

AUTOMORPHISMS OF FINE CURVE GRAPHS FOR NONORIENTABLE SURFACES

MITSUAKI KIMURA AND ERIKA KUNO

ABSTRACT. The fine curve graph of a surface was introduced by Bowden, Hensel, and Webb as a graph consisting of the actual essential simple closed curves on the surface. Long, Margalit, Pham, Verberne, and Yao proved that the automorphism group of the fine curve graph of a closed orientable surface is isomorphic to the homeomorphism group of the surface. In this paper, based on their argument, we prove that the automorphism group of the fine curve graph of a closed nonorientable surface N of genus $g \geq 4$ is isomorphic to the homeomorphism group of N .

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $N = N_{g,p}^b$ be a connected nonorientable surface of genus $g \geq 1$ with $b \geq 0$ boundary components and $p \geq 0$ punctures, and $S = S_{g,p}^b$ a connected orientable surface of genus $g \geq 0$ with $b \geq 0$ boundary components and $p \geq 0$ punctures. Note that $N_{g,p}^b$ is homeomorphic to the surface obtained from a sphere with p punctures by removing $g+b$ open disks and attaching g Möbius bands along their boundaries, and we call each of the Möbius bands a *crosscap*. We drop the subscript b (resp. p) from $N_{g,p}^b$ and $S_{g,p}^b$ if $b = 0$ (resp. $p = 0$). Especially, $N_g = N_{g,0}^0$ and $S_g = S_{g,0}^0$ denote closed surfaces. If we do not care whether the surface is orientable or not, we write F for the surface.

In [2], Bowden, Hensel, and Webb introduced the *fine curve graph* $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(F)$ of a surface F in order to study the homeomorphism group $\text{Homeo}(F)$ and the diffeomorphism group $\text{Diff}(F)$ of F . Here, the fine curve graph $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(F)$ of a surface F is the graph whose vertex is an actual essential simple closed curve in F and whose edge is a pair of vertices that are disjoint in F . The action of $\text{Homeo}(F)$ on $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(F)$ induces the natural map $\eta: \text{Homeo}(F) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}^\dagger(F))$.

In [6], Long, Margalit, Pham, Verberne and Yao proved the following:

Theorem 1.1 ([6]). *For $g \geq 2$, the natural map $\eta: \text{Homeo}(S_g) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}^\dagger(S_g))$ is an isomorphism.*

In this paper, we prove the following result corresponding to Theorem 1.1 for closed nonorientable surfaces.

Theorem 1.2. *For $g \geq 4$, the natural map $\eta: \text{Homeo}(N_g) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N_g))$ is an isomorphism.*

We note that in this paper, only Theorem 1.2 requires the assumption that $g \geq 4$; for all the other theorems, propositions, lemmas, and corollaries, the statements

Date: March 30, 2023.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 20F65, 57K20, 57S05.

Key words and phrases. Homeomorphism groups; fine curve graphs; nonorientable surfaces.

hold for $g \geq 3$ or any genus. See Remark 5.3 for the reason why the assumption $g \geq 4$ appears in Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 1.1 can be thought of as an analogy to the classical result of Ivanov [4], which states that the automorphism group $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}(S_g))$ of the ordinary curve graph $\mathcal{C}(S_g)$ is isomorphic to the extended mapping class group $\text{Mod}^\pm(S_g)$ of S_g if $g \geq 3$. Similarly, Theorem 1.2 can also be thought of as an analogy to the result of Atalan and Korkmaz [1], which states that the automorphism group $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}(N_g))$ is isomorphic to the mapping class group $\text{Mod}(N_g)$ if $g \geq 5$.

To prove Theorem 1.2, we apply the argument in [6], but with some modifications. Here we list some of the differences from the case of orientable surfaces.

- We define torus pairs, pants pairs, and bigon pairs described in Subsection 2.1 to be two-sided. If we allow one-sided simple closed curves for torus pairs, pants pairs, and bigon pairs, we can not use same argument in the proofs of the lemmas in Section 2 (for the details, see Subsection 2.1).
- In the statement of Lemma 2.4, we restrict the curves corresponding to the vertices of X to be two-sided, and for the reason see Remark 2.5.
- In the first step of the proof of Lemma 2.6, we can not use the same argument as that of orientable surfaces since the inessential simple closed curves of closed nonorientable surfaces are not only the simple closed curves bounding a disk but also the simple closed curves bounding a Möbius band (for the details, see Remark 2.9 (1)).
- In [6], they used the *extended fine curve graph*, denoted as $\mathcal{EC}^\dagger(S)$, consisting of all simple closed curves in a closed orientable surface S . For a closed nonorientable surface N , we define $\mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N)$ (see Section 4 for the definition) to consist of all the simple closed curves on N but the inessential simple closed curves which bound a Möbius band. For the reason why the extended fine curve graphs of nonorientable surfaces should not contain any inessential simple closed curve bounding a Möbius band, see Remark 5.2.

