



## CENTRE DE RECERCA MATEMÀTICA

This is a preprint of: *Uniform hyperbolicity of the curve graph via surgery sequences*

Journal Information: *CRM Preprints*,

Author(s): M. Clay, K. Rafi and S. Schleimer.

Volume, pages: 1-20,

DOI:[--]



CENTRE DE RECERCA MATEMÀTICA

Preprint núm. 1167  
July 2013

Uniform hyperbolicity of the curve graph via  
surgery sequences

M. Clay, K. Rafi, S. Schleimer



# UNIFORM HYPERBOLICITY OF THE CURVE GRAPH VIA SURGERY SEQUENCES

MATT CLAY, KASRA RAFI, AND SAUL SCHLEIMER

ABSTRACT. We prove that the curve graph  $\mathcal{C}^{(1)}(S)$  is Gromov-hyperbolic with a constant of hyperbolicity independent of the surface  $S$ . The proof is based on the proof of hyperbolicity of the free splitting complex by Handel and Mosher, as interpreted by Hilion and Horbez.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years the curve graph has emerged as the central object in a variety of areas, such as Kleinian groups [17, 16, 7], Teichmüller spaces [18, 19, 6] and mapping class groups [15, 2]. The initial breakthrough was the result of Masur and Minsky showing that the curve graph is Gromov hyperbolic [14].

In this note, we give a new proof of the hyperbolicity of all curve graphs. We improve on the original proof by additionally showing that the hyperbolicity constants are *uniform*: that is, independent of the topology of the surface.

We use the same hyperbolicity criterion as defined and used by Masur and Minsky [14, Definition 2.2]. Suppose  $\mathcal{X}$  is a graph, equipped with a family of paths, and each path  $\sigma$  is equipped with a projection map  $\pi_\sigma: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \sigma$ . If the family of paths and projection maps satisfy the *retraction*, *Lipschitz*, and *contraction* axioms, as stated in Section 5 then  $\mathcal{X}$  is hyperbolic [14, Theorem 2.3]. We also provide a proof in Section 6. Bestvina and Feighn recently used a similar argument to show that the *free factor graph* of a free group is Gromov hyperbolic [3].

For the curve graph and for the free factor graph another, more geometric, space played the key role in the definition of paths and projection maps. For the curve graph this was *Teichmüller space*; for the free factor graph it was *outer space*. An understanding of geodesics in the geometric spaces was necessary to define the family of paths and their projection maps.

The *splitting graph*, another variant of the curve graph for the free group, was recently shown to be hyperbolic by Handel and Mosher [10]. They also use the hyperbolicity criterion of Masur and Minsky. A novel aspect of their approach was to dispense with the ancillary geometric space; instead they define projection as if the space *were* hyperbolic, and the family of paths were geodesics. Specifically,

---

The first author is partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1006898. The second author is partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1007811. The third author is partially supported by EPSRC grant EP/1028870/1. This work is in the public domain.

given three points  $x$ ,  $y$  and  $z$  in the space, the projection of  $z$  to the path  $\sigma$  from  $x$  to  $y$  is the first point along  $\sigma$  that is close (in a uniform sense) to the path from  $z$  to  $y$ . See Figure 1.1.




FIGURE 1.1. Handel–Mosher projection of a point  $z$  to the path from  $x$  to  $y$ .

The paths used by Handel and Mosher in the splitting graph have a key property that is very reminiscent of negatively curved spaces: *exponential divergence*. In the other direction we find exponential convergence. On a small scale, Handel and Mosher show paths that start distance two apart, and that have the same target, must “intersect” after a distance depending only on the rank of the free group. On a larger scale, this implies that the “girth” of two paths, with the same target, is cut in half after a similar distance. This property is the main tool used to verify the Masur and Minsky axioms.

Hilion and Horbez [13] gave a geometric spin to Handel and Mosher’s argument; this led them to an alternative proof of hyperbolicity of the splitting graph (in their setting called the *sphere graph*). Their paths were surgery sequences of spheres in the doubled handlebody. We closely follow their set-up and use surgery sequences of arcs and curves as defined by Hatcher [11] as paths in the curve graph. We now state our main results.

Let  $S = S_{g,n}$  be a surface of genus  $g$  with  $n$  boundary components, let  $\mathcal{C}(S)$  be the complex of curves, and let  $\mathcal{AC}(S)$  be the complex of curves and arcs; we defer the definitions to Section 2. We add a superscript (1) to denote the one-skeleton.

**Theorem 6.4.** *There is a constant  $U$  such that if  $3g - 3 + n \geq 2$  and  $n > 0$  then  $\mathcal{AC}^{(1)}(S_{g,n})$  is  $U$ -hyperbolic.*

The inclusion  $\mathcal{C}^{(1)}(S_{g,n}) \rightarrow \mathcal{AC}^{(1)}(S_{g,n})$  gives a quasi-isometric embedding with constants independent of  $g$  and  $n$ . Deduce the following.

**Corollary 7.1.** *There is a constant  $U$  such that if  $3g - 3 + n \geq 2$  and  $n > 0$  then  $\mathcal{C}^{(1)}(S_{g,n})$  is  $U$ -hyperbolic.*

We also prove uniform hyperbolicity in the closed case, when  $n = 0$ . This follows from Theorem 6.4, as  $\mathcal{C}^{(1)}(S_{g,0})$  isometrically embeds in  $\mathcal{C}^{(1)}(S_{g,1})$ .

**Theorem 7.2.** *There is a constant  $U$  such that if  $3g - 3 \geq 2$  then  $\mathcal{C}^{(1)}(S_g)$  is  $U$ -hyperbolic.*

As noted above, the various constants appearing in our argument are uniform. This is mostly due to Lemma 3.3 which shows that paths that start distance two apart, and that have the same target, must “intersect” after a uniform distance.

After the original paper of Masur and Minsky, Bowditch [4] and Hamenstädt [9] also gave proofs of the hyperbolicity of the curve graph. In all of these the upper bound on the hyperbolicity constant depended on the topology of the surface  $S$ . During the process of writing this paper, several other proofs of uniform hyperbolicity emerged. Bowditch [5] has refined his approach to obtain uniform constants using techniques he developed in [4]; the proof by Aougab [1] has many common themes with the work of Bowditch. The work of Hensel, Przytycki, and Webb [12] also uses surgery paths and has other points of contact with our work. However Hensel, Przytycki, and Webb do not use the Masur–Minsky criterion; they also obtain much smaller hyperbolicity constants than given here.

We remark that the techniques used in this paper can also be used to prove that the free factor graphs are uniformly hyperbolic [8].

**Acknowledgements.** We thank the Centre de Recerca Matemàtica for its hospitality during its 2012 research program on automorphisms of free groups.

## 2. BACKGROUND

Let  $S = S_{g,n}$  be a connected, compact, oriented surface of genus  $g$  with  $n$  boundary components. We make the standing assumption that the *complexity* of  $S$ , namely  $3g - 3 + n$ , is at least two. This rules out three surfaces:  $S_{0,4}$ ,  $S_1$ ,  $S_{1,1}$ . In each case the arc and curve complex is a version of the Farey graph; the Farey graph has hyperbolicity constant one when we restrict to the vertices, and  $3/2$  when we include the edges.

