

October 26, 2011

## COUNTING ESSENTIAL SURFACES IN A CLOSED HYPERBOLIC THREE MANIFOLD

JEREMY KAHN AND VLADIMIR MARKOVIC

ABSTRACT. Let  $\mathbf{M}^3$  be a closed hyperbolic three manifold. We show that the number of genus  $g$  surface subgroups of  $\pi_1(\mathbf{M}^3)$  grows like  $g^{2g}$ .

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $\mathbf{M}^3$  be a closed hyperbolic 3-manifold and let  $S_g$  denote a closed surface of genus  $g$ . Given a continuous mapping  $f : S_g \rightarrow \mathbf{M}^3$  we let  $f_* : \pi_1(S_g) \rightarrow \pi_1(\mathbf{M}^3)$  denote the induced homomorphism.

**Definition 1.1.** *We say that  $G < \pi_1(\mathbf{M}^3)$  is a surface subgroup of genus  $g \geq 2$  if there exists a continuous map  $f : S_g \rightarrow \mathbf{M}^3$  such that the induced homomorphism  $f_*$  is injective and  $f_*(\pi_1(S_g)) = G$ . Moreover, the subsurface  $f(S_g) \subset \mathbf{M}^3$  is said to be an essential subsurface.*

Recently, we showed [5] that every closed hyperbolic 3-manifold  $\mathbf{M}^3$  contains an essential subsurface and consequently  $\pi_1(\mathbf{M}^3)$  contains a surface subgroup. It is therefore natural to consider the question: How many conjugacy classes of surface subgroups of genus  $g$  there are in  $\pi_1(\mathbf{M}^3)$ ? This has already been considered by Masters [6], and our approach to this question builds on our previous work and improves on the work by Masters.

Let  $s_2(\mathbf{M}^3, g)$  denote the number of conjugacy classes of surface subgroups of genus at most  $g$ . We say that two surface subgroups  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  of  $\pi_1(\mathbf{M}^3)$  are commensurable if  $G_1 \cap G_2$  has a finite index in both  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ . Let  $s_1(\mathbf{M}^3, g)$  denote the number surface subgroups of genus at most  $g$ , modulo the equivalence relation of commensurability. Then clearly  $s_1(\mathbf{M}^3, g) \leq s_2(\mathbf{M}^3, g)$ . The main result of this paper is the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{M}^3$  be a closed hyperbolic 3-manifold. There exist two constants  $c_1, c_2 > 0$  such that*

$$(c_1 g)^{2g} \leq s_1(\mathbf{M}^3, g) \leq s_2(\mathbf{M}^3, g) \leq (c_2 g)^{2g},$$

*for  $g$  large enough. The constant  $c_2$  depends only on the injectivity radius of  $\mathbf{M}^3$ .*

In fact, Masters shows that

$$s_2(g, \mathbf{M}^3) < g^{c_2 g}$$

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 20H10.  
JK was supported by NSF grant DMS 0905812.

for some  $c_2 \equiv c_2(\mathbf{M}^3)$ , and likewise for some  $c_1 \equiv c_1(\mathbf{M}^3)$

$$g^{c_1g} < s_1(g, \mathbf{M}^3)$$

when  $\mathbf{M}^3$  has a self-transverse totally geodesic subsurface. We follow Masters' approach to the upper bound, improving it from  $g^{c_2g}$  to  $(c_2g)^{2g}$  by more carefully counting the number of suitable triangulations of a genus  $g$  surface. Using our previous work [5] we replace Masters' conditional lower bound with an unconditional one, and we improve it from  $g^{c_1g}$  to  $(c_1g)^{2g}$  with the work of Muller and Puchta [7] counting number of maximal surface subgroups of a given surface group. We then make new subgroup from old in the spirit of Masters' construction, but taking the nearly geodesic subgroup from [5] as our starting point.

The above theorem enables us to determine the order of the number of surface subgroups up to genus  $g$ . We have the following corollary.

**Corollary 1.1.** *We have*

$$\lim_{g \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log s_1(\mathbf{M}^3, g)}{2g \log g} = \lim_{g \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log s_2(\mathbf{M}^3, g)}{2g \log g} = 1.$$

We make the following conjecture.

**Conjecture 1.1.** *For a given closed hyperbolic 3-manifold  $\mathbf{M}^3$ , there exists a constant  $c(M) > 0$  such that*

$$\lim_{g \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{g} \sqrt[2g]{s_i(\mathbf{M}^3, g)} = c(M), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

## 2. THE UPPER BOUND

Fix a closed hyperbolic 3-manifold  $\mathbf{M}^3$ . In this section we prove the upper bound in Theorem 1.1, that is we show

$$(1) \quad s_2(\mathbf{M}^3, g) \leq (c_2g)^{2g},$$

for some constant  $c_2 > 0$ .

**2.1. Genus  $g$  triangulations.** We have the following definition.

**Definition 2.1.** *Let  $S_g$  denote a closed surface of genus  $g$ . We say that a connected graph  $\tau$  is a triangulation of genus  $g$  if it can be embedded into the surface  $S_g$  such that every component of the set  $S_g \setminus \tau$  is a triangle. The set of genus  $g$  triangulations is denoted by  $\mathcal{T}(g)$ . We say that  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}(k, g) \subset \mathcal{T}(g)$  if:*

- each vertex of  $\tau$  has the degree at most  $k$ ,
- the graph  $\tau$  has at most  $kg$  vertices and at most  $kg$  edges.

We observe that any given genus  $g$  triangulation  $\tau$ , can be in a unique way (up to a homeomorphism of  $S_g$ ) be embedded in  $S_g$ .

We say that Riemann surface is  $s$ -thick is its injectivity radius is bounded below by  $s > 0$ . Every thick Riemann surface has a good triangulation in the sense of the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $S$  be an  $s$ -thick Riemann surface of genus  $g \geq 2$ . Then there exists  $k = k(s) > 0$  and a triangulation  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}(k, g)$  that embeds in  $S$ , such that every edge of  $\tau$  is a geodesic arc of length at most  $s$ .*

*Proof.* Choose a maximal collection of disjoint open balls in  $S$  of radius  $\frac{s}{4}$ . Let  $V$  denote the set of centers of the balls from the collection. We may assume that no four points from  $V$  lie on a round circle (we always reduce the radius of the balls by a small amount and move them into a general position). We construct the Delaunay triangulation associated to the set  $V$  as follows. We connect two points from  $V$  with the shortest geodesic arc between them, providing they belong to the boundary of a closed ball in  $S$  that does not contain any other point from  $V$ . This gives an embedded graph  $\tau$ . Since no four points from  $V$  lie on the same circle the graph  $\tau$  is a triangulation. It is elementary to check that  $\tau$  has the stated properties, and we leave it to the reader.  $\square$

Given any  $\pi_1$ -injective immersion of  $g : S_g \rightarrow \mathbf{M}^3$ , we can find a genus  $g$  hyperbolic surface  $S$ , and a map  $f : S \rightarrow \mathbf{M}^3$  homotopic to  $g$ , such that  $f(S)$  is a pleated surface. Then  $f$  does not increase the hyperbolic distance. Let  $s$  denote the injectivity radius of  $\mathbf{M}^3$ . It follows that the injectivity radius of  $S$  is bounded below by  $s$ . We choose a triangulation  $\tau(S)$  of  $S$  that satisfies the conditions in Lemma 2.1.

Let  $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, \dots, C_m\}$  be a finite collection of balls of radius  $\frac{s}{4}$  that covers  $\mathbf{M}^3$ . We may assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a minimal collection, that is, if we remove a ball from  $\mathcal{C}$ , the new collection of balls does not cover  $\mathbf{M}^3$ . Let  $f_i : S_i \rightarrow \mathbf{M}^3$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , be two pleated maps, and denote by  $\tau(S_1)$  and  $\tau(S_2)$  the corresponding triangulations from Lemma 2.1 of genus  $g$  surfaces  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ . If the genus  $g$  triangulations  $\tau(S_1)$  and  $\tau(S_2)$  are identical, there exists a homeomorphism  $h : S_1 \rightarrow S_2$  such that  $h(\tau(S_1)) = \tau(S_2)$ . Assume in addition that for every vertex  $v$  of  $\tau(S_1)$ , the points  $f_1(v)$  and  $f_2(h(v))$  belong to the same ball  $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$ . Then by Lemma 2.4 in [6], the maps  $f_1$  and  $f_2 \circ h$  are homotopic.

