When P is simply-connected, we need to check the compatibility of the definition of rectangles in P defined in this section and the definition of rectangles in loom spaces. In fact, the definition of rectangles in P is weaker than the definition of rectangles in loom spaces since in loom spaces, we refined the orientation for loom spaces as \mathcal{O}_+ to say north, east, west, and south. See Section 12.2.

Nonetheless, we can abuse these definitions because the only problem is defining the red and blue rectangles. To see this, we take a subatlas \mathcal{O}_+ of \mathcal{O} so that each coordinate function of transition maps of \mathcal{O}_+ is increasing as in Section 12.2.

Then, choose a rectangle R in P and let $f_R : (0, 1)^2 \rightarrow R$ be the associated map that is the orientation preserving map respecting \mathcal{O} . Then, we can take another orientation preserving map $g_R : (0, 1)^2 \rightarrow R$ so that g_R respects \mathcal{O}_+ , if necessary, by precomposing the orientation preserving homeomorphism $\pi : (x, y) \mapsto (1 - x, 1 - y)$ on $(0, 1)^2$ which flips the direction of leaves of F_1 and F_2 . Therefore, the definition of rectangles in transversely foliated planar surfaces is well-defined.

Moreover, π is essentially the only homeomorphism on $(0, 1)^2$ (other than the trivial map) up to isotopy passing along the homeomorphisms that preserve the orientation and the leaves of foliations. This means that an edge rectangle being blue or red is well-defined. \square

Lemma 12.6. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair and \mathbf{M} a marking on \mathcal{V} . Let R be a rectangle on $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ such that an associate homeomorphism f_R can be extended to the homeomorphism $\overline{f_R}$ from $[0, 1]^2$ to the closure \overline{R} in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. Then, there is an unmarked frame $\mathbf{F} = (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$ of \mathcal{V} such that $\#^{-1}(\overline{R}) = \overline{\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{F})}$. Moreover, if there is a frame \mathbf{F}' in \mathcal{V} such that $\#^{-1}(\overline{R}) = \overline{\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{F}')}$, then \mathbf{F}' is either (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4) or (I_3, I_4, I_1, I_2) .*

Proof. Let f_R be an homeomorphism associated to R . By the assumption, f_R is extended to a homeomorphism $\overline{f_R} : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \overline{R}$. We write l_1 for the leaf of $\mathcal{F}_1^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ containing $\overline{f_R}(0 \times [0, 1])$. Similarly, we also write l_2, l_3 , and l_4 for the leaves containing $\overline{f_R}([0, 1] \times 0)$, $\overline{f_R}(1 \times [0, 1])$, and $\overline{f_R}([0, 1] \times 1)$, respectively. Also, for each $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ we denote the intersection point of l_i and l_{i+1} by d_i (throughout the proof, assume everything is cyclically indexed). By Lemma 11.13, d_i are uniquely determined and so

$$d_1 = \overline{f_R}(0, 0), \quad d_2 = \overline{f_R}(1, 0), \quad d_3 = \overline{f_R}(1, 1), \quad \text{and} \quad d_4 = \overline{f_R}(0, 1).$$

Observe that, for each $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, if l_i and l_{i+1} are leaves of \mathcal{V} such that $l_i \subset \#(\mathcal{O}(l_i))$ and $l_{i+1} \subset \#(\mathcal{O}(l_{i+1}))$, then l_i and l_{i+1} are linked since d_i is an unmarked regular class. See Proposition 7.13.

Now, for each $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, we choose a leaf ℓ_i such that $l_i \subset \#(\mathcal{O}(\ell_i))$. Note that by the definition of the weaving relation, ℓ_1 and ℓ_3 are ultraparallel and ℓ_2 and ℓ_4 are ultraparallel. Then, there is the unique sector (J_1, J_2) of the stitch (ℓ_1, ℓ_2) such that the stitch (ℓ_3, ℓ_4) lies on (J_1^*, J_2^*) . Likewise, there is the unique sector (J_3, J_4) of the stitch (ℓ_3, ℓ_4) such that the stitch (ℓ_1, ℓ_2) lies on (J_3^*, J_4^*) . Note that the sectors (J_1, J_2) and (J_3, J_4) are counter-clockwise as f_R preserves the orientation. Therefore, the quadruple $\mathbf{Q} = (J_1, J_2, J_3, J_4)$ is a frame of \mathcal{V} . Then, we can take an orientation preserving homeomorphism $\rho_{\mathbf{Q}}$ from $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ to $\#(\overline{\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{Q})})$ as in Lemma 10.12. Since each l_i is homeomorphic to \mathbb{R} by Lemma 11.13, $\rho_{\mathbf{Q}}(\partial[0, 1]^2) = \partial R$ and as $W(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is the open disk, by the Jordan–Schoenflies theorem, $\#(\overline{\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{Q})}) = \overline{R}$. However, in general, $\overline{\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{Q})} \neq \#^{-1}(\overline{R})$. Hence, we need to modify the frame \mathbf{Q} .

If J_1 is not isolated, then there is no leaf ℓ of \mathcal{L}_1 lying on J_1 such that $l_1 \subset \#(\mathcal{O}(\ell))$. See Remark 11.14. In this case, we set $I_1 = J_1$. Otherwise, by Remark 11.14, there is a unique element I_1 in \mathcal{L}_1 such that $I_1 \not\subset J_1$ and $l_1 \subset \#(\mathcal{O}(\ell(I_1)))$. Likewise, for each $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, we can take I_i . Then, by the previous observation, $\ell(I_i)$ and $\ell(I_{i+1})$ are linked for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Therefore, the quadruple $\mathbf{F} = (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$ is a frame covering \mathbf{Q} . By the construction, $l_i \subset \#(\mathcal{O}(\ell(I_i)))$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Then, by Lemma 11.13, $\#(\overline{\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{F})}) = \overline{R}$.

Now, we want to show that $\#^{-1}(\overline{R}) = \overline{\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{F})}$. Note that $\#^{-1}(R) = \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{F})$ by Lemma 10.12. Let $s = (m_1, m_2)$ be a stitch with $\#(s) \in \overline{R}$. Then, there is a unique leaf n_1 of $\mathcal{F}_1^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ such that $\#(s) \in n_1 \subset \#(\mathcal{O}(m_1))$. See Remark 11.14. Then, there is a unique class w_1 in the intersection of n_1 and l_2 . Then, $w_1 = \#(s_1)$ where s_1 is the stitch $(m_1, \ell(I_2))$.

Claim 12.7. Let ℓ be a leaf of \mathcal{L}_i . Assume that $\mathcal{I}(t_1, t)$ and $\mathcal{I}(t_2, t)$ are non-empty intervals in $\mathcal{O}(\ell)$. If $\overline{\mathcal{I}}(t_1, t) \not\subset \overline{\mathcal{I}}(t_2, t)$ and $\#(\overline{\mathcal{I}}(t_1, t)) = \#(\overline{\mathcal{I}}(t_2, t))$, then $t_1 \sim_w t_2$ and so $\eta_{i+1}(t_1)$ and $\eta_{i+1}(t_2)$ are parallel.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 8.6 and Remark 7.7. \square

The interval $\mathcal{I}(c_1(\mathbf{F}), c_2(\mathbf{F}))$ is the maximal interval on $\mathcal{O}(\ell(J_2))$ in the following sense. If there is an interval $\mathcal{I}(t_1, t_2)$ in $\mathcal{O}(\ell(J_2))$ such that $\#(\overline{\mathcal{I}}(t_1, t_2)) = \overline{f_R}([0, 1] \times 0)$, then $\overline{\mathcal{I}}(t_1, t_2) \subset \overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_1(\mathbf{F}), c_2(\mathbf{F}))$ by the choice of I_1 and I_2 and by Claim 12.7. Therefore, $s_1 \in \overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_1(\mathbf{F}), c_2(\mathbf{F}))$. Likewise, we can show that the stitch $(\ell(I_1), m_2)$ belongs to $\overline{\mathcal{I}}(c_1(\mathbf{F}), c_4(\mathbf{F}))$. Therefore, $s \in \overline{\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{F})}$ as $\sigma_{\mathbf{F}}(s_1, s_2) = s$. Thus, $\#^{-1}(\overline{R}) = \overline{\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{F})}$. Also, since $R \subset W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$, \mathbf{F} is unmarked.

Note that if a map f'_R from $(0, 1)^2$ to R is defined by $f'_R(x, y) = f_R(1 - x, 1 - y)$, then f'_R is also an orientation preserving homeomorphism associated with R . This possibility of the choice of an associated homeomorphism implies the second statement. \square

For a rectangle R , we call frames (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4) and (I_3, I_4, I_1, I_2) as in Lemma 12.6 the *maximal frame representatives* of R .

Proposition 12.8. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair and \mathbf{M} a marking on \mathcal{V} . Let R_1 and R_2 be rectangles in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ such that $R_1 \subset R_2$ and a homeomorphism f_{R_2} associated with R_2 can be extended to the homeomorphism $\overline{f_{R_2}}$ from $[0, 1]^2$ to the closure $\overline{R_2}$ in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. Then, there are maximal frame representatives F_1 and F_2 of R_1 and R_2 , respectively, such that F_2 covers F_1 .*

Proof. It follows from Lemma 12.6. \square

Lemma 12.9. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair and \mathbf{M} a marking on \mathcal{V} . Let R be a rectangle on $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. Then, there is an unmarked frame $F = (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$ such that $\mathcal{S}(F) = \#^{-1}(R)$ and I_i^* is not isolated for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Moreover, if $F' = (J_1, J_2, J_3, J_4)$ is a frame such that $\mathcal{S}(F') = \#^{-1}(R)$ and J_i^* is not isolated for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, then F' is either (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4) or (I_3, I_4, I_1, I_2) .*

Proof. Let f_R be a homeomorphism associated with R . Given a real numbers α with $0 \leq \alpha < 1/2$, we define a map p^α from $[0, 1]^2$ to $[\alpha, 1 - \alpha]^2$ by $p^\alpha(x, y) = ((1-x)\alpha + x(1-\alpha), (1-y)\alpha + y(1-\alpha))$. Then, we write $f_R^\alpha := f_R \circ p^\alpha$ and the rectangles $f_R^\alpha([0, 1]^2)$ are denoted by R^α . Note that $f_R = f_R^0$ and that if $0 \leq \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < 1/2$, then $\overline{R^{\alpha_2}} \subset R^{\alpha_1}$. Since $\overline{R^\alpha} \subset R^0$ for all α with $0 < \alpha < 1/2$, by Lemma 12.6, there is a maximal frame representative F^α of R^α for all real number α with $0 < \alpha < 1/2$. Moreover, by Proposition 12.8, we may assume that if $0 < \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < 1/2$, then F^{α_1} covers F^{α_2} .

For each α with $0 < \alpha < 1/2$, we write $F^\alpha = (I_1^\alpha, I_2^\alpha, I_3^\alpha, I_4^\alpha)$ and $I_i^\alpha = (u_i^\alpha, v_i^\alpha)_{S^1}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Now, we consider the stem S_1 from $I_1^{1/3}$ to $(v_4^{1/3}, u_2^{1/3})_{S^1}$ in \mathcal{L}_1 . Observe that $I_1^\alpha \in S_1$ for all α with $0 < \alpha \leq 1/3$. As $\{I_1^{1/(n+2)}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a descending sequence in S_1 , then there is an element I_1 in S_1 such that $I_1^* = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (I_1^{1/(n+2)})^*$, that is, $\ell(I_1^{1/(n+2)}) \rightarrow \ell(I_1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Similarly, we can find I_2, I_3 , and I_4 such that $I_i^* = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (I_i^{1/(n+2)})^*$ for all $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$.

Note that as \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 are strongly transverse, $\ell(I_i)$ and $\ell(I_{i+1})$ are either linked or ultraparallel for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ (everything in the proof is cyclically indexed). If $\ell(I_i)$ and $\ell(I_{i+1})$ are ultraparallel for some $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, then there is a number N in \mathbb{N} such that $\ell(I_i^{1/(n+2)})$ and $\ell(I_{i+1}^{1/(n+2)})$ are unlinked for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $N < n$ since $\ell(I_j^{1/(n+2)}) \rightarrow \ell(I_j)$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. This is a contradiction. Therefore, $\ell(I_i)$ and $\ell(I_{i+1})$ are linked for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. This implies that the quadruple $F = (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$ is a frame. Note that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\overline{\mathcal{S}(F^{1/(n+2)})} \subset \mathcal{S}(F)$ since $\ell(I_i^{1/(n+2)})$ and $\ell(I_i)$ are ultraparallel for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.

Given a stitch s lying on F , there is a frame $F^{1/(m+2)}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $s \in \overline{\mathcal{S}(F^{1/(m+2)})}$ since $\ell(I_j^{1/(n+2)}) \rightarrow \ell(I_j)$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Thus,

$$\mathcal{S}(F) = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{\mathcal{S}(F^{1/(n+2)})}$$

Observe that $\#^{-1}(R) = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{\mathcal{S}(F^{1/(n+2)})}$ since $F^{1/(n+2)}$ are maximal frame representatives. Thus, $\mathcal{S}(F) = \#^{-1}(R)$. The second statement comes from the possibility of the choice of f_R . \square

Given a rectangle R , we call any frame that satisfies the conclusion of Lemma 12.9 is called a *minimal frame representatives* of R . Lemma 12.9 shows that a minimal frame is unique up to reordering of components.

Remark 12.10. Let $(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ be a marked veering pair. Assume that R is a rectangle in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. If F is a frame with $\#(\mathcal{S}(F)) = R$, then F covers a minimal frame representative of R . \parallel

Remark 12.11. Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair and \mathbf{M} a marking on \mathcal{V} . Assume that R is a cusp rectangle in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. By Lemma 12.9, there is a minimal frame representative F of R . Then, we can take a homeomorphism ρ_F as in Lemma 10.12 of which the restriction $\rho_F^\circ := \rho_F|_{(0, 1)^2}$ is an associated homeomorphism of R . Since R is a cusp rectangle, we may assume that ρ_F° is extended to $\overline{\rho_F^\circ}$ from $[0, 1]^2 \setminus 0 \times 0$ to the closure \overline{R} in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. Observe that $\overline{\rho_F^\circ} = \rho_F$ on $[0, 1]^2 \setminus 0 \times 0$. Therefore, $\rho_F(0, 0)$ is a cusp or cone class in $\overline{W}(\mathcal{V})$ since $\rho_F([0, 1]^2) \subset \overline{W}(\mathcal{V})$. Hence, we denote $\rho_F(0, 0)$ by $\text{cusp}(R)$. \parallel

Remark 12.12. Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair with a marking \mathbf{M} . Assume that R is a rectangle in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ and that there is a tetrahedron frame F under \mathbf{M} such that $\#(\mathcal{S}(F)) = R$. Then, we can take a homeomorphism ρ_F as in Lemma 10.12. Then, since F is i^{th} -side full for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, by Lemma 10.5 and Remark 12.11, $\rho_F(0 \times (0, 1))$, $\rho_F((0, 1) \times 0)$, $\rho_F(1 \times (0, 1))$, and $\rho_F((0, 1) \times 1)$ contain cusp

or cone classes w_1, w_2, w_3 , and w_4 , respectively. Moreover, by Remark 11.14, connected components of $\rho_F(0 \times [0, 1]) - \{w_1\}$, are contained in different prongs at w_1 . This implies that w_1 is a unique cusp or cone class in $\rho_F(0 \times [0, 1])$. Similar statement also holds for w_2, w_3 , and w_4 . This implies that R is a tetrahedron rectangle in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$.

Conversely, given a tetrahedron rectangle R in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$, we can take a minimal frame representative F for R . Then, by Lemma 10.8 and Lemma 10.12, it follows that F is a tetrahedron frame under \mathbf{M} . Therefore, by Lemma 12.9, there is a one-to-one correspondence between the set of all tetrahedron rectangles in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ and the set of all tetrahedron frames under \mathbf{M} up to reordering of components. $\quad //$

12.13. Construction of a Loom Space. We now present our main construction of a loom space. Then our main theorem of this section is the following:

Theorem 12.14. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair with a marking \mathbf{M} . Then the universal cover $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ of the regular weaving $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is a loom space with the foliations $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_1^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_2^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ induced by lifting $\mathcal{F}_1^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ and $\mathcal{F}_2^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$, respectively.*

In light of Theorem 11.9 and Theorem 11.12, $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is an open disk with a discrete closed subset of countably many points removed. We then know that the universal cover $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is homeomorphic to the plane \mathbb{R}^2 equipped with (non-singular) transverse foliations $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_1^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_2^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ induced by lifting $\mathcal{F}_1^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ and $\mathcal{F}_2^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$, respectively. Therefore, it remains to show that $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ fulfils the properties listed in Definition 12.3.

Remark 12.15. By Lemma 11.13, every leaf of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_1^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_2^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is homeomorphic to \mathbb{R} . $\quad //$

Although $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ itself is not a loom space, it shares the same properties that rectangles in a loom space have.

Lemma 12.16. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair with a marking \mathbf{M} .*

- (1) *Any cusp side of a cusp rectangle in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is contained in a rectangle in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$.*
- (2) *Any rectangle in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is contained in a tetrahedron rectangle.*
- (3) *For parameters a, b, c and d of a tetrahedron rectangle in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$, we have $a \neq c$ and $b \neq d$.*

Proof. Due to Lemma 12.9, given a rectangle R in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$, we can take a minimal frame representative F of R .

(1) Let R be a cusp rectangle in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ and F a minimal frame representative of R . Then, we can take a homeomorphism ρ_F as in Lemma 10.12. For simplicity, we say that $\rho_F(0, 0)$ is cusp(R). See Remark 12.11. Then, $c_1(F)$ is a marked or singular stitch and as F is a minimal representative of R , $\mathcal{I}(c_1(F), c_4(F))$ and $\mathcal{I}(c_1(F), c_2(F))$ have no marked or singular stitch. By Lemma 10.5, F is not 1^{st} -side and 2^{nd} -side full. By Lemma 10.8, there is unmarked 1^{st} -side extension F^1 of F that is 1^{st} -side full. Also, there is an unmarked 2^{nd} -side extension F^2 of F that is 2^{nd} -side full. Then, by Lemma 10.12, $\#(\mathcal{S}(F^1))$ and $\#(\mathcal{S}(F^2))$ are rectangles containing the cusp sides $\rho_F(0 \times (0, 1))$ and $\rho_F([0, 1] \times 0)$ of R , respectively.

(2) Let R a rectangle in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ and F a minimal frame representative of R . By Lemma 10.9, F is covered by a tetrahedron frame F' under \mathbf{M} . By Remark 12.12, $\mathcal{S}(F')$ is a tetrahedron rectangle in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ containing R .

(3) It follows from Remark 12.11 and Remark 11.14. $\quad \square$

Lemma 12.17. *Let D be the group of deck transformations of the covering $p: \widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}) \rightarrow W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$.*

- (1) *The covering map p sends a rectangle to a rectangle.*
- (2) *For any $g \in D \setminus \{1\}$ and any rectangle R in $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$, $g(R)$ is also a rectangle of $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ and $g(R) \cap R = \emptyset$.*
- (3) *For a rectangle R in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$, each component of $p^{-1}(R)$ is a rectangle.*

Proof. (1) Let R be a rectangle and let $f_R: (0, 1) \times (0, 1) \rightarrow R$ be the associated homeomorphism. We claim that $p \circ f_R$ is a homeomorphism onto its image. We first show that $p \circ f_R$ is injective.