**2.1. Arcs and curves.** A properly embedded curve or arc  $\alpha \subset S$  is *essential* if  $\alpha$  does not cut a disk off of  $S$ . A properly embedded curve  $\alpha$  is *non-peripheral* if it does not cut an annulus off of  $S$ . Define  $\mathcal{AC}(S)$  to be the set of ambient isotopy classes of essential arcs and essential non-peripheral curves.

For classes  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{AC}(S)$  define the geometric intersection number  $i(\alpha, \beta)$  to be the minimal intersection number among representatives. A non-empty subset  $A \subset \mathcal{AC}(S)$  is a *system of arcs and curves*, or simply a *system*, if for all  $\alpha, \beta \in A$  we have  $i(\alpha, \beta) = 0$ . We now give  $\mathcal{AC}(S)$  the structure of a simplicial complex by taking systems for the simplices. We use  $\mathcal{C}(S)$  to denote the subcomplex of  $\mathcal{AC}(S)$  spanned by curves alone. Note that these are flag complexes: when the one-skeleton of a simplex is present, so is the simplex itself. Let  $\mathcal{K}^{(1)}$  denote the one-skeleton of a simplicial complex  $\mathcal{K}$ .

If  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are vertices of  $\mathcal{AC}(S)$  then we use  $d_S(\alpha, \beta)$  to denote the combinatorial distance coming from  $\mathcal{AC}^{(1)}(S)$ . Given two systems  $A, B \subset \mathcal{AC}(S)$  we define their *outer distance* to be

$$\text{outer}(A, B) = \max\{d_S(\alpha, \beta) \mid \alpha \in A, \beta \in B\}$$

and their *inner distance* to be

$$\text{inner}(A, B) = \min\{d_S(\alpha, \beta) \mid \alpha \in A, \beta \in B\}.$$

For  $\beta \in \mathcal{AC}(S)$  we write  $\text{inner}(A, \beta)$  instead of  $\text{inner}(A, \{\beta\})$ , and similarly for the outer distance. If  $A$  and  $B$  are systems and  $C \subset B$  is a subsystem then

$$(2.2) \quad \text{inner}(A, B) \leq \text{inner}(A, C) \leq \text{inner}(A, B) + 1.$$

For any three systems  $A$ ,  $B$ , and  $C$  there is a triangle inequality, up to an additive error of one, namely

$$(2.3) \quad \text{inner}(A, B) \leq \text{inner}(A, C) + \text{inner}(C, B) + 1.$$

The additive error can be reduced to zero when  $C$  is a singleton.

Suppose  $A \subset \mathcal{AC}(S)$  is a system and  $\gamma \in \mathcal{AC}(S)$  is an arc or curve. We say  $\gamma$  *cuts*  $A$  if there is an element  $\alpha \in A$  so that  $i(\gamma, \alpha) > 0$ . If  $\gamma$  does not cut  $A$  then we say  $\gamma$  *misses*  $A$ .

A system  $A$  *fills*  $S$  if every curve  $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(S)$  cuts  $A$ . Note that filling systems are necessarily comprised solely of arcs. A filling system  $A$  is *minimal* if no subsystem is filling.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Suppose  $S = S_{g,n}$ , with  $n > 0$ , and suppose  $A$  is a minimal filling system. If  $S - A$  is a disk then  $|A| = 2g - 1 + n$ . On the other hand, if  $S - A$  is a collection of peripheral annuli then  $|A| = 2g - 2 + n$ .  $\square$*

**2.5. Surgery.** If  $X$  is a space and  $Y \subset X$  is a subspace, let  $N = N_X(Y)$  denote a small regular neighborhood of  $Y$  taken in  $X$ . Let  $\text{fr}(N) = \overline{\partial N} - \partial X$  be the *frontier* of  $N$  in  $X$ .

Now suppose  $A$  is a system and  $\omega$  is a directed arc cutting  $A$ . We seek to describe Hatcher's surgery of  $A$  along  $\omega$  [11]. Choose representatives to minimize intersection numbers between elements of  $A$  and  $\omega$ . Suppose  $\delta$  is the component of  $\omega - A$  containing the initial point of  $\omega$ . Thus  $\delta$  meets only one component of  $A$ , say  $\alpha$ ; we call  $\alpha$  the *active element* of  $A$ . Let  $N = N_S(\alpha \cup \delta)$  be a neighborhood. Let  $N'$  be the component of  $N - \alpha$  containing the interior of  $\delta$ . Let  $\alpha^\omega$  be the component(s) of  $\text{fr}(N)$  that are contained in  $N'$ . See Figure 2.6 for the two possible cases.

We call the arcs of  $\alpha^\omega$  the *children* of  $\alpha$ . Define  $A^\omega = (A - \alpha) \cup \alpha^\omega$ ; this is the result of *surgering*  $A$  exactly once along  $\omega$ .

**Lemma 2.7.** *Suppose  $A, B$  are systems and  $\omega$  is a directed arc cutting  $A$ . Then  $|\text{inner}(A^\omega, B) - \text{inner}(A, B)| \leq 1$ .*

*Proof.* Note that  $A^\omega \cup A$  is again a system. The conclusion now follows from two applications of Equation 2.2.  $\square$

When  $B = \{\omega\}$  a stronger result holds.

**Proposition 2.8.** *Suppose  $A$  is a system and  $\omega$  is a directed arc cutting  $A$ . Then  $\text{inner}(A^\omega, \omega) \leq \text{inner}(A, \omega)$ .*




FIGURE 2.6. The result of surgery,  $\alpha^\omega$ , is either a pair of arcs or a single arc as  $\alpha$  is an arc or a curve.

*Proof.* We induct on  $\text{inner}(A, \omega)$ . Suppose that  $\text{inner}(A, \omega) = n + 1$ . Let  $\alpha$  be the element of  $A$  realizing the minimal distance to  $\omega$ . There are two cases. If  $\alpha$  is not the active element then  $\alpha \in A^\omega$  and the inner distance remains the same or decreases. For example, this occurs when  $n = 0$ .

Suppose, instead, that  $\alpha$  is the active element and that  $n > 0$ . Pick  $\beta \in \mathcal{AC}(S)$  with

- $d_S(\alpha, \beta) = 1$ ,
- $d_S(\beta, \omega) = n$ , and,
- subject to the above,  $\beta$  minimizes  $i(\beta, \omega)$ .

Consider the system  $B = \{\alpha, \beta\}$ . The induction hypothesis gives  $\text{inner}(B^\omega, \omega) \leq \text{inner}(B, \omega)$ . If  $\beta$  is the active element of  $B$  then we contradict the minimality of  $\beta$ . Thus  $\alpha$  is the active element of  $B$ . We deduce  $\text{inner}(\alpha^\omega, \omega) \leq d_S(\alpha, \omega)$ , completing the proof.  $\square$

If  $A$  is a system and  $\omega$  is a directed arc cutting  $A$  then we define a *surgery sequence* starting at  $A$  with *target* the directed arc  $\omega$ , as follows. Set  $A_0 = A$  and let  $A_{i+1} = A_i^\omega$ ; that is, we obtain  $A_{i+1}$  by surgering the active element of  $A_i$  exactly once along  $\omega$ . The arc  $\omega$  misses the last system  $A_N$ ; the resulting sequence is  $\{A_i\}_{i=0}^N$ .