For a related research, Roux and Wolff [8] considered a variant $\mathcal{NC}_\text{th}^\dagger(F)$ of the fine curve graph and its automorphism group. They proved that $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{NC}_\text{th}^\dagger(F))$ is isomorphic to $\text{Homeo}(F)$ for every non-spherical surfaces (i.e., surfaces not embeddable in the 2-sphere) without boundary, orientable or not, compact or not. In [8], they mentioned the possibility of proving Theorem 1.1 via the graph $\mathcal{NC}_\text{th}^\dagger(F)$. We note that Theorem 1.2 could also be approached with the strategy.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we fix the notations and prepare key propositions (Propositions 2.1 and 2.2) for the proof of Theorem 1.2. We also list the lemmas required for the key propositions. Most of these propositions and lemmas are shown same as in [6], their proofs will be omitted, with the following exceptions: We will include a proof of Lemma 2.4 to explain where we should care in the case of nonorientable surfaces (Remark 2.5). We will outline a proof of Lemma 2.6 and give a proof of Claims 2.7 and 2.8, which are required in the proof of Lemma 2.6.

2.1. Notation. Throughout this paper, a curve on F means a simple closed curve on F unless otherwise noted. For a nonorientable surface N , a curve c on N is said to be *one-sided* if a regular neighborhood of c is a Möbius band, and c is said to be *two-sided* if a regular neighborhood of c is an annulus. We remark that a curve c

on N is one-sided if and only if c goes through crosscaps odd number of times, and two-sided if and only if c goes through crosscaps even number of times.

We say that curves c and d on N are *noncrossing at a component a* of $c \cap d$ if there are a neighborhood U of a and a homeomorphism $U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ so that the image of $c \cap U$ and $d \cap U$ lie in the (closed) upper and lower half plane of \mathbb{R}^2 , respectively (otherwise, c and d are called *crossing at a*). The curves c and d are *noncrossing* if they are noncrossing at any component of $c \cap d$.

Let c and d be curves on N . We say that a pair $\{c, d\}$ of essential simple closed curves in N is:

- a *torus pair* if c and d are both two-sided, $c \cap d$ is a single interval, and c and d are crossing at that interval.
- a *pants pair* if c and d are both two-sided, $c \cap d$ is a single interval, c and d are noncrossing at that interval, and c and d are not homotopic.
- a *bigon pair* if c and d are both two-sided, $c \cap d$ is just one nontrivial closed interval, and c and d are homotopic.

Note that we consider torus pairs, pants pairs, and bigon pairs to be restricted to two-sided curves. In the proof of Lemma 2.6, Step 2 requires a claim (Claim 2.8) which is false if we allow one-sided curves for torus pairs (see Remark 2.9 (2)). Thus, torus pairs should consist of only two-sided curves. Pants pairs and bigon pairs should also be restricted to two-sided curves for consistency with other notions.

A torus pair or a pants pair $\{c, d\}$ is *degenerate* if $c \cap d$ is a single point. If $\{c, d\}$ is a nondegenerate torus pair, then the curve $\overline{c \triangle d} := \overline{c \cup d - c \cap d}$ is the exactly one other essential simple closed curve e which is contained in $c \cup d$, and we refer to $\{c, d, e\}$ as a *torus triple*. We should remark that for nonorientable surfaces if $\{c, d\}$ is a nondegenerate torus pair, then the curve $\overline{c \triangle d}$ is also two-sided. We can see this as follows. If the arc $c \cap d$ passes the crosscaps odd number of times, then both arcs $c - c \cap d$ and $d - c \cap d$ also pass crosscaps odd number of times since c and d are both two-sided curves. Then we see that the curve $\overline{c \triangle d} = \overline{(c - c \cap d) \cup (d - c \cap d)}$ is also two-sided since it passes the crosscaps even number of times. For the other case, that is, the case where $c \cap d$ passes the crosscaps even number of times, we see $\overline{c \triangle d}$ is two-sided by the same way.

If $\{c, d\}$ is a bigon pair, then $e := \overline{c \triangle d}$ is a simple closed curve bounding a disk. When the two curves in a bigon pair are nonseparating, we refer the pair to a *nonseparating bigon pair*.

Moreover, we suppose that bigon pairs $\{c, d\}$ and $\{c', d'\}$ determine the same inessential curve e bounding a disk. We say that the pair of bigon pairs $\{\{c, d\}, \{c', d'\}\}$ is a *sharing pair* if the corresponding arcs connecting e have disjoint interiors. The sharing pair is *linked* if the corresponding arcs are linked at e , which means that a curve parallel to e and sufficiently close to e intersects the arcs alternately.

2.2. Key propositions. Next, we prepare the key propositions for the proof of Theorem 1.2. In this subsection, all propositions and lemmas are taken from [6, Section 2], with the assumption of orientable surfaces changed to nonorientable surfaces. The key propositions are the following:

Proposition 2.1 (cf. [6, Proposition 2.1]). *Let $N = N_g$ with $g \geq 3$. Then every automorphism of $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N)$ preserves the set of nonseparating bigon pairs.*

Proposition 2.2 (cf. [6, Proposition 2.2]). *Let $N = N_g$ with $g \geq 3$. Then every automorphism of $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N)$ preserves the set of linked sharing pairs.*

We use Lemmas 2.3, 2.4, 2.6 and 2.11 to prove Propositions 2.1 and 2.2. The proofs of the propositions from these lemmas are the same as in [6] and will be omitted.