On the contrary, suppose that there are two distinct points $a \times b$ and $c \times d$ in $(0, 1) \times (0, 1)$ that are mapped by $p \circ f_R$ to a same point in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. Then, there are leaves l_1 and l_2 of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_1^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ containing $f_R(a \times [0, 1])$ and $f_R(c \times [0, 1])$, respectively. By definition, $p(l_1)$ and $p(l_2)$ are also leaves of $\mathcal{F}_1^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ and by the assumption that $p \circ f_R(a, b) = p \circ f_R(c, d)$, $p(l_1)$ and $p(l_2)$ are equal. We say that $l = p(l_1) = p(l_2)$.

Observe that if $a = c$, then $b \neq d$ and $l_1 = l_2$. This implies that l is homeomorphic to the circle. See Remark 12.15. This is a contradiction by Lemma 11.13. Therefore, $a \neq c$.

On the other hand, there is a leaf m of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_2^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ containing $f_R([0, 1] \times 1/2)$. Also, by definition, $p(m)$ is a leaf of $\mathcal{F}_2^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. Then, if $p \circ f_R(a, 1/2) \neq p \circ f_R(c, 1/2)$, then l and $p(m)$ intersect in two distinct points and it is a contradiction by Lemma 11.13. Hence, $p \circ f_R(a, 1/2) = p \circ f_R(c, 1/2)$. This implies that $p(m)$ is homeomorphic to the circle as $a \neq c$. See Remark 12.15. This is also a contradiction by Lemma 11.13. Therefore, $p \circ f_R$ is injective.

Moreover, $p \circ f_R$ is an open map being the composition of a homeomorphism and a covering map. Therefore, $p \circ f_R((0, 1) \times (0, 1))$ is a rectangle in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$.

(2) Let R be a rectangle in $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ with the associated homeomorphism $f_R : (0, 1) \times (0, 1) \rightarrow R$. Since the induced transverse foliations in $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ are D -invariant, $g \circ f_R$ is a homeomorphism onto $g(R)$ that preserves the transverse foliations. This shows that $g(R)$ is a rectangle. The assertion that $g(R) \cap R = \emptyset$ follows from (1).

(3) Clear from the lifting property together with the fact that R is simply-connected. \square

Lemma 12.18. *Any rectangle in $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is contained in a tetrahedron rectangle in $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$.*

Proof. Let R be a rectangle in $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. In light of Lemma 12.17, we know that $p(R)$ is a rectangle in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ and by Lemma 12.16, $p(R)$ is contained in a tetrahedron rectangle R' .

Given a tetrahedron rectangle R' in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ with a homeomorphism $f_{R'} : (0, 1) \times (0, 1) \rightarrow W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$, we have the extended homeomorphism $\overline{f_{R'}} : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \setminus \{a \times 0, 1 \times b, c \times 1, 0 \times d\} \rightarrow \overline{R'}$ for some $0 < a, b, c, d < 1$. Because the domain of $\overline{f_{R'}}$ is simply-connected and $\overline{f_{R'}}$ is a homeomorphism onto its image, we know that there is a lift $\widetilde{\overline{f_{R'}}} : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \setminus \{a \times 0, 1 \times b, c \times 1, 0 \times d\} \rightarrow \widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$.

Let Z be the image of $\widetilde{\overline{f_{R'}}}$. Since the image $\overline{R'}$ of $\overline{f_{R'}}$ is simply-connected, we know that the connected component of $p^{-1}(\overline{R'})$ that contains Z is Z itself. Since $\overline{R'}$ is closed, one of its lift Z is also closed in $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. Hence, the interior $\text{Int}(Z)$ of Z is, by definition, a tetrahedron rectangle. Finally, by Lemma 12.17, $g(\text{Int}(Z))$ is a tetrahedron rectangle containing R for some $g \in D$. \square

We summarize the above results in the following form.

Proposition 12.19. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair with a marking \mathbf{M} . Let $p : \widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}) \rightarrow W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ be the universal covering map. Then, p induces a one-to-one correspondence:*

$$\{\text{Rectangles in } \widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})\} / \sim \xrightarrow{\mathbf{p}} \{\text{Rectangles in } W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})\}$$

where two rectangles in $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ are equivalent if there is a deck transformation that maps one to the other. Moreover, this correspondence respects being cusp, red/blue edge, face or tetrahedron.

Proof. The correspondence \mathbf{p} is simply to map an equivalence class of rectangles R in $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ to $p(R)$. \mathbf{p} is well-defined by Lemma 12.17. It suffices to show that this correspondence respects the types of rectangles.

We first show that \mathbf{p} sends tetrahedron rectangles to tetrahedron rectangles. According to Lemma 12.18 and its proof, a tetrahedron rectangle in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ can be lifted to a tetrahedron rectangle in $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. Conversely, a tetrahedron rectangle in $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is mapped to a tetrahedron rectangle by the same argument of the proof of Lemma 12.17.

For the remaining cases, we use Lemma 12.18 and the one-to-one correspondence between tetrahedron rectangles. \square

Now we can prove the main theorem of this section.

Proof of Theorem 12.14. As mentioned in the beginning of this subsection, it is enough to show that rectangles in $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ satisfy the properties in Definition 12.3.

Let R be a cusp rectangle in $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ with a cusp side e . According to Proposition 12.19, $p(R)$ is the corresponding cusp rectangle in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ with the cusp edge $p(e)$. By Lemma 12.16, we know that there is a rectangle R' in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ that contains $p(e)$. Then the corresponding equivalence class of rectangles in $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ has a representative \widetilde{R}' that contains e . Hence we have the first property.

The second property is already proven in Lemma 12.18.

For the last property, let a, b, c and d be parameters for a tetrahedron rectangle R in $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. Then $p(R)$ is a tetrahedron rectangle in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ with the same parameters a, b, c and d . By Lemma 12.16, we know that $a \neq c$ and $b \neq d$. This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

Part 3. Veering Pair Preserving Laminar Groups

In this part, we introduce laminar automorphisms and show that any groups of laminar automorphisms of a given veering pair is an irreducible 3-orbifold group. On the way of the proof, we prove the classification theorems for the actions of laminar automorphisms of pseudo-fibered pairs, e.g. Theorem 15.9, Theorem 15.18, and Theorem 15.22.

13. LAMINAR AUTOMORPHISMS

We begin with defining terms related to laminar groups.

Let g be a homeomorphism on S^1 . Then we say that g is *orientation preserving* if for any clockwise triple (x_1, x_2, x_3) in S^1 , $(g(x_1), g(x_2), g(x_3))$ is clockwise. We denote the group of orientation preserving homeomorphisms on S^1 by $\text{Homeo}^+(S^1)$.

Let g be an element in $\text{Homeo}^+(S^1)$. We denote the *fixed point set* of g on S^1 by $\text{Fix}(g)$ and the *periodic point set* of g by $\text{Per}(g)$. When p is a fixed point of g , p is an *attracting fixed point* of g if there is a good interval I such that $I \cap \text{Fix}(g) = \{p\}$ and $g(\bar{I}) \subset I$. Likewise, p is a *repelling fixed point* of g if there is a good interval I such that $I \cap \text{Fix}(g) = \{p\}$ and $I \subset g(\bar{I})$.

Assume that g is a non-trivial element in $\text{Homeo}^+(S^1)$. Then, we say that

- g is *elliptic* if g is of finite order.
- g is *parabolic* if g has a unique fixed point.
- g is *hyperbolic* if g has exactly two fixed points such that one is attracting and the other is repelling.

We also say that g is *Möbius-like* if g is either elliptic, parabolic, or hyperbolic.

Let \mathcal{L} be a lamination system. We call an element g in $\text{Homeo}^+(S^1)$ a *laminar automorphism* of \mathcal{L} if g *preserves* \mathcal{L} , namely, $g(\mathcal{L}) = \mathcal{L}$. Also, we define the *laminar automorphism group* of \mathcal{L} to be the set of all laminar automorphisms of \mathcal{L} and denote it by $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{L})$.

A subgroup G of $\text{Homeo}^+(S^1)$ is said to be *laminar* if there is a lamination system \mathcal{L} such that $G \leq \text{Aut}(\mathcal{L})$.

Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{L}_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Gamma}$ be a collection of lamination systems. Then the *laminar automorphism group* $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$ of \mathcal{C} is

$$\bigcap_{\alpha \in \Gamma} \text{Aut}(\mathcal{L}_\alpha),$$

and each element of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$ is called an *laminar automorphism* of \mathcal{C} .

When g is a non-trivial laminar automorphism of a pseudo-fibered pair \mathcal{C} , g is said to be *pseudo-Anosov-like* or *pA-like* if g is neither elliptic nor parabolic and g preserves an interleaving pair of \mathcal{C} . In particular, a pA-like homeomorphism with non-empty fixed point set is called a *properly pseudo-Anosov*.

14. LAMINAR AUTOMORPHISMS OF QUITE FULL LAMINATION SYSTEMS

In the subsequent sections, we analyze the circle actions of laminar automorphisms of pseudo-fibered pairs. Before that, we study dynamics of laminar automorphisms preserving a single quite full lamination system.

14.1. Obstruction from the Rotation number. In this subsection, we show that any element g in $\text{Homeo}^+(S^1)$ preserving a quite full lamination system has a rational rotation number. In other words, there is a periodic point. See [KH95, Chapter 11] and [Ghy01, Section 5] for the rotation number theory.

First, we observe that any irrational rotation can not preserve a lamination system.

Proposition 14.2. *Let $g \in \text{Homeo}^+(S^1)$. Suppose that g is topologically transitive. Then, there is no lamination system \mathcal{L} such that $g \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{L})$.*

Proof. Let $\tau(g)$ be the rotation number of g . Since g is topologically transitive, $\tau(g)$ is irrational and there is a ϕ in $\text{Homeo}^+(S^1)$ such that $\phi^{-1}g\phi = R_{\tau(g)}$ where for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, R_α is the map defined as

$$R_\alpha(z) = e^{2\pi i \alpha} z.$$

Now assume that there is a lamination system \mathcal{L} such that $g \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{L})$. Then $\phi^{-1}(\mathcal{L})$ is also a lamination system and $R_{\tau(g)} \in \text{Aut}(\phi^{-1}(\mathcal{L}))$. Let $(a, b)_{S^1}$ be a good open interval in $\phi^{-1}(\mathcal{L})$. Since $R_{\tau(g)}$ is minimal, there is a sequence $\{r_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in $\mathbb{Z} \setminus 0$ such that $\{(R_{\tau(g)})^{r_n}(a)\}_{n=1}^\infty$ converges to a . Then $\{a, b\}$ and $\{(R_{\tau(g)})^{r_k}(a), (R_{\tau(g)})^{r_k}(b)\}$ are linked for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. It is a contradiction by the unlinkedness. Thus, there is no lamination system \mathcal{L} such that $g \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{L})$. \square

Then, we show the main lemma in this section.

Lemma 14.3. *Let $g \in \text{Homeo}^+(S^1)$ and \mathcal{L} a quite full lamination system. Suppose that $g \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{L})$. Then there is a periodic point, that is, $\text{Per}(g) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\text{Per}(g) = \emptyset$. Then the rotation number τ of g is irrational. Due to Proposition 14.2, g is not minimal. Hence, there is the g -invariant exceptional minimal set K which is a cantor set. Thus, by collapsing the components of $S^1 \setminus K$, we obtain a semi-conjugacy $\phi : S^1 \rightarrow S^1$ such that $\phi g = R_\tau \phi$, where R_τ is the rotation by τ .

We claim that for any leaf ℓ of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L})$, $\phi(\ell)$ is a singleton. For, if $\phi(\ell)$ is not a singleton, we can find $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $R_\tau^n \phi(\ell)$ and $\phi(\ell)$ are linked. This implies that ℓ and $g^n(\ell)$ are linked. It is a contradiction.

From the above claim, every leaf of \mathcal{L} lies on a component of $S^1 \setminus K$. This contradicts the fact that \mathcal{L} is quite full. Thus, $\text{Per}(g) \neq \emptyset$. □

14.4. Laminar Automorphisms That Preserve Gaps. If an element of a laminar group preserves a gap, its dynamics on S^1 becomes very restrictive.

Proposition 14.5. *Let \mathcal{L} be a quite full lamination system and let \mathcal{G} be a crown. Let $g \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{L})$. If g preserves \mathcal{G} , then the pivot of \mathcal{G} is a fixed point of g . Conversely, if g fixes the pivot of \mathcal{G} , then g preserves \mathcal{G} .*

Proof. g must fix the pivot of \mathcal{G} as the pivot is the only accumulation point of $v(\mathcal{G})$. The converse statement follows from the fact that there are no distinct crowns sharing the pivot point. □

Lemma 14.6. *Let \mathcal{L} be a quite full lamination system and g a laminar automorphism of \mathcal{L} . Suppose that there is a rainbow point p . If g is elliptic, then there is an ideal polygon \mathcal{G} preserved by g . In particular, the order of g divides the number of elements of \mathcal{G} .*

Proof. Let σ be the order of g . Since g is non-trivial, $\sigma > 1$. Let \mathcal{O} be the orbit of p under the iteration of g . Then $|\mathcal{O}| = \sigma$.

First we consider the case where $\sigma > 2$. Then $S^1 \setminus \mathcal{O}$ is a disjoint union of good intervals. Then there are two good intervals $(u, p)_{S^1}$ and $(p, v)_{S^1}$ which are components of $S^1 \setminus \mathcal{O}$. Since u and v are in \mathcal{O} and $\sigma > 2$, u and v are distinct. Hence, $(u, v)_{S^1}$ is good.

Now, we consider the stem $S_p^{(u, v)_{S^1}}$. As p is a rainbow point, $S_p^{(u, v)_{S^1}}$ is not empty. Therefore, there is the base B of $S_p^{(u, v)_{S^1}}$. Moreover, since u and v are also rainbow points, $\overline{B} \subset (u, v)_{S^1}$, so B^* is isolated. Therefore, by Proposition 3.8, there is a non-leaf gap \mathcal{G} containing B .

Claim 14.7. Let ℓ be a leaf of \mathcal{L} . Then there is a I in ℓ such that $|I \cap \mathcal{O}| \leq 1$.

Proof. Note that $v(\ell) \cap \mathcal{O} = \emptyset$ since every point in \mathcal{O} is a rainbow point. The case where $\sigma = 3$ is obvious so we assume $\sigma > 3$. Suppose that $1 < |I \cap \mathcal{O}|$ for all $I \in \ell$. Now we write $v(\ell) = \{e, f\}$. Then for each $w \in v(\ell)$, there is a good interval $(x_w, y_w)_{S^1}$ containing w which is a component of $S^1 \setminus \mathcal{O}$. Observe that $[x_e, y_e]_{S^1} \cap [x_f, y_f]_{S^1} = \emptyset$, $\{x_e, y_f\} \subset (f, e)_{S^1}$, and $\{y_e, x_f\} \subset (e, f)_{S^1}$. There is a $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $y_e = g^k(x_e)$. Obviously, $y_f = g^k(x_f)$. Then $\{e, f\}$ and $\{g^k(e), g^k(f)\}$ are linked. This is a contradiction. Thus, there is a I in ℓ such that $|I \cap \mathcal{O}| \leq 1$. □

Since u is also a rainbow point, by Lemma 4.2, $u \notin v(\mathcal{G})$ and there is an element I_u in \mathcal{G} containing u . Observe that $\{p, v\} \in I_u^*$ since B is the base of $S_p^{(u, v)_{S^1}}$. By Claim 14.7, $\overline{I_u} \cap \mathcal{O} = \{u\}$. Note that $u = g^k(p)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore, we have that $I_u \in S_u^{g^k((u, v)_{S^1})}$. Since $g^k(B)$ is the base of $S_u^{g^k((u, v)_{S^1})}$, $I_u \subset g^k(B)$. If $I_u \neq g^k(B)$, then \mathcal{G} lies on $g^k(B)$ by Proposition 5.14. This implies that the boundary leaf $\ell(B)$ lies on $g^k((u, v)_{S^1})$. However, it is a contradiction by Claim 14.7 and the fact that $p \notin g^k((u, v)_{S^1})$. Therefore, $I_u = g^k(B)$. By Proposition 5.14, this implies that $\mathcal{G} = g^k(\mathcal{G})$. Note that by the choice of k , g^k is a generator of $\langle g \rangle$. Thus, \mathcal{G} is preserved by g . By Proposition 14.5, if \mathcal{G} is a crown, g has a fixed point, but this contradict the assumption that g is elliptic. Hence, \mathcal{G} is an ideal polygon.

Now, we consider the case where $\sigma = 2$. Since p is a rainbow point, there is a I in \mathcal{L} containing p such that $I \cap g(I) = \emptyset$. We define S_p to be the set

$$\{J \in \mathcal{L} : p \in J \text{ and } J \cap g(J) = \emptyset\}.$$

As $I \in S_p$, S_p is not empty. Observe that for each $J \in S_p$, $p \in J$ and $g(p) \in J^*$, and so S_p is totally ordered by inclusion \subseteq . Then $B = \bigcup S_p \in \mathcal{L}$ and $B \in S_p$. If $B^* = g(B)$, the leaf $\ell(B)$ is the gap preserved by g .

Assume that $B^* \neq g(B)$. Now we consider the stem $S_B^{g(B)^*}$. If there is a K in $S_B^{g(B)^*} \setminus \{B, g(B)^*\}$, then $K \cap g(K) \neq \emptyset$ as $K \notin S_p$. Hence, $g(K)^* \subset K$ and so $g(K)^* \cap K^* = \emptyset$. Therefore, $g(K)^* \in S_p$ and $g(K)^* \subseteq B$. This implies that $B^* \subseteq g(K)$ and $g(B)^* \subseteq K$ since $\sigma = 2$. It is a contradiction by the choice of K . Hence, $S_B^{g(B)^*} = \{B, g(B)^*\}$. Thus, B^* is isolated.

By Proposition 3.8, there is a non-leaf gap \mathcal{G} containing B . Then, there is a J in \mathcal{G} containing $g(p)$. Observe that $J = g(B)$. Thus \mathcal{G} is the gap preserved by g and \mathcal{G} is also an ideal polygon. See Proposition 14.5. \square

15. LAMINAR AUTOMORPHISMS OF PSEUDO-FIBERED PAIRS

In this section, we begin to study groups acting on the circle preserving pseudo-fibered or veering pairs.

15.1. Classification of Automorphisms for a Pseudo-fibered Pair. In the first subsection, we present various classification results. We first begin with the study of dynamical properties of each individual element.

Lemma 15.2. *Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a pseudo-fibered pair and g a laminar automorphism in $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$. If g is parabolic, then for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, there is a crown in \mathcal{L}_i preserved by g whose pivot is the fixed point of g .*

Proof. Let p be the fixed point of g . Without loss of generality, we assume that $i = 1$. First, we consider the case where p is a rainbow point in \mathcal{L}_1 . Choose a point q in $S^1 \setminus \{p\}$. Since p is a rainbow point, there is a I in \mathcal{L}_1 containing $\{q, g(q)\}$ with $p \in I^*$. Then $v(\ell(I))$ and $v(\ell(g(I)))$ are linked. This is a contradiction. Therefore, p is an endpoint of \mathcal{L} or the pivot of a crown by Lemma 4.2.

Assume that p is a vertex of a leaf ℓ of \mathcal{L}_1 . Then, the distinct leaves $\{g^n(\ell)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ share p as a common vertex. This is a contradiction by Proposition 4.5. Therefore, p is the pivot of a crown \mathcal{G} . By Proposition 14.5, g preserves \mathcal{G} . \square

Now we would like to further analyze the case when we have a pair of lamination systems invariant under a homeomorphism with two or more fixed point. First note that if $g \in \text{Homeo}^+(S^1)$ has more than two fixed points and I is a connected component of the complement, then I is a good open interval.