Given integers  $i \leq j$  we adopt the notation  $[i, j] = \{k \in \mathbb{Z} \mid i \leq k \leq j\}$ .

**Lemma 2.9.** *Suppose  $\{A_i\}_{i=0}^N$  is a surgery sequence with target  $\omega$ . Then for each distance  $d \in [0, \text{inner}(A, \omega) - 1]$  there is an index  $i \in [0, N]$  such that  $\text{inner}(A, A_i) = d$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\text{outer}(A_N, \omega) \leq 1$  the triangle inequality

$$\text{inner}(A, \omega) \leq \text{inner}(A, A_N) + \text{inner}(A_N, \omega)$$

holds without additive error. Thus  $\text{inner}(A, A_N) \geq \text{inner}(A, \omega) - 1$ . The conclusion now follows from Lemma 2.7.  $\square$

We can also generalize Proposition 2.8 to sequences. As we do not use this in the remainder of the paper, we omit the proof.



**Proposition 2.10.** *Suppose  $\{A_i\}_{i=0}^N$  is a surgery sequence with target  $\omega$ . Let  $\alpha_k \subset A_k$  be the active element and set  $\omega_k = \alpha_k^\omega$ . Then  $\text{inner}(A_{i+1}, \omega_k) \leq \text{inner}(A_i, \omega_k)$ , for  $i < k$ .  $\square$*

Suppose  $B \subset A$  is a subsystem and  $\omega$  is a directed arc cutting  $A$ . Let  $\{A_i\}$  be the surgery sequence starting at  $A$  with target  $\omega$ . Let  $B_0 = B$  and suppose we have defined  $B_i \subset A_i$ . If the active element  $\alpha \in A_i$  is *not* in  $B_i$  then we define  $B_{i+1} = B_i$ . If the active element  $\alpha \in A_i$  is in  $B_i$  then define  $B_{i+1} = B_i^\omega$ . In any case we say that the elements of  $B_{i+1}$  are the *children* of the elements of  $B_i$ ; for  $j \geq i$  we say that the elements of  $B_j$  are the *descendants* of  $B_i$ . We call the sequence  $\{B_i\}$  a surgery sequence with *waiting times*; the sequence  $\{B_i\}$  is *subordinate* to  $\{A_i\}$ .

### 3. DESCENDANTS

The goal of this section is to prove Lemma 3.3: disjoint systems have a common descendant within constant distance. Recall that a simplex  $A \subset \mathcal{AC}(S)$  is called a system.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Suppose  $A$  is a system and  $\omega$  is a directed arc cutting  $A$ . Suppose  $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(S)$  is a curve. If  $\gamma$  cuts  $A$  then  $\gamma$  cuts  $A^\omega$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $\alpha \in A$  is the active element. If  $\gamma$  cuts some element of  $A - \alpha$  then there is nothing to prove. If  $\gamma$  cuts  $\alpha$  then, consulting Figure 2.6, the curve  $\gamma$  also cuts  $\alpha^\omega$  and so cuts  $A^\omega$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.2.** *Suppose  $\{A_i\}$  is a surgery sequence with target  $\omega$ . For any index  $k$ , if  $\text{outer}(A_0, A_k) \geq 3$  then  $A_j$  is filling for all  $j \geq k$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.1 it suffices to prove that  $A_k$  is filling. Pick any  $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(S)$ . Since  $\text{outer}(A_0, A_k) \geq 3$  it follows that  $\gamma$  cuts  $A_0$  or  $A_k$ , or both. If  $\gamma$  cuts  $A_k$  we are done. If  $\gamma$  cuts  $A_0$  then we are done by Lemma 3.1.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3.** *Suppose  $A$  is a system and  $\omega$  is a directed arc with  $\text{inner}(A, \omega) \geq 6$ . Suppose  $B, C \subset A$  are subsystems. Let  $\{A_i\}_{i=0}^N$  be the surgery sequence starting at  $A_0 = A$  with target  $\omega$ . Let  $\{B_i\}$  and  $\{C_i\}$  be the subordinate surgery sequences. Then there is an index  $k \in [0, N]$  such that:*

- (1)  $B_k \cap C_k \neq \emptyset$  and
- (2)  $\text{inner}(A_0, A_i) \leq 5$  for all  $i \in [0, k]$ .

We paraphrase this as “the subsystems  $B$  and  $C$  have a common descendant within constant distance of  $A$ ”.

*Proof of Lemma 3.3.* Let  $\ell$  be the first index with  $\text{inner}(A, A_\ell) = 3$ . Note that  $\ell$  exists by Lemma 2.9. Also, Lemma 2.7 implies that  $\text{inner}(A, A_{\ell-1}) = 2$ . Suppose  $\beta$  is the active element of  $A_{\ell-1}$ . It follows that  $\text{inner}(A, \beta) = 2$  and  $\beta$  is the only element of  $A_{\ell-1}$  with this inner distance to  $A$ . Thus every  $\alpha \in A_\ell$  has inner distance three to  $A$ . If  $\omega$  misses some element of  $A_\ell$  then  $\text{inner}(A, \omega) \leq 4$ , contrary

to hypothesis. Thus  $\omega$  cuts every element of  $A_\ell$ . Isotope the arcs of  $A_\ell$  to be pairwise disjoint and to intersect  $\omega$  minimally.

If  $B_\ell \cap C_\ell \neq \emptyset$  then we take  $k = \ell$  and we are done. Suppose instead  $B_\ell$  and  $C_\ell$  are disjoint. Since  $\text{inner}(A, A_\ell) = 3$  we have both  $\text{outer}(B, B_\ell)$  and  $\text{outer}(C, C_\ell)$  are at least three. Deduce from Lemma 3.2 that  $B_\ell$  and  $C_\ell$  both fill  $S$ , and thus consist only of arcs. Let  $B' \subset B_\ell$  and  $C' \subset C_\ell$  be minimal filling subsystems.

Set  $x = -\chi(S) = 2g - 2 + n$ . Set  $b = 1$  if  $S - B'$  is a disk. Set  $b = 0$  if  $S - B'$  is a union of peripheral annuli. Lemma 2.4 implies  $|B'| = x + b$ . Define  $c$  similarly, with respect to  $C'$ . Let  $A' = B' \cup C'$ . Let  $p$  be the number of peripheral annuli in  $S - A'$ . Observe that if either  $b$  or  $c$  is one, then  $p$  is zero.

We build a graph  $G$ , *dual* to  $A'$ , as follows. For every component  $C \subset S - A'$  there is a dual vertex  $v_C$ . For every arc  $\alpha \in A'$  there is a dual edge  $e_\alpha$ ; the two ends  $e_\alpha$  are attached to  $v_C$  and  $v_D$  where  $C$  and  $D$  meet the two sides of  $\alpha$ . Note the possibility that  $C$  equals  $D$ . Finally, for every peripheral annulus component  $P \subset S - A'$  there is a peripheral edge  $e_P$ . Both ends of  $e_P$  are attached to  $v_P$ .