Since the set  $\mathcal{C}$  has  $m$  elements, there are at most  $m$  ways of mapping a given vertex of  $\tau$  to the set  $\mathcal{C}$ . Choose a vertex  $v_1$  of  $\tau$  and choose an image of  $v_1$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ , say  $v_1$  is mapped to  $C_1$ . Let  $v_2$  be a vertex of  $\tau$ , such that  $v_2$  and  $v_1$  are the endpoints of the same edge.

Each edge of  $\tau$  has the length at most  $s$ , and the balls from  $\mathcal{C}$  have the radius  $\frac{s}{4}$ . Since  $f$  does not increase the distance, and  $\mathcal{C}$  is a minimal cover of  $\mathbf{M}^3$ , it follows that  $v_2$  can be mapped to at most  $K$  elements of  $\mathcal{C}$ , where

$K$  is a constant that depends only on  $s$ . Repeating this analysis to the remaining vertices of  $\tau$  yields the following estimate:

$$(2) \quad \tilde{s}_2(\mathbf{M}^3, g) \leq mK^{kg-1}|\mathcal{T}(k, g)|,$$

where  $\tilde{s}_2(\mathbf{M}^3, g)$  denotes the number of conjugacy classes of surface subgroups of genus equal to  $g$ .

Let  $\nu(k, n)$  denote the set of all graphs on  $n$  vertices so that each vertex has the degree at most  $k$ . Then  $|\mathcal{T}(k, g)| \leq |\nu(k, kg)|$ .

*Remark.* Observing the estimate

$$|\nu(k, n)| \leq n^{kn},$$

Masters showed

$$\tilde{s}_2(\mathbf{M}^3, g) \leq g^{Dg},$$

for some constant  $D > 0$ . However, the set  $\nu(k, kg)$  has many more elements than the set  $\mathcal{T}(k, g)$ .

The following lemma will be proved in the next subsection.

**Lemma 2.2.** *There exists a constant  $C > 0$  that depends only on  $k$ , such that for  $g$  large we have*

$$|\mathcal{T}(k, g)| \leq (Cg)^{2g}.$$

Given this lemma we now prove estimate (1). It follows from the Lemma 2.2 that for every  $g$  large we have

$$|\mathcal{T}(k, g)| \leq (Cg)^{2g}.$$

Combining this with (2) we get

$$\tilde{s}_2(\mathbf{M}^3, g) \leq mK^{kg-1}(Cg)^{2g} \leq (C_1g)^{2g},$$

holds for every  $g \geq 2$ , for some constant  $C_1$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} s_2(\mathbf{M}^3, g) &= \sum_{r=2}^g \tilde{s}_2(\mathbf{M}^3, r) \\ &= \sum_{r=2}^g (C_1r)^{2r} \\ &\leq (c_2g)^{2g}, \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $c_2$ . This proves the estimate (1).

**2.2. The proof of Lemma 2.2.** Fix a triangulation  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}(k, g)$  and denote the set of oriented edges by  $E(\tau)$ . Let  $\mathbb{Q}E(\tau)$  denote the vector space of all formal sums (with rational coefficients) of edges from  $E(\tau)$ .

Choose a spanning tree  $T$  (a spanning tree of a connected graph is a connected tree that contains all of its vertices) for  $\tau$ . Let  $H_1(S_g)$  denote the first homology with rational coefficients of the surface  $S_g$ . We define the linear map  $\phi : \mathbb{Q}E(\tau) \rightarrow H_1(S_g)$  as follows. Let  $e \in (E(\tau) \setminus T)$ . Then the union  $e \cup T$  is homotopic (on  $S_g$ ) to a unique (up to homotopy) simple closed curve  $\gamma_e \subset S_g$ . We let  $\phi(e)$  denote the homology class of the curve  $\gamma_e$  in  $H_1(S_g)$ . We extend the map  $\phi$  to  $\mathbb{Q}E(\tau)$  by linearity.

Denote the kernel of  $\phi$  by  $K(\phi)$  and set

$$H_1(\tau, T) = \frac{\mathbb{Q}E(\tau)}{K(\phi)}.$$

Then the quotient map (also denoted by)  $\phi : H_1(\tau, T) \rightarrow H_1(S_g)$  is injective, and in fact is an isomorphism. Since  $\tau$  is a genus  $g$  triangulation, the embedding of the triangulation  $\tau$  to  $S_g$  induces the surjective map of the fundamental group of  $\tau$  to the fundamental group of  $S_g$ . Then the induced map  $\phi$  between the corresponding homology groups is injective.

Let  $e_1, \dots, e_{2g} \in E(\tau)$  denote a set of  $2g$  edges whose equivalence classes generate  $H_1(\tau, T)$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $X = T \cup \{e_1, \dots, e_{2g}\}$ . Then every component of the set  $S_g \setminus X$  is simply connected.*

*Proof.* The set  $X$  is connected (since it contains the spanning tree  $T$ , and the tree  $T$  contains all the vertices). Suppose that there exists a component of the set  $S_g \setminus X$  that is not simply connected. Then there exists a simple closed curve  $\gamma \subset S_g$  that is not homotopic to a point, and such that

$$\gamma \cap X = \emptyset.$$

If  $\gamma$  is a non-separating curve then the homology class of  $\gamma$  is non-trivial in  $H_1(S_g)$ . Therefore, there exists a non-separating simple closed  $\alpha \subset S_g$  that intersects the curve  $\gamma$  exactly once. Let  $q_1, \dots, q_{2g} \in \mathbb{Q}$  be such that

$$\phi(q_1 e_1 + \dots + q_{2g} e_{2g}) = [\alpha],$$

where  $[\alpha] \in H_1(S_g)$  denotes the homology class of  $\alpha$ . Since the intersection pairing between  $[\alpha]$  and  $[\gamma]$  is non-zero, and  $\phi(e_1), \dots, \phi(e_{2g})$  is a basis for  $H_1(S_g)$ , we conclude that for some  $i \in \{1, \dots, 2g\}$ , the curve  $\gamma$  intersects  $e_i \cup T$ , which is a contradiction.

Suppose that  $\gamma$  is a separating curve and denote by  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  the two components of the set  $S_g \setminus \gamma$ . The set  $X$  is connected, and by the assumption it does not intersect  $\gamma$ . This implies that  $X$  is contained in one of the two sub-surfaces  $A_i$ , say  $X \subset A_1$ . Then  $X \cap A_2 = \emptyset$ .

Since  $\gamma$  is not homotopic to a point, each  $A_i$  is a non-planar surface with one boundary component. Therefore, the subsurface  $A_2$  contains a non-separating simple closed curve  $\gamma_2$ . Then  $\gamma_2$  is a non-separating simple

closed curve in  $S_g$  by the above argument we have that  $\gamma_2$  intersects the set  $X$ . This is a contradiction since  $X \cap A_2 = \emptyset$ .  $\square$

Let  $P_1, \dots, P_l$  denote the components of the set  $S_g \setminus X$ . Each  $P_i$  is a polygon and we let  $m_i$  denote the number of sides of the polygon  $P_i$ . Since each edge in  $X$  can appear as a side in at most two such polygons, we have the inequality

$$(3) \quad \sum_{i=1}^l m_i \leq 2kg,$$

since by definition the triangulation  $\tau$  has at most  $kg$  edges.

We proceed to prove Lemma 2.2. We can obtain every triangulation  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}(k, g)$  as follows. We first choose a spanning tree  $T$ , which is a tree that has at most  $kg$  vertices. Then to the tree  $T$  we add  $2g$  edges  $e_1, \dots, e_{2g}$  in an arbitrary way. After adding the edges, at each vertex of the graph  $T \cup \{e_1, \dots, e_{2g}\}$  we choose a cyclic ordering. We thicken the edges of the graph  $T \cup \{e_1, \dots, e_{2g}\}$  to obtain the ribbon graph and the corresponding surface  $R$  with boundary (if this surface does not have genus  $g$  we discard this graph). The boundary components of the surface  $R$  are polygonal curves  $P_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, l$ , made out of the edges from  $T \cup \{e_1, \dots, e_{2g}\}$ . We then choose a triangulation of each polygon  $P_i$ .