Lemma 15.3. *Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a pseudo-fibered pair and let $g \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$. If $|\text{Fix}(g)| = 2$, then g is hyperbolic and each fixed point of g is a rainbow point in both \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 .*

Proof. Otherwise, it is easy to see that $\text{Fix}(g)$ is in both $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L}_1)$ and $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L}_2)$. This contradicts the strongly transversality. \square

Lemma 15.4. *Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a pseudo-fibered pair and let $g \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$. Then, for each leaf ℓ of \mathcal{C} , either $v(\ell) \subset \text{Fix}(g)$ or $v(\ell) \cap \text{Fix}(g) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that ℓ is a leaf of \mathcal{L}_1 . Assume that g fixes only one vertex p of ℓ . Then, the images of ℓ under iterations of g forms an infinite collection of leaves which all have p as a common vertex. This is a contradiction by Proposition 4.5. \square

Lemma 15.5. *Let \mathcal{L} be a quite full lamination system and let $g \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{L})$. Assume that g is a non-trivial automorphism with $|\text{Fix}(g)| \geq 2$. Let $I = (u, v)_{S^1}$ be a connected component of the complement of $\text{Fix}(g)$. Then neither u nor v is the pivot of a crown of \mathcal{L} .*

Proof. Suppose that \mathcal{G} is a crown in \mathcal{L} and u is the pivot of \mathcal{G} . By Proposition 14.5, g preserves \mathcal{G} . Then either g is parabolic or $v(\mathcal{G}) \subset \text{Fix}(g)$. Since g has at least two fixed points, g can not be parabolic. Hence, $v(\mathcal{G}) \subset \text{Fix}(g)$. However, as $v(\mathcal{G}) \cap I \neq \emptyset$, I must contain a fixed point of g . This is a contradiction since $I \subset S^1 \setminus \text{Fix}(g)$. Therefore, u is not a pivot. Similarly, v cannot be a pivot either. \square

Lemma 15.6. *Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a pseudo-fibered pair and let $g \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$. Suppose that g is a non-trivial automorphism with $|\text{Fix}(g)| > 2$. Then, for each component I of $S^1 \setminus \text{Fix}(g)$, $|\partial I \cap \text{E}(\mathcal{L}_i)| = 1$ for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$.*

Proof. Let $I = (u, v)_{S^1}$ be a connected component of the complement of $\text{Fix}(g)$. Our claim is that $|\partial I \cap \text{E}(\mathcal{L}_i)| = 1$ for each $i = 1, 2$.

By the fact that $\text{E}(\mathcal{L}_1) \cap \text{E}(\mathcal{L}_2) = \emptyset$ and Lemma 15.5, u is a rainbow point of one of \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 . Without loss of generality, let us assume that u is a rainbow point of \mathcal{L}_1 . Then there exists $J \in \mathcal{L}_1$ such

that $u \in J$, and one boundary point of J , say x , is in I and the other boundary point of J , say y , is in I^* . We may take such J so that $(v, y)_{S^1} \cap \text{Fix}(g) \neq \emptyset$ since $|\text{Fix}(g)| \geq 3$.

Replacing g by g^{-1} if necessary, we may assume that $\{g^n(J)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an increasing sequence of intervals. Since J^* contains at least two fixed point of g including v , $\{g^n(\ell(J))\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to a leaf ℓ' of \mathcal{L}_1 . Since g acts on I as a translation without fixed points and $\{g^n(x)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to v , ℓ' has v as a vertex. Therefore, $v \in E(\mathcal{L}_1)$.

Now in \mathcal{L}_2 , v is not an endpoint and not a pivot, hence by Lemma 4.2 it is a rainbow point. By the symmetric argument, then u must be an endpoint of \mathcal{L}_2 , which proves our claim. \square

Lemma 15.7. *Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a pseudo-fibered pair and let $g \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$. Suppose that g is a non-trivial automorphism with $|\text{Fix}(g)| > 2$. Then, there is a unique interleaving pair $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ of real gaps preserved by g . Furthermore, $v(\mathcal{G}_1) \cup v(\mathcal{G}_2) = \text{Fix}(g)$.*

Proof. By definition, we need to find a real gap \mathcal{G}_1 in \mathcal{L}_1 and a real gap \mathcal{G}_2 in \mathcal{L}_2 such that \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 are preserved by g and interleave.

Let $I = (u, v)_{S^1}$ be a connected component of $S^1 \setminus \text{Fix}(g)$. Note that I is a good open interval as $|\text{Fix}(g)| > 2$. Our first claim is that each boundary point of I is isolated in $\text{Fix}(g)$.

By Lemma 15.6, we may assume that u is a rainbow point of \mathcal{L}_1 and v is an end point of \mathcal{L}_1 . Then there exists $J \in \mathcal{L}_1$ such that $u \in J$, and one boundary point of J , say x , is in I and the other boundary point of J , say y , is in I^* . We may take such J so that $(v, y)_{S^1} \cap \text{Fix}(g) \neq \emptyset$ since $|\text{Fix}(g)| \geq 3$. By Lemma 15.4, there is another connected component $I_y = (s, t)_{S^1}$ of $S^1 \setminus \text{Fix}(g)$ containing y .

Replacing g by g^{-1} if necessary, we may assume that $\{g^n(J)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a decreasing sequence of intervals. Note that $\overline{g^{n+1}(J)} \subset g^n(J)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose there exists a fixed point of g , say p , in the open interval $(y, u)_{S^1}$. Then $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} g^n(J) \in \mathcal{L}_1$ and u is a boundary point of it, which is impossible since u is a rainbow point in \mathcal{L}_1 . This proves that $\text{Fix}(g) \cap (y, u)_{S^1} = \emptyset$, hence $t = u$ and u is an isolated fixed point. By a symmetrical argument using \mathcal{L}_2 , we know that v is an isolated fixed point too.

Now let $I' = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} g^{-i}(J)$. From the above, we know that $I' = (s, v)_{S^1}$ and u is the only fixed point of g in I' . Furthermore, since $v \in \text{Fix}(g)$, s is also fixed by g by Lemma 15.4. Let us denote s by u_1 . By applying the above argument to $(u_1, u)_{S^1}$ instead of I , we show that u_1 is isolated, and there exists $u_2 \in \text{Fix}(g)$, and so on by induction. Similarly, we have fixed points v_1, v_2, \dots on the other side of I .

In \mathcal{L}_1 , u is a rainbow point and since $v(\ell(I')) = \{u_1, v\}$, there is a leaf \mathcal{L}_1 connecting v to u_1 . Similarly in \mathcal{L}_2 , v is a rainbow point and there is a leaf in \mathcal{L}_2 connecting u to v_1 . It is possible that $u_2 = v_1$ and $u_3 = v$. In that case, these two leaves form a genuine stitch preserved by g .

Suppose not. In any case, u_1 is a rainbow point of \mathcal{L}_2 . Hence there is a leaf in \mathcal{L}_2 connecting u to u_2 . Similarly, there is also a leaf in \mathcal{L}_2 connecting v_1 to v_3 (we are not excluding the possibility of $v_3 = u_2$ here). Observe that $(u, v_1)_{S^1}^*$ is isolated in \mathcal{L}_2 as $(u_2, u)_{S^1}$, $(u, v_1)_{S^1}$, and $(v_1, v_3)_{S^1}$ are in \mathcal{L}_2 . Then, by Proposition 3.8, there is a non-leaf gap \mathcal{G}_2 of \mathcal{L}_2 containing $(u, v_1)_{S^1}$. Inductively, by Proposition 4.5 and Lemma 4.8, $(u_{2n}, u_{2(n-1)})_{S^1}$ and $(v_{2n-1}, v_{2(n+1)-1})_{S^1}$ are in \mathcal{G}_2 for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (here one uses the convention that $u = u_0$ and $v = v_0$). Similarly, there exists a gap \mathcal{G}_1 in \mathcal{L}_1 containing $(u_1, v)_{S^1}$ and \mathcal{G}_1 contains $(u_{2(n+1)-1}, u_{2n-1})_{S^1}$ and $(v_{2(n-1)}, v_{2n})_{S^1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Now there are two cases. First, it is possible that $u_n = v_m$ for some n, m . In that case, both \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 are ideal polygons. Otherwise, both \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 have infinitely many tips, therefore they are crowns. Since each crown has only one pivot, the only possibility is that both sequences $\{u_i\}$ and $\{v_i\}$ converge to the same point, say p , and p is the pivot of \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 . In any case, by construction, it is obvious that \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 are real gaps all of whose tips are fixed by g , and \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 interleave.

The claim that the set of vertices of \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 is precisely the set $\text{Fix}(g)$ is obviously by the construction. This ends the proof. \square

To classify a pseudo-fibered pair preserving homeomorphism on the circle, we need a slightly weaker notion of interleaving gaps. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a pair of quite full lamination systems. For convenience, we say that gaps \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 of \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 , respectively, *weakly interleave* if it is one of the following cases:

- (1) For each $i \in \{1, 2\}$ $\mathcal{G}_i = \{(u_n^i, u_{n+1}^i)_{S^1} : n \in \mathbb{Z}_{n_i}\}$ for some integer $n_i \geq 2$ and there is a natural number d dividing $\gcd(n_1, n_2)$ such that for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, whenever $u_n^i \in (u_m^{i+1}, u_{m+1}^{i+1})_{S^1}$, $u_{n+(n_i/d)}^i \in (u_{m+(n_{i+1}/d)}^{i+1}, u_{m+(n_{i+1}/d)+1}^{i+1})_{S^1}$ (cyclically indexed).

- (2) For each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $\mathcal{G}_i = \{(u_n^i, u_{n+1}^i)_{S^1} : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ and there are natural numbers d_1 and d_2 such that for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, whenever $u_n^i \in (u_m^{i+1}, u_{m+1}^{i+1})_{S^1}$, $u_{n+d_i}^i \in (u_{m+d_{i+1}}^{i+1}, u_{m+d_{i+1}+1}^{i+1})_{S^1}$ (cyclically indexed).

Also, we call the pair $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ a *weakly interleaving pair* of \mathcal{C} .




FIGURE 15.8. A weakly interleaving pair (left) and interleaving pairs (middle and right)

Now, summarizing what we have shown so far, we state the first main result of Part 3 as follows:

Theorem 15.9. *Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a pseudo-fibered pair. If g is a non-trivial laminar automorphism in $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$, then g falls into one of the following cases:*

- (1) g is elliptic and there is a weakly interleaving pair of ideal polygons of \mathcal{C} preserved by g .
- (2) g is parabolic and there is a weakly interleaving pair of crowns of \mathcal{C} preserved by g . Furthermore, the pivot of the crowns is the fixed point of g .
- (3) g is hyperbolic and each fixed point of g is a rainbow point in both \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 .
- (4) g is a pA-like automorphism without fixed point and there is an interleaving pair $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ of real ideal polygons preserved by g such that $v(\mathcal{G}_1) \cup v(\mathcal{G}_2) = \text{Per}(g)$.
- (5) g is a properly pseudo-Anosov and there is an interleaving pair $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ of real gaps preserved by g such that $v(\mathcal{G}_1) \cup v(\mathcal{G}_2) = \text{Fix}(g)$. Moreover, the tips of \mathcal{G}_i are attracting fixed points of g and the tips of \mathcal{G}_{i+1} are repelling fixed points of g for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$ (cyclically indexed). Therefore, we say that \mathcal{G}_i is the attracting gap of g and \mathcal{G}_{i+1} is the repelling gap of g .

Proof. First, we consider the case where $\text{Fix}(g) \neq \emptyset$. If g has only one fixed point p , then g is parabolic. By Lemma 15.2, there are crowns \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 in \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 , respectively, whose pivots are p and that are preserved by g .

To show that \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 weakly interleave, for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, we write $\mathcal{G}_i = \{(u_n^i, u_{n+1}^i)_{S^1} : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Observe that there are non-zero integers d_1 and d_2 such that d_1 and d_2 have same sign and for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $g(u_n^i) = u_{n+d_i}^i$ since g acts on $(p, p)_{S^1}$ as a translation without fixed point. This implies that \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 weakly interleave. This gives the case (2).

By Lemma 15.3, the case where g has exactly two fixed points is the case (3). Then, we consider the case where $|\text{Fix}(g)| \geq 3$. By Lemma 15.7, there is a unique interleaving pair $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ of real gaps preserved by g such that $v(\mathcal{G}_1) \cup v(\mathcal{G}_2) = \text{Fix}(g)$.

Note that for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, each tip of \mathcal{G}_i is a rainbow point in \mathcal{L}_{i+1} by Lemma 15.5 and Lemma 4.2. Fix a tip t of \mathcal{G}_1 . There is a unique element $(s_1, s_2)_{S^1}$ in \mathcal{G}_2 crossing over t and we can take an element J_t in \mathcal{L}_2 crossing over t so that $\overline{J_t} \subset (s_1, s_2)_{S^1}$. Then, either $g(\overline{J_t}) \subset J_t$ or $\overline{J_t} \subset g(J_t)$ since $\partial J_t \subset S^1 \setminus \text{Fix}(g)$. If $g(\overline{J_t}) \subset J_t$, then t is an attracting fixed point of g and, otherwise, t is a repelling fixed point of g . Without loss of generality, we may assume that t is an attracting fixed point.

As s_1 and s_2 are rainbow points in \mathcal{L}_1 , we can take two elements $(u_1, v_1)_{S^1}$ and $(u_2, v_2)_{S^1}$ in \mathcal{L}_1 crossing over s_1 and s_2 , respectively such that $v_1 \in (s_1, t)_{S^1}$ and $u_2 \in (t, s_2)_{S^1}$. Since t is an attracting fixed point, $g((v_1, t)_{S^1}) = (g(v_1), t)_{S^1} \subsetneq (v_1, t)_{S^1}$ and $g((t, u_2)_{S^1}) = (t, g(u_2))_{S^1} \subsetneq (t, u_2)_{S^1}$. Hence, we get that $[u_1, v_1]_{S^1} \subset g((u_1, v_1)_{S^1})$ and $[u_2, v_2]_{S^1} \subset g((u_2, v_2)_{S^1})$. Therefore, s_1 and s_2 are repelling fixed points of g . Inductively, applying similar arguments to tips of \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 , we can conclude that the tips of \mathcal{G}_1 are attracting fixed points and the tips of \mathcal{G}_2 are repelling fixed points. This implies the case (5).

Now, we consider the case where g has no fixed point. By Lemma 14.3, $\text{Per}(g)$ is not empty. Then, we can take a minimal natural number $k > 1$ such that $\text{Per}(g) \subset \text{Fix}(g^k)$. Note that $\text{Per}(g) = \text{Fix}(g^k)$ as $\text{Fix}(g^k) \subset \text{Per}(g)$ by definition. Then, if $\text{Fix}(g^k) = S^1$, then g is an elliptic automorphism of order k . This is the case (1) by Lemma 14.6.

Assume that $\text{Fix}(g^k) \neq S^1$. If $|\text{Fix}(g^k)| = 1$, then $|\text{Per}(g)| = 1$ and so g has a fixed point. This is a contraction to the assumption. If $|\text{Fix}(g^k)| = 2$, then g has exactly two periodic points p_1 and p_2 with $g(p_1) = p_2$ and so $k = 2$. By Lemma 15.3, g^2 is a hyperbolic automorphism with $\text{Fix}(g^2) = \{p_1, p_2\}$. We say that p_1 is the attracting fixed point of g^2 and p_2 is the repelling fixed point of g^2 . Then, the hyperbolic automorphism $g \circ g^2 \circ g^{-1}$ also has $g(p_1) = p_2$ as the attracting fixed point. On the other hand, $g \circ g^2 \circ g^{-1} = g^2$ and so p_2 is also the repelling fixed points of $g \circ g^2 \circ g^{-1}$. This is a contradiction. Therefore, $|\text{Fix}(g^k)| > 2$.

Now, we can apply Lemma 15.7 to g^k . Then, there is a unique interleaving pair $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ of real gaps preserved by g^k with $v(\mathcal{G}_1) \cup v(\mathcal{G}_2) = \text{Fix}(g^k)$. Also, $(g(\mathcal{G}_1), g(\mathcal{G}_2))$ is a unique interleaving pair preserved by $g \circ g^2 \circ g^{-1}$. By the uniqueness of the interleaving pair and the fact that $g \circ g^2 \circ g^{-1} = g^2$, $g(\mathcal{G}_i) = \mathcal{G}_i$ for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$. When \mathcal{G}_i are crowns, g fixed the pivot of $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$. This is a contradiction by assumption. Therefore, \mathcal{G}_i are ideal polygons preserved by g . Also, $\text{Per}(g) = v(\mathcal{G}_1) \cup v(\mathcal{G}_2)$ since $\text{Per}(g) = \text{Fix}(g^k)$. This shows the case (4). \square

We may simplify Theorem 15.9 in the following form.

Corollary 15.10. *Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a pseudo-fibered pair. Each non-trivial automorphism in $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$ is either a hyperbolic automorphism or an automorphism preserving a weakly interleaving pair.*

Corollary 15.11. *Let \mathcal{C} be a pseudo-fibered pair. Then, for each $g \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$, $\text{Per}(g) = \text{Per}(g^n)$ for all non-zero $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 15.9. \square

For clarity, we restate Theorem 15.9 for automorphism of veering pairs.

Theorem 15.12. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. If g is a non-trivial laminar automorphism in $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$, then g falls into one of the following cases:*

- (1) g is elliptic and there is an interleaving pair of ideal polygons of \mathcal{V} preserved by g .
- (2) g is parabolic and there is an interleaving pair of crowns of \mathcal{V} preserved by g . Furthermore, the pivot of the crowns is the fixed point of g .
- (3) g is hyperbolic and each fixed point of g is a rainbow point in both \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 .
- (4) g is a pA-like automorphism without fixed point and there is an interleaving pair $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ of real ideal polygons preserved by g such that $v(\mathcal{G}_1) \cup v(\mathcal{G}_2) = \text{Per}(g)$.
- (5) g is a properly pseudo-Anosov and there is an interleaving pair $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ of real gaps preserved by g such that $v(\mathcal{G}_1) \cup v(\mathcal{G}_2) = \text{Fix}(g)$. Moreover, \mathcal{G}_i is the attracting gap of g and \mathcal{G}_{i+1} is the repelling gap of g for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$ (cyclically indexed).

15.13. Relationship with Pants-like COL_2 Pairs. In this section, we explain how to extend a pseudo-fibered pair to a pants-like pair. As a result, every group which preserves a pseudo-fibered pair is a pants-like COL_2 group. Recall from [Bai15] that for a subgroup $G \leq \text{Homeo}^+(S^1)$, we say that G is pants-like COL_2 if there is a pair $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ of very full lamination systems satisfying the followings:

- $G \leq \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$,
- \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 are transverse, that is, $\mathcal{L}_1 \cap \mathcal{L}_2 = \emptyset$, and
- the set $E(\mathcal{L}_1) \cap E(\mathcal{L}_2)$ is precisely the set of the cusp points of G (i.e., the fixed points of parabolic elements of G).

We also call such a pair \mathcal{C} a pants-like pair for G .

For future reference, we start with a pair of laminations which satisfies weaker conditions than those of a pseudo-fibered pair. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a pair of quite full lamination systems that are strongly transverse, namely, $E(\mathcal{L}_1) \cap E(\mathcal{L}_2) = \emptyset$. In this section, given a subgroup G of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$, we are going to construct a pair of very full lamination systems $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_1$ and $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_2$ which contains \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 , respectively, so that $\{\overline{\mathcal{L}}_1, \overline{\mathcal{L}}_2\}$ is a pants-like pair for G .

In this subsection, we will abuse the language a bit and treat \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 as circle laminations instead of lamination systems in the following sense. Given a lamination system \mathcal{L} , we call a subset \mathcal{G} of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L})$ a gap in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L})$ if there is a gap \mathcal{G} in \mathcal{L} such that $\mathcal{G} = \{\epsilon(\ell(I)) : I \in \mathcal{G}\}$. We denote \mathcal{G} by $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{G})$.