Thus  $G$  has  $|A'| + p = 2x + b + c + p$  edges. Since  $S$  is homotopy equivalent to  $G$ , we deduce that  $G$  has  $x + b + c + p$  vertices. Since  $B' \cap C' = \emptyset$ , the graph  $G$  has no vertices of degree one or two.

*Claim.* One of the following holds.

- (1) The graph  $G$  has a vertex of valence three, dual to a disk component of  $S - A'$ .
- (2) Every vertex of  $G$  has valence four and every component of  $S - A'$  is a disk.

*Proof of Claim.* Let  $V_d$  denote the number of vertices of  $G$  with degree  $d$ . As there are no vertices of valence one or two, twice the number of edges of  $G$  equals  $\sum_{d \geq 3} d \cdot V_d$ . Hence:

$$\begin{aligned}
 4x + 2b + 2c + 2p &= \sum_{d \geq 3} d \cdot V_d \\
 &\geq 3V_3 + 4 \sum_{d \geq 4} V_d \\
 &= 4 \sum_{d \geq 3} V_d - V_3 \\
 &= 4x + 4b + 4c + 4p - V_3.
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $V_3 \geq 2b + 2c + 2p$  where equality holds if and only if  $V_d = 0$  for  $d \geq 5$ . If  $p = 0$  then either  $V_3 > 0$ , and we obtain the first conclusion, or  $V_3 = 0$ , and we have the second. If  $p > 0$  then  $V_3 \geq 2p$  and we obtain the first conclusion.  $\square$

Let  $\{\delta_i\}_{i=1}^M$  enumerate the arcs of  $\omega \cap (S - A_\ell)$ , where the order of the indices agrees with the orientation of  $\omega$ . So the system  $A_{\ell+1}$  is obtained from  $A_\ell$  via

surgery along  $\delta_1$ . Generically, our strategy is to find a disk component  $R \subset S - A_\ell$  and an arc  $\delta_i \subset R$  so that

- $\delta_i$  meets both  $B_\ell$  and  $C_\ell$  and
- $\delta_i$  is parallel in  $R$  to a subarc of  $\partial S$ .

That is,  $\delta_i$  cuts a rectangle off of  $R$ . Surgery along  $\delta_i$  then produces a common descendent for the systems  $B$  and  $C$ .

Suppose conclusion (1) of the claim holds. Deduce there is a disk component  $R \subset S - A_\ell$  that is combinatorially a hexagon, with sides alternating between  $\partial S$  and  $A_\ell$ . Furthermore,  $R$  meets both  $B_\ell$  and  $C_\ell$ . As a very special case, if  $\delta_1$  lies in  $R$  then take  $k = \ell + 1$  and we are done. See the left-hand side of Figure 3.4.




FIGURE 3.4. The lower and the vertical sides of  $R$  lie in  $\partial S$ ; the longer boundary arcs lie in  $A_\ell$ . The arcs in the interior are subarcs of  $\omega$ . The arc with the arrow is  $\delta_1$  on the left and is  $\delta_m$  on the right.

If  $\delta_1$  does not lie in  $R$ , then let  $\delta_m$  be the first arc contained in  $R$  that meets both  $B_\ell$  and  $C_\ell$ . Set  $k = \ell + m$ . See the right-hand side of Figure 3.4. One of the arcs in  $\text{fr}(R)$  survives to  $A_{k-2}$ . Thus  $\text{inner}(A, A_i) \leq 3$  for all  $i \in [\ell, k-2]$ . The frontier of  $R$  may be surgered during the interval  $[\ell+1, k-2]$ , but there is always a hexagon bounded by the children of  $\text{fr}(R)$ , containing the arc  $\delta_m$ . Surgering  $\delta_m$  produces the desired common descendants in  $A_k$ . Finally, we note that  $\text{inner}(A, A_{k-1})$  and  $\text{inner}(A, A_k)$  are at most 4 as a child of an arc of  $\text{fr}(R)$  is in both  $A_{k-1}$  and  $A_k$ . Hence the lemma holds in this case.

Suppose instead that conclusion (2) of the claim holds. Thus every component of  $S - A'$  is combinatorially an octagon with sides alternating between  $\partial S$  and  $A'$ . If  $A_\ell \neq A'$  then  $S - A_\ell$  has a disk component that is combinatorially a hexagon, and the above argument applies. Therefore, we assume  $A', B', C' = A_\ell, B_\ell, C_\ell$ .

Fix a component  $R \subset S - A_\ell$  that does not contain  $\delta_1$ . We refer to the four sides of  $\text{fr}(R) \subset A_\ell$  using the cardinal directions N, S, E and W. Up to interchanging  $B_\ell$  and  $C_\ell$ , there are three cases to consider, depending on how N, S, E and W lie in  $B_\ell$  or  $C_\ell$ .

Suppose that N lies in  $B_\ell$  and the three other sides lie in  $C_\ell$ . Suppose there is an arc  $\delta_i$  in  $R$  connecting N to E or N to W. Let  $\delta_m$  be the first such arc. Arguing as before, under conclusion (1), the lemma holds. If there is no such arc then, as

$\omega$  cuts  $N$ , there is an arc  $\delta_i$  connecting  $N$  to  $S$ . Let  $\delta_m$  be the first such arc; set  $k = \ell + m$ . As  $N \in A_j$  for all  $j \in [\ell, k-2]$ , deduce  $\text{inner}(A, A_i) \leq 3$  for all such  $j$ . Also  $\text{inner}(A, A_{k-1})$  and  $\text{inner}(A, A_k)$  are at most 4 as a child of an arc of  $\text{fr}(R)$  is in both  $A_{k-1}$  and  $A_k$ . We now observe that some descendants of  $\text{fr}(R)$  cobound a combinatorial hexagon  $R'$  in  $S - A_k$ . If  $\omega$  misses any arc in the frontier of  $R'$ , then  $\text{inner}(A, \omega) \leq 5$ , contrary to the hypothesis. Else, arguing as in conclusion (1), the lemma holds.

Suppose  $N$  and  $E$  lie in  $B_\ell$  while  $S$  and  $W$  lie in  $C_\ell$ . If there is an arc connecting  $N$  to  $W$  or connecting  $E$  to  $S$ , then surgery along the first such produces common descendants. If there is no such arc, then there must be an arc connecting  $N$  to  $S$  or an arc connecting  $E$  to  $W$ ; if not  $\omega$  misses one of the diagonals of  $R$ , so  $\text{inner}(\omega, A_\ell) \leq 2$  implying  $\text{inner}(\omega, A) \leq 5$ , contrary to assumption. Again, surgery along the first such arc produces a combinatorial hexagon.

Suppose finally that  $N$  and  $S$  lie in  $B_\ell$  while  $E$  and  $W$  lie in  $C_\ell$ . Surgery along the first arc connecting  $B_\ell$  to  $C_\ell$ , inside of  $R$ , produces common descendants. Such an arc exists because  $\omega$  cuts every arc of  $A_\ell$ .  $\square$

#### 4. FOOTPRINTS

In this section we define the *footprint* of an arc or curve on a surgery sequence. This is not to be confused with the projection, which is defined in Section 5.