It follows from this description that we can bound the number of triangulations from  $\mathcal{T}(k, g)$  by  $|\mathcal{T}(k, g)| \leq abcd$ , where

$$a = \{\text{number of unlabeled trees } T \text{ with } n \leq kg \text{ vertices}\},$$

$$b = \{\text{number of ways of adding } 2g \text{ unlabeled edges } e_1, \dots, e_{2g} \text{ to } T\},$$

$$c = \{\text{number of cyclic orderings of edges of } T \cup \{e_1, \dots, e_{2g}\}\},$$

$$d = \{\text{number of triangulations of the polygons } P_i\}.$$

Let  $t(n)$  denote the number of different unlabeled trees on  $n$  vertices. By [1] we have  $t(n) \leq C12^n$ , for some universal constant  $C > 0$ . It follows that  $a \leq 2C12^{kg}$ . The tree  $T$  has at most  $kg$  edges, so there are at most  $(kg)^2$  ways of adding a labeled edge to  $T$ . All together there are at most  $(kg)^{4g}$  ways of adding a labeled collection of  $2g$  edges to  $T$ . To obtain the number of ways of adding unlabeled collection of  $2g$  edges we need to divide this number by  $(2g)!$ . This yields the estimate

$$b \leq \frac{(kg)^{4g}}{(2g)!} < (k^2g)^{2g},$$

for  $g$  large.

Since each vertex of  $\tau$  has the degree at most  $k$ , and  $\tau$  has at most  $kg$  edges, we obtain the estimate

$$c \leq (k!)^{kg}.$$

Let  $p(m)$  denote the number of triangulations of a polygon with  $m$  sides. Then  $p(m)$  is the  $(m-2)$ -th Catalan number and we have  $p(m) < 2^{2m}$ . As above, let  $P_1, \dots, P_l$  denote the polygons that we need to triangulate and let  $m_i$  denote the number of sides of the polygon  $P_i$ . Then

$$d \leq \max \prod_{i=1}^l p(m_i) \leq 4^{m_1 + \dots + m_l},$$

where the maximum is taken over all possible vectors  $(m_1, \dots, m_l)$ ,  $1 \leq l \leq 2kg$ , such that  $m_1 + \dots + m_l \leq 2kg$  (see estimate (3) above). But since  $m_1 + \dots + m_l \leq 2kg$  we have  $d \leq 4^{2kg}$ .

Putting the estimates for  $a, b, c, d$  together we prove the lemma.

*Remark.* If we are given a tree on a surface  $S$ , along with  $2g$  edges connecting the vertices of the tree (and satisfying the hypothesis of Lemma 2.3) and a map of the resulting graph into  $\mathbf{M}^3$ , then we can determine the map of  $S$  into  $\mathbf{M}^3$ , up to homotopy. Thus we need only bound  $|\mathcal{T}'(k, g)|$ , where  $\mathcal{T}'(k, g)$  is the set of trees of size at most  $kg$ , with  $2g$  more edges added; we observe that  $|\mathcal{T}'(k, g)| < ab$ .

### 3. QUASIFUCHSIAN REPRESENTATIONS OF SURFACE GROUPS

**3.1. Generalized pants decomposition and the Complex Fenchel-Nielsen coordinates.** For background on complex Fenchel-Nielsen coordinates see [9], [4], [8], [5]. The exposition and notation we use here is in line with Section 2 in [5].

Let  $X$  be a compact topological surface (possibly with boundary) and let  $\rho : \pi_1(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  be a representation (a homomorphism). We say that  $\rho$  is a  $K$ -quasifuchsian representation if the group  $\rho(\pi_1(X))$  is  $K$ -quasifuchsian, in which case we can equip  $X$  with a complex structure  $X = \mathbb{H}^2/F$ , for some Fuchsian group  $F$ , such that  $f_* = \rho \circ \iota$ . Here  $\iota : F \rightarrow \pi_1(X)$  is an isomorphism, and  $f_* : F \rightarrow fFf^{-1}$  is the conjugation homomorphism, induced by an equivariant  $K$ -quasiconformal map  $f : \partial\mathbb{H}^3 \rightarrow \partial\mathbb{H}^3$ .

We will also say that a quasisymmetric map  $f : \partial\mathbb{H}^2 \rightarrow \partial\mathbb{H}^3$  is  $K$ -quasiconformal if it has a  $K$ -quasiconformal extension to  $\partial\mathbb{H}^3$ .

By  $\Pi$  we denote a topological pair of pants with cuffs  $C_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Recall that to every representation  $\rho : \pi_1(\Pi) \rightarrow \mathbf{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ , we associate the three half lengths  $\mathbf{hl}(C_i) \in \mathbb{C}_+/2i\pi\mathbb{Z}$ , where  $\mathbb{C}_+ = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re}(z) > 0\}$ . If  $\rho$  is quasifuchsian then it is uniquely determined by the half lengths. The conjugacy class  $[\rho]$  of a quasifuchsian representation  $\rho$  is called a skew pair of pants.

We let  $\Pi$  and  $\Pi'$  denote two pairs of pants and let  $\rho : \pi_1(\Pi) \rightarrow \mathbf{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  and  $\rho' : \pi_1(\Pi') \rightarrow \mathbf{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  denote two representations. Suppose that for some  $c_1 \in \pi_1(\Pi)$  and  $c'_1 \in \pi_1(\Pi')$ , that belong to the conjugacy classes of  $C_1$  and  $C'_1$  respectively, we have  $\rho(c_1) = \rho'(c'_1)$ , and  $\mathbf{hl}(C_1) = \mathbf{hl}(C'_1)$ . By

$s(C) \in \mathbb{C}/(\mathbf{hl}(C)\mathbb{Z} + 2\pi i\mathbb{Z})$  we denote the reduced twist-bend parameter, which measures how the two skew pairs of pants  $[\rho]$  and  $[\rho']$  align together along the axis of the loxodromic transformation  $\rho(c_1) = \rho'(c'_1)$ .

A pair  $(\tilde{\Pi}, \chi)$  is a generalized pair of pants if  $\tilde{\Pi}$  is a compact surface with boundary and  $\chi$  is a finite degree covering map  $\chi : \tilde{\Pi} \rightarrow \Pi$ , where  $\Pi$  is a pair of pants. (We will also call  $\tilde{\Pi}$  a generalized pair of pants if  $\chi$  is understood.) By  $\chi_* : \pi_1(\tilde{\Pi}) \rightarrow \pi_1(\Pi)$  we denote an induced homomorphism.

**Definition 3.1.** *Let  $(\tilde{\Pi}, \chi)$  be a generalized pair of pants and*

$$\tilde{\rho} : \pi_1(\tilde{\Pi}) \rightarrow \mathbf{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C}),$$

*be a representation. We say that  $\tilde{\rho}$  is admissible with respect to  $\chi$  if it factors through  $\chi_*$ , that is there exists  $\rho : \pi_1(\Pi) \rightarrow \mathbf{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  such that  $\tilde{\rho} = \rho \circ \chi_*$ .*

Let  $\tilde{C}_j, j = 1, \dots, k$ , denote the cuffs (the boundary curves) of the surface  $\tilde{\Pi}$ , and let  $C_1, C_2, C_3$  continue to denote the cuffs of  $\Pi$ . Then  $\chi$  maps each  $\tilde{C}_j$  onto some  $C_i$  with some degree  $m_j \in \mathbb{N}$ . We say that such a curve  $\tilde{C}_j$  is a *degree  $m_j$  curve*. For every admissible  $\tilde{\rho}$  we define the half length  $\mathbf{hl}(\tilde{C}_j)$  as  $\mathbf{hl}(\tilde{C}_j) = \mathbf{hl}(C_i)$ . Let  $\tilde{c}_j \in \pi_1(\tilde{\Pi}^0)$  be in the conjugacy class that corresponds to the cuff  $\tilde{C}_j$ . Then

$$\mathbf{l}(\tilde{\rho}(\tilde{c}_j)) = 2m_j \mathbf{hl}(C_i) \pmod{2\pi i\mathbb{Z}}.$$

Let  $S$  be an oriented closed topological surface with a generalized pants decomposition. By this we mean that we are given a collection  $\mathcal{C}$  of disjoint simple closed curves on  $S$ , such that for every component  $\tilde{\Pi}$  of  $S \setminus \mathcal{C}$  there is an associated finite cover  $\chi : \tilde{\Pi} \rightarrow \Pi$ . Let

$$\tilde{\rho} : \pi_1(S) \rightarrow \mathbf{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$$

be a representation. We make the following assumptions on  $\rho$ :