A *multicurve* is a finite collection of pairwise disjoint essential simple closed curves in N . A multicurve is *separating* if its complement has more than one component. We say that two curves a and b lie on the *same side* of a separating multicurve m if they are disjoint from m and lie in the same complementary component. We remark that a separating multicurve m should contain at least one two-sided curve. In fact, if we cut a nonorientable surface N of genus g with b boundary components along mutually disjoint k one-sided curves, then the resulting surface is homeomorphic to a nonorientable surface N' of genus $g - k$ with $b + k$ boundary components, which is connected.

Lemma 2.3 (cf. [6, Lemma 2.3]). *Let $N = N_g$ with $g \geq 3$. Then every automorphism α of $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N)$ preserves:*

- *the set of separating curves in $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N)$, and*
- *the set of separating multicurves in $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N)$.*

Moreover, α preserves the sides of separating multicurves, that is, a and b lie on the same side of a separating multicurve m if and only if $\alpha(a)$ and $\alpha(b)$ lie on the same side of $\alpha(m)$.

We omit the proof of Lemma 2.3 since they can be proven in the same way as in [6].

We define the *hull* of a collection of curves in a surface to be the union of the curves along with any embedded disks bounded by the curves.

Lemma 2.4 (cf. [6, Lemma 2.4]). *Let $N = N_g$ with $g \geq 3$, X a finite set of vertices represented by two-sided curves on N of $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N)$, and d a vertex of $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N)$. Then, d lies in the hull of X if and only if the link of d contains the link of X . In particular, if d lies in the hull of X , then $\alpha(d)$ lies in the hull of $\alpha(X)$ for every $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N))$.*

Note that we assume that X consists only of two-sided curves in Lemma 2.4. With this restriction, we can prove Lemma 2.4 as same as the proof of [6, Lemma 2.4]. However, we include a proof of Lemma 2.4 to explain why we added such a restriction (Remark 2.5).

Proof of Lemma 2.4. For the forward direction, suppose that d is a vertex of $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N)$ that does not lie in the hull of X , that is, d is not a vertex of X nor a curve lies in the union of disks bounding the curves in X . This means that there is a component of $d \setminus X$ that lies in a component R of $N \setminus X$ that is not a disk. If the genus (as either orientable or nonorientable surface) of R is at least 1, it is clear that there exists a curve on R which is essential in N . If the genus of R is 0, then each curve in R parallel to a boundary component of R is an essential curve (here we use two-sidedness of the curves corresponding to the vertices of X). Particularly, R contains an essential curve in N which intersects d , as desired.

Suppose for the other direction that d is a vertex of $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N)$ that lies in the hull of X . We assume that there exists a vertex e of $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N)$ which intersects d but is

disjoint from each curve in X . Then, e should be contained in $N \setminus X$. Since d lies in the hull of X and e intersects with d , e should be contained in a connected component of $N \setminus X$ which is a disk. Then it follows that e is an inessential curve bounding a disk. It contradicts that e is a vertex of $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N)$. \square

Remark 2.5. We note that in Lemma 2.4, the set X should consist of only vertices represented by two-sided curves in N ; if we allow one-sided curves, the same proof of Lemma 2.4 ([6, Lemma 2.4]) does not work. More specifically, if X contains a one-sided curve c and the genus of R in the proof of Lemma 2.4 is 0, then there is the boundary component ∂_c of $N \setminus X$ corresponding to c . Thus a curve on R parallel to ∂_c bounds a Möbius band in N , which is not essential in N . We also remark that we will use Lemma 2.4 to the proof of Lemma 2.6 as X is a torus pair or a pants pair, and so this restriction does not disturb the argument in this paper.

From now on, we describe how to prove Lemma 2.6 since there are several difference from the proof of [6, Lemma 2.5] (see Remark 2.9 for the reason why the same argument as that of orientable surfaces does not work).

Lemma 2.6 (cf. [6, Lemma 2.5]). *Let $N = N_g$ with $g \geq 3$. Then every automorphism α of $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N)$ preserves:*

- the set of torus pairs,
- the set of degenerate torus pairs,
- the set of nondegenerate torus pairs, and
- the set of torus triple.

As in the case of orientable surfaces [6], we can prove Lemma 2.6 in four steps:

1. α preserves the union of torus pairs and pants pairs consists of only non-separating curves
2. α preserves the set of torus pairs
3. α preserves the degenerate torus pairs
4. α preserves the set of torus triples

Step 1. Let c and d are nonseparating two-sided curves which intersect. It is enough to show that the following three conditions are equivalent:

- (1) The pair $\{c, d\}$ is a torus pair or a pants pair.
- (2) There exists at most one other vertex of $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N)$ that lies in the hull of $\{c, d\}$.
- (3) There exists at most one vertex of $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N)$ whose link contains the link of $\{c, d\}$, where the *link* of a set A of vertices in a graph is the subgraph spanned by the set of vertices that are not in A and are connected by an edge to each vertex in A .

As in [6], (2) and (3) are equivalent by Lemma 2.4. Item (1) implies (2) in the same way as in [6]. Step 1 is completed by proving that (2) implies (1), i.e., the following claim.