Fix a subgroup G of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$. We write $\Lambda_1 = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L}_1)$ and $\Lambda_2 = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L}_2)$ for the circle laminations associated with \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 . Let \mathcal{G} be a crown in \mathcal{L}_1 and let p be its pivot. We write $\mathcal{G} = \{(t_n, t_{n+1})_{S^1} : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ and $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{G})$. First, we note that if g is a nontrivial element of G , then $\text{Stab}_G(g(\mathcal{G})) = g \text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G}) g^{-1}$ where for a group G acting on a set X and for any subset Y of X , $\text{Stab}_G(Y)$ denotes the stabilizer of

Y under the G -action. Hence, if we add leaves in Λ_1 dividing \mathcal{G} into ideal polygons so that the result is $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ -invariant, then one can just add the orbit of those leaves under the G -action to get a new G -invariant circle lamination which contains Λ_1 .

Only thing we need to be cautious here is that we would like to have $p \in E(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_1)$ if and only if $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ contains a parabolic element. Here is how we achieve this.

If all elements in $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ fix all tips of \mathcal{G} , then it actually does not matter what we do inside the gap \mathcal{G} . Hence, in this case, we add leaves $\{\{t_n, t_{-n}\} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ in \mathcal{G} so that \mathcal{G} is decomposed into ideal polygons and there exists a rainbow at p consisting of the new leaves in \mathcal{G} .

If there exists a parabolic element h in G which fixes the pivot of \mathcal{G} and preserves \mathcal{G} , then one can just add leaves $\{\{t_n, p\} : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ in \mathcal{G} so that each tip of \mathcal{G} is connected to the pivot p in \mathcal{G} by a leaf. Then such leaves are permuted by h . In any case, we have the extended \mathcal{G} is still $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ -invariant, so by adding their G -orbit, one gets a lamination which contains Λ_1 and has one less orbit class of crowns.

Note that there are at most countably many crowns in \mathcal{L}_1 . By repeating this process inductively for all orbit classes of crowns, we get a very full lamination $\overline{\Lambda}_1$ which contains Λ_1 . Now, we say that $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_1$ is the lamination system associated with $\overline{\Lambda}_1$. Then, $\mathcal{L}_1 \subset \overline{\mathcal{L}}_1$. Similarly, we can obtain an extended lamination system $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_2$ for \mathcal{L}_2 .

Then, we observe the following claim.

Claim 15.14. If g is a parabolic element of G with $\text{Fix}(g) = \{p\}$, then for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, p is either an end point of \mathcal{L}_i or the pivot of a crown in \mathcal{L}_i preserved by g .

Proof. Observe that p can not be a rainbow point in each \mathcal{L}_i . Thus, the claim follows from Lemma 4.2. \square

Then, there are two possible case on a cusp point p of G by Claim 15.14 and the fact that \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 are strongly transverse. One is that p is a pivot point in both \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 . The other case is that there is $i \in \{1, 2\}$ such that p is a pivot in \mathcal{L}_i and an end point of \mathcal{L}_{i+1} (cyclically indexed). In both cases, p is a common end point of $E(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_1)$ and $E(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_2)$ from the construction of $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_i$.

From the construction of $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_i$, $E(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_i) \setminus E(\mathcal{L}_i)$ consist of the pivots of crowns in \mathcal{L}_i which are fixed by some parabolic elements of G , i.e., they are cusp points of G . A point in $E(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_1) \cap E(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_2)$ is such a cusp point or a point already in $E(\mathcal{L}_1) \cap E(\mathcal{L}_2)$ but $E(\mathcal{L}_1) \cap E(\mathcal{L}_2) = \emptyset$ by assumption. Hence, we get that $E(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_1) \cap E(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_2)$ is precisely the set of all cusp points of G and the pair $\{\overline{\mathcal{L}}_1, \overline{\mathcal{L}}_2\}$ is a desired one which makes G a pants-like COL_2 group.

15.15. Classification of Elementary Groups. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a pseudo-fibered pair and G a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$. Let \mathcal{G} be a gap of \mathcal{C} , and we now study the structure of $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$. In the case where \mathcal{G} is a crown, an element of $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ is called a *guardian of the crown* \mathcal{G} , or more shortly just a GOC element. Let $\overline{\mathcal{C}} = \{\overline{\mathcal{L}}_1, \overline{\mathcal{L}}_2\}$ be a pants-like pair for G constructed in Section 15.13. The collection of ideal polygons in $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_i$ which is just a decomposition of a crown in \mathcal{L}_i is called a *fractured crown*. More generally, we call the process of obtaining $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_i$ from \mathcal{L}_i described in Section 15.13 *fracturing* \mathcal{L}_i . Note that any element of G which preserves a fractured crown in $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_i$ is a GOC element in the perspective of \mathcal{L}_i .

Recall that a descending sequence of elements $\{I_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in a lamination system is called a rainbow at p if $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} I_n = \{p\}$ for some $p \in S^1$. If a descending sequence of elements $\{I_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in a lamination system satisfies that $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{I_n} = \{p\}$ for some $p \in S^1$, then we call it a *quasi-rainbow* at p . Note that in our case, all quasi-rainbows in \mathcal{L}_i are actually rainbows by Proposition 4.5, but in the fractured lamination systems $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_i$, there are new quasi-rainbows at pivot points of fractured crowns.

For a lamination system \mathcal{L} and for a subgroup G of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{L})$, suppose that there exists a quasi-rainbow $\{I_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ at $x \in S^1$. A sequence $\{(g_n, I_n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of elements of $G \times \mathcal{L}$ is called a *pre-approximation sequence* at x if there is a point y in S^1 such that $g_n(y) \in I_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Since $\{\overline{\mathcal{L}}_1, \overline{\mathcal{L}}_2\}$ is a pants-like pair for G in the sense of [Bai15], the following lemma from [BK20] holds.

Lemma 15.16 ([BK21]). *Suppose that we have a sequence $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of elements of S^1 converging to $x \in S^1$ and a sequence $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of distinct elements of G such that $\{g_n(x_n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$ converges to $x' \in S^1$. Then we can have one of the following cases:*

- (1) *there is a subsequence $\{g_{n_k}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ such that $g_{n_k}(x) = x'$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$;*
- (2) *there is a subsequence $\{g_{n_k}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ and a quasi-rainbow $\{I_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ at x' in $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_i$ for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$ such that the sequence $\{(g_{n_k}, I_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is a pre-approximation sequence at x' ;*

- (3) there is a subsequence $\{g_{n_k}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ and a quasi-rainbow $\{I_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ at x in $\overline{\mathcal{L}_i}$ for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$ such that the sequence $\{(g_{n_k}^{-1}, I_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is a pre-approximation sequence at x .

Here is the key lemma of the current section.

Lemma 15.17. *Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a pseudo-fibered pair and G a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$. Assume that G is not trivial. If G preserves an open interval $I = (u, v)_{S^1}$ and faithfully and freely acts on I , then there is an automorphism g generating G so that G is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} and acts on I as a translation without fixed point.*

Proof. Choose a point p in I . The set $G \cdot p$ is the orbit of p in I under the G -action. Suppose that there is a sequence $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of distinct elements of G such that the sequence $\{g_n(p)\}_{n=1}^\infty$ converges to a point q in I . By Lemma 15.16, there is a subsequence $\{g_{n_k}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ of $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ and a quasi-rainbow $\{I_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ in some $\overline{\mathcal{L}_i}$ such that either $\{(g_{n_k}, I_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is a pre-approximation sequence at p or $\{(g_{n_k}^{-1}, I_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is a pre-approximation sequence at q . Otherwise, $g_n(p) = g_m(p) = q$ for some $n \neq m$. This implies that the non-trivial element $g_n^{-1} \circ g_m$ in G has a fixed point p in I . This is a contradiction by assumption.

If $\{(g_{n_k}, I_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is a pre-approximation sequence at p , then there is a point x_p in S^1 such that $g_{n_k}(x_p) \in I_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, since $\bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{I_k} = \{p\}$ and $p \in I$, there is a natural number N such that $\overline{I_k} \subset I$ for all $k > N$. Fix $k_0 > N$. Then

$$x_p \in g_{n_{k_0}}^{-1}(I_{n_{k_0}}) \cap g_{n_{k_0+1}}^{-1}(I_{n_{k_0+1}}) \subseteq g_{n_{k_0}}^{-1}(I_{n_{k_0}}) \cap g_{n_{k_0+1}}^{-1}(I_{n_{k_0}}).$$

Therefore,

$$g_{n_{k_0+1}} g_{n_{k_0}}^{-1}(I_{n_{k_0}}) \cap I_{n_{k_0}} \neq \emptyset.$$

Note that $g_{n_{k_0+1}} g_{n_{k_0}}^{-1}$ is not the identity element since $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is a sequence of distinct elements of G . Then, by unlinkedness, there are three cases:

- (1) $g_{n_{k_0+1}} g_{n_{k_0}}^{-1}(I_{n_{k_0}}) \subseteq I_{n_{k_0}}$;
- (2) $I_{n_{k_0}} \subseteq g_{n_{k_0+1}} g_{n_{k_0}}^{-1}(I_{n_{k_0}})$;
- (3) $g_{n_{k_0+1}} g_{n_{k_0}}^{-1}(I_{n_{k_0}}^*) \subseteq I_{n_{k_0}}$.

The case where $g_{n_{k_0+1}} g_{n_{k_0}}^{-1}(I_{n_{k_0}}^*) \subseteq I_{n_{k_0}}$ does not occur since every element in G preserves I and fixes u and v . In the remaining cases, there is a fixed point of $g_{n_{k_0+1}} g_{n_{k_0}}^{-1}$ in $\overline{I_{n_{k_0}}}$. Hence, $g_{n_{k_0+1}} g_{n_{k_0}}^{-1}$ has a fixed point in I . This is a contradiction since $I \cap \text{Fix}(g_{n_{k_0+1}} g_{n_{k_0}}^{-1}) = \emptyset$ by assumption. In the case where $\{(g_{n_k}^{-1}, I_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is a pre-approximation sequence at q , we can do in a similar way. Therefore, for any p in I , $G \cdot p$ has no limit point in I . Hence, $G \cdot p$ is a countable closed subset of I since the set $G \cdot p$ is a discrete closed subset of I .

Fix p in I . Then, there is a connected component of $I \setminus G \cdot p$ which is $(g(p), p)_{S^1}$ for some g in G . Now, we show that G is generated by g . Let $\langle g \rangle$ be the subgroup of G generated by g . Suppose that h is an element in $G \setminus \langle g \rangle$. Then there is an integer m in \mathbb{Z} such that $h(p) \in [g^{m+1}(p), g^m(p)]_{S^1}$ since

$$I = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} [g^{n+1}(p), g^n(p)]_{S^1}.$$

Therefore, $g^{-m} h(p) \in [g(p), p]_{S^1} \cap G \cdot p = \{g(p), p\}$ and since G acts freely on I , $g^{-m} h = g$ or $g^{-m} h = \text{Id}_G$. Hence, $h = g^{m+1}$ or $h = g^m$. This is a contradiction since $h \notin \langle g \rangle$. Thus, $G = \langle g \rangle$. \square

Theorem 15.18. *Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a pseudo-fibered pair and G a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$. If G has an infinite cyclic normal subgroup, G is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} , the infinite dihedral group, $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}_n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n > 1$, or $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$. Furthermore, one of the following cases holds.*

- (1) When $G \cong \mathbb{Z}$,
 - (a) G is generated by a parabolic automorphism,
 - (b) G is generated by a hyperbolic automorphism, or
 - (c) G is generated by a pA-like automorphism.
- (2) When G is isomorphic to the infinite dihedral group, G is generated by an hyperbolic automorphism g and an elliptic automorphism e of order two, and so $G = \langle g, e \mid e^2 = 1, ege = g^{-1} \rangle$.
- (3) When $G \cong \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}_n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n > 1$, G preserves a unique interleaving pair of ideal polygons of \mathcal{C} and there is a pA-like automorphism g and an elliptic automorphism e of order n such that $G = \langle g \rangle \times \langle e \rangle$.
- (4) When $G \cong \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$, G preserves a unique asterisk of crowns of \mathcal{C} and there is a properly pseudo-Anosov g and a parabolic automorphism h such that $G = \langle g \rangle \times \langle h \rangle$.

Proof. Let $\langle h \rangle$ be a normal subgroup of G for some infinite order element h .

Claim 15.19. Every element in G preserves $\text{Per}(h)$. Therefore, $\text{Per}(h) \subset \text{Per}(g)$ for all $g \in G$.

Proof. Choose g in G . Since H is normal in G , $ghg^{-1} = h^n$ for some non-zero $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then, by Corollary 15.11, $g(\text{Per}(h)) = \text{Per}(ghg^{-1}) = \text{Per}(h^n) = \text{Per}(h)$. \square

Given $g \in G$, we have $ghg^{-1} = h^n$ and $g^{-1}hg = h^m$ for some $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$. We compute $h = g^{-1}h^n g = (h^m)^n = h^{mn}$. Since h is not of finite order, we know that $mn = 1$. This shows that for any $g \in G$, we have either $ghg^{-1} = h$ or $ghg^{-1} = h^{-1}$.

We split the cases according to the type of h . Note that the possible types of h are parabolic, hyperbolic and pA-like.

Case 1: h is a parabolic automorphism preserving a weakly interleaving pair of crowns $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$.

If all non-trivial elements of G are parabolic, then they share the same fixed point as h . We apply Lemma 15.17 to conclude that G is cyclic. Suppose that there is a non-trivial $g \in G$ that has more than one fixed point. Observe that g must be properly pseudo-Anosov with $\text{Fix}(g) = v(\mathcal{G}_1) \cup v(\mathcal{G}_2)$; otherwise g maps the h -invariant crowns to another crowns, which is not allowed. Hence, $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ is an interleaving pair. By Lemma 15.17, we know that the set G_{pA} of properly pseudo-Anosovs together with the identity is a cyclic group generated by a properly pseudo-Anosov $g_0 \in G$.

Let $h_0 \in G$ be a parabolic element that has the smallest translation on the set of vertices of \mathcal{G} . We claim that $g_0 h_0 g_0^{-1} = h_0$. We prove this by mean of contradiction. Hence assume that $g_0 h_0 g_0^{-1} = h_0^{-1}$. Let v be a fixed point of g_0 that is a tip of \mathcal{G}_1 . Then, we have that $h_0(v) = g_0 h_0 g_0^{-1}(v) = h_0^{-1}(v)$, which is absurd. Thus, $g_0 h_0 g_0^{-1} = h_0$.

It is clear that h_0 and g_0 generate G ; for any $g \in G$, since h_0 has the smallest translation on $v(\mathcal{G}_1)$, there is $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $h_0^m g$ fixes $v(\mathcal{G}_1) \cup v(\mathcal{G}_2)$ pointwise, i.e., $h_0^m g$ is in G_{pA} . Therefore, G is abelian as $[g_0, h_0] = 1$. Thus, it follows that G is either $\langle h_0 \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}$ for some parabolic h_0 or $G = \langle h_0 \rangle \times \langle g_0 \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ for some parabolic h_0 and properly pseudo-Anosov g_0 .

Case 2: h is hyperbolic.

In this case, any $g \in G$ permutes two fixed points of h and this action gives rise to a homomorphism $\psi : G \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$. Note that each non-trivial element in $\ker \psi$ can not be pA-like because if it were, two fixed points of $\text{Fix}(h)$ would be tips of a crown or polygon, violating Lemma 15.3 and Lemma 4.8. Hence, each non-trivial element of $\ker \psi$ is hyperbolic and $\ker \psi$ acts faithfully and freely on each component of $S^1 \setminus \text{Fix}(h)$. By Lemma 15.17, $\ker \psi$ is an infinite cyclic group generated by a hyperbolic h_0 . If $\ker \psi = G$, we are done.

If not, we take any $g \in G \setminus \ker \psi$. Since $g^2 \in \ker \psi$, g is either elliptic of order two or pA-like. As the kernel has no pA-like automorphism, g is an elliptic element of order two. We claim now that $gh_0g^{-1} = h_0^{-1}$. Suppose, on the contrary, that $gh_0g^{-1} = h_0$. Choose a neighborhood U of the attracting fixed point of h_0 so that $g(U) \cap U = \emptyset$. Let $x \in U \setminus \text{Fix}(h_0)$. Choose a large enough n such that $h_0^n g^{-1}(x) \in U$ and $h_0^n(x) \in U$. Because $h_0^n g^{-1}(x) \in U$ and because $g(U) \cap U = \emptyset$, we have that $gh_0^n g^{-1}(x) \notin U$. On the other hand, $gh_0^n g^{-1}(x) = h_0^n(x) \in U$, a contradiction. Therefore, $gh_0g^{-1} = h_0^{-1}$. We therefore have shown that G is either $\langle h_0 \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}$ for some hyperbolic h_0 or the infinite dihedral group $\langle h_0, g \mid g^2 = 1, gh_0g^{-1} = h_0^{-1} \rangle$ for some hyperbolic h_0 and elliptic g of order two.

Case 3: h is pA-like with an interleaving invariant pair $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ of crowns or polygons.

First assume that $\text{Per}(h)$ is finite, equivalently, \mathcal{G}_i are polygons. Since any $g \in G$ cyclically permutes $\text{Per}(h)$, we have a homomorphism $\psi : G \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. As $\ker \psi$ faithfully and freely acts on each component of $S^1 \setminus \text{Per}(h)$, by Lemma 15.17, we know that $\ker \psi$ is cyclic generated by some properly pseudo-Anosov h_0 .

If $G \setminus \ker \psi$ is not empty, we choose g in $G \setminus \ker \psi$ so that $\psi(g)$ generates the cyclic group $G/\ker \psi \leq \mathbb{Z}_n$. As $g^n \in \ker \psi$, we know that g is either pA-like or elliptic with the same invariant interleaving pair $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$. Either cases, we claim that $gh_0g^{-1} = h_0$. By the method of contradiction, we assume that $gh_0g^{-1} = h_0^{-1}$. Pick a neighborhood U near an attracting fixed point of h_0 so that U avoids small neighborhood of the set of repelling fixed points of h_0 . Let $x \in U \setminus \text{Fix}(h_0)$. There is large $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $h_0^m g^{-1}(x) \in g^{-1}(U)$ and $h_0^{-m}(x) \notin U$. We then have that $gh_0^m g^{-1}(x) \in U$. But $gh_0^m g^{-1}(x) = h_0^{-m}(x) \notin U$, a contradiction. This shows that G is an abelian group generated by h_0 and g . By elementary algebra, we can see that G is either an infinite cyclic group generated by a pA-like automorphism or $\langle f \rangle \times \langle e \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}_k$ for some pA-like f and some elliptic e of order k .