Fix  $\gamma \in \mathcal{AC}(S)$ . Suppose  $A$  is a system and  $\omega$  is a directed arc. Let  $\{A_i\}_{i=0}^N$  be the surgery sequence starting at  $A$  with target  $\omega$ . We define  $\phi(\gamma)$ , the *footprint* of  $\gamma$  on  $\{A_i\}$ , to be the set

$$\phi(\gamma) = \{i \in [0, N] \mid \gamma \text{ misses } A_i\}.$$

Note that if  $\gamma$  is an element of  $A_i$  then  $i$  lies in the footprint  $\phi(\gamma)$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *With  $\gamma, A, \omega$  as above: the footprint  $\phi(\gamma)$  is an interval.*

*Proof.* When  $\gamma$  is a curve, this follows from Lemma 3.1. So suppose that  $\gamma$  is an arc. Without loss of generality we may assume  $\phi(\gamma)$  is non-empty and  $\min \phi(\gamma) = 0$ . Note that if  $\omega$  misses  $\gamma$  then we are done. Isotope  $\gamma$ ,  $A$ , and  $\omega$  to minimize their intersection numbers.

We now surger  $A_0 = A$ . These surgeries are ordered along  $\omega$ . Let  $\alpha_i$  be the active element of  $A_i$ . Let  $\delta_i \subset \omega$  be the surgery arc for  $\alpha_i$ , in other words, the subarc of  $\omega$  with endpoints the initial endpoint of  $\omega$  and the initial intersection point between  $\omega$  and  $\alpha_i$ . We define a pair of intervals.

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \{i \mid \delta_{i-1} \cap \gamma = \emptyset\} \cup \{0\} \\ J &= \{i \mid \delta_{i-1} \cap \gamma \neq \emptyset\} \end{aligned}$$

The inclusions  $\delta_{i-1} \subset \delta_i$  and the fact that  $\gamma$  misses  $A_0$  implies that  $I \subset \phi(\gamma)$ . To finish the proof we will show  $J \cap \phi(\gamma) = \emptyset$ , implying that  $I = \phi(\gamma)$ .

Fix any  $k \in J$ . Let  $\alpha_{k-1}$  be the active element of  $A_{k-1}$ . As  $\alpha_{k-1}$  is an arc or a curve we consult the left- or right-hand side of Figure 2.6. Note that  $\gamma$  meets

$\delta_{k-1}$ , and  $\gamma$  is an arc, so it enters and exits the region cobounded by  $\alpha_{k-1}$  and its children. Thus  $\gamma$  cuts  $A_k$  and we are done.  $\square$

## 5. PROJECTIONS TO SURGERY SEQUENCES

In Propositions 5.6, 5.7, and 5.8 below we verify that a surgery path has a projection map satisfying three properties, called here the *retraction axiom*, the *Lipschitz axiom*, and the *contraction axiom*. These were first set out by Masur and Minsky [14, Definition 2.2]. We closely follow Handel and Mosher [10]. We also refer to the paper of Hilion and Horbez [13]. We emphasize that the various constants appearing in our argument are *uniform*, that is, independent of the surface  $S = S_{g,n}$ , mainly by virtue of Lemma 3.3.

The relevance of the three axioms is given by the following theorem of Masur and Minsky [14, Theorem 2.3].

**Theorem 5.1.** *If  $\mathcal{X}$  has an almost transitive family of paths, with projections satisfying the three axioms, then  $\mathcal{X}^{(1)}$  is hyperbolic. Furthermore, the paths in the family are uniform reparametrized quasi-geodesics.*

Before turning to definitions, we remark that the hyperbolicity constant and the quasi-geodesic constants depend only on the constants coming from almost transitivity and from the three axioms. In Section 6 we provide a proof of Theorem 5.1, giving an estimate for the resulting hyperbolicity constant.

**5.2. Transitivity.** Suppose that  $\mathcal{X}$  is a flag simplicial complex. A *path* is a sequence  $\{\sigma_i\}_{i=0}^N$  of simplices in  $\mathcal{X}$ . A family of paths in  $\mathcal{X}$  is *d-transitive* (or simply *almost transitive*) if for any vertices  $x, y \in \mathcal{X}^{(0)}$  there exists a path  $\{\sigma_i\}_{i=0}^N$  in the family such that  $\text{inner}(x, \sigma_0)$ ,  $\text{inner}(\sigma_i, \sigma_{i+1})$ , and  $\text{inner}(\sigma_N, y)$  are all at most  $d$ .

**Lemma 5.3** (Transitivity). *Surgery sequences form a 2-transitive family of paths.*

*Proof.* Fix  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{AC}(S)$ . Pick an oriented arc  $\omega \in \mathcal{AC}(S)$  so that  $i(\beta, \omega) = 0$ . Let  $\{A_i\}_{i=0}^N$  be the surgery sequence starting at  $A_0 = \{\alpha\}$  with target  $\omega$ . Since  $\text{inner}(A_N, \beta) \leq 2$ , the lemma is proved.  $\square$

**5.4. Projection.** We now define the projection map to a surgery sequence, following Handel and Mosher, see Figure 1.1. We then state and verify the three axioms in our setting.

**Definition 5.5** (Projection). Suppose  $\{A_i\}_{i=0}^N$  is a surgery sequence with target  $\omega$ . We define the *projection map*  $\pi: \mathcal{AC}(S) \rightarrow [0, N]$  as follows. Fix  $\beta \in \mathcal{AC}(S)$ . Suppose that  $\{B_j\}$  is the surgery sequence starting at  $B = \{\beta\}$  with target  $\omega$ . Define  $\pi(\beta)$  to be the least index  $m \in [0, N]$  so that there is an index  $k$  with  $A_m \cap B_k \neq \emptyset$ . If no such index  $m$  exists then we set  $\pi(\beta) = N$ .

In the following we use the notation  $[i, j] = [\min\{i, j\}, \max\{i, j\}]$  when the order is not important. We also write  $A[i, j]$  for the union  $\cup_{k \in [i, j]} A_k$ .

**Proposition 5.6** (Retraction). *For any surgery sequence  $\{A_i\}_{i=0}^N$ , index  $k \in [0, N]$ , and element  $\beta \in A_k$  we have the diameter of  $A[\pi(\beta), k]$  is at most two.*

*Proof.* Let  $\{B_j\}_{j=k}^N$  be the surgery sequence subordinate to  $\{A_i\}_{i=k}^N$  that starts at  $B = \{\beta\}$ . Set  $m = \pi(\beta)$ ; note that  $m \leq k$ , as  $\beta \in B_k \subset A_k$ .

Suppose that  $A_m \cap B_\ell \neq \emptyset$  for some  $\ell \geq k$ . As  $\{B_j\}$  is subordinate to  $\{A_i\}$  we have  $B_\ell \subset A_\ell$ . Pick any  $\gamma \in A_m \cap A_\ell$ . By Lemma 4.1 we have that  $[m, \ell]$  lies in  $\phi(\gamma)$ , the footprint of  $\gamma$ . Thus  $[m, k]$  lies in  $\phi(\gamma)$ . Thus the diameter of  $A[m, k]$  is at most two, finishing the proof.  $\square$

Instead of using footprints, Hilion and Horbez [13, Proposition 5.1] verify the retraction axiom by using the fact that intersection numbers decrease monotonically along a surgery sequence.