Claim 2.7. *Let c and d be nonseparating two-sided curves which intersect. If there exists at most one other vertex of $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N)$ that lies in the hull of $\{c, d\}$, then the pair $\{c, d\}$ is a torus pair or a pants pair.*

Proof. We modify the argument in [6]. If $\{c, d\}$ is neither a torus pair nor a pants pair, then $c \cap d$ has two distinct connected components, say a_1 and a_2 . Then they divide c into two curves c_1 and c_2 : $c \setminus (a_1 \sqcup a_2) = c_1 \sqcup c_2$. Similarly, they also divide d into d_1 and d_2 . We can take a_1 and a_2 so that $c \cap d_1 = \emptyset$.

We also take two distinct connected components b_1 and b_2 of $c \cap d$ with $a_1 \neq b_1$ (it could be $a_1 = b_2$ or $a_2 = b_1$). They divide c into c'_1, c'_2 and divide d into d'_1, d'_2 . We can take b_1 and b_2 to satisfy $c'_1 \cap d = \emptyset$ and $c'_1 \neq c_1$ (we can choose $c'_1 = c_2$ if $a_1 = b_2$ and $a_2 = b_1$).

In $c \cup d$, there are four distinct simple closed curves e_1, e_2, e_3 , and e_4 that contain $c_1 \cup d_1, c_2 \cup d_1, c'_1 \cup d'_1$, and $c'_2 \cup d'_1$, respectively; they are all distinct from c and d . Hence, if we assume the second statement, then the following holds: at least one of pairs $\{e_1, e_2\}$ and $\{e_3, e_4\}$ consists only of inessential curves.

We assume that both e_1 and e_2 are inessential. If both e_1 and e_2 bound a Möbius band, then they represent the same homology class $[e_1] = [e_2]$ of $H_1(N, \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$. Then $[c] = [e_1] + [e_2] = 0$ in $H_1(N, \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$; this means that c is separating, which is contrary to the assumption.

Hence, e_1 or e_2 bound a disk. Then the hull of $\{c, d\}$ contains infinitely many distinct curves; this is again a contradiction. Therefore, (2) does not hold if (1) does not; we obtain the contrapositive of the claim. \square

Step 2. By Lemma 2.3, it is sufficient to prove the following:

Claim 2.8. *Let c, d be nonseparating two-sided curves which form a torus pair or a pants pair. Then, the pair $\{c, d\}$ is a torus pair if and only if there exists a separating curve e such that e is disjoint from both c and d and satisfies the following property: all nonseparating simple closed curves in N lying on the same side of e as $\{c, d\}$ intersect $c \cup d$.*

We can prove Claim 2.8 in the same way as the proof of [6, Step 2 in Lemma 2.5]. However, we include a proof of Claim 2.8 to explain the reason why we only consider two-sided curves (Remark 2.9 (2)).

Proof of Claim 2.8. Let $\{c, d\}$ be a torus pair (then it automatically follows that both c and d are nonseparating). We put R as a neighborhood of $c \cup d$ which is homotopic to a torus with one boundary component e (here, we use the two-sidedness of torus pairs). The resulting surface by cutting R along $c \cup d$ is an annulus. Any nonseparating curve in R is not homotopic to e . Hence, any nonseparating curve in R intersects with $c \cup d$. For the other direction, we assume that c, d are nonseparating two-sided curves on N form a pants pair $\{c, d\}$. Let e be any separating curve which is disjoint from $c \cup d$, and let R be the subsurface of N that contains $c \cup d$ and has boundary e . Then, R need to have a positive genus, since now N is closed and c and d is not homotopic. There exists a closed neighborhood of $c \cup d$ which is a pair of pants P contained in R . We put P° as the interior of P . Since the genus of P is 0, there exists a curve on $R \setminus P^\circ$ which is nonseparating in R (hence in N), and so we are done. \square

The proofs of Step 3 and Step 4 are similar to those for orientable surfaces, so we omit them. Thus we obtain Lemma 2.6.

Remark 2.9. We summarize here the issues in considering nonorientable surfaces in the proof of Lemma 2.6.

- (1) In Step 1 of the proof of Lemma 2.6, we cannot use the same argument as that for the orientable surfaces [6]. More precisely, in [6], they used the fact that any inessential curve of orientable surfaces bounds a disk, and so if at least one curve in $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$ is inessential, then it follows that the

hull of $\{c, d\}$ contains infinite essential curves other than c and d . However, for nonorientable surfaces, the curves bounding a Möbius band are also inessential. Then we have the case where the hull of $\{c, d\}$ contains at most one essential curve other than c and d but $\{c, d\}$ does not form a torus pair nor a pants pair.

- (2) The reason why we consider only two-sided curves for torus pairs/triples is as follows: if both c and d are one-sided curves in Step 2, the curve e may not be separating by taking a boundary curve of R .