- (1) Given a curve  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  there exists two (not necessarily different) generalized pairs of pants  $\tilde{\Pi}_1$  and  $\tilde{\Pi}_2$  that both contain  $C$  as a cuff, and that lie on different sides of  $C$ . Let  $\chi_1 : \tilde{\Pi}_1 \rightarrow \Pi_1$  and  $\chi_2 : \tilde{\Pi}_2 \rightarrow \Pi_2$  be the corresponding finite covers, where  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$  are two pairs of pants. We assume that the restrictions of  $\chi_1$  and  $\chi_2$  on the curve  $C$  are of the same degree.
- (2) For every generalized pair of pants  $\tilde{\Pi}$  from the above decomposition of  $S$ , the restriction  $\rho : \pi_1(\tilde{\Pi}) \rightarrow \mathbf{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  is admissible with respect to the covering map  $\chi : \tilde{\Pi} \rightarrow \Pi$  (in the sense of Definition 3.1).
- (3) For every  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ , the half lengths of  $C$  coming from the representations  $\rho : \pi_1(\tilde{\Pi}_1) \rightarrow \mathbf{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  and  $\rho : \pi_1(\tilde{\Pi}_2) \rightarrow \mathbf{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  are one and the same.

Continuing with the above notation, let  $C_i \subset \Pi_i$  denote the cuff such that  $\chi_i(C) = C_i$ . Let  $\rho_i : \pi_1(\Pi_i) \rightarrow \mathbf{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , be the representations



such that the restriction of  $\rho$  to  $\pi_1(\tilde{\Pi}_i)$  is equal to  $\rho_i \circ (\chi_i)_*$ . We define the reduced twist bend parameter  $s(C)$  associated to  $\rho$  to be equal to the reduced twist-bend parameter for the representations  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$ .

So given a closed surface  $S$  with a generalized pants decomposition  $\mathcal{C}$ , and a representation  $\rho : \pi_1(S) \rightarrow \mathbf{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ , we have defined the parameters  $\mathbf{hl}(C) \in \mathbb{C}_+ / 2k\pi\mathbb{Z}$  and  $s(C) \in \mathbb{C} / (\mathbf{hl}(C)\mathbb{Z} + 2\pi i\mathbb{Z})$ . The collection of pairs  $(\mathbf{hl}(C), s(C))$ ,  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ , is called the reduced Fenchel-Nielsen coordinates. We observe that a representation  $\rho : \pi_1(S) \rightarrow \mathbf{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  is Fuchsian if and only if all the coordinates  $(\mathbf{hl}(C), s(C))$  are real. This is well known (see [5]) when  $\mathcal{C}$  is a pants decomposition. The same is true when  $\mathcal{C}$  is a generalized pants decomposition. This follows directly from Definition 3.1 and the above three conditions we impose on  $\rho$ .

The following elementary proposition (see [5]) states that although a representation  $\rho : \pi_1(S) \rightarrow \mathbf{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  is not uniquely determined by its reduced Fenchel-Nielsen coordinates, it can be in a unique way embedded in a holomorphic family of representations (uniquely means that there is a unique holomorphic family of representations such that  $\rho$  can be embedded in this family as described in the following lemma).

**Proposition 3.1.** *Fix a closed topological surface  $S$  with a generalized pants decomposition  $\mathcal{C}$ . Let  $z \in \mathbb{C}_+^{\mathcal{C}}$  and  $w \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{C}}$  denote complex parameters. Then there exists a holomorphic (in  $(z, w)$ ) family of representations*

$$\rho_{z,w} : \pi_1(S) \rightarrow \mathbf{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C}),$$

such that  $\mathbf{hl}(C) = z(C)$ , ( $\text{mod}(2\pi i\mathbb{Z})$ ) and  $s(C) = w(C)$ , ( $\text{mod}(\mathbf{hl}(C)\mathbb{Z} + 2\pi i\mathbb{Z})$ ). Moreover, for any  $(z_0, w_0) \in \mathbb{C}_+^{\mathcal{C}} \times \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{C}}$ , the family of representations  $\rho_{z,w}$  is uniquely determined by the representation  $\rho_{z_0, w_0}$ .

The representation  $\rho_{z,w}$  is Fuchsian if and only if both  $z$  and  $w$  are real, that is  $z \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{C}}$  and  $w \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{C}}$ . In this case the group  $\rho_{z,w}(\pi_1(S))$  is of course discrete. Moreover, in [4] it has been proved that all quasifuchsian representations (up to conjugation in  $\mathbf{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ ) of  $\pi_1(S)$  correspond to some neighborhood of the set  $\mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{C}}$  and  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{C}}$ . But in general, little is known for which choice of parameters  $z, w$  the group  $\rho_{z,w}(\pi_1(S))$  will be discrete. In the next subsection we prove the following result in this direction. Start with a nearly Fuchsian group  $G < \mathbf{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ . We obtain a new group  $G_1 < \mathbf{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  from  $G$  by bending (by some definite angles) along some sparse equivariant collection of geodesics whose endpoints are in the limit set of  $G$ . Then the new group  $G_1$  is also quasifuchsian (although it is not nearly Fuchsian anymore).

**3.2. Small deformations of a sparsely bent pleated surface.** We let  $S$  continue to denote a closed surface with a generalized pants decomposition  $\mathcal{C}$ , and we fix a holomorphic family of representations  $\rho_{z,w}$  as in Proposition 3.1. We set  $G(z, w) = \rho_{z,w}(\pi_1(S))$ .

Let  $\mathcal{C}_0 \subset \mathcal{C}$  denote a sub-collection of curves. For  $z \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{C}_0}$  and  $w \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{C}_0}$ , we let  $S_{z,w}$  denote the Riemann surface isomorphic to  $\mathbb{H}^2 / G(z, w)$ , and on

$S_{z,w}$  we identify the curves from  $\mathcal{C}$  with the corresponding geodesics representatives. By  $\mathcal{K}(S_{z,w})$  we denote the largest number so that the collection of collars (of width  $\mathcal{K}(S_{z,w})$ ) around the curves from  $\mathcal{C}_0$  is disjoint on  $S_{z,w}$ . For each  $C \in \mathcal{C}_0$ , we choose a number  $-\frac{3}{4}\pi < \theta_C < \frac{3}{4}\pi$  (for each curve  $C \in (\mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}_0)$  we set  $\theta_C = 0$ ).

The purpose of this subsection is to prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.1.** *There exist constants  $K > 1$  and  $D > 0$  such that the following holds. Let  $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{C}}$  and  $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{C}}$ , and  $z_1 \in \mathbb{C}_+^{\mathcal{C}}$  and  $w_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{C}}$  be such that the representation  $\rho = \rho_{z_1, w_1} \circ \rho_{z_0, w_0}^{-1} : G(z_0, w_0) \rightarrow G(z_1, w_1)$ , is  $K$ -quasifuchsian. Set  $z_2 = z_1$  and  $w_2 = w_1 + i\theta_C$ . If  $\mathcal{K}(S_{z_0, w_0}) \geq D$ , then the representation  $\rho_{z_2, w_2} : \pi_1(S) \rightarrow \mathbf{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  is  $K_1$ -quasifuchsian, where  $K_1$  depends only on  $K$  and  $D$ .*

The following lemma is elementary.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $0 \leq \theta_0 < \pi$  and  $B_0 \geq 1$ . There exist constants  $L(\theta_0, B_0) > 0$  and  $D(\theta_0, B_0) > 0$  such that the following holds. Let  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$  be an interval that is partitioned into intervals  $I_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, k$ . Let  $\psi : I \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^3$  be a continuous map, such that  $\psi$  maps each  $I_j$  onto a geodesic segment and the restriction of  $\psi$  on  $I_j$  is  $B_0$ -bilipschitz. Assume in addition that the bending angle between two consecutive geodesic intervals  $\psi(I_j)$  and  $\psi(I_{j+1})$  is at most  $\theta_0$ . If the length of every  $I_j$  is at least  $D(\theta_0, B_0)$  then  $\psi$  is  $L(\theta_0, B_0)$ -bilipschitz.*

Let  $\psi : I \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^3$  be a  $C^1$  map, where  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$  is a closed interval. For  $x \in I$  let  $v(x) \in T^1I$  denote the unit vector that points toward  $+\infty$ . Let  $\delta > 0$ . We say that the map  $\psi$  is  $\delta$ -nearly geodesic if for every  $x, y \in I$  such that  $x < y \leq x + 1$ , we have that the angle between the vector  $\psi_*(v(x))$  and the oriented geodesic segment from  $\psi(x)$  to  $\psi(y)$  is at most  $\delta$ .