The verification of the final two axioms is identical to that of Handel and Mosher [10]: replace their Proposition 6.5 in the argument of Section 6.3 with Lemma 3.3. Alternatively, in the geometric setting these arguments appear in Section 7 of [13]: replace their Proposition 7.1 with our Lemma 3.3.

**Proposition 5.7** (Lipschitz). *For any surgery sequence  $\{A_i\}_{i=0}^N$  and any vertices  $\beta, \gamma \in \mathcal{AC}(S)$ , if  $d_S(\beta, \gamma) \leq 1$  then the diameter of  $A[\pi(\beta), \pi(\gamma)]$  is at most 14.*

*Proof.* Let  $m = \pi(\beta)$  and  $k = \pi(\gamma)$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that  $m \leq k$ . There are two cases. Suppose that  $\text{inner}(A_m, \omega) \leq 6$ . By Proposition 2.8, for all  $i \geq m$  we have  $\text{inner}(A_i, \omega) \leq 6$ . It follows that the diameter of  $A[m, k]$  is at most 14.

Suppose instead that  $\text{inner}(A_m, \omega) \geq 7$ . Fix some  $\beta' \in A_m$ , a descendent of  $\beta$ . Thus there is a descendent  $\gamma'$  of  $\gamma$  with  $d_S(\beta', \gamma') \leq 1$ . Set  $B' = \{\beta', \gamma'\}$  and note that  $\text{inner}(B', \omega) \geq 6$ . Let  $\{B'_i\}$  be the resulting surgery sequence with target  $\omega$ .

By Lemma 3.3, there is an index  $p$  and some  $\delta \in B'_p$  that is a common descendent of both  $\beta'$  and  $\gamma'$ . Additionally, any vertex of  $B'[0, p]$  has inner distance to  $B' = B'_0$  of at most five. Now, since  $\delta$  is a descendent of  $\beta'$  there is some least index  $q$  so that  $\delta \in A_q$ . Thus  $k \leq q$ . It follows that the diameter of  $A[m, k]$  is at most 14.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.8** (Contraction). *There are constants  $a, b, c$  with the following property. For any surgery sequence  $\{A_i\}_{i=0}^N$  and any vertices  $\beta, \gamma \in \mathcal{AC}(S)$  if*

- $\text{inner}(\beta, A[0, N]) \geq a$  and
- $d_S(\beta, \gamma) \leq b \cdot \text{inner}(\beta, A[0, N])$

*then the diameter of  $A[\pi(\beta), \pi(\gamma)]$  is at most  $c$ .*

*In fact, the following values suffice:  $a = 24$ ,  $b = \frac{1}{8}$  and  $c = 14$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $\{A_i\}_{i=0}^N$  is a surgery sequence with target  $\omega$ . Let  $\pi: \mathcal{AC}(S) \rightarrow [0, N]$  denote the projection to the surgery sequence  $\{A_i\}$ . Let  $\{B_j\}_{j=0}^M$  be the surgery sequence starting with  $B_0 = \{\beta\}$  with target  $\omega$ .

The contraction axiom is verified by repeatedly applying Lemma 3.3: if two arcs or curves are far from  $\{A_i\}_{i=0}^N$  but proportionally close to one another, then

their surgery sequences have a common descendant prior to intersecting  $\{A_i\}$ . An application of the Lipschitz axiom, Proposition 5.7, completes the proof.

We begin with a claim. For the purpose of the claim, we use weaker hypotheses:  $\text{inner}(\beta, A[0, N]) \geq 21$  and  $d_S(\beta, \gamma) \leq \frac{1}{7} \text{inner}(\beta, A[0, N])$ .

*Claim.* There is an index  $k \in [0, M]$  so that

- $B_k$  contains a descendent of  $\gamma$  and
- $\text{inner}(\beta, B_j) \leq 6d_S(\beta, \gamma)$  for all  $j \in [0, k]$ .

*Proof of Claim.* Fix  $\alpha \in \mathcal{AC}(S)$  such that  $d_S(\beta, \alpha) = d_S(\beta, \gamma) - 1$  and  $i(\alpha, \gamma) = 0$ . By induction, there is an index  $\ell \in [0, M]$  such that  $B_\ell$  contains a descendent of  $\alpha$  and such that  $\text{inner}(\beta, B_j) \leq 6d_S(\beta, \alpha) = 6d_S(\beta, \gamma) - 6$  for all  $j \in [0, \ell]$ . Let  $\beta' \in B_\ell$  be such a descendent. As  $i(\alpha, \gamma) = 0$ , it follows that  $\gamma$  has a descendant,  $\gamma'$ , that misses  $\beta'$ . Let  $B' = \{\beta', \gamma'\}$  and let  $\{B'_i\}$  be the resulting surgery sequence with target  $\omega$ .

We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{inner}(B', \omega) &\geq \text{inner}(B_\ell, \omega) - 1 \\ &\geq d_S(\beta, \omega) - \text{inner}(\beta, B_\ell) - 2 \\ &\geq \text{inner}(\beta, A_N) - 1 - (6d_S(\beta, \gamma) - 6) - 2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{7} \text{inner}(\beta, A_N) + 3 \\ &\geq 6. \end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of Proposition 5.7, we use Lemma 3.3 to obtain an index  $p$  and element  $\delta \in B'_p$ , so that  $\delta$  is a common descendent of  $\beta'$  and  $\gamma'$ . Additionally, any element of  $B'[0, p]$  has inner distance to  $B'$  of at most five. Let  $k \in [\ell, M]$  be the first index such that  $\delta \in B_k$ .

What is left to show is that for  $j \in [\ell, k]$  we have  $\text{inner}(\beta, B_j) \leq 6d_S(\beta, \gamma)$ ; by induction it holds for  $j \in [0, \ell]$ . As for each  $j \in [\ell, k]$  the system  $B_j$  contains a descendent of  $\beta'$  we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{inner}(\beta, B_j) &\leq \text{inner}(\beta, B') + \text{inner}(B', B_j) + 1 \\ &\leq (6d_S(\beta, \gamma) - 6) + 5 + 1 \\ &\leq 6d_S(\beta, \gamma). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the claim.  $\square$