Finally, suppose that $\text{Per}(h)$ is not finite, namely, \mathcal{G}_i are crowns. Then any nontrivial $g \in G$ is either parabolic or properly pseudo-Anosov. If all non-trivial elements of G are properly pseudo-Anosov, we know

that $G = \langle h_0 \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}$ for some $h_0 \in G$. If not, consider the subgroup $G_{pA} = \{g \in G : g \text{ is properly pseudo-Anosov or trivial}\}$ and choose an element $p \in G$ that has the smallest translation on $v(\mathcal{G}_1)$. G_{pA} is cyclic generated by, say, f . Then by the same argument as in Case 2, we see that $pf p^{-1} = f$. By the same argument as in Case 1, p and f generate G . Therefore, $G \cong \langle f \rangle \times \langle p \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$. \square

Remark 15.20. Theorem 15.18 gives the strong Tits alternative questioned in [ABS19]. In [ABS19], they showed the Tits alternative for the automorphism group of a pseudo-fibered pair of very full laminations with the countable fixed point condition that every element has at most countable fixed points. $\quad //$

15.21. Classification of Gap Stabilizers.

Theorem 15.22. *Let \mathcal{C} be a pseudo-fibered pair and G be a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$. Then, the non-trivial stabilizer $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ of a gap \mathcal{G} of \mathcal{C} falls into one of the following cases.*

- (1) *When \mathcal{G} is an ideal polygon,*
 - (a) $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ is generated by an elliptic automorphism e of order n in $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ and so $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G}) \cong \mathbb{Z}_n$.
 - (b) $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ is generated by a pA-like element in $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ without fixed point and $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G}) \cong \mathbb{Z}$.
 - (c) $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ is generated by a properly pseudo-Anosov in $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G}) \cong \mathbb{Z}$.
 - (d) $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ is generated by a pA-like automorphism g and an elliptic automorphism e of order n in $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{G})$ and

$$\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G}) = \langle g, e \mid [g, e] = 1, e^n = 1 \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}_n.$$

- (2) *When \mathcal{G} is a crown,*
 - (a) $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ is generated by a parabolic element in $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{G})$ and $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G}) \cong \mathbb{Z}$.
 - (b) $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ is generated by a properly pseudo-Anosov in $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{G})$ and $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G}) \cong \mathbb{Z}$.
 - (c) $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ is generated by a properly pseudo-Anosov g and a parabolic element h in $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{G})$ and

$$\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G}) = \langle g, h \mid [g, h] = 1 \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}.$$

Proof. Let \mathcal{G} be a gap of \mathcal{C} . First, we consider the case where \mathcal{G} is an ideal polygon. Then, by Theorem 15.9, each non-trivial element in $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ is elliptic or pA-like.

If there is no pA-like automorphism, then every element in $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ is elliptic. Choose a tip t of \mathcal{G} . Observe that the orbit $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G}) \cdot t$ has at least two points. Then, we may take an automorphism g in $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ such that the good interval $(t, g(t))_{S^1}$ is a connected component of $S^1 \setminus \text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G}) \cdot t$. Let n be the order of g . Then,

$$\bigcup_{k=1}^n (g^{k-1}(t), g^k(t))_{S^1} = S^1 \setminus \text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G}) \cdot t$$

and so $\langle g \rangle \cdot t = \text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G}) \cdot t$. Hence, for any non-trivial h in $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$, $h(t) = g^{k_0}(t)$ for some k_0 in \mathbb{Z} . Then, $g^{-k_0}h$ fixes t and $g^{-k_0}h$ is the identity. Therefore, $h = g^{k_0}$ and g generates $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$. This is the first case where \mathcal{G} is an ideal polygon.

Assume that there is a pA-like automorphism in $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$. This implies that there is a properly pseudo-Anosov in $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ by powering the pA-like automorphism. Also, by Theorem 15.9, there is an interleaving gap \mathcal{H} of \mathcal{G} . Without loss of generality, we may assume that $(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H})$ is an interleaving pair.

Let H be the set of all properly pseudo-Anosov automorphisms in $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ with the identity. Then, H is a normal subgroup of $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$. Note that by Theorem 15.9, $\text{Fix}(g) = v(\mathcal{G}) \cup v(\mathcal{H})$ for all $g \in \text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$. Then, H faithfully and freely on each connected component of $S^1 \setminus (v(\mathcal{G}) \cup v(\mathcal{H}))$ and by Lemma 15.17, there is a properly pseudo-Anosov h generating H . Therefore, H is an infinite cyclic normal subgroup of $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$. Thus, the result follows from Theorem 15.18 and the fact that every non-trivial element in $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ is either elliptic or pA-like.

Now, we assume that \mathcal{G} is a crown. Then, by Theorem 15.9, each non-trivial element in $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ is a parabolic element or a properly pseudo-Anosov.

If there is no properly pseudo-Anosov in $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$, then every element in $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ is parabolic. Choose a tip t of \mathcal{G} . Then, we may take an automorphism g in $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ such that $(t, g(t))_{S^1}$ is a connected component of $S^1 \setminus \text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G}) \cdot t$. Note that $\langle g \rangle \cdot t = \text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G}) \cdot t$. For any h in $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$, $h(t) = g^n(t)$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. As $g^{-n}h$ fixes t and there is no properly pseudo-Anosov in $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$, $g^{-n}h = 1$ and so $h = g^n$. Therefore, $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ is generated by the parabolic automorphism g .

Otherwise, there is a properly pseudo-Anosov in $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ and so there is an interleaving crown \mathcal{H} of \mathcal{G} . Without loss of generality, we may assume that $(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H})$ is an interleaving pair. Let H be the set of all properly pseudo-Anosov elements in $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$. We can see that H is a normal subgroup of $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$. Note that $\text{Fix}(g) = v(\mathcal{G}) \cup v(\mathcal{H})$ for all non-trivial g in H . Hence, the subgroup H faithfully and freely acts on each connected components of $S^1 \setminus (v(\mathcal{G}) \cup v(\mathcal{H}))$. By Lemma 15.17, there is a properly Anosov g generating H . Therefore, H is an infinite cyclic normal subgroup of $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$. Thus, the result follows from Theorem 15.18 and the fact that every non-trivial element in $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ is a parabolic element or a properly pseudo-Anosov. \square

Recall that for each non-zero integer m and n , the *Baumslag-Solitar group* $\text{BS}(m, n)$ is given by the group presentation

$$\langle a, b \mid ba^mb^{-1} = a^n \rangle.$$

Corollary 15.23. *Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a pseudo-fibered pair. If a Baumslag-Solitar group $\text{BS}(m, n)$ is contained in $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$, $m = n = 1$.*

Proof. We split the cases. Recall that $\text{BS}(m, n)$ is torsion-free. Hence, a is parabolic, hyperbolic, or pA-like.

Case 1: a is parabolic. Let $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ be the a -invariant asterisk of crowns. We order the set of tips of \mathcal{G}_1 counter-clockwise so that a maps a tip t_i to t_{i+d} for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\text{Per}(a^n) = \text{Per}(a^m) = \text{Per}(a)$ by Corollary 15.11, b permutes $\text{Per}(a)$. Hence, by Proposition 14.5 and Theorem 15.9, b is either a properly pA-like or a parabolic automorphism with the same invariant asterisk $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ of crowns. In either cases, choose any tip t_i of \mathcal{G}_1 . Then $t_{i+md} = ba^mb^{-1}(t_i) = a^n(t_i) = t_{i+nd}$. This shows that $m = n$ and that $\langle a^m \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}$ is an infinite cyclic normal subgroup of $\text{BS}(m, m)$. Therefore, by Theorem 15.18, $\text{BS}(m, m)$ is \mathbb{Z} , $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}_n$, $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ or an infinite dihedral group. Among them, only $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \cong \text{BS}(1, 1)$ can be a Baumslag-Solitar group.

Case 2: a is hyperbolic. We know that b permutes two fixed points of a . If b fixes $\text{Fix}(a)$ pointwise, we know that $\langle a, b \rangle$ is in fact cyclic, which is not a Baumslag-Solitar group. See the proof of Theorem 15.18. Hence, b must exchange two fixed points of a . However, in this case, $\langle a, b \rangle$ contains an elliptic element of order two, which is a contradiction.

Case 3: a is a pA-like automorphism preserving an asterisk $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ of \mathcal{C} . Then, by Proposition 14.5 and Theorem 15.9, b is either a parabolic or pA-like automorphism preserving $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$. Then, by Theorem 15.22, $\text{BS}(m, n) \leq \text{Stab}_{\text{BS}(m, n)}(\mathcal{G}_i)$ and so $\text{BS}(m, n)$ is abelian. Hence, we get that $a^m = ba^mb^{-1} = a^n$ and $m = n$. Therefore, $\langle a^m \rangle$ is an infinite cyclic normal subgroup of $\text{BS}(m, m)$. Therefore, we have that $\langle a, b \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \cong \text{BS}(1, 1)$ as in Case 1. \square

This corollary is a supportive evidence for that $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$ is hyperbolic or relatively hyperbolic. See [Bes04, Q1.1].

15.24. 2-Torsions and the Canonical Marking. We show that given a veering pair $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$, each laminar group $G \leq \text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$ canonically gives rise to a G -invariant marking \mathbf{M} .

The following lemma shows that no two fixed points of elliptic elements of order two can sit on a same leaf.

Lemma 15.25. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair. Suppose that there are elliptic elements e_1 and e_2 in $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$. If e_1 and e_2 preserve a leaf ℓ of \mathcal{V} , then both e_1 and e_2 preserve a common stitch in the thread $\mathcal{O}(\ell)$.*

Proof. Since e_1 and e_2 preserve a leaf of \mathcal{V} , we know that both e_1 and e_2 are of order 2. Without loss of generality, we may assume that ℓ is a leaf of \mathcal{L}_1 . Let ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 be leaves of \mathcal{L}_2 that are linked to ℓ and preserved by e_1 and e_2 respectively. See Theorem 15.12.

If $\ell_1 \neq \ell_2$, the composition $g := e_1e_2$ is not the identity and has at least two fixed points the vertices of ℓ . Hence g is either hyperbolic or properly pseudo-Anosov by Theorem 15.12. Note that g cannot be hyperbolic because no leaf can have hyperbolic fixed points as its vertices. Hence, g is properly pseudo-Anosov like preserving ℓ .

Then, there is a stitch $s = (\ell, m)$ preserved by g such that $\text{Fix}(g) = v(\ell) \cup v(m)$.

Observe that

$$g^{-1} = (e_1e_2)^{-1} = e_2^{-1}e_1^{-1} = e_2e_1$$

and for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$e_i g e_i^{-1} = e_i g e_i = e_2e_1 = g^{-1}$$

as e_i are of order two. Then, for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$

$$e_i \text{Fix}(g) = \text{Fix}(e_i g e_i^{-1}) = \text{Fix}(g^{-1}) = \text{Fix}(g).$$

This implies that e_i preserve m as $\text{Fix}(g) = v(\ell) \cup v(m)$. Therefore, $m = \ell_1 = \ell_2$ and it is a contradiction. Thus, both e_1 and e_2 preserve the same stitch. \square

Lemma 15.26. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair.*

- (1) *If an order 2 elliptic element of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$ preserves a stitch (ℓ_1, ℓ_2) , then each ℓ_i is a real leaf of \mathcal{L}_i . Therefore, (ℓ_1, ℓ_2) is a genuine stitch of \mathcal{V} .*
- (2) *The set of stitches preserved by elliptic elements of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$ is closed and discrete in the stitch space $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{V})$.*

Proof. (1) We show that a leaf $\ell = \{I, I^*\}$ of \mathcal{L}_1 preserved by an order 2 elliptic element g is a real leaf. Since ℓ is not isolated by Proposition 4.7, at least one of I and I^* is not isolated. Without loss of generality, we may say that I is not isolated. Then, there is a I -side sequence $\{\ell_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathcal{L}_1 . Since g swaps I and I^* , the sequence $\{g(\ell_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an I^* -side sequence. This shows that ℓ is a real leaf.

(2) Let \mathbf{M} be the set of stitches preserved by elliptic elements of order 2. Suppose that, in $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{V})$, \mathbf{M} has an accumulation point $(\ell_\infty^1, \ell_\infty^2)$. Let $\{(\ell_i^1, \ell_i^2)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of distinct stitches in \mathbf{M} with $(\ell_\infty^1, \ell_\infty^2) \neq (\ell_i^1, \ell_i^2)$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ that converges to a stitch $(\ell_\infty^1, \ell_\infty^2)$. By Lemma 15.25, we know that the sets $\{\ell_i^1\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\ell_i^2\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ are infinite. Passing to a subsequence, we assume that we have sequences of strictly increasing intervals $K_1^j \subset K_2^j \subset \dots \subset K_\infty^j$ such that $\ell_i^j = \ell(K_i^j)$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \infty\}$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$. Note that, as ℓ_i^j is real, $\overline{K_i^j} \subset K_{i+1}^j$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j \in \{1, 2\}$. Let $K_i^j = (x_i^j, y_i^j)_{S^1}$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \infty\}$ and $j \in \{1, 2\}$. Find disjoint good intervals $I_1, J_1 \in \mathcal{L}_2$ and $I_2, J_2 \in \mathcal{L}_1$ such that the closures of the good intervals are pairwise disjoint and $x_\infty^1 \in I_1$, $y_\infty^1 \in J_1$, $x_\infty^2 \in I_2$ and $y_\infty^2 \in J_2$.

Choose a large enough N such that $x_k^1 \in I_1$, $y_k^1 \in J_1$, $x_k^2 \in I_2$, and $y_k^2 \in J_2$ for all $k > N$. We claim the following fact:

Claim 15.27. For any $k > N$, $e_k(I_1) \cap I_1 = \emptyset$. The same is true for I_2, J_1 and J_2 .

Proof. Suppose, on the contrary, that $e_k(I_1) \cap I_1 \neq \emptyset$ for some k . Because $e_k(I_1)$ is connected and meets J_1 and I_1 , it contains either J_2 or I_2 as well. Let us first assume that $e_k(I_1)$ contains I_2 . Then, since $e_k(x_k^2) = y_k^2 \in J_2$, we have $J_2 \cap I_1 \neq \emptyset$, a contradiction. The same argument reveals that $e_k(I_1)$ cannot contain J_2 either. Hence, $e_k(I_1) \cap I_1 = \emptyset$ for all $k > N$. \square

We now claim that there is a subsequence $\{e_{n_i}\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $e_{n_i}(I_1) \cap e_{n_j}(I_1) \neq \emptyset$ for all i, j . For this, we consider the set $\{e_k(x_\infty^1)\}_{k > N}$. We may assume there is a large enough M with $M \geq N$ that $e_k(x_\infty^1)$ is in J_1 for all $k > M$. If not, we have $e_k(I_1) \supset J_1$ for infinitely many k and the claim immediately follows. We may also assume that $\{e_k(x_\infty^1)\}_{k > M}$ is an infinite set. If not, the claim also follows. Therefore, the set $\{e_k(x_\infty^1)\}_{k > M}$ accumulates in $\overline{J_1}$. Give a linear order on $\overline{J_1}$ so that $\{y_k^1\}_{k > M}$ is a strictly increasing sequence. Note that $y_k^1 = e_k(x_k^1) > e_k(x_\infty^1)$ for all $k > M$.

Let z be an accumulation point of $\{e_k(x_\infty^1)\}_{k > M}$. We have two cases. Either $e_k(x_\infty^1)$ has a subsequence $e_{n_i}(x_\infty^1)$ that converges strictly monotonically to z from the below or from the above. If $e_{n_i}(x_\infty^1) > z$ for all i , then $e_{n_i}(I_1)$ contains all $y_{n_j}^1 = e_{n_j}(x_{n_j}^1) \in e_{n_j}(I_1)$ with $j < i$. Therefore, $e_{n_i}(I_1) \cap e_{n_j}(I_1) \neq \emptyset$ for all i, j .

On the other hand, suppose that $e_{n_i}(x_\infty^1) < z$ for all i . We first rule out one possible case:

Claim 15.28. If $z = y_\infty^1$, then we can take a further subsequence n_i so that $e_{n_i}(I_1) \cap e_{n_j}(I_1) \neq \emptyset$ for all i, j .

Proof. In fact, we will show that $y_\infty^1 \in e_{n_i}(I_1)$ for all sufficiently large i . By mean of contradiction, suppose that there is another subsequence such that $y_\infty^1 \notin e_{n_i}(I_1)$ for all i . By Claim 15.27, we have $e_{n_i}(J_1) \cap J_1 = \emptyset$ for all n_i . From this, we conclude that $e_{n_i}(y_\infty^1)$ lies in the complement of $I_1 \cup J_1$. Therefore, the sequence of leaves $(e_{n_i}(\ell_\infty^1))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to a leaf different from ℓ_∞^1 but with one of its endpoint $y_\infty^1 = z = \lim_i e_{n_i}(x_\infty^1)$. This violates the fact that $\ell_\infty^1 = \ell(K_\infty^1)$ has the K_∞^1 -side sequence $(\ell_k^1)_{k > N}$. Hence, $e_{n_i}(I_1)$ contains y_∞^1 for all large enough n_i . In particular, by taking another subsequence, $e_{n_i}(I_1) \cap e_{n_j}(I_1)$ contains y_∞^1 for all i, j concluding the claim. \square

Therefore, we only need to handle the case when $z \neq y_\infty^1$. Since $\{y_{n_i}^1\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to $y_\infty^1 > z$, we know that there is a large L such that $y_{n_i}^1 > z$ for all $i > L$. Therefore, by taking a further subsequence, we know that $e_{n_i}(I_1) \cap e_{n_j}(I_1)$ contains z , and therefore is nonempty for each i, j .

Now by repeating the above argument for I_2 , J_1 and J_2 , we know that there are large enough $m > n$ such that $e_m(I_1) \cap e_n(I_1)$, $e_m(I_2) \cap e_n(I_2)$, $e_m(J_1) \cap e_n(J_1)$, and $e_m(J_2) \cap e_n(J_2)$ are not empty. We now show that $e_m e_n$ is a properly pseudo-Anosov by claiming that $e_m e_n$ has at least four fixed points, one for the closure of each I_1 , I_2 , J_1 , and J_2 (Theorem 15.12). In fact, we only show that $e_m e_n$ has a fixed point in $\overline{I_1}$. Then the rest of cases follow by symmetry. For this, observe, by Claim 15.27 and the fact that $e_m(I_1) \cap e_n(I_1) \neq \emptyset$, that we have either $e_m(I_1) \subset e_n(I_1)$ or $e_m(I_1) \supset e_n(I_1)$. But in any case, $e_m e_n$ attains a fixed point in $\overline{I_1}$.

To conclude the proof, we claim that $g := e_m e_n$ cannot be a properly pseudo-Anosov. Observe that $g^{-1} = (e_n e_m)^{-1} = e_m^{-1} e_n^{-1} = e_m e_n$ and that $e_m g e_m^{-1} = e_n g e_n^{-1} = g^{-1}$. Hence,

$$e_m \text{Fix}(g) = \text{Fix}(e_m g e_m^{-1}) = \text{Fix}(g^{-1}) = \text{Fix}(g)$$

and, similarly, $e_n \text{Fix}(g) = \text{Fix}(g)$. Let $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ be the interleaving pair preserved by g . Note that by Theorem 15.12, $\text{Fix}(g) = v(\mathcal{G}_1) \cup v(\mathcal{G}_2)$. Observe that, for each $i = 1, 2$,

$$e_m(\mathcal{G}_i) = e_m g^{-1}(\mathcal{G}_i) = e_m(e_m g e_m^{-1})(\mathcal{G}_i) = g(e_m^{-1}(\mathcal{G}_i)) = g(e_m(\mathcal{G}_i)).$$

Thus, $\mathcal{G}_i = e_m(\mathcal{G}_i)$ by the uniqueness of the interleaving pair preserved by g . Likewise, e_n preserves \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 . But by Theorem 15.12 we have, $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2) = (\ell_m^1, \ell_m^2) = (\ell_n^1, \ell_n^2)$. This contradicts the assumption that $(\ell_m^1, \ell_m^2) \neq (\ell_n^1, \ell_n^2)$. \square

Now we can prove the main theorem of this section:

Theorem 15.29. *Given a veering pair $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$,*

$$\mathbf{M} := \{s \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{V}) : g(s) = s \text{ for some order 2 elliptic element } g \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})\}$$

is a marking.

Proof. By Lemma 15.26, we know that all elements of \mathbf{M} are genuine and \mathbf{M} is a closed subspace of $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{V})$. By Lemma 15.25, we know that $\eta_i|_{\mathbf{M}}$ is injective for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$. \square

Corollary 15.30. *Let \mathcal{V} be a veering pair. Given a subgroup G of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$,*

$$\mathbf{M}(G) := \{s \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{V}) : g(s) = s \text{ for some order 2 elliptic element } g \in G\}$$

is a marking. Furthermore, $\mathbf{M}(G)$ is G -invariant.