Clearly, every 0-nearly geodesic map is an isometry, and a sequence of normalized  $\delta_n$ -nearly geodesic maps converges (uniformly on compact sets) in the  $C^1$  sense to an isometry, when  $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$ . The following lemma is a generalization of the previous one.

**Lemma 3.2.** *There exist universal constants  $L, D, \delta > 0$ , such that the following holds. Suppose that  $I$  is partitioned into intervals  $I_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, k$ , and let  $\psi : I \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^3$  be a continuous map, whose restriction on every closed sub-interval  $I_j$  is  $C^1$  and  $\delta$ -nearly geodesic. Assume that the bending angle between two consecutive curves  $\psi(I_j)$  and  $\psi(I_{j+1})$  is at most  $\frac{3\pi}{4}$  (by the bending angle between two  $C^1$  curves we mean the appropriate angle determined by the two tangent vectors at the point where the two curves meet). If the length of every  $I_j$  is at least  $D$  then  $\psi$  is  $L$ -bilipschitz.*

*Proof.* Choose any two numbers  $\frac{3\pi}{4} < \theta_0 < \pi$  and  $B_0 > 1$ . Assuming that  $D > D(\theta_0, B_0)$  we can partition each  $I_j$  into sub-intervals of length between  $D(\theta_0, B_0)$  and  $2D(\theta_0, B_0)$ . Replacing each  $I_j$  with these new intervals we obtain the new partition of  $I$  into intervals  $J_i$ , where each  $J_i$  has the length

between  $D(\theta_0, B_0)$  and  $2D(\theta_0, B_0)$ . Let  $\phi : I \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^3$  be the continuous map that agrees with  $\psi$  at the endpoints of all intervals  $J_i$ , and such that the restriction of  $\phi$  to each  $J_i$  maps  $J_i$  onto a geodesic segment in  $\mathbb{H}^3$ , and is affine (the map  $\phi$  either stretches or contracts distances by a constant factor on a given  $J_i$ ).

Next, since we have the upper bound  $2D(\theta_0, B_0)$  on the length of each interval  $J_i$ , we can choose  $\delta > 0$  small enough such that the bending angle between two consecutive geodesic segments  $\phi(J_i)$  and  $\phi(J_{i+1})$  is at most  $\theta_0$ . Also, by choosing  $\delta$  small we can arrange that the map  $\phi \circ \psi^{-1}$  is 2-bilipschitz (the same statement holds if we replace 2 by any other number greater than 1). By the previous lemma the map  $\phi$  is  $L(\theta_0, B_0)$ -bilipschitz. Then the map  $\psi$  is  $2L(\theta_0, B_0)$ -bilipschitz. We take  $L = 2L(\theta_0, B_0)$ , and  $D = 2D(\theta_0, B_0)$ , and the lemma is proved.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 3.1.

*Proof.* Recall that  $f : \partial\mathbb{H}^2 \rightarrow \partial\mathbb{H}^3$  is a  $K$ -quasiconformal map that conjugates  $G(z_0, w_0)$  to  $G(z_1, w_1)$ . Let  $\tilde{f} : \mathbb{H}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^3$  denote the Douady-Earle extension of  $f$ .

*Remark.* Usually the Douady-Earle extension refers to the barycentric extensions of a homeomorphism  $f : \partial S^1 \rightarrow \partial S^1$  (see [2]). In the same paper (see Section 11 in [2]) Douady and Earle have shown that in a similar vein one defines the barycentric extension of any homeomorphism  $f : \partial S^k \rightarrow \partial S^k$ , for any  $k > 0$ . Similarly one can define the barycentric extension  $\tilde{f} : \mathbb{H}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^n$  of any continuous map  $f : \partial S^{m-1} \rightarrow \partial S^{n-1}$ . Alternatively, given a  $K$ -quasiconformal map  $f : \partial\mathbb{H}^2 \rightarrow \partial\mathbb{H}^3$  we first extend  $f$  to an equivariant  $K$ -quasiconformal map  $\bar{f} : \partial\mathbb{H}^3 \rightarrow \partial\mathbb{H}^3$  and then take the corresponding Douady-Earle extension of  $\tilde{f} : \mathbb{H}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^3$  of  $\bar{f}$  (as defined by Douady-Earle in [2]). The restriction of  $\tilde{f}$  to  $\mathbb{H}^2$  is also called  $\tilde{f}$ .

Then  $\tilde{f}$  is  $\delta$ -nearly geodesic (this means that the restriction of  $\tilde{f}$  to every geodesic segment is  $\delta$ -nearly geodesic in the sense of the above definition) for some  $\delta = \delta(K)$ , and  $\delta(K) \rightarrow 0$ , when  $K \rightarrow 1$ .

If we assume that  $\mathcal{K}(S_{z_0, w_0})$  is large enough, by adjusting  $\tilde{f}$ , we can arrange that  $\tilde{f}$  is then  $C^\infty$  mapping that maps the geodesics in  $\mathbb{H}^2$  that are lifts of the geodesics from  $\mathcal{C}_0$  onto the corresponding geodesics in  $\mathbb{H}^3$ , and ensure that  $\tilde{f}$  is  $2\delta$ -nearly geodesic. Moreover, we can arrange that  $\tilde{f}$  is conformal at every point of every geodesic  $\gamma$  that is a lift of a curve from  $\mathcal{C}_0$ .

We construct the map  $\tilde{g} : \mathbb{H}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^3$  that conjugates  $G(z_0, w_0)$  to  $G(z_2, w_2)$  as follows. Let  $M$  be a component of the set  $S_{z_0, w_0} \setminus \mathcal{C}_0$ , and let  $\tilde{M} \subset \mathbb{H}^2$  denote its universal cover, that is  $\tilde{M}$  is an ideal polygon with infinitely many sides in  $\mathbb{H}^2$ , whose sides are lifts of the geodesics from  $\mathcal{C}_0$  that bound  $M$ . We set  $\tilde{g} = \tilde{f}$  on  $\tilde{M}$ .

Let  $\tilde{M}_1 \subset \mathbb{H}^2$  be the universal cover of some other component  $M_1$  of the set  $S_{z_0, w_0} \setminus \mathcal{C}_0$ . Let  $\gamma$  denote a lift of a geodesic  $C \in \mathcal{C}_0$ , and assume that

the polygons  $\widetilde{M}$  and  $\widetilde{M}_1$  are glued to each other along  $\gamma$  (that is,  $C$  is in the boundary of both  $M$  and  $M_1$ ). Let  $R(\theta_C) \in \mathbf{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ , denote the rotation about  $\widetilde{g}(\gamma)$  for the angle  $\theta_C$ . We define  $\widetilde{g}$  on  $\widetilde{M}_1$  by letting  $\widetilde{g} = R(\theta_C) \circ \widetilde{f}$ . We then define  $\widetilde{g}$  inductively on the rest of  $\mathbb{H}^2$ .

Clearly  $\widetilde{g}$  conjugates  $G(z_0, w_0)$  to  $G(z_2, w_2)$ . Let  $x \in \gamma$ , and  $v(x)$  a non-zero vector that is orthogonal to  $\gamma$ . Since  $|\theta_C| \leq \frac{3}{4}\pi$ , and since  $\widetilde{f}$  is differentiable at  $x$ , it follows that the bending angle between the vectors  $\widetilde{g}_*(v(x))$  and  $\widetilde{g}_*(-v(x))$  is at most  $\frac{3}{4}\pi$ . If  $u(x)$  is any other vector at  $x$ , since  $\widetilde{f}$  is conformal at  $x$ , it follows that the bending angle between the vectors  $\widetilde{g}_*(u(x))$  and  $\widetilde{g}_*(-u(x))$  is at most as big as the bending angle between the vectors  $\widetilde{g}_*(v(x))$  and  $\widetilde{g}_*(-v(x))$ . Therefore, the restriction of the map  $\widetilde{g}$  on every geodesic segment satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 3.2. It follows that  $\widetilde{g}$  is  $L$ -bilipschitz, where  $L$  depends only on  $K$  and  $D$ . Therefore the representation  $\rho_{z_2, w_2} : \pi_1(S) \rightarrow \mathbf{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  is  $K_1$ -quasifuchsian, where  $K_1$  depends only on  $K$  and  $D$ . □

**3.3. Convex hulls and pleated surfaces.** In this subsection we digress from the notions of generalized pants decompositions and Fenchel-Nielsen coordinates, to prove a preliminary lemma about hyperbolic convex hulls of quasicircles.