We explain the definition of an annulus set from now on. Suppose that (a, b) is an ordered pair of vertices in $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N)$ that are disjoint, homotopic two-sided curves. Assuming $g \geq 3$, there is a unique annulus A in N_g whose boundary is $a \cup b$. Let $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(a, b)$ be the set of vertices of $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N_g)$ consisting of curves contained in the interior of A . We refer to $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(a, b)$ as an *annulus set*. A *nonseparating noncrossing annulus pair* is an annulus pair where both curves are nonseparating and the pair is noncrossing. There is a natural partial ordering on the annulus set $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(a, b)$: we say that $c \preceq d$ if c and d are noncrossing and each component of $c \setminus d$ lies in the component of $A \setminus d$ bounded by a .

Lemma 2.10 (cf. [6, Lemma 2.6]). *Let $N = N_g$ with $g \geq 3$, let α be an automorphism of $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N)$, and let a and b be disjoint, homotopic nonseparating two-sided curves. Then,*

- (1) *the curves $\alpha(a)$ and $\alpha(b)$ are disjoint, homotopic nonseparating two-sided curves,*
- (2) *the image of $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(a, b)$ under α is $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(\alpha(a), \alpha(b))$,*
- (3) *if $c, d \in \mathcal{C}^\dagger(a, b)$ are noncrossing then $\alpha(c)$ and $\alpha(d)$ are noncrossing, and*
- (4) *if $c \preceq d$ in $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(a, b)$ then $\alpha(c) \preceq \alpha(d)$ in $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(\alpha(a), \alpha(b))$.*

Note that if two curves a and b on N are disjoint and homotopic, then it automatically follows that a and b are two-sided since any pair of homotopic one-sided curves must intersect.

Now we define type 1 and type 2 curves. Suppose that $\{c, d\}$ is a nonseparating noncrossing annulus pair, and suppose that e is a curve so that $\{c, e\}$ and $\{d, e\}$ are degenerate torus pairs. If $c \cup e$ and $d \cap e$ are the same point, then we say that e is a *type 1 curve* for $\{c, d\}$. Otherwise, we say that e is a *type 2 curve* for $\{c, d\}$.

Lemma 2.11 (cf. [6, Lemma 2.7]). *Let $N = N_g$ with $g \geq 3$. Then every automorphism α of $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N)$ preserves type 1 and type 2 curves for nonseparating noncrossing annulus pairs. More precisely, if $\{c, d\}$ is a nonseparating noncrossing annulus pair and e is a type 1 curve for $\{c, d\}$, then $\alpha(e)$ is a type 1 curve for the nonseparating noncrossing annulus pair $\{\alpha(c), \alpha(d)\}$, and similar for type 2 curves.*

Since Lemmas 2.10 and 2.11 can be proven in the same way as in [6], we also omit their proofs.

3. CONNECTEDNESS OF FINE ARC GRAPHS

In [6], they introduced several fine arc graphs of orientable surfaces and proved that they are connected. In this section, we consider fine arc graphs of nonorientable surfaces and discuss their connectedness. Through of this section, let F be a compact surface with nonempty boundary $\partial F \neq \emptyset$.

We will define the *fine arc graph* $\mathcal{A}^\dagger(F)$ of F . An arc $a: [0, 1] \rightarrow F$ is said to be *simple* if a is injective, *proper* if $a^{-1}(\partial F) = \{0, 1\}$, and *essential* if it is not homotopic to into ∂F . We say that two arcs have *disjoint interior* if they are disjoint away from ∂F . The fine arc graph $\mathcal{A}^\dagger(F)$ is the graph whose vertices are essential simple proper arcs in F and whose edges connect vertices with disjoint interior.

In [6, Proposition 3.1], they proved that the fine arc graph $\mathcal{A}^\dagger(S)$ is connected for every compact orientable surface S with nonempty boundary. Their argument is based on the connectedness of the (ordinary) arc graph $\mathcal{A}(S)$ and the compactness of S . These properties also hold for nonorientable surfaces; for every $N = N_g^b$ with $b > 0$, the arc graph $\mathcal{A}(N)$ is connected (see [5, Corollary 1] for example), and N is compact. Thus, the following proposition holds.

Proposition 3.1 (cf. [6, Proposition 3.1]). *For any $N = N_g^b$ with $b > 0$, the graph $\mathcal{A}^\dagger(N)$ is connected.*

We say that an arc in F is *nonseparating* if its complement in F is connected. The *fine nonseparating arc graph* $\mathcal{NA}^\dagger(F)$ is the subgraph of $\mathcal{A}^\dagger(F)$ spanned by the nonseparating arcs.

In [6], they proved the connectedness of $\mathcal{NA}^\dagger(S)$ by using the connectedness of $\mathcal{A}^\dagger(S)$. In their argument, the following property is a key: a separating arc in a surface divides the surface into two topological surfaces. Since this also holds for nonorientable surfaces, we can make the same argument as they do, and thus obtain the following.

Corollary 3.2 (cf. [6, Corollary 3.2]). *For any $N = N_g^b$ with $b > 0$, the graph $\mathcal{NA}^\dagger(N)$ is connected.*

For a surface F with positive genus and a connected component d_0 of ∂F , we will define the *fine linked arc graph* $\mathcal{A}_{\text{Lk}}^\dagger(F, d_0)$. Let a and b be two vertices of $\mathcal{A}^\dagger(F)$ whose interiors are disjoint arcs. We say that a and b are linked at d_0 if all four endpoints lie on d_0 and a curve parallel and sufficiently close to d_0 intersects the arcs alternately. We define $\mathcal{A}_{\text{Lk}}^\dagger(F, d_0)$ as the graph whose vertices are nonseparating simple proper arcs in F with both endpoints lie on d_0 and whose edges connect arcs with disjoint interiors that are linked at d_0 .