Proof. It follows from Theorem 15.29 since any subset of a marking is also a marking. \square

16. GROUP ACTIONS ON WEAVINGS

In this section we study the laminar group actions preserving veering pairs. We will see that such an action induces the action on the associated loom space and weaving.

Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair with a marking \mathbf{M} . It is clear that $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$ acts on $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{V})$ as homeomorphisms by the diagonal action. An *automorphism* of $(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is an automorphism g in $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$ preserving \mathbf{M} . We denote by $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ the group of automorphisms of $(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. Note that $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}) < \text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$ and that for any marking \mathbf{M}' with $\mathbf{M}' \subseteq \mathbf{M}$, $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}) < \text{Aut}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}')$.

An *automorphism* of $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is a homeomorphism on $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ that preserves the orientation of $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ and maps each leaf of $\mathcal{F}_i^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ to a leaf of $\mathcal{F}_i^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$. We denote by $\text{Aut}(W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}))$ the group of automorphisms of $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$.

Proposition 16.1. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair with a marking \mathbf{M} . The group $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ faithfully acts on $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ as automorphisms of $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. Moreover, This action gives rise to an isomorphism $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}))$.*

Proof. Let g be an automorphism of $(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. As for any pair of stitches s_1, s_2 with $s_1 \sim s_2$, $g(s_1) \sim g(s_2)$. Hence, g induces an orientation preserving homeomorphism of $W(\mathcal{V})$. Furthermore, the induced homeomorphism preserves \mathbf{M} in $W(\mathcal{V})$ as g preserves \mathbf{M} in $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{V})$. Then, the restriction of the induced homeomorphism to $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is an automorphism of $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$.

Conversely, let f be an automorphism of $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. We first claim that f can be uniquely extended to a homeomorphism on $\overline{W}(\mathcal{V})$ whose restriction to $W(\mathcal{V})$ preserves the orientation. We define a map \hat{f} on $\overline{W}(\mathcal{V})$ as follows. For x in $\overline{W}(\mathcal{V})$, $\hat{f}(x) = f(x)$ if $x \in W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ and, otherwise, $\hat{f}(x)$ is cusp($f(R)$) for some cusp rectangle R with $x = \text{cusp}(R)$. See Remark 12.11. Like in loom spaces, we say that two cusp rectangles P and Q in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ are *equivalent* if and only if there is a finite sequence of cusp

rectangles $P = R_1, R_2, \dots, R_n = Q$ such that for each pair (R_i, R_{i+1}) , some cusp side of one is contained in a cusp side of the other. Observe that for any pair $\{P, Q\}$ of cusp rectangles in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$, P and Q are equivalent if and only if $\text{cusp}(P) = \text{cusp}(Q)$. Therefore, \hat{f} is a well-defined homeomorphism on $\overline{W}(\mathcal{V})$ preserving $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_1(\mathcal{V})$ and $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_2(\mathcal{V})$.

Now, let \hat{g} be the homeomorphism on $\text{Im } \hat{\omega}$ defined as $\hat{g}(x) = \hat{\omega} \circ \hat{f} \circ \hat{\omega}^{-1}(x)$, and for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let E_i be the union of $E(\mathcal{L}_i)$ and the pivot points. We then claim that \hat{g} induces a bijection g° on $E_1 \cup E_2$ that preserves the circular order, that is, for any counter-clockwise triple (x_1, x_2, x_3) of elements of $E_1 \cup E_2$, $(g^\circ(x_1), g^\circ(x_2), g^\circ(x_3))$ is counter-clockwise

First, fix $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and choose an element μ in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_i(\mathcal{V})$. Then, there is a unique real gap \mathcal{G} in \mathcal{L}_i such that $\#^{-1}(\mu) = \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{G}} \mathcal{O}(\ell(I))$, and $\overline{\hat{\omega}(\mu)} \cap \partial \mathcal{D}(C(\mathcal{V})) = v(\mathcal{G})$ and $\hat{\omega}(\mu) \cap \mathcal{D}(C(\mathcal{V})) = \hat{\omega}(\mu)$. Likewise, as $\hat{f}(\mu) \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_1(\mathcal{V})$, $\hat{f}(\mu)$ has a unique real gap \mathcal{H} such that $\#^{-1}(\hat{f}(\mu)) = \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{H}} \mathcal{O}(\ell(I))$, and $\hat{\omega}(\hat{f}(\mu)) \cap \partial \mathcal{D}(C(\mathcal{V})) = v(\mathcal{H})$ and $\hat{\omega}(\hat{f}(\mu)) \cap \mathcal{D}(C(\mathcal{V})) = \hat{\omega}(\hat{f}(\mu))$. Therefore, the homeomorphism $\hat{g}|_{\hat{\omega}(\mu)}$ from $\hat{\omega}(\mu)$ to $\hat{g}(\hat{\omega}(\mu)) = \hat{\omega}(\hat{f}(\mu))$ can be uniquely extended to the homeomorphism \hat{g}_μ from $\overline{\hat{\omega}(\mu)}$ to $\overline{\hat{g}(\hat{\omega}(\mu))}$. Thus, the restriction $\hat{g}_\mu|_{v(\mathcal{G})}$ is the circular order preserving homeomorphism from $v(\mathcal{G})$ to $v(\mathcal{H})$.

Now, we define g° on E_1 as follows. For x in E_1 , there is a unique element μ_x in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_1(\mathcal{V})$ such that $\overline{\hat{\omega}(\mu_x)}$ contains x , and so we define $g^\circ(x) = \hat{g}_{\mu_x}(x)$. In a similar way, we define g° on E_2 . Since \hat{f} is an orientation preserving homeomorphism, by construction, g° preserves the circular order.

Finally, we extend g° to an automorphism g in $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$ as follows. For each point x in $S^1 \setminus (E_1 \cup E_2)$, x is a rainbow point in both \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 and if $\{I_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a rainbow at x in some \mathcal{L}_i , $\{x\} = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{I_n} \cap E_i$. For x in S^1 , $g(x) = g^\circ(x)$ if $x \in E_1 \cup E_2$ and, otherwise, we define $g(x)$ to be the point in $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (g^\circ(u_n), g^\circ(v_n))_{S^1} \cap E_i$ for some rainbow $\{(u_n, v_n)_{S^1}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ at x in some \mathcal{L}_i . The map g is well-defined since $\{(g^\circ(u_n), g^\circ(v_n))_{S^1}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is also a rainbow in \mathcal{L}_i . If not, $\{\ell((g^\circ(u_n), g^\circ(v_n))_{S^1})\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to a leaf ℓ in \mathcal{L}_i . This implies that the sequence of lines $f(\#(\mathcal{O}(\ell((u_n, v_n)_{S^1}))))$ converges to the line $\#(\mathcal{O}(\ell))$. This contradicts to the fact that $\{(u_n, v_n)_{S^1}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a rainbow at x as f is an orientation preserving homeomorphism. By the fact that every bijection on S^1 preserving the circular order is in $\text{Homeo}^+(S^1)$, g is in $\text{Homeo}^+(S^1)$. Therefore, as $g^\circ(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L}_i)) = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L}_i)$ for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$, g also preserves each \mathcal{L}_i and so $g \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$. Thus, the result follows \square

We now show that no nontrivial element of G preserves a rectangle of the regular weaving. At the end this result related to the induced G -action on some 3-manifold is properly discontinuous and free.

Proposition 16.2. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair and G be a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$. The stabilizer of a rectangle in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}(G))$ under the G -action is trivial where $\mathbf{M}(G)$ is the marking obtained in Corollary 15.30.*

Proof. Let R be a rectangle on $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}(G))$. Let g be an element in G such that $g(R) = R$. By Lemma 12.9, there is a minimal frame representative (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4) of R . Then, $(g(I_1), g(I_2), g(I_3), g(I_4))$ is a minimal representative of $g(R)$ and so $(g(I_1), g(I_2), g(I_3), g(I_4))$ is also a minimal representative of R . By Lemma 12.9, there are two possible cases:

- $(I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4) = (g(I_1), g(I_2), g(I_3), g(I_4))$;
- $(I_3, I_4, I_1, I_2) = (g(I_1), g(I_2), g(I_3), g(I_4))$.

If $(I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4) = (g(I_1), g(I_2), g(I_3), g(I_4))$, then g fixes leaves $\ell(I_1)$ and $\ell(I_3)$. By the minimality of (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4) , there is no gap of \mathcal{L}_1 that has $\ell(I_1)$ and $\ell(I_3)$ as boundary leaves. Therefore, by Theorem 15.9, g is the identity.

When $(I_3, I_4, I_1, I_2) = (g(I_1), g(I_2), g(I_3), g(I_4))$, g^2 is the identity by the first case. Hence, g is an elliptic element of order 2. By Theorem 15.9, there is a unique interleaving pair $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ preserved by g . Note that \mathcal{G}_i are ideal polygons.

Now, we claim that $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ is a genuine stitch lying on (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4) . Observe that there are distinct elements J_1 and J_3 in \mathcal{G}_1 such that $g(J_1) = J_3$ and $I_i \subset J_i$ for all $i \in \{1, 3\}$. Then, $\ell(I_2)$ and $\ell(I_4)$ are linked with \mathcal{G}_1 .

Assume that \mathcal{G}_1 is not a leaf. By Proposition 5.14, $\ell(I_2)$ and $\ell(I_4)$ cross over tips t_2 and t_4 of \mathcal{G}_1 , respectively. If $t_2 \neq t_4$, then $v(\ell(J_1)) = v(\ell(J_3)) = \{t_2, t_4\}$ and it is a contradiction. Hence, $t_2 = t_4$ and $t_2 \in v(\ell(J_1)) \cap v(\ell(J_3))$

Now, we write $J_1 = (a, b)_{S^1}$ and $J_3 = (u, v)_{S^1}$. Note that $g(J_1) = J_3$ and so $g(a) = u$ and $g(b) = v$. If $t_2 = b$, then $t_2 = u$ and $b = u$. Therefore,

$$a = g(g(a)) = g(u) = g(b) = v$$

and so $J_1 = J_3^*$. This implies that \mathcal{G}_1 is a leaf and it is a contradiction. Likewise, if $t_2 = a$, then $t_2 = v$ and $a = v$. Also,

$$b = g(g(b)) = g(v) = g(a) = u.$$

This implies that \mathcal{G}_1 is a leaf and it is a contradiction. Therefore, \mathcal{G}_1 is a leaf with $\mathcal{G}_1 = \{J_1, J_3\}$.

Moreover, since $I_1^* \neq I_3$ and $g(I_1) = I_3$, $J_i \neq I_i$ for all $i \in \{1, 3\}$. The leaf \mathcal{G}_1 lies between $\ell(I_1)$ and $\ell(I_3)$. Also, by the minimality of (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4) , \mathcal{G}_1 and $\ell(I_i)$ are ultraparallel for all $i \in \{1, 3\}$. Therefore, \mathcal{G}_1 properly lies between $\ell(I_1)$ and $\ell(I_3)$.

Similarly, we can show that \mathcal{G}_2 is a leaf which properly lies between $\ell(I_2)$ and $\ell(I_4)$. By Lemma 15.26, $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ is a genuine stitch lying on (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4) . Then, $\#((\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)) \in R$. However, it is a contradiction since $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2) \in \mathbf{M}(G)$. Therefore, g can not be an elliptic element of order two. Thus, g is the identity. \square

17. GROUP ACTIONS ON TRIANGULATED 3-MANIFOLDS

In this section, we study the action of laminar groups on 3-manifolds with veering triangulation.

17.1. From Loom Spaces to Veering Triangulations. We recall definitions of veering triangulations and functors between the category of loom spaces and the category of veering triangulations on \mathbb{R}^3 . We refer readers to [FSS19], [SS20], and [SS21] for details.

A model veering tetrahedron is a tetrahedron with the following extra data:

- (Co-orientations) two faces are oriented outward and the other two are oriented inward.
- (Dihedral angles) two faces with the same orientation meet at angle π and faces with opposite orientations meet at angle 0.
- (Colors on edges) View the tetrahedron from the top. The equatorial edges are colored blue or red such that on each visible top face, we see π -edge, red-edge, and blue-edge in the counter-clockwise order. Colors of π -edges are indefinite.

Figure 17.2 depicts a model veering tetrahedron.




FIGURE 17.2. A model veering tetrahedron, top view.

Definition 17.3. Let M be a 3-manifold with boundary. A (transverse) veering triangulation \mathcal{V} on M is an ideal triangulation with extra data:

- (Transversality) each face is given an orientation such that for each ideal tetrahedron, two of its faces are oriented outward and other two are oriented inward.
- (Taut angle structure) each interference of two faces of \mathcal{V} is given an angle π or 0 in such a way that the dihedral angle sum around each edge is 2π .
- (Edge coloring) each edge is given a color either red or blue such that for each ideal triangle $t \in \mathcal{V}$, there is a cellular map from a model veering tetrahedron onto t that preserves co-orientations, dihedral angles and colors.

//

Note that some authors omit the transversality condition in veering triangulation.

We summarize some notations used in [FSS19].

- The veering functor \mathbf{V} is the functor from the category of loom spaces to the category of veering triangulations on \mathbb{R}^3 .
- The loom functor \mathbf{L} is the functor from the category of veering triangulations on \mathbb{R}^3 to the category of loom spaces.

- For a tetrahedron rectangle R in a loom space \mathcal{L} , $\mathfrak{c}(R)$ denotes the corresponding tetrahedron in $\mathfrak{V}(\mathcal{L})$. We define \mathfrak{c} for cusp, edge and face rectangles in the same manner.
- For a tetrahedron t in a veering triangulation \mathcal{V} of \mathbb{R}^3 , $\mathfrak{R}(t)$ denotes the corresponding tetrahedron rectangle in the loom space $\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{V})$. We define \mathfrak{R} for ideal vertices, edges and faces in the same manner.

The definition of $\mathfrak{c}(c)$ for a cusp c in a loom space deserves a comment. Recall that a cusp is defined as an equivalence class of cusp rectangles. Hence, $\mathfrak{c}(c)$ should be defined first for a cusp rectangle R in the equivalence class c by the common ideal vertex of the set of edges $\mathfrak{c}(R_1) \cap \mathfrak{c}(R_2)$ where R_1 and R_2 are edge rectangles containing R . It is clear that this assignment descends to the equivalence class $c = [R]$.

Conversely, $\mathfrak{R}(v)$ for an ideal vertex v should be also defined as an equivalence class that contains the cusp rectangle $\mathfrak{R}(e_1) \cap \mathfrak{R}(e_2)$ where e_1 and e_2 are edges sharing the ideal vertex v .

In [FSS19], it is shown that \mathfrak{L} and \mathfrak{V} are equivalences between two categories and the explicit natural transform between $\mathfrak{L} \circ \mathfrak{V}$ and the identity functor is constructed.

Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair and G a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$. Then, there is a canonical marking \mathbf{M} , from Corollary 15.30, namely, $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}(G)$. Let D be the group of deck transformations of the universal covering $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}) \rightarrow W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. By [SS21], we can associate the canonical veering triangulation $\widetilde{\mathfrak{V}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}) := \mathfrak{V}(\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}))$ with the *realisation* $|\widetilde{\mathfrak{V}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})|$ homeomorphic to \mathbb{R}^3 . This association is functorial in the sense that loom isomorphisms induce taut isomorphisms of the taut triangulation. In particular, a deck transformation of the universal covering $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}) \rightarrow W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ acts as a taut isomorphism on $\widetilde{\mathfrak{V}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. Since each element of D preserves the orientations of $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$, the associated taut isomorphism preserves the co-orientation of the horizontal branched surface and the veering coloring. See Lemma 17.4. Hence, D preserves the orientation and transverse veering structure of \mathbb{R}^3 .

In the subsequent sections, if not mentioned otherwise, $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ is a veering pair, $G \leq \text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$ is a fixed laminar group, and \mathbf{M} is the marking $\mathbf{M}(G)$ from Corollary 15.30. In fact, most of the following results also hold under the assumption that \mathbf{M} is a G -invariant marking. Nonetheless, for simplicity, we assume that \mathbf{M} is $\mathbf{M}(G)$. We write $p : \widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}) \rightarrow W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ for the universal covering and D its group of deck transformations.

Lemma 17.4. *Let D be the group of deck transformations for the universal covering $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}) \rightarrow W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$.*

- (1) *The induced action $\mathfrak{V}(D)$ of D on $|\widetilde{\mathfrak{V}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})|$ is free and properly discontinuous.*
- (2) *The $\mathfrak{V}(D)$ -action on $\widetilde{\mathfrak{V}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ preserves the transverse taut structure.*
- (3) *The quotient space $|\widetilde{\mathfrak{V}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})|/\mathfrak{V}(D)$ is an orientable 3-manifold with the induced transverse veering triangulation,*

$$\mathfrak{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}) = \widetilde{\mathfrak{V}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})/\mathfrak{V}(D).$$

Proof. (1) By Lemma 12.17, we know that no elements in $D \setminus \{1\}$ stabilize a rectangle in $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V})$. Hence, the stabilizers of the skeletal rectangles are trivial. Therefore, the $\mathfrak{V}(D)$ -action is properly discontinuous and free.

(2) We only need to prove that the $\mathfrak{V}(D)$ -action respects the co-orientations of the faces. Recall that each face $f = \mathfrak{c}(R)$ of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{V}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is given the co-orientation according to the counter-clockwise ordering on the three cusps of R inherited from the orientation of $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ by the right-hand grip rule. See Section 12.4 and [SS21, The proof of Lemma 5.12]. Since the D -action on $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is orientation preserving, the circular order of the cusps is preserved. See Section 12.1.

(3) By (1), $|\widetilde{\mathfrak{V}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})|/\mathfrak{V}(D)$ is a 3-manifold. By (2) and the fact that $\mathfrak{V}(D)$ preserves the orientation of $|\widetilde{\mathfrak{V}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})|$, $|\widetilde{\mathfrak{V}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})|/\mathfrak{V}(D)$ is orientable. Since each element of D preserves the orientation of $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$, each deck transformation maps red and blue edge rectangles to red and blue edge rectangles, respectively. Therefore, by (2) and Proposition 12.19, $\widetilde{\mathfrak{V}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})/\mathfrak{V}(D)$ is a transverse veering triangulation of $|\widetilde{\mathfrak{V}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})|/\mathfrak{V}(D)$. \square

Lemma 17.5. *Let c be a cusp of $\widetilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. The isomorphism $\mathfrak{V} : D \rightarrow \mathfrak{V}(D)$ induces the isomorphism $\text{Stab}_D(c) \rightarrow \text{Stab}_{\mathfrak{V}(D)}(\mathfrak{c}(c))$.*

Proof. Since \mathfrak{V} is already known to be an isomorphism, it suffices to show that $\mathfrak{V}(\text{Stab}_D(c)) = \text{Stab}_{\mathfrak{V}(D)}(\mathfrak{c}(c))$ as sets. But this claim clearly follows from the construction of the functors \mathfrak{L} and \mathfrak{V} and the fact that they are equivalences of categories. \square

17.6. Actions on Veering Triangulations. This subsection is devoted to proving our main theorem.

Lemma 17.7. *The group $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ acts on $|\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})|$ properly discontinuously and freely. Moreover, this action respects the transverse taut structure $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ and the veering coloring.*

Proof. Let g be an automorphism in $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})) = \text{Aut}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. Any such homeomorphism can be lifted to a loom isomorphism \tilde{g} on $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}^\circ}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. Note that \tilde{g} commutes with the group D of deck transformations of the universal covering $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}^\circ}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}) \rightarrow \mathcal{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. The homeomorphism $\mathcal{V}(\tilde{g})$ on \mathbb{R}^3 associated to \tilde{g} preserves the veering triangulation $\mathcal{V}(\widetilde{\mathcal{W}^\circ}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}))$. Since \tilde{g} commutes with D , $\mathcal{V}(\tilde{g})$ commutes with $\mathcal{V}(D)$. Therefore, $\mathcal{V}(\tilde{g})$ gives rise to a homeomorphism on $|\mathcal{V}(\widetilde{\mathcal{W}^\circ}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}))|/\mathcal{V}(D)$ and this homeomorphism is independent of the choice of the lift \tilde{g} . Hence we have the well-defined action of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ on $|\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})|$ and this action preserves the induced taut ideal triangulation $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}) = \widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})/\mathcal{V}(D)$.