We now complete the verification of the contraction axiom. There are two cases. Suppose  $\pi(\beta) \leq \pi(\gamma)$  and the weaker hypotheses hold:  $\text{inner}(\beta, A[0, N]) \geq 21$  and  $d_S(\beta, \gamma) \leq \frac{1}{7} \text{inner}(\beta, A[0, N])$ . Let  $k \in [0, M]$  be as in the claim and let  $\gamma_1 \in B_k$  be a descendent of  $\gamma$ . As  $\gamma_1$  is a descendant of  $\gamma$ , we have that  $\pi(\gamma) \leq \pi(\gamma_1)$ . Let  $\ell \in [0, N]$  be such that  $\text{inner}(\beta, A_\ell)$  is minimal. For all  $j \in [0, k]$ , by the second bullet of the claim we have:

$$\text{inner}(\beta, B_j) \leq 6d_S(\beta, \gamma)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{6}{7} \text{inner}(\beta, A_\ell) \\
&\leq \text{inner}(\beta, A_\ell) - 2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have that  $B_j \cap A_i = \emptyset$  for all  $j \in [0, k]$  and  $i \in [0, N]$  and so  $\beta$  has a descendant  $\beta_1 \in B_k$  such that  $\pi(\beta) = \pi(\beta_1)$ . Hence  $[\pi(\beta), \pi(\gamma)] \subset [\pi(\beta_1), \pi(\gamma_1)]$ . By Proposition 5.7 as  $d_S(\beta_1, \gamma_1) \leq 1$ , the diameter of  $A[\pi(\beta_1), \pi(\gamma_1)]$  is at most 14. Therefore the diameter of  $A[\pi(\beta), \pi(\gamma)]$  is also at most 14.

We now deal with the remaining case. Suppose  $\pi(\beta) > \pi(\gamma)$ ,  $\text{inner}(\beta, A[0, N]) \geq 24$  and  $d_S(\beta, \gamma) \leq \frac{1}{8} \text{inner}(\beta, A[0, N])$ . Here we proceed along the lines of [10, Lemma 3.2]. We find for all  $i \in [0, N]$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{inner}(\gamma, A_i) \geq \text{inner}(\beta, A_i) - d_S(\beta, \gamma) \\
(5.9) \quad &\geq \frac{7}{8} \text{inner}(\beta, A_i) \geq 21
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$(5.10) \quad d_S(\beta, \gamma) \leq \frac{1}{8} \text{inner}(\beta, A_i) \leq \frac{1}{7} \text{inner}(\gamma, A_i)$$

As  $\pi(\gamma) \leq \pi(\beta)$ , the above argument now implies that the diameter of  $A[\pi(\beta), \pi(\gamma)]$  is at most 14.  $\square$

## 6. HYPERBOLICITY

In this section, we use the contraction properties of  $\mathcal{AC}^{(1)}(S)$  to prove it is Gromov hyperbolic. This is already proven in [14]. However, we need an explicit estimate for the hyperbolicity constant. Hence, we reproduce the argument here, keeping careful track of constants.

We say a path  $g: I \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  is  $(\ell, L)$ -Lipschitz if

$$\frac{|s - t|}{\ell} \leq d_{\mathcal{X}}(g(s), g(t)) \leq L|s - t|.$$

Let  $a$ ,  $b$  and  $c$  be the constants from Proposition 5.8.

**Proposition 6.1.** *Suppose  $g: [0, M] \rightarrow \mathcal{AC}^{(1)}(S)$  is  $(\ell, L)$ -Lipschitz and let  $\{A_i\}_{i=0}^N$  be a surgery sequence so that  $g(0)$  misses  $A_0$  and  $g(M)$  misses  $A_N$ . Then, for every  $t \in [0, M]$ ,*

$$d_{\mathcal{AC}}(g(t), \{A_i\}) \leq \frac{4c\ell L(\ell L + 1)}{b},$$

assuming  $\frac{2c\ell L}{b} \geq a$ .

*Remark 6.2.* Note that the hypothesis  $\frac{2c\ell L}{b} \geq a$  holds for the constants  $a$ ,  $b$  and  $c$  given by Proposition 5.8 if  $\ell, L \geq 1$ .



*Proof of Proposition 6.1.* For  $t \in [0, M]$ , let  $g_t = g(t)$ . Define

$$(6.3) \quad D = \frac{2c\ell L}{b},$$

and let  $I \subset [0, M]$  be an interval so that for  $t \in I$ ,  $d_{\mathcal{AC}}(g_t, \{A_i\}) \geq D$ . Divide  $I$  to intervals of size at most  $bD/L$ . Assume there are  $m$  such intervals with

$$\frac{(m-1)bD}{L} \leq |I| \leq \frac{mbD}{L}.$$

Note that the image of every subinterval  $J$  under  $g$  has a length of  $bD/L \leq bD$  and the whole interval is distance at least  $D \geq a$  from the surgery path  $\{A_i\}$ . Hence, Proposition 5.8 applies; so  $\pi(g(J))$  has a diameter of at most  $c$ . Let  $R$  be the largest distance between a point in  $g(I)$  to the set  $\{A_i\}$ . Since  $g(0)$  and  $g(M)$  are within distance  $D$  of the set  $\{A_i\}$ , we have

$$R \leq D + \frac{L|I|}{2}.$$

Also, since  $g$  is a  $(\ell, L)$ -quasi-geodesic, the end points of  $g(I)$  are at least  $|I|/\ell$  apart. That is,

$$\frac{(m-1)bD}{\ell L} \leq \frac{|I|}{\ell} \leq mc + 2D.$$

Thus,

$$m(bD - c\ell L) \leq 2\ell LD + bD \implies m \leq \frac{D(2\ell L + b)}{bD - c\ell L}.$$

This, in turn, implies that

$$R \leq D + \frac{\ell L(mc + 2D)}{2} \leq (\ell L + 1)D + \frac{c\ell LD(2\ell L + b)}{2(bD - c\ell L)}.$$

From Equation 6.3 we get

$$R \leq (\ell L + 1)D + D(\ell L + b/2) \leq D(2\ell L + 2) = \frac{4c\ell L(\ell L + 1)}{b},$$

which is as we claimed.  $\square$

**Theorem 6.4.** *If  $3g - 3 + n \geq 2$  and  $n > 0$ , then  $\mathcal{AC}^{(1)}(S_{g,n})$  is  $\delta$ -hyperbolic where*

$$\delta = \frac{56c}{b} + \frac{c}{2} + 1.$$

*Proof.* Consider three points  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathcal{AC}^{(1)}(S_{g,n})$ . Choose a geodesic segment connecting  $\alpha$  to  $\beta$  and denote it by  $[\alpha, \beta]$ . Let  $[\beta, \gamma]$  and  $[\alpha, \gamma]$  be similarly defined. We need to show that the geodesic segment  $[\beta, \gamma]$  is contained in a  $\delta$ -neighborhood of  $[\alpha, \beta] \cup [\alpha, \gamma]$ .