Let  $\lambda$  be a discrete geodesic lamination in  $\mathbb{H}^2$ , and let  $\mathcal{K}(\lambda)$  denote the largest number such that for every small  $\epsilon > 0$ , the collection of collars (crescent in  $\mathbb{H}^2$ ) of width  $\mathcal{K}(\lambda) - \epsilon$  around the leafs of  $\lambda$  is disjoint in  $\mathbb{H}^2$ . Let  $\mu$  denote a real valued measure on  $\lambda$ . By  $\iota_{\lambda, \mu} = \iota : \mathbb{H}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^3$ , we denote the corresponding pleating map. As usual, by  $\iota(\lambda)$  we denote the collection of geodesics in  $\mathbb{H}^3$  that are images of geodesics from  $\lambda$  under  $\iota$ . If the map  $\iota$  is  $L$ -bilipschitz then  $\iota$  extends continuously to a  $K$ -quasiconformal map  $f : \partial\mathbb{H}^2 \rightarrow \partial\mathbb{H}^3$ , for some  $K = K(L)$ . In this case, let  $W \subset \mathbb{H}^3$  denote the convex hull of the quasicircle  $\iota(\partial\mathbb{H}^2)$ . The convex hull  $W$  has two boundary components which we denote by  $\partial_1 W$  and  $\partial_2 W$ . We prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.3.** *There exist universal constants  $C_1, \delta_1 > 0$ , with the following properties. Assume that  $\mathcal{K}(\lambda) > C_1$ , and that  $\frac{\pi}{4} \leq |\mu(l)| \leq \frac{3\pi}{4}$ , for every  $l \in \lambda$ . Then for every geodesic  $\gamma \subset W$  the following holds:*

- (1) *If  $\gamma \in \iota(\lambda)$ , then for every point  $p \in \gamma$ , the inequality*

$$\max_{i=1,2} d(p, \partial_i W) > \delta_1$$

*holds,*

- (2) *If  $\gamma$  does not belong to  $\iota(\lambda)$ , then for some point  $p \in \gamma$ , the inequality  $\max_{i=1,2} d(p, \partial_i W) < \frac{\delta_1}{3}$  holds.*

Compare this lemma with Lemma 4.2 in [6].

*Proof.* It follows from Lemma 3.1 that for  $C_1$  large enough, the pleating map  $\iota$  is  $L$ -bilipschitz for some universal constant  $L > 1$ . Observe that  $\iota(\mathbb{H}^2) \subset W$ . Moreover, there is a constant  $M_0 > 0$ , that depends only on  $L$ , such that for every  $p \in W$  we have  $d(p, \iota(\mathbb{H}^2)) < M_0$ .

We choose  $\delta_1 > 0$  as follows. Let  $P_0$  be the pleated surface in  $\mathbb{H}^3$  that has a single bending line  $\gamma_0$ , and with the bending angle equal to  $\frac{\pi}{4}$ . Then  $P_0$  is bounded by a quasicircle at  $\partial\mathbb{H}^3$ . Denote by  $W_0$  the convex hull of this quasicircle and let  $\partial_i(W_0)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , denote the two boundary components of  $W_0$ . Then there exists  $\delta_1 > 0$  such that for every point  $p \in \gamma_0$ , we have  $\max_{i=1,2} d(p, \partial_i W_0) > 2\delta_1$ . Observe that  $\gamma_0$  belongs to exactly one of the convex hull boundaries  $\partial_1 W_0$  and  $\partial_2 W_0$ , so one of the numbers  $d(p, \partial_1 W_0)$  and  $d(p, \partial_2 W_0)$  is zero and the other one is larger than  $2\delta_1$ .

Assume that the first statement of the lemma is false. Then there exists a sequence of measured laminations  $(\lambda_n, \mu_n)$  with the property  $\mathcal{K}(\lambda_n) \rightarrow \infty$ , and there are geodesics  $l_n \in \lambda_n$ , and points  $p_n \in \gamma_n = \iota_n(l_n)$ , such that the inequality

$$(4) \quad \max_{i=1,2} d(p_n, \partial_i W_n) \leq \delta_1,$$

holds. We may assume that  $p_n = p$ , and  $\gamma_n = \gamma$ , for every  $n$ , where  $p$  and  $\gamma$  are fixed. Since  $\iota_n$  is  $L$ -bilipschitz, after passing to a subsequence if necessary, the sequence  $\iota_n$  converges (uniformly on compact sets) to a pleating map  $\iota_\infty$ . The pleating map  $\iota_\infty$  corresponds to the pleating surface  $P_\infty$ , that has a single bending line  $\gamma_\infty$ , with the bending angle at least  $\frac{\pi}{4}$ . Then  $W_n$  converges to  $W_\infty$  uniformly on compact sets in  $\mathbb{H}^3$ , where  $W_\infty$  is the convex hull of the quasicircle that bounds  $P_\infty$ . It follows that  $d(p_n, \partial_i W_n) \rightarrow d(p, \partial_i W_\infty)$ . We may assume that  $\gamma_\infty = \gamma_0$ , where  $\gamma_0$  is the bending line of the pleated surface  $P_0$  defined above. Then we have  $\max_{i=1,2} d(p, \partial_i W_\infty) \geq \max_{i=1,2} d(p, \partial_i W_0) > 2\delta_1$ . But this contradicts (4).

We now prove the second statement of the lemma. Let  $\gamma$  be a geodesic in  $W$  that is not in  $\iota(\lambda)$ . Then we can find a point  $p \in \gamma$ , such that  $d(p, \iota(\lambda)) > \mathcal{K}(\lambda)$ . Assuming that the second statement is false, we again produce a sequence  $\lambda_n$  with  $\mathcal{K}(\lambda_n) \rightarrow \infty$ , and such that for some sequence of geodesics  $\gamma_n \subset W_n$ , that do not belong to  $\iota(\lambda_n)$ , and all the points  $p \in \gamma_n$ , the inequality

$$(5) \quad \max_{i=1,2} d(p, \partial_i W_n) \geq \frac{\delta_1}{3},$$

holds for  $n$  large enough. By the previous discussion, there exists a sequence of points  $p_n \in \gamma_n$ , such that  $d(p_n, \iota_n(\lambda_n)) > \mathcal{K}(\lambda_n)$ .

Let  $q_n \in \iota_n(\mathbb{H}^2)$  be points such that  $d(p_n, q_n) < M_0$ , where  $M_0$  is the constant defined at the beginning of the proof. Let  $z_n \in \mathbb{H}^2$ , such that  $q_n = \iota(z_n)$ . We may assume that  $z_n = i \in \mathbb{H}^2$  and  $q_n = q$ , for some point  $q$  that we fix. Then  $p_n \rightarrow p$ , where  $d(p, q) \leq M_0$ . Moreover, since  $\mathcal{K}(\lambda_n) \rightarrow \infty$ , the pleating maps  $\iota(\lambda_n)$  converge to an isometry uniformly on compact sets in  $\mathbb{H}^2$ . In particular, the sequence of convex hulls  $W_n$  converges to a geodesic

plane uniformly on compact sets, and therefore  $d(p_n, \partial_i W_n) \rightarrow 0$ . But this contradicts (5), and thus we have completed the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

**3.4.  $(\epsilon, R)$  skew pants.** We let  $S$  continue to denote a closed surface with a generalized pants decomposition  $\mathcal{C}$ , and we fix a holomorphic representations  $\rho_{z,w}$  as in Proposition 3.1.

Let  $\mathcal{C}_0 \subset \mathcal{C}$  denote a sub-collection of curves, and for each  $C \in \mathcal{C}_0$  we choose a number  $-\frac{3}{4}\pi < \theta_C < \frac{3}{4}\pi$  (for each curve  $C \in (\mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}_0)$  we set  $\theta_C = 0$ ).