The fact that the action defined above is properly discontinuous and free follows from Proposition 16.2 and Proposition 12.19. \square

Given an ideal vertex v of $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$, we define its *link* $L(v)$ as follows. Choose a model tetrahedron t that has v as its vertex. Consider $L_t(v)$ the convex hull in the tetrahedron t of three points chosen from each of three edges adjacent to v . We assume that the points are chosen close enough to v so that $L_t(v)$ is completely situated in upper and lower cusp neighborhoods of v . We do this in the $\text{Stab}_G(v)$ equivariant manner. Then we define

$$L(v) = \bigcup_t L_t(v)$$

where the union is taken over all tetrahedra t that contain v as their ideal vertex.

We say that v is a *singular* vertex if $L(v)$ is homeomorphic to the infinite cylinder. If $L(v)$ is homeomorphic to the plane, v is called a *cuspidal* vertex.

For a cuspidal vertex v of $\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$, we define its vertex link $L(v)$ similarly. We assume that $L(v)$ is chosen in the $\text{Stab}_{\mathcal{V}(D)}(v)$ -equivariant manner.

Lemma 17.8. *Let v be an ideal vertex of $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. Let $q : \widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ be the universal covering. Then,*

- (1) v is either a cuspidal or a singular vertex.
- (2) v is a cuspidal if and only if the stabilizer of each component of $q^{-1}(L(v))$ in $\mathcal{V}(D)$ is trivial.
- (3) v is a singular point if and only if the stabilizer of each component of $q^{-1}(L(v))$ in $\mathcal{V}(D)$ is infinite cyclic.

Proof. In the universal cover $\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}) = \mathcal{V}(\widetilde{\mathcal{W}^\circ}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}))$, each connected component of $q^{-1}(L(v))$ gives rise to a vertex link $L(c)$ of some ideal vertex c in $\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. It follows that $q^{-1}(L(v))$ consists of copies of planes. Since the ladderpole curves and the transverse taut structure are preserved under the action of $\mathcal{V}(D)$, $L(v)$ is either an infinite cylinder, a plane or a torus. The torus case can be ruled out because D has no free abelian subgroups of rank 2. \square

By [FG13], we know that the ladderpole slopes decompose $L(c)$ into disjoint strips so-called *ladders*. This ladder decomposition induces the *equivalence relation* on the set of tetrahedra that have c as their ideal vertex as follows: t_1 and t_2 are equivalent if and only if $L_{t_1}(c)$ and $L_{t_2}(c)$ are contained in the same ladder. The set of ladders is linearly ordered from right to left seen from the cusp.

On the other hand, each cusp c (see Section 12.2 for the definition of cusps) of a loom space induces a partition on the set of tetrahedron rectangles containing the cusp c . To illustrate this, let us first define a *west division* rectangle as a rectangle R with an orientation preserving homeomorphism $f_R : (0, 1)^2 \rightarrow R$ such that there is a homeomorphism extension $\overline{f_R} : [0, 1]^2 \setminus \{0 \times a\} \rightarrow \overline{R}$ for some $0 < a < 1$.

We define a *east*, *north* and *south division* rectangles likewise. We say that tetrahedron rectangles R_1 and R_2 are equivalent if $R_1 \cap R_2$ contains a division rectangle. A *division* at c is an equivalence class of this equivalence relation. The set of divisions is linearly ordered by the adjacency relation.

Remark 17.9. In [SS21], a sector at a cusp x in a loom space is defined as a connected component of the complement of all leaves passing through x . In fact, a division corresponds to two consecutive sectors in the sense of [SS21, Definition 6.9]. Hence, the following proposition holds for sectors. \sphericalangle

Proposition 17.10. *Let c be a cusp vertex of a veering triangulation $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. There is an order preserving one-to-one correspondence between the set of ladders in the ladder decomposition of $L(c)$ and the set of divisions at the corresponding cusp $R(c)$ in the loom space.*

Proof. For any tetrahedron rectangle R that contains $R(c)$ as a cusp, let $l(R)$ be the ladder that contains $L_{c(R)}(c)$. We show that if tetrahedron rectangles R_1 and R_2 are in the same division S then $l(R_1) = l(R_2)$. We prove this only for a west division. Remaining cases are similar.

Choose a west division rectangle R_0 for the division S . We can split R_0 into two cusp rectangles, one with south-west ideal corner and the other with north-west ideal corner. These cusp rectangles generate staircases U and V respectively with the common lower axis ray m . Denote by Δ the union of all exterior cusps of these two staircases. Then there is a (injective) projection π_m from Δ into m . For a tetrahedron rectangle R in S , the image of the east cusp of R under the map π_m is also denoted by $\pi_m(R) \in m$. Note that a tetrahedron rectangle R is in the division S if and only if we have $R \subset U \cup V$, $R \cap U \neq \emptyset$, and $R \cap V \neq \emptyset$.

Let R_1 and R_2 be tetrahedron rectangles in the same division S . Without loss of generality, we assume $R_1 < R_2$, i.e., R_1 west-east spans R_2 . We use the induction on the cardinality n of image of $\pi_m(\Delta)$ between $\pi_m(R_1)$ and $\pi_m(R_2)$, which is finite by the Astroid lemma [SS21, Lemma 4.10]. As the base case, assume that $n = 1$. Let $x \in \pi_m(\Delta)$ be between $\pi_m(R_1)$ and $\pi_m(R_2)$. The preimage of x , say z , is either north or south cusp of R_2 . In either cases, we can find a tetrahedron rectangle Q in the same division that has z as its east cusp such that $L_{c(Q)}(c)$ shares rungs with $L_{c(R_1)}(c)$ and with $L_{c(R_2)}(c)$ since $c(Q)$ shares a face with each $c(R_i)$ which is corresponded to a rung. See Figure 17.11. Therefore, R_1 and R_2 are in the same ladder. Suppose now that the assertion holds for $n < k$ and assume $n = k$. We choose the closest point x to $\pi_m(R_2)$ among the points in $\pi_m(\Delta)$ between $\pi_m(R_1)$ and $\pi_m(R_2)$. Let z be the preimage of x . Then, z must be either north or south cusp of R_2 . We then find a tetrahedron rectangle Q as in the $n = 1$ case. We now use the induction hypothesis to conclude that $c(Q)$ and $c(R_2)$ are in the same ladder.




FIGURE 17.11. Two possible configurations for the proof of the proposition

For the inverse, let t be a tetrahedron with a vertex c . Define $\mathfrak{s}(t)$ to be the division that contains $R(t)$. Again we prove that if t_1 and t_2 are in the same ladder, then $\mathfrak{s}(t_1) = \mathfrak{s}(t_2)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $t_1 < t_2$. Then there is an increasing sequence of tetrahedra $t_1 = u_1 < \dots < u_n = t_2$ such that $L_{u_i}(c)$ and $L_{u_{i+1}}(c)$ share a rung. We show that $R(u_i)$ and $R(u_{i+1})$ are in the same division. For this let Q be the face rectangle $R(u_i) \cap R(u_{i+1})$. Because u_i and u_{i+1} share a cusp c , Q also contains the corresponding cusp $R(c)$ in the loom space. Since u_i and u_{i+1} share a rung, the cusp $R(c)$ cannot be a corner of Q . Say $R(c)$ is a west cusp of Q . Then, it follows that $R(u_i) \cap R(u_{i+1})$ contains a west division rectangle, completing the well-definedness of \mathfrak{s} .

From the construction, it is clear that \mathfrak{s} and l are inverse to each other and preserve orders. \square

Let s be a cone class in $\overline{W}(\mathcal{V}) \setminus W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ of order $n \geq 2$. Let c be a cusp in $\tilde{W}^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ such that $\text{cusp}(R) = s$ for all $R \in \mathfrak{p}(c)$ (see Proposition 12.19 for the definition of \mathfrak{p} and also see Remark 12.11 for the notation $\text{cusp}(R)$). By Lemma 17.8, the group $\text{Stab}_D(c)$ is an infinite cyclic group with a generator γ . The action of γ on the linearly ordered set of divisions $\{\dots, S_{-1}, S_0, S_1, \dots\}$ can be understood as follow: Assume that γ preserves a division S_k for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then, there is a tetrahedron rectangle R in S_k

such that $\gamma(R)$ is also in S_k . By Lemma 12.17, this is a contradiction as R and $\gamma(R)$ share a division rectangle. Therefore, there is no division preserved by γ . Thus, γ acts on the set $\{\dots, S_{-1}, S_0, S_1, \dots\}$ of divisions at c as $S_i \mapsto S_{i+2n}$. This shows the following lemma.

Lemma 17.12. *Let $c = q^{-1}(s)$ be a lift of a singular vertex s of $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ where $q: \widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is the universal covering. Let $g \in \text{Stab}_{\mathcal{V}(D)}(c)$ be a nontrivial element. For each ladder L_i , we have $g(L_i) \cap L_i = \emptyset$. In particular, the ladderpole lines in $L(c)$ descend to parallel lines in $L(s)$.*

The following lemma is used to extend an action on an infinite cylinder to a solid cylinder. Let $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}$ be the standard torus and cylinder respectively, obtained as the quotients of $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ by the actions $(x, y) \mapsto (x + 1, y)$, $(x, y) \mapsto (x, y + 1)$.

Lemma 17.13. *Let L be an infinite cylinder. Let $G = \mathbb{Z} + \mathbb{Z}_n$. Suppose that G acts freely and properly discontinuously on L . Assume that the G -action fixes the ends of L . Then there is a topological conjugacy $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow L$ such that the G -action on $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}$ is standard: $(x, y) \mapsto (x + \frac{1}{n}, y)$, $(x, y) \mapsto (x, y + 1)$. Similar results hold when $G = \mathbb{Z}$ or \mathbb{Z}_n .*

Proof. We prove the lemma for the case when $G = \mathbb{Z} + \mathbb{Z}_n$. Other cases can be shown along the same line.

We know that L/G must be a torus, otherwise, the \mathbb{Z} factor of G would not act properly discontinuously and freely on the infinite cylinder L . We regard $\pi_1(L) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ as a subgroup of $\pi_1(L/G)$. Let $\phi: \mathbb{Z} + \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \pi_1(L/G)$ be an isomorphism such that ϕ maps the first factor to $\pi_1(L)$. Then there is a homeomorphism $\psi: \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow L/G$ such that $\psi_* = \phi$. The lift $\widetilde{\psi}: \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow L$ of ψ provides the desired topological conjugacy. \square

For a singular vertex s of $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$, any essential simple closed curve in $L(s)$ is called a *meridian*.

Lemma 17.14. *Let \mathcal{V} be a veering pair. Let \mathfrak{S} be the set of singular vertices of $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. Fix a base point x_0 in $|\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})|$. Choose a meridian of $L(s)$ for each $s \in \mathfrak{S}$ in $|\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})|$ and by choosing a path from x_0 to $L(s)$, regard this meridian as a loop γ_s based at x_0 . Then $\pi_1(|\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})|, x_0)$ is normally generated by $\{[\gamma_s]\}_{s \in \mathfrak{S}}$, where $[\gamma_s]$ denotes an element in $\pi_1(|\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})|, x_0)$ represented by γ_s .*

Proof. We have isomorphisms $\pi_1(|\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})|) \cong \mathcal{V}(D) \cong \pi_1(W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})) \cong D$. Note that D is generated by $\cup \text{Stab}_D(c)$, where the union is taken over all preimages of all singular and marked classes in $W^\circ(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. By Lemma 17.5, $\text{Stab}_D(c) \cong \text{Stab}_{\mathcal{V}(D)}(c(c))$. Thus, $\pi_1(|\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})|, x_0) \cong \mathcal{V}(D)$ is generated by $\cup \text{Stab}_{\mathcal{V}(D)}(c(c))$. For each generator g of $\text{Stab}_{\mathcal{V}(D)}(c(c))$ there is $h \in \mathcal{V}(D)$ such that $g = h[\gamma_s]^{\pm 1}h^{-1}$. Therefore, $\pi_1(|\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})|)$ is normally generated by meridians. \square

Theorem 17.15. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair and G be a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$. Then G is the fundamental group of an irreducible 3-orbifold. Moreover, this orbifold is obtained by orbifold Dehn fillings of a 3-manifold with a taut veering triangulation.*

Proof. Let X° be the space obtained from $|\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})|$ by removing small neighborhoods of ideal vertices. Boundary components of X° are cusp links. X° is a 3-manifold and G acts on $|\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})|$ properly discontinuously and freely (Lemma 17.4 and Lemma 17.7).

Let \mathfrak{S} be the set of singular vertices of $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. By Lemma 17.13, we can find a topological conjugacy $\phi_s: \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow L(s)$ for each $s \in \mathfrak{S}$. Let X be the space obtained by gluing the standard solid cylinders $C_s = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \|z\| \leq 1\} \times \mathbb{R}$ to each $\{L(s)\}_{s \in \mathfrak{S}}$ via the gluing maps $\{\phi_s\}_{s \in \mathfrak{S}}$. By Lemma 17.14, X is simply-connected.

Now we extend the G -action on X° to X . First note that the standard action on $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}$ can be coned off to give the action on the standard solid cylinder. More precisely, introduce the cylindrical coordinates (r, θ, t) on the standard solid cylinder $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : \|z\| \leq 1\} \times \mathbb{R}$. Given a homeomorphism g on the boundary $\{(1, \theta, t)\}$, we define \widehat{g} by $\widehat{g}(r, \theta, t) = (r, g(\theta, t))$. Then, given an element $g \in G$, we define $\widetilde{g}: X \rightarrow X$ as follow: For $x \in X^\circ$, we let $\widetilde{g}(x) = g(x)$. In the solid cylinder C_s attached to $s \in \mathfrak{S}$, $\widetilde{g}: C_s \rightarrow C_{g \cdot s}$ is given by $\phi_{g \cdot s}^{-1} \circ g \circ \phi_s$. This gives a well-defined homeomorphism on X : For if $x \in \partial C_s$ and $\phi_s(x) \in X^\circ$ are equivalent in X , we have $\phi_{g \cdot s}(\widehat{g}(x)) = \phi_{g \cdot s} \circ \phi_{g \cdot s}^{-1} \circ g \circ \phi_s(x) = g \circ \phi_s(x)$. Moreover, we have $\widetilde{gh} = \widetilde{g} \circ \widetilde{h}$ for all $g, h \in G$. The G -action on X is then given by $g \cdot x = \widetilde{g}(x)$.

For the standard \mathbb{Z} , \mathbb{Z}_n , and $\mathbb{Z}_n + \mathbb{Z}$ actions on the standard cylinder, their coned-off actions on the solid cylinder are also properly discontinuous and their quotients are (possibly singular) solid cylinders or solid tori. Since the $\text{Stab}_G(s)$ -action on ∂C_s is standard, the extended G -action on X is still properly discontinuous (but may not be free). Therefore, X/G is a 3-orbifold with $\pi_1^{\text{orb}}(X) = G$. From the

construction, we know that X/G is a Dehn filling of X°/G by (possibly singular) solid cylinders or solid tori $C_s/\text{Stab}_G(s)$.

Finally, we show that X/G is irreducible. Due to Proposition 3.23 followed by the remark in [BMP03], a 3-orbifold is irreducible if and only if its universal cover is irreducible. Therefore, it is enough to show that X is irreducible.

Consider the Mayer-Vietoris sequence:

$$H_2\left(\bigcup_{s \in \mathfrak{S}} \partial C_s\right) \rightarrow H_2\left(\bigcup_{s \in \mathfrak{S}} C_s\right) \oplus H_2(X^\circ) \rightarrow H_2(X) \rightarrow H_1\left(\bigcup_{s \in \mathfrak{S}} \partial C_s\right) \rightarrow H_1\left(\bigcup_{s \in \mathfrak{S}} C_s\right) \oplus H_1(X^\circ).$$

We know that $H_2(\bigcup_{s \in \mathfrak{S}} \partial C_s) = H_2(\bigcup_{s \in \mathfrak{S}} C_s) = H_1(\bigcup_{s \in \mathfrak{S}} C_s) = 0$, reducing the above sequence to

$$0 \rightarrow H_2(X^\circ) \rightarrow H_2(X) \rightarrow H_1\left(\bigcup_{s \in \mathfrak{S}} \partial C_s\right) \rightarrow H_1(X^\circ).$$

Note that $H_1(\bigcup_{s \in \mathfrak{S}} \partial C_s)$ is generated by meridians of each ∂C_s and by Lemma 17.14, so is $H_1(X^\circ)$. Therefore, $H_1(\bigcup_{s \in \mathfrak{S}} \partial C_s) \rightarrow H_1(X^\circ)$ is an isomorphism. As a result, we get $H_2(X; \mathbb{Z}) \cong H_2(X^\circ; \mathbb{Z})$.

Observe that X° is a $K(\pi_1(X^\circ), 1)$ space. Hence, we know that $H_*(X^\circ; \mathbb{Z})$ is isomorphic to the group homology $H_*(\pi_1(X^\circ); \mathbb{Z})$. Since $\pi_1(X^\circ)$ is a free group (with at most countably many generators), we have that $H_2(\pi_1(X^\circ); \mathbb{Z}) = 0$. Thus, $H_2(X^\circ; \mathbb{Z}) = 0$ as well. Combined with the previous computation, we have that $H_2(X; \mathbb{Z}) = H_2(X^\circ; \mathbb{Z}) = 0$.

Since X is simply-connected, it follows that $\pi_2(X) \cong H_2(X; \mathbb{Z}) = 0$. By the sphere theorem, X is irreducible. \square

Remark 17.16. Here is another proof for the irreducibility of X/G when the laminations are very full and G does not have 2-torsions. Being cofinite means that X/G is compact. By construction and Lemma 17.12, each torus boundary of X°/G has at least two parallel ladderpole curves and X/G is the Dehn filling of X°/G along slopes s that intersect every ladderpole curve transversely. Hence, $|\langle s, l \rangle| \geq 2$ where l is the collection of ladderpole curves. By [AT22], X/G admits a transitive pseudo-Anosov flow without perfect fits. Since G does not contain $\mathbb{Z} + \mathbb{Z}$, X/G is atoroidal. Therefore, the universal cover X of X/G is homeomorphic to \mathbb{R}^3 and X/G is irreducible [CD03, GO89]. \square

18. VEERING PAIRS AND KLEINIAN GROUPS

In this section, we improve our main Theorem 17.15 to yield more geometric conclusion. To do this, we need ‘‘cocompactness’’ of the action, although we believe that this assumption is not essential.

18.1. Cofinite Actions. Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair with a marking \mathbf{M} and G a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. Now, we say that the G action on the veering triangulation $\mathbf{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is *cofinite* if there are only finitely many orbit classes of ideal tetrahedra. In this section, we give a necessary and sufficient condition to make the G -action be cofinite.

Let \mathcal{G} be a gap of \mathcal{V} that is either a marked leaf or a non-leaf gap. The gap \mathcal{G} has *the maximal rank stabilizer* if it is one of the following cases.