In [6], they obtained the connectedness of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{Lk}}^\dagger(S, d_0)$ from the connectedness of $\mathcal{NA}^\dagger(S)$. The key to their argument is the following claim: if x and y are unlinked, then there exists an arc z which is linked with x and y . This claim is based on the assumption that x and y are nonseparating, and the same argument goes through for the nonorientable case. Hence, we obtain the following.

Corollary 3.3 (cf. [6, Corollary 3.3]). *For any $N = N_g^b$ with $b > 0$, and any component d_0 of ∂N , the graph $\mathcal{A}_{\text{Lk}}^\dagger(N, d_0)$ is connected.*

4. AUTOMORPHISMS OF THE EXTENDED FINE CURVE GRAPHS

The goal of this section is to state that the automorphism group of the extended fine curve graph $\mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N_g)$ of a closed nonorientable surface N_g of genus $g \geq 3$ is isomorphic to the homeomorphism group $\text{Homeo}(N_g)$ of N_g :

Theorem 4.1 (cf. [6, Theorem 1.2]). *For $g \geq 3$, the natural map $\nu: \text{Homeo}(N_g) \rightarrow \mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N_g)$ is an isomorphism.*

We define the *extended fine curve graph* $\mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N)$ of a closed nonorientable surface N to be a graph whose vertices are all the essential simple closed curves on N or the inessential simple closed curves which bound a disk on N , and an edge is a pair of vertices which are disjoint in N . We emphasize that in our argument the vertex set of the extended fine curve graph $\mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N)$ of any closed nonorientable surface N does not contain any inessential curves bounding a Möbius band.

Following the method of [6], we also use convergent sequences described below to prove Theorem 4.1. We see that the lemmas and corollaries correspond to [6, Section 4] also hold for nonorientable surfaces. Then, it follows that the natural map $\nu: \text{Homeo}(N_g) \rightarrow \mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N_g)$ is injective (c.f. [6, Lemma 4.6]) and furthermore an isomorphism (c.f. [6, Theorem 1.2]). Hence, in this section, we describe the definitions related to convergent sequences for closed nonorientable surfaces and prepare the lemmas and corollaries which we need to prove Theorem 4.1. Since the proofs of the lemmas and corollaries in this section are the same those of [6] for orientable surfaces, we will only describe why they are valid for nonorientable surfaces and omit their proofs.

Let N be a closed nonorientable surface of genus g . We say that a sequence of vertices (c_i) of $\mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N)$ *converges* to a point $x \in N$ if every neighborhood of x contains all but finitely many of the corresponding curves to c_i , and we write $\lim(c_i) = x$. If (c_i) is convergent, it must be that there exists $M > 0$ so that each c_i with $i > M$ bounds a disk in N .

Since [6, Lemma 4.1] is proved by a local argument in a surface, the same argument works also for nonorientable surfaces.

Lemma 4.2 (cf. [6, Lemma 4.1]). *Let N be a closed nonorientable surface, and let (x_i) be a sequence of points in N that converges to a point $x \in N$. Then, there exists a simple closed curve in N that contains infinitely many of the x_i .*

Since the argument in [6, Lemma 4.2] is based on the limit point compactness of surfaces, we can show the same result for nonorientable surfaces.

Lemma 4.3 (cf. [6, Lemma 4.2]). *Let N be a closed nonorientable surface. Automorphisms of $\mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N)$ preserve convergent sequences*

We say that two convergent sequences of vertices of $\mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N)$ are *coincident* if they converge to the same point of N . The *interleave* of two sequences (c_i) and (d_i) is a sequence $c_1, d_1, c_2, d_2, \dots$. We have the following corollary of Lemma 4.3.

Corollary 4.4 (cf. [6, Corollary 4.3]). *Let N be a closed nonorientable surface. Let (c_i) and (d_i) be two convergent sequences of vertices of $\mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N)$. Then, (c_i) and (d_i) are coincident if the interleave of (c_i) and (d_i) is convergent. In particular, automorphisms of $\mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N)$ preserve coincidence of convergent sequences.*

We say that a sequence $(c_i^1), (c_i^2), (c_i^3), \dots$ of a convergent sequences of vertices of $\mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N)$ *converges* if the sequence of limit points $\lim(c_i^1), \lim(c_i^2), \lim(c_i^3), \dots$ converges to a point $x \in N$. In this case we say that the sequence converges to x .

Corollary 4.5 (cf. [6, Corollary 4.4]). *Let N be a closed nonorientable surface. Let (c_i) and (d_i) be two convergent sequences of vertices of $\mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N)$. Then, (c_i) and (d_i) are coincident if and only if the interleave of (c_i) and (d_i) is convergent. In particular, automorphism of $\mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N)$ preserve coincidence of convergent sequences.*

We say that a vertex c is a *limit curve* for a sequence (c_i) of vertices $\mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N)$ if $\lim(c_i) \in c$.