For  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ , let  $\zeta_C, \eta_C \in \mathbb{D}$ , where  $\mathbb{D}$  denotes the unit disc in the complex plane. Let  $\tau \in \mathbb{D}$  denote a complex parameter and let  $t \in \{0, 1\}$ . Fix  $R > 1$ , and let  $z : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_+^{\mathcal{C}}$  and  $w : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{C}}$  be the mappings given by

$$z(C)(\tau) = \frac{R}{2} + \frac{\tau \zeta_C}{2},$$

and

$$w(C)(\tau, t) = 1 + it\theta_C + \frac{\tau \eta_C}{R}.$$

The maps  $z(\tau)$  and  $w(\tau, t)$  are complex linear, and therefore holomorphic in  $\tau$  and  $t$ . Therefore the induced family of representations  $\rho_{\tau, t} = \rho_{z(\tau), w(\tau, t)}$  is holomorphic in  $\tau$  and  $t$ . Note that  $\rho_{\tau, t}$  depends on  $R$ ,  $\zeta_C$ ,  $\eta_C$  and  $\theta_C$ , but we suppress this.

The representation  $\rho_{0,0}$  is Fuchsian. Let  $S_0$  denote the Riemann surface isomorphic to the quotient  $\mathbb{H}^2 / \rho_{0,0}(\pi_1(S))$  (we also equip  $S_0$  with the corresponding hyperbolic metric). Let  $\mathcal{K}(\rho_{0,0})$  denote the largest number so that the collection of collars (of width  $\mathcal{K}(\rho_{0,0})$ ) around the curves from  $\mathcal{C}_0$  is disjoint on  $S_0$ .

The representation  $\rho_{0,1}$  is not Fuchsian (unless  $\theta(\mathcal{C}_0) = 0$ ), and the following proposition gives a sufficient condition for it to be quasifuchsian.

We adopt the following notation. Let  $G(\tau, t) = \rho_{\tau, t}(\pi_1(S))$ . If  $G(\tau, t)$  is a quasifuchsian group we let  $f_{\tau, t} : \partial\mathbb{H}^3 \rightarrow \partial\mathbb{H}^3$ , denote the quasiconformal map that conjugates  $G(0, 0)$  to  $G(\tau, t)$ . The following theorem is a generalization of Theorem 2.2 from [5] (see Theorem 3.4 below). Assuming the above notation, we have:

**Theorem 3.2.** *There exist universal constants  $\widehat{R}, \widehat{\epsilon}, M > 0$ , such that the following holds. If  $\mathcal{K}(\rho_{0,0}) > M$ , then for every  $R \geq \widehat{R}$  and  $|\tau| < \widehat{\epsilon}$ , and any choice of constants  $\eta_C, \zeta_C \in \mathbb{D}$ , and  $-\frac{3}{4}\pi < \theta_C < \frac{3}{4}\pi$ , for  $C \in \mathcal{C}_0$ , the group  $G(\tau, 1)$  is quasifuchsian and the induced quasiconformal map  $f_{\tau, 1} \circ (f_{0, 1})^{-1}$  (that conjugates  $G(0, 1)$  to  $G(\tau, 1)$ ), is  $K(\tau)$ -quasiconformal, where*

$$K(\tau) = \frac{\widehat{\epsilon} + |\tau|}{\widehat{\epsilon} - |\tau|}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{C}_0(\tau, t)$  denote the collection of axes of elements of the form  $\rho_{\tau, t}(c)$ , where  $c \in \pi_1(S)$  and  $c$  belongs to the conjugacy class of some curve  $C \in \mathcal{C}_0$ . Then by definition, the set  $\mathcal{C}_0(\tau, t)$  is invariant under the group  $G(\tau, 1)$ . Next,

we prove that  $\mathcal{C}_0(\tau, 1)$  is invariant under any Möbius transformation from  $\mathbf{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  that preserves the limit set of  $G(\tau, 1)$ . The following theorem is the main result of this section.

**Theorem 3.3.** *There exist constants  $\widehat{\epsilon}_1, M_1 > 0$ , with the following properties. Assume that  $\mathcal{K}(\rho_{0,0}) > M_1$  and let  $|\tau| < \widehat{\epsilon}_1$ . If  $T \in \mathbf{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ , is a Möbius transformation that preserves the limit set of  $G(\tau, 1)$ , then the set of geodesics  $\mathcal{C}_0(\tau, 1)$  is invariant under  $T$ .*

Compare this theorem with Lemma 4.2 in [6].

*Proof.* Let  $W(\tau, t)$  denote the convex hull of the limit set of  $G(\tau, t)$ . It follows from Lemma 3.3 that for  $\mathcal{K}(\rho_{0,0})$  large enough, the following holds

- (1) For every  $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_0(0, 1)$  and  $p \in \gamma$ , the inequality

$$\max_{i=1,2} d(p, \partial_i W(0, t)) > \delta_1$$

holds,

- (2) For every  $\gamma \subset W(0, 1)$ , there exists  $p \in \gamma$  such that

$$\max_{i=1,2} d(p, \partial_i W(0, 1)) < \frac{\delta_1}{2}.$$

Then by Theorem 3.2 we can choose  $\widehat{\epsilon}_1$  small enough so that for  $|\tau| < \widehat{\epsilon}_1$ , the constant  $K(\tau)$  (from Theorem 3.2) is close enough to 1, so that the following holds:

- (1) For every  $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_0(\tau, 1)$  and  $p \in \gamma$ , the inequality

$$\max_{i=1,2} d(p, \partial_i W(0, t)) > \frac{4\delta_1}{5}$$

holds,

- (2) For every  $\gamma \subset W(0, 1)$ , there exists  $p \in \gamma$  such that

$$\max_{i=1,2} d(p, \partial_i W(0, 1)) < \frac{2\delta_1}{3}.$$

Then any Möbius transformation  $A \in \mathbf{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  that preserves  $W(\tau, 1)$  will also preserve the set  $\mathcal{C}(\tau, 1)$ . This proves the theorem.  $\square$

**3.5. A proof of Theorem 3.2.** We need to prove that  $G(\tau, 1)$  is a quasi-fuchsian group. The last estimate in Theorem 3.2 then follows from the fact that a holomorphic map from the unit disc into the Teichmüller space of a Riemann surface is a contraction with respect to the hyperbolic metric on the unit disc and the Teichmüller metric.

Recall Theorem 2.2 from [5].

**Theorem 3.4.** *There exist universal constants  $\widehat{R}, \widehat{\epsilon}$ , such that the following holds. For every  $R \geq \widehat{R}$  and  $|\tau| < \widehat{\epsilon}$ , and any choice of constants  $\eta_C, \zeta_C \in \mathbb{D}$ ,*

the group  $G(\tau, 0)$  is quasifuchsian, and the induced quasiconformal map  $f_{\tau,0}$  that conjugates  $G(0, 0)$  to  $G(\tau, 0)$ , is  $K(\tau)$ -quasiconformal, where

$$K(\tau) = \frac{\widehat{\epsilon} + |\tau|}{\widehat{\epsilon} - |\tau|}.$$

The group  $G(\tau, 1)$  is obtained from the group  $G(\tau, 0)$ , by bending along the lifts of curves  $C \in \mathcal{C}_0$ , for the angle  $\theta_C$ . It follows from Theorem 3.1 that the group  $G(\tau, 1)$  is quasifuchsian if  $\mathcal{K}(\rho_{0,0}) > C$ , and if the map  $f_{\tau,0}$  is  $K$ -quasiconformal, where  $K$  is close enough to 1. But it follows from Theorem 3.4 that for  $|\tau|$  small enough this will be the case. This proves Theorem 3.2.

#### 4. THE LOWER BOUND

**4.1. Amalgamating two representations.** Let  $S$  denote a closed surfaces with generalized pants decompositions  $\mathcal{C}$ , and let  $\rho : \pi_1(S) \rightarrow \mathbf{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  denote an admissible (in sense of Definition 3.1) representation with the reduced Fenchel-Nielsen coordinates satisfying the inequalities

$$|\mathbf{hl}(C) - \frac{R}{2}| \leq \epsilon,$$

and

$$|s(C) - 1| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{R},$$

for some  $\epsilon, R > 0$ , and  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ . We say that such a representation is  $(\epsilon, R)$ -good.