Let  $\alpha'$  be the closest point in  $[\beta, \gamma]$  to  $\alpha$ . The path  $p_{\alpha, \beta}$  obtained from the concatenation  $[\alpha, \alpha'] \cup [\alpha', \beta]$  is a  $(3, 1)$ -Lipschitz path [14, page 147]. By Proposition 6.1,

$$\text{if } \ell = 3, L = 1, \text{ then } R \leq \frac{48c}{b}.$$

That is,  $p_{\alpha, \beta}$  stays in a  $(48c/b)$ -neighborhood of any surgery path  $\{A_i\}$  that starts next to  $\alpha$  and end next to  $\beta$ . (Recall that surgery paths are 2-transitive.) Also by Proposition 6.1,

$$\text{if } \ell = L = 1, \text{ then } R \leq \frac{8c}{b}.$$

That is, the geodesic  $[\alpha, \beta]$ , which is a  $(1, 1)$ -Lipschitz path, stays in a  $(8c/b)$ -neighborhood of  $\{A_i\}$ . By the Lipschitz property of projection, its image is  $c$  dense. That is, any point in  $\{A_i\}$  is at most  $8c/b + \frac{c}{2} + 1$  away from a point in  $[\alpha, \beta]$ . Therefore, the path  $p_{\alpha, \beta}$  is contained in a

$$\delta = \frac{48c}{b} + \frac{8c}{b} + \frac{c}{2} + 1$$

neighborhood of  $[\alpha, \beta]$ . Similar arguments shows that the path  $p_{\alpha, \gamma}$  is contained in a  $\delta$ -neighborhood of  $[\alpha, \gamma]$ . Hence,  $[\beta, \gamma]$  is contained in a  $\delta$ -neighborhood of  $[\alpha, \beta] \cup [\alpha, \gamma]$ . That is,  $\mathcal{AC}^{(1)}(S)$  is  $\delta$ -hyperbolic.  $\square$

## 7. INCLUSIONS

In this section, we show that the hyperbolicity of the curve complex follows from the hyperbolicity of the arc and curve complex.

**Corollary 7.1.** *There is a constant  $U$  such that if  $3g - 3 + n \geq 2$  and  $n > 0$  then  $\mathcal{C}^{(1)}(S_{g,n})$  is  $U$ -hyperbolic.*

*Proof.* The surgery relation  $\sigma: \mathcal{AC} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  takes curves to themselves and sends an arc  $\alpha$  to a system  $A = \sigma(\alpha)$  so that  $\alpha$  is contained in a pants component of  $S - A$ . For  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{AC}$  we have

$$d_{\mathcal{C}}(\sigma(\alpha), \sigma(\beta)) \leq 2d_{\mathcal{AC}}(\alpha, \beta)$$

by Lemma 2.2 of [15]. On the other hand, for  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{C}$  we have

$$d_{\mathcal{AC}}(\alpha, \beta) \leq d_{\mathcal{C}}(\alpha, \beta).$$

Thus the inclusion of  $\mathcal{C}^{(1)}(S_{g,n})$  into  $\mathcal{AC}^{(1)}(S_{g,n})$  sends geodesics to  $(1, 2)$ -Lipschitz paths. Continuing as in the proof of Theorem 6.4, we get that the image of a geodesic in  $\mathcal{C}$  is in a uniformly bounded neighborhood of a geodesic in  $\mathcal{AC}$ . Hence, the hyperbolicity of  $\mathcal{AC}$  implies the hyperbolicity of  $\mathcal{C}$ .  $\square$

We now deal with the case when  $S = S_g$  is closed.

**Theorem 7.2.** *If  $3g - 3 \geq 2$  then  $\mathcal{C}^{(1)}(S_g)$  is Gromov hyperbolic. Furthermore, the constant of hyperbolicity is at most that of  $\mathcal{C}^{(1)}(S_{g,1})$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\Sigma = S_{g,1}$ . By Corollary 7.1 we have  $\mathcal{C}^{(1)}(\Sigma)$  is U-hyperbolic. By Theorem 1.2 of [20], the curve complex  $\mathcal{C}^{(1)}(S)$  isometrically embeds in the curve complex  $\mathcal{C}^{(1)}(\Sigma)$ .  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] Tarik Aougab. Uniform hyperbolicity of the graphs of curves. December 2012, arXiv:1212.3160. [3]
- [2] Jason Behrstock, Bruce Kleiner, Yair Minsky, and Lee Mosher. Geometry and rigidity of mapping class groups. *Geom. Topol.*, 16(2):781–888, 2012, arXiv:0801.2006. [1]
- [3] Mladen Bestvina and Mark Feighn. Hyperbolicity of the complex of free factors. July 2011, arXiv:1107.3308. [1]
- [4] Brian H. Bowditch. Intersection numbers and the hyperbolicity of the curve complex. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 598:105–129, 2006. bhb-curvecomplex.pdf. [3]
- [5] Brian H. Bowditch. Uniform hyperbolicity of the curve graphs, 2012. uniformhyp.pdf. [3]
- [6] Jeffrey Brock, Howard Masur, and Yair Minsky. Asymptotics of Weil-Petersson geodesic. I. Ending laminations, recurrence, and flows. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 19(5):1229–1257, 2010, arXiv:0802.1370. [1]
- [7] Jeffrey F. Brock, Richard D. Canary, and Yair N. Minsky. The classification of Kleinian surface groups, II: The ending lamination conjecture. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 176(1):1–149, 2012, arXiv:math/0412006v2. [1]
- [8] Matt Clay, Thierry Coulbois, Arnaud Hilion, Camille Horbez, and Richard D. Wade. Uniform hyperbolicity of the free factor graph via surgery sequences. In preparation. [3]
- [9] Ursula Hamenstädt. Geometry of the complex of curves and of Teichmüller space. In *Handbook of Teichmüller theory. Vol. I*, volume 11 of *IRMA Lect. Math. Theor. Phys.*, pages 447–467. Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2007, arXiv:math/0502256. [3]
- [10] Michael Handel and Lee Mosher. The free splitting complex of a free group I: Hyperbolicity. November 2011, arXiv:1111.1994. [1, 10, 11, 13]
- [11] Allen Hatcher. On triangulations of surfaces. *Topology Appl.*, 40(2):189–194, 1991. [2, 4]
- [12] Sebastian Hensel, Piotr Przytycki, and Richard C. H. Webb. Slim unicorns and uniform hyperbolicity for arc graphs and curve graphs. January 2013, arXiv:1301.5577. [3]
- [13] Arnaud Hilion and Camille Horbez. The hyperbolicity of the sphere complex via surgery paths. October 2012, arXiv:1210.6183. [2, 10, 11]
- [14] Howard A. Masur and Yair N. Minsky. Geometry of the complex of curves. I. Hyperbolicity. *Invent. Math.*, 138(1):103–149, 1999, arXiv:math/9804098v2. [1, 10, 13, 15]
- [15] Howard A. Masur and Yair N. Minsky. Geometry of the complex of curves. II. Hierarchical structure. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 10(4):902–974, 2000, arXiv:math/9807150v1. [1, 15]
- [16] Yair Minsky. The classification of Kleinian surface groups. I. Models and bounds. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 171(1):1–107, 2010, arXiv:math/0302208v3. [1]
- [17] Yair N. Minsky. The classification of punctured-torus groups. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 149(2):559–626, 1999. arXiv:math/9807001. [1]
- [18] Kasra Rafi. A characterization of short curves of a Teichmüller geodesic. *Geom. Topol.*, 9:179–202 (electronic), 2005. arXiv:math/0404227. [1]
- [19] Kasra Rafi. Hyperbolicity in Teichmüller space. November 2010, arXiv:1011.6004. [1]
- [20] Kasra Rafi and Saul Schleimer. Covers and the curve complex. *Geom. Topol.*, 13(4):2141–2162, 2009, arXiv:math/0701719v2. [16]