Corollary 4.6 (cf. [6, Corollary 4.5]). *Let N be a closed nonorientable surface. Let c be a limit curve for a sequence (c_i) of vertices and α an automorphism of $\mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N)$. Then, $\alpha(c)$ is a limit curve for $(\alpha(c_i))$.*

Proposition 4.1 holds by the above lemmas and corollaries in this section, and we finish this section.

5. AUTOMORPHISMS OF THE FINE CURVE GRAPH

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.2. We need the following lemma, and the proof is the same as [6, Lemma 5.1].

Lemma 5.1 (cf. [6, Lemma 5.1]). *Let N be a closed nonorientable surface. The natural map $\eta: \text{Homeo}(N) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N))$ is injective.*

Before proving Theorem 1.2, we prepare a tool to prove it. Let Γ be a graph and $\Delta \subset \Gamma$ a subgraph. A map $E: \text{Aut}(\Delta) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ is an *extension map* if for any $\varphi \in \text{Aut}(\Delta)$, $E(\varphi)(\Delta) = \Delta$ and $E(\varphi)|_\Delta = \varphi$.

From now on, we prove Theorem 1.2. We follow the same strategy as in [6] for the proof.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We prove in two steps. In the first step, we construct an extension homomorphism $\varepsilon: \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N)) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N))$, and in the second step, we complete the proof by using the extension homomorphism ε .

Step 1. Let $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N))$. We define $\hat{\alpha}: \mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N) \rightarrow \mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N)$ as follows. If c is an essential curve on N , that is, if $c \in \mathcal{C}^\dagger(N)$, then $\hat{\alpha}(c) = \alpha(c)$. If e is an inessential curve which bounds a disk in N , then we choose a nonseparating bigon pair $\{c, d\}$ determines e and we correspond $\hat{\alpha}(e)$ to an inessential curve bounding a disk determined by the nonseparating bigon pair $\{\alpha(c), \alpha(d)\}$; this correspondence makes sense because of Proposition 2.1. We will verify $\hat{\alpha}$ is well-defined and an automorphism of $\mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N)$.

Suppose that $\{c', d'\}$ is another nonseparating bigon pair determines e . It follows from Corollary 3.3 that there exists a sequence of bigon pairs

$$\{c, d\} = \{c_0, d_0\}, \{c_1, d_1\}, \dots, \{c_n, d_n\} = \{c', d'\},$$

where each pair $\{\{c_i, d_i\}, \{c_{i+1}, d_{i+1}\}\}$ is a linked sharing pair for e . It follows from Proposition 2.2 that $\{\alpha(c'), \alpha(d')\}$ also determines the inessential curve $\hat{\alpha}(e)$ bounding a disk, and we see $\hat{\alpha}$ is well-defined.

Next we will show that $\hat{\alpha}$ is an automorphism. Since $\hat{\alpha}$ is bijection on the set of vertices of $\mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N)$ it suffices to show that $\hat{\alpha}$ maps any edge to an edge.

Let a_1 and a_2 are two distinct essential curves. Then $\hat{\alpha}(a_1) = \alpha(a_1)$ and $\hat{\alpha}(a_2) = \alpha(a_2)$, and so $\hat{\alpha}(a_1)$ and $\hat{\alpha}(a_2)$ form an edge if and only if a_1 and a_2 form an edge.

For the case where an essential curve c and an inessential curve e bounding a disk form an edge, we claim that we can take a nonseparating bigon pair $\{d_1, d_2\}$ which determines e and disjoint from c . In fact, if c is a separating curve on N , we set the two connected component N' and N'' of $N \setminus c$, and we suppose that e lies on N' . Since c is essential and N is a closed nonorientable surface, the genera of N' and N'' are at most 2. Hence we can take two-sided (note that bigon pairs are constructed by only two-sided curves) nonseparating curves d_1 and d_2 on the component N'

containing e so that the pair $\{d_1, d_2\}$ is a bigon pair which determines e . If c is a nonseparating curve on N , the complement $N \setminus c$ of c in N is homeomorphic to any one of N_{g-1}^1 , N_{g-2}^2 , $S_{\frac{g-1}{2}}^1$, or $S_{\frac{g-2}{2}}^2$. Since we assume that the genus of N is at least 4, we can take two-sided nonseparating curves d_1 and d_2 on the subsurface $N \setminus c$ so that the pair $\{d_1, d_2\}$ is a bigon pair which determines e , as desired.




FIGURE 1. Bigon pairs for disjoint inessential curves bounding a disk in the nested case (left) and the unnested case (right).