- If \mathcal{G} is an ideal polygon, then $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ contains an infinite cyclic group.
- If \mathcal{G} is a crown, then $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ contains a rank two free abelian group.

We say that G has the *maximal stabilizer property* if every gaps that is either a marked leaf or a non-leaf gap of \mathcal{V} has the maximal rank stabilizer.

Assume that G has the maximal stabilizer property. Let \mathcal{G} be a gap of \mathcal{L}_1 that is either a marked leaf or a non-leaf gap. When \mathcal{G} is a marked leaf, then, by Theorem 15.22, there is a pA-like element g in $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$. Furthermore, there is a leaf \mathcal{H} of \mathcal{L}_2 such that $(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H})$ is the stitch preserved by g . Observe that \mathcal{H} is also marked. Hence, $(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H}) \in \mathbf{M}$. Also, observe that $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ contains a properly pseudo-Anosov as at least one of g or g^2 is properly pseudo-Anosov. Similarly, when \mathcal{G} is an ideal polygon, $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ contains a properly pseudo-Anosov by Theorem 15.22. When \mathcal{G} is a crown, by Theorem 15.22, $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G})$ contains a properly pseudo-Anosov and also contains a parabolic automorphism.

Let $\mathbf{F} = (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$ be a tetrahedron frame under \mathbf{M} . Then, by Lemma 10.5, $\mathcal{I}(c_4(\mathbf{F}), c_1(\mathbf{F}))$ contains either a unique marked stitch or exactly two singular stitches. Let s be such a stitch. There is a unique tip t in $v(\eta_2(s))$ over which I_1^* cross. Observe that t does not depend on the choice of s by Remark 7.5. Therefore, we say that the tetrahedron frame $\mathbf{F} = (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$ under \mathbf{M} is *penetrated* by the tip t . Note that $t \in E(\mathcal{L}_2)$ and I_3 crosses over t .

Conversely, if p in $E(\mathcal{L}_2)$ and the tip gap $\diamond(p)$ is a marked leaf or a non-leaf gap, then we can take a tetrahedron frame under \mathbf{M} penetrated by p in the similar way of the proof of Lemma 12.16-(1). Now,

we denote the set of tetrahedron frames under \mathbf{M} by $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$. Also, for any t in $\mathsf{E}(\mathcal{L}_2)$ such that $\diamond(t)$ is either a marked leaf or a non-leaf gap, we denote the set of tetrahedron frames under \mathbf{M} penetrated by a tip t by $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}, t)$. Then, we have that the set

$$\{\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}, t) : t \in \mathsf{E}(\mathcal{L}_2) \text{ and } \diamond(t) \text{ is a marked leaf or a non-leaf gap}\}$$

is a partition for $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$.

Then, observe that if two distinct tetrahedron frames $F_1 = (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$ and $F_2 = (J_1, J_2, J_3, J_4)$ are penetrated by a same tip t , then $I_1 = J_1$. To see this, we first assume that $\diamond(t)$ is a marked leaf. Then, both $(\ell(I_1), \diamond(t))$ and $(\ell(J_1), \diamond(t))$ are marked leaves and so $I_1 = J_1$ since I_1^* and J_1^* cross over t and $\eta_1|_{\mathbf{M}}$ is injective by the definition of markings. When $\diamond(t)$ is a non-leaf gap, both I_1^* and J_1^* are the element of the interleaving gap of $\diamond(t)$ crossing over t and so $I_1 = J_1$. Hence, for a tetrahedron frame $F = (I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4)$ under \mathbf{M} penetrated by a tip t , we denote I_1 by I_t and I_3 by $\pi_t(F)$.

Let t be an end point of \mathcal{L}_2 whose tip gap is either a marked leaf or a non-leaf gap. We may think of π_t as an injective map from $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}, t)$ to the stem $S_t^{I_t^*}$ in \mathcal{L}_1 . Hence, we can define a linear order \leq_t on $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}, t)$ as follows. For any F_1 and F_2 in $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}, t)$, $F_1 \leq_t F_2$ if and only if $\pi_t(F_1) \subseteq \pi_t(F_2)$. Hence, $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}, t)$ is linearly ordered and π_t is order preserving.

Remark 18.2. Let t be an end point of \mathcal{L}_2 whose tip gap is either a marked leaf or non-leaf gap. For any automorphism g in G ,

$$g(\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}, t)) = \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}, g(t))$$

and g is order preserving under \leq_t and $\leq_{g(t)}$. //

Lemma 18.3. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair and G a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$. Set \mathbf{M} as the marking $\mathbf{M}(G)$. Assume that G has the maximal stabilizer property. If the sets of non-leaf gaps of \mathcal{L}_i consist of finitely many orbit classes under the G -action and \mathbf{M} also consists of finitely many orbit classes under the G -action, then the G -action on $\mathsf{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is cofinite.*

Proof. Let t be an end point of \mathcal{L}_2 whose tip gap is either a marked leaf or a non-leaf gap. Since G has the maximal stabilizer property, there is a properly pseudo-Anosov automorphism g in $\text{Stab}_G(\diamond(t))$. Note that I_t is the element of the interleaving gap of $\diamond(t)$ as explained. Then, g preserves $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}, t)$. This implies that $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}, t)$ consists of finitely many orbit classes under the $\langle g \rangle$ -action.

Now, we consider the set E of all end points of \mathcal{L}_2 whose tip gap are marked leaves or non-leaf gaps. Note that the stabilizer of each crown in \mathcal{L}_2 has a parabolic automorphism. Hence, by assumption, we can see that E has finitely many orbit classes under the G -action. Since $\{\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}, t) : t \in \mathsf{E}\}$ is a partition of $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$, by Remark 18.2, $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ consists of finitely many orbit classes under the G -action. Thus, by Remark 12.12, we can conclude that the G -action on $\mathsf{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is cofinite. □

The converse implication is also true. See the following proposition.

Proposition 18.4. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair and G a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$. Set \mathbf{M} as the marking $\mathbf{M}(G)$. If the G -action on $\mathsf{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is cofinite, then G satisfies the following.*

- (1) G has the maximal stabilizer property,
- (2) the sets of non-leaf gaps of \mathcal{L}_i consist of finitely many orbit classes under the G -action, and
- (3) \mathbf{M} consists of finitely many orbit classes under the G -action.

Proof. Since the G -action on $\mathsf{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is cofinite, equivalently, $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ consists of the finitely many orbit classes under the G -action. Hence, the (2) and (3) follow immediately. It is enough to show (1).

First, let $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ be an interleaving pair in \mathcal{V} such that $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ is either a marked stitch or an asterisk. Choose a tip t of \mathcal{G}_2 . Then, observe that $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}, t)$ is countable since \mathbf{M} is at most countable and in each \mathcal{L}_i , there are countably many non-leaf gaps by totally disconnectedness. Hence, as $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ consists of finitely many orbit classes under the G -action, by the Pigeonhole principle, there are distinct frames F_1 and F_2 in $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}, t)$ such that $g(F_1) = F_2$ for some non-trivial automorphism g in G . Then, as

$$g(\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}, t)) = \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}, g(t)) = \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}, t),$$

$g(t) = t$ and $g(I_t) = I_t$. Since $I_t \in \mathcal{G}_1$, by Theorem 15.12, $g(\mathcal{G}_1) = \mathcal{G}_1$. Hence, g is a properly pseudo-Anosov in $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G}_1)$. Therefore, each $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G}_i)$ contains an infinite cyclic subgroup.

Now, assume that $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ is an asterisk of crowns of \mathcal{V} . Then, for each tip s of \mathcal{G}_2 , $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}, s)$ is countable and the set

$$\bigcup_{\text{a tip } s \in \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{G}_2)} \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}, s)$$

is also countable. Since $\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ consists of finitely many orbit classes under the G -action, there are distinct tips t_1 and t_2 in $v(\mathcal{G}_2)$ penetrating frames F_1 and F_2 , respectively, such that $h(F_1) = F_2$ for some non-trivial automorphism $h \in G$. Then, $h(I_{t_1}) = I_{t_2}$ and, by Theorem 15.12, $h(\mathcal{G}_2) = \mathcal{G}_2$. Then, \mathcal{G}_i are preserved by $\langle h \rangle$ and as h does not fix the tips, h is parabolic. Therefore, as $\langle g, h \rangle \leq \text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G}_i)$, by Theorem 15.22, each $\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G}_i)$ contains a rank two free abelian group. Thus, G has the maximal stabilizer property. \square

18.5. Veering Pairs and Kleinian Groups. We have some corollaries related to Conjecture 8.8 of [Bai15]. Note that every veering pair is also a pants-like COL_2 pair as shown in Section 15.13.

Corollary 18.6. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair and G a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$. Set \mathbf{M} as the marking $\mathbf{M}(G)$. If the G -action on $\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M})$ is cofinite, then G is the fundamental group of a hyperbolic 3-orbifold.*

Proof. We show this by appealing to the geometrization theorem.

We have already showed some properties of X/G . In Theorem 17.15, we proved that X/G is irreducible. Moreover, thanks to Theorem 15.18 and Proposition 18.4, we know that G does not contain an infinite cyclic normal subgroup nor a non-peripheral rank 2 free abelian subgroup. Hence, X/G is homotopically atoroidal.

If \mathcal{V} does not contain any non-leaf ideal polygon gaps and \mathbf{M} is empty, G is torsion-free by Theorem 15.12, X/G becomes a compact irreducible atoroidal 3-manifold with infinite $\pi_1(X/G) = G$. By the Perelman-Thurston hyperbolization theorem, X/G is hyperbolic.

If \mathcal{V} contains some (and therefore infinitely many) non-leaf ideal polygon gaps or marked leaves, X becomes irreducible homotopically atoroidal 3-orbifold with non-empty singular locus. By the orbifold geometrization theorem [BMP03, Theorem 9.1], X is geometric. Since X is homotopically atoroidal and $G = \pi_1(X)$ is infinite, the only possible geometry that X/G can support is hyperbolic. \square

Example 18.7. There are many examples where Corollary 18.6 applies. The most common situation is when G is the fundamental group of the mapping torus of a hyperbolic surface by a pseudo-Anosov mapping class. In this case, G preserves a veering pair induced from the invariant laminations of the pseudo-Anosov mapping class.

Corollary 18.8. *Let \mathcal{V} be a veering pair and G a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$. If the G -action on $\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}(G))$ is cofinite, then G is relatively hyperbolic with respect to $\{\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G}) \mid \mathcal{G} \text{ is a crown}\}$.*

Corollary 18.9. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$ be a veering pair without non-leaf polygons and G a torsion free subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$. If the G -action on $\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{V})$ is cofinite, then $|\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{V})|/G$ is a tautly foliated hyperbolic 3-manifold whose fundamental group is G .*

Proof. By Theorem 17.15 and Corollary 18.6, $|\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{V})|/G$ is a hyperbolic 3-manifold with a taut veering triangulation $\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{V})/G$ whose fundamental group is G . Moreover, as remarked in [Lac00], the horizontal branched surface of $\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{V})/G$ carries at least one taut foliation. Thus, the result follows. \square

19. NEXT STEP

We suspect that $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V}) = \text{Aut}(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}(\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})))$ is still geometric even without the cofinite condition. More weakly, we also expect that every subgroup G of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$ is relatively hyperbolic with respect to $\{\text{Stab}_G(\mathcal{G}) : \mathcal{G} \text{ is a crown}\}$. One of supportive evidences is Corollary 15.23 in the sense of the Gersten conjecture [Bes04, Q1.1]. Unfortunately, our argument does rely on the cocompactness of the action and does not seem to work well in the noncompact setting. One of directions to tackle this issue is to see the action of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$ on the ‘‘boundary’’ of the space X in the proof of Corollary 18.6, although no natural compactification of this space is known yet. With the characterization of the Bowditch boundary [Yam04], this leads us to the following question.

Question 19.1. Let \mathcal{V} be a veering pair. Does $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$ admit a convergence action on S^2 ?

More precisely, given a veering pair $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\}$, the partition $Q = Q_1 \cup J(Q_2)$ is a cellular decomposition of $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ where Q_1 , Q_2 , and J are defined in Section 6.3. Hence, by Theorem 6.2, $\mathcal{D}(Q)$ is homeomorphic to the sphere. Furthermore, $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$ faithfully acts on $\mathcal{D}(Q)$. By Theorem 15.9, each element of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$ acts on the sphere like an element of $\text{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$. Therefore, the precise statement is of the following form.

Question 19.2. Does any subgroup G of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V})$ act on $\mathcal{D}(Q)$ as a convergence action? Furthermore, if the G -action on $V(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{M}(G))$ is cofinite, does $\mathcal{D}(Q)$ consist only of conical limit points and bounded parabolic points?

A related result can be found in [ABS19] where they proved that a subgroup of $\text{Homeo}^+(S^1)$ preserving a pseudo-fibered pair of very full lamination systems such that all elements are hyperbolic admits a convergence action on S^2 .

As of now, we do not know any “non-trivial” example of veering pair. Namely, all known veering pairs come from some extra structures defined in 3-manifolds, e.g. pseudo-Anosov flow, essential lamination, or veering triangulation. Because our setting is quite general and seemingly independent of 3-dimensional topology, we expect that there are interesting constructions and examples of veering pairs. Especially, we hope that the following question holds.

Question 19.3. Does every hyperbolic group with sphere boundary act on the circle preserving a veering pair?

If so, our theorem gives an answer of Cannon’s conjecture.

REFERENCES

- [ABS19] Juan Alonso, Hyungrul Baik, and Eric Samperton. On laminar groups, Tits alternatives and convergence group actions on S^2 . *J. Group Theory*, 22(3):359–381, 2019.
- [Ago11] Ian Agol. Ideal triangulations of pseudo-Anosov mapping tori. In *Topology and geometry in dimension three*, volume 560 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 1–17. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2011.
- [AT22] Ian Agol and Chi Cheuk Tsang. Dynamics of veering triangulations: infinitesimal components of their flow graphs and applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.02706*, 2022.
- [Bai15] Hyungrul Baik. Fuchsian groups, circularly ordered groups and dense invariant laminations on the circle. *Geom. Topol.*, 19(4):2081–2115, 2015.
- [Bes04] Mladen Bestvina. Questions in geometric group theory. Problem list, 2004.
- [BK20] Hyungrul Baik and KyeongRo Kim. Laminar groups and 3-manifolds. In *In the tradition of Thurston—geometry and topology*, pages 365–421. Springer, Cham, [2020] ©2020.
- [BK21] Hyungrul Baik and KyeongRo Kim. Complete Characterization of Fuchsian groups in terms of invariant laminations. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2110.06481, October 2021.
- [BMP03] Michel Boileau, Sylvain Maillot, and Joan Porti. *Three-dimensional orbifolds and their geometric structures*, volume 15 of *Panoramas et Synthèses [Panoramas and Syntheses]*. Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 2003.
- [Bow07] Brian H. Bowditch. The Cannon-Thurston map for punctured-surface groups. *Math. Z.*, 255(1):35–76, 2007.
- [Cal06a] Danny Calegari. Promoting essential laminations. *Invent. Math.*, 166(3):583–643, 2006.
- [Cal06b] Danny Calegari. Universal circles for quasigeodesic flows. *Geom. Topol.*, 10:2271–2298, 2006.
- [Cal07] Danny Calegari. *Foliations and the geometry of 3-manifolds*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007.
- [CD03] Danny Calegari and Nathan M Dunfield. Laminations and groups of homeomorphisms of the circle. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 152(1):149–204, 2003.
- [CJ94] Andrew Casson and Douglas Jungreis. Convergence groups and Seifert fibered 3-manifolds. *Invent. Math.*, 118(3):441–456, 1994.
- [CT07] James W. Cannon and William P. Thurston. Group invariant Peano curves. *Geom. Topol.*, 11:1315–1355, 2007.
- [Fen12] Sérgio Fenley. Ideal boundaries of pseudo-anosov flows and uniform convergence groups with connections and applications to large scale geometry. *Geometry & Topology*, 16(1):1–110, 2012.
- [FG13] David Futer and François Guéritaud. Explicit angle structures for veering triangulations. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 13(1):205–235, 2013.
- [FSS19] Steven Frankel, Saul Schleimer, and Henry Segerman. From veering triangulations to link spaces and back again. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.00006*, 2019.
- [Gab92] David Gabai. Convergence groups are Fuchsian groups. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 136(3):447–510, 1992.
- [Ghy01] Étienne Ghys. Groups acting on the circle. *Enseign. Math. (2)*, 47(3-4):329–407, 2001.
- [GO89] David Gabai and Ulrich Oertel. Essential laminations in 3-manifolds. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 130(1):41–73, 1989.
- [Hin90] A. Hinkkanen. Abelian and nondiscrete convergence groups on the circle. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 318(1):87–121, 1990.
- [HRS12] Craig D Hodgson, J Hyam Rubinstein, and Henry Segerman. Triangulations of hyperbolic 3-manifolds admitting strict angle structures. *Journal of Topology*, 5(4):887–908, 2012.
- [HRST11] Craig D Hodgson, J Hyam Rubinstein, Henry Segerman, and Stephan Tillmann. Veering triangulations admit strict angle structures. *Geometry & Topology*, 15(4):2073–2089, 2011.
- [HY88] J.G. Hocking and G.S. Young. *Topology*. Addison-Wesley series in mathematics. Dover Publications, 1988.
- [KH95] Anatole Katok and Boris Hasselblatt. *Introduction to the modern theory of dynamical systems*, volume 54 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995. With a supplementary chapter by Katok and Leonardo Mendoza.
- [Lac00] Marc Lackenby. Taut ideal triangulations of 3-manifolds. *Geom. Topol.*, 4:369–395, 2000.

- [Lan18] Michael Landry. Taut branched surfaces from veering triangulations. *Algebraic & Geometric Topology*, 18(2):1089–1114, 2018.
- [Lan19] Michael Landry. Stable loops and almost transverse surfaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.08709*, 2019.
- [Lan22] Michael P Landry. Veering triangulations and the thurston norm: homology to isotopy. *Advances in Mathematics*, 396:108102, 2022.
- [LMT20] Michael Landry, Yair N Minsky, and Samuel J Taylor. A polynomial invariant for veering triangulations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.04836*, 2020.
- [LMT21] Michael P Landry, Yair N Minsky, and Samuel J Taylor. Flows, growth rates, and the veering polynomial. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.04066*, 2021.
- [Moo29] R. L. Moore. Concerning upper semi-continuous collections. *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik*, 36(1):81–88, 1929.
- [SS20] Saul Schleimer and Henry Segerman. Essential loops in taut ideal triangulations. *Algebraic & Geometric Topology*, 20(1):487–501, 2020.
- [SS21] Saul Schleimer and Henry Segerman. From loom spaces to veering triangulations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.10264*, 2021.
- [Thu97] William P Thurston. Three-manifolds, foliations and circles, i. *arXiv preprint math/9712268*, 1997.
- [Tuk88] Pekka Tukia. Homeomorphic conjugates of Fuchsian groups. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 391:1–54, 1988.
- [Wil49] Raymond Louis Wilder. *Topology of Manifolds*. American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, Vol. 32. American Mathematical Society, New York, N. Y., 1949.
- [Yam04] Asli Yaman. A topological characterisation of relatively hyperbolic groups. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 566:41–89, 2004.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, KOREA ADVANCED INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (KAIST), 291 DAEHAK-RO, YUSEONG-GU, DAEJEON 34141, REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Email address: `hrbaik@kaist.ac.kr`

CENTER FOR GEOMETRY AND PHYSICS, INSTITUTE FOR BASIC SCIENCE (IBS), POHANG 37673, KOREA

Email address: `htjung@ibs.re.kr`

RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, SEOUL NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, GWANAKRO 1, GWANAK- GU, SEOUL 08826, KOREA

Email address: `cantor14@snu.ac.kr`