For the case where two inessential curves e and f which bound a disk form an edge, similar to the case of orientable surfaces we claim that two inessential curves e and f bounding a disk are disjoint if and only if the following holds up to relabeling e and f : for every nonseparating bigon pair $\{c, d\}$ that determines e , there is a bigon pair $\{c', d'\}$ that determines f and is disjoint from e . The forward direction is proved by direct construction (see Figure 1), and note that since the genus of N is at least 4, N has a subsurface homeomorphic to an orientable subsurface of genus 1. For the reverse direction, we assume that two inessential curves e and f which bound a disk intersect. We choose an intersection point $x \in e \cap f$. We can take a nonseparating bigon pair $\{c, d\}$ determining e where x is one of the vertices of the bigon. Let $\{c', d'\}$ be any bigon pair which determines f . Then $x \in f \subset c' \cup d'$, and so $c' \cup d'$ intersects c , as desired. By this claim, we see that $\hat{\alpha}$ preserves the set of edges spanned by two inessential curves bounding a disk. Therefore we see that $\hat{\alpha}$ is an automorphism of $\mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N)$, in particular $\hat{\alpha}$ is an automorphism of $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N)$.

By the definition of $\varepsilon: \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N)) \rightarrow \mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N)$ given by $\varepsilon(\alpha) = \hat{\alpha}$ is the desired extension map.

Step 2. Recall that $\eta: \text{Homeo}(N) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N))$ and $\nu: \text{Homeo}(N) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N))$ are the natural homomorphisms. By Theorem 4.1, ν is an isomorphism. Let ε be the extension homomorphism constructed in the first step. We consider the composition

$$\text{Homeo}(N) \xrightarrow{\eta} \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N)) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \text{Aut}(\mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N)) \xrightarrow{\nu^{-1}} \text{Homeo}(N).$$

We will show that this composition is the identity map on $\text{Homeo}(N)$. Indeed, by the definition of ν and ε , it follows that for any $f \in \text{Homeo}(N)$ we have

$$\eta \circ \nu^{-1} \circ \varepsilon \circ \eta(f) = \eta(f)$$

as in [6]. Since η is injective (Lemma 5.1) it follows that

$$\nu^{-1} \circ \varepsilon \circ \eta(f) = f,$$

which is to say that $\nu^{-1} \circ \varepsilon$ is the inverse map of η , and we complete the proof. \square

Remark 5.2. In the definition of $\mathcal{EC}^\dagger(N)$, we excluded curves that bound a Möbius band and allowed only those that bound a disk as inessential curves. This is done

to avoid the difficulty of including curves that bound a Möbius band, and it is sufficient for the proof of our main theorem.

Remark 5.3. In the part where we verify $\hat{\alpha}$ is bijection for the edges between one essential curve and one inessential curve bounding a disk in Proof of Theorem 1.2, if the genus of a closed nonorientable surface is $g \leq 3$, we can not take a bigon pair $\{d_1, d_2\}$ which is disjoint from c in the case where c is nonseparating. In fact, in our definition of bigon pairs $\{d_1, d_2\}$, the curves d_1 and d_2 are two-sided curves, and by Proposition 2.1 we see that automorphisms of the fine curve graph $\mathcal{C}^\dagger(N)$ preserve “nonseparating” bigon pairs. Therefore, we should take two-sided and nonseparating curves d_1 and d_2 on $N \setminus c$ which is homeomorphic to N_{g-1}^1 , N_{g-2}^2 , $S_{\frac{g-1}{2}}^1$, or $S_{\frac{g-2}{2}}^2$. If $g \leq 3$, $N \setminus c$ can be N_1^1 , N_1^2 , S_0^1 , or S_0^2 , and we can not take two-sided essential curves in these surfaces (see [1, Section 2.4] for example).

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors wish to express their great appreciation to Genki Omori for variable comments. The first author is supported by JST-Mirai Program Grant Number JPMJMI22G1. The second author is supported by JSPS KAKENHI, grant number 21K13791.

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Atalan and M. Korkmaz, *Automorphisms of curve complexes on nonorientable surfaces*, Groups Geom. Dyn. **8** (2014), no. 1, 39–68.
- [2] J. Bowden, S. Hensel, and R. Webb, *Quasi-morphisms on surface diffeomorphism groups*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **35** (2022), 211–231.
- [3] J. Bowden, S. Hensel, K. Mann, E. Militon, and R. Webb, *Rotation sets and actions on curves*, arXiv:2104.11217.
- [4] N. V. Ivanov, *Complexes of curves and Teichmüller modular groups*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **42**(1987), 49–91, English transl.: Russ. Math. Surv. **42**, (1987) 55–107.
- [5] E. Kuno, *Uniform hyperbolicity for curve graphs of non-orientable surfaces*, Hiroshima Math. J. **46** (2016), no. 3, 343–355.
- [6] A. Long, D. Margalit, A. Pham, Y. Verberne, and C. Yao, *Automorphisms of the fine curve graph*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, to appear.
- [7] I. Richards, *On the classification of noncompact surfaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **106** (1963), 259–269.
- [8] F. L. Roux and M. Wolff, *Automorphisms of some variants of fine graphs*, arXiv:2210.05460.

(Mitsuaki Kimura) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KYOTO UNIVERSITY, KITASHIRAKAWA OIWAKE-CHO, SAKYO-KU, KYOTO 606-8502, JAPAN

Email address: mkimura@math.kyoto-u.ac.jp

(Erika Kuno) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE, OSAKA UNIVERSITY, 1-1 MACHIKANEYAMA-CHO TOYONAKA, OSAKA 560-0043, JAPAN

Email address: e-kuno@math.sci.osaka-u.ac.jp