Let  $\mathbf{M}^3$  denote a closed hyperbolic manifold such that  $\mathbf{M}^3 = \mathbb{H}^3/\Gamma$  for some Kleinian group  $\Gamma$ . In [5] we proved that one can find many  $(\epsilon, R)$ -good representations  $\rho : \pi_1(S) \rightarrow \Gamma$ , for a given  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $R$  large enough. Moreover, if  $A \in \Gamma$  has the translation length  $\mathbf{l}(A)$  satisfying the inequality  $|\mathbf{l}(A) - R| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ , then we can find such  $\rho$  so that  $A$  is in the image of  $\rho$ . From now on we assume that such  $A \in \Gamma$  is primitive, that is  $A$  is not equal to an integer power of another element of  $\Gamma$ .

In particular, it follows from Section 4 of [5] (the statements about the equidistribution of  $(\epsilon, R)$ -good pairs of skew pants around a given closed curve in  $\mathbf{M}^3$  whose length is  $\epsilon$  close to  $R$ ) that we can find two  $(\epsilon, R)$ -good representations  $\rho(i) : \pi_1(S(i)) \rightarrow \Gamma$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , where  $S(1)$  and  $S(2)$  are two closed surfaces with pants decompositions  $\mathcal{C}(i)$ , and two pairs of pants  $\Pi_i^+$  and  $\Pi_i^-$  with the following properties:

- There are two oriented, degree one curves  $C(i) \in \mathcal{C}(i)$ , and  $c(i) \in \pi_1(S(i))$  in the conjugacy classes of  $C(1)$  and  $C(2)$  respectively, such that  $\rho(1)(C(1)) = \rho(2)(C(2)) = [A]$ , where  $[A]$  is the conjugacy class of a given primitive element  $A \in \Gamma$ , whose translation length  $\mathbf{l}(A)$  satisfies the inequality  $|\mathbf{l}(A) - R| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ .
- Let  $\gamma$  denote the closed geodesic corresponding to  $A$ . There exist two pairs of skew pants  $\Pi_i^+$  and  $\Pi_i^-$  in  $\rho(i)(\pi_1(S(i)))$  such that  $\gamma$  is positively oriented boundary component of  $\Pi_i^+$  and negatively



oriented for  $\Pi_i^-$ , and recalling the notation from [5] we have the inequality

$$(6) \quad |\text{foot}_\gamma(\Pi_2^+) - \text{foot}_\gamma(\Pi_1^-) - \frac{\pi}{2}| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{R}.$$

After replacing  $S(1)$  and  $S(2)$  with appropriate finite degree covers if necessary, we may assume in addition to the above two conditions the following also hold

- The curves  $C(1)$  and  $C(2)$  are non-separating simple closed curves in  $S(1)$  and  $S(2)$  respectively,
- The surfaces  $S(1)$  and  $S(2)$  have the same genus,
- By Proposition 3.1 the representation  $\rho(i)$  can be embedded in the holomorphic family of representations  $\rho_{\tau,t}(i)$ . We may assume that  $\mathcal{K}(\rho_{0,0}(S(i))) > C_1$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , where  $C_1$  is the constant from Theorem 3.3.

We now fix such two representations  $\rho(1)$  and  $\rho(2)$ , surfaces  $S(1)$  and  $S(2)$ , and the two oriented curves  $C(1)$  and  $C(2)$  (we also fix the corresponding primitive element  $A \in \Gamma$ ).

Let  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . For  $n > 1$ , let  $S_n(1)$  and  $S_n(2)$  denote two primitive degree  $n$  covers of  $S(1)$  and  $S(2)$  respectively (a finite cover of a surface is primitive if it does not factor through an intermediate cover), such that for some  $1 \leq k \leq (n-1)$ , the curves  $C(1)$  and  $C(2)$  have two degree  $k$  lifts  $C_n(1)$  and  $C_n(2)$ . Then  $C_n(1)$  and  $C_n(2)$  are two oriented, non-separating simple closed curves in  $S_n(1)$  and  $S_n(2)$  respectively. We then have the two induced representations  $\rho_n(i) : \pi_1(S_n(i)) \rightarrow \Gamma$ , that also satisfy the above five conditions, except that

$$\rho_n(1)(\pi_1(S_n(1))) \cap \rho_n(2)(\pi_1(S_n(2))) = \{A^k\}.$$

We amalgamate them as follows. Cut the surface  $S_n(i)$  along  $C_n(i)$ , to get two topological surfaces  $\bar{S}_n(i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , each having two boundary components  $C_n^1(i)$  and  $C_n^2(i)$ . We glue together the surfaces  $\bar{S}_n(1)$  and  $\bar{S}_n(2)$  by gluing  $C_n^j(1)$  to  $C_n^j(2)$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , and obtain a closed topological surface  $S_n$  (this is well defined up to a twist by  $\Re(\mathbf{1}(A))$  which has a period  $k$ ). The surface  $S_n$  has the induced generalized pants decomposition  $\mathcal{C}_n$ . The pair of curves  $C_n^1(1)$  and  $C_n^1(2)$  that were glued together produce a closed curve  $C_n^1$  in  $S_n$ . Similarly, the pair of curves  $C_n^2(1)$  and  $C_n^2(2)$  that were glued together produce a closed curve  $C_n^2$  in  $S_n$ . We set  $\mathcal{C}_{0,n} = \{C_n^1, C_n^2\}$ .

Then there is the induced representation  $\rho_n : \pi_1(S_n) \rightarrow \Gamma$ . We orient the curves  $C_n^1$  and  $C_n^2$  such that for any choice of  $c_i \in \pi_1(S_n)$ , where  $c_i$  is in the conjugacy class of  $C_n^i$ , we have that both  $\rho_n(c_1)$  and  $\rho_n(c_2)$  are in the conjugacy class of  $A^k$  in  $\Gamma$ .

The representation  $\rho_n$  has the reduced Fenchel-Nielsen coordinates satisfying the relations

$$|\mathbf{hl}(C) - \frac{R}{2}| \leq \epsilon,$$

and

$$|s(C) - 1| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{R},$$

if  $C$  does not belong to  $\mathcal{C}_{0,n}$ , and

$$|s(C) - (1 + i\frac{\pi}{2})| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{R},$$

if  $C \in \mathcal{C}_{0,n}$ .

It follows from Theorem 3.2 that for  $\epsilon$  small enough and  $R$  large enough, the group  $\rho_n(\pi_1(S_n))$  is quasifuchsian. In the remainder of this subsection we prove that the group  $\rho_n(\pi_1(S_n))$  is a maximal subgroup of  $\Gamma$ .

First we prove a preliminary lemma. Let  $\bar{S}$  be a surface with boundary components  $C_+$  and  $C_-$ , oriented so that  $\bar{S}$  is on the left of  $C_+$  and on the right of  $C_-$ . We say that  $f : \bar{S} \rightarrow \mathbf{M}^3$  is rejoinable if the restrictions of  $f$  to  $C_+$  and  $C_-$  respectively are freely homotopic in  $\mathbf{M}^3$ . We say  $(f, \bar{S})$  is geodesically rejoinable if  $f|_{C_+}$  and  $f|_{C_-}$  map to the same closed geodesic in  $\mathbf{M}^3$ . In this case we say a rejoining of  $(f, \bar{S})$  is a homeomorphism  $h : C_+ \rightarrow C_-$  such that  $f \circ h = f$ , and we say  $(f, \bar{S}/h)$  is  $\bar{S}$  rejoined by  $h$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *If  $(f, \bar{S})$ , and  $(g, \bar{T})$  are (geodesically) rejoinable surfaces, and  $\pi : \bar{S} \rightarrow \bar{T}$  is a finite cover such that  $g \circ \pi$  is homotopic to  $f$ , then for any rejoining  $h$  of  $(f, \bar{S})$  we can find a rejoining  $k$  of  $(g, \bar{T})$  such that  $(f, \bar{S})$  rejoined by  $h$  covers  $(g, \bar{T})$  rejoined by  $k$ .*

*Proof.* Left to the reader. □

The following theorem is a corollary of Theorem 3.3. We adopt the following definition. Let  $f : S \rightarrow \mathbf{M}^3$  be a map such that  $f(S)$  is a quasifuchsian surface in  $\mathbf{M}^3$ , and let  $\mathcal{C}_0$  denote a collection of disjoint simple closed curves on  $S$ . We say that  $f$  is bent along each curve of  $\mathcal{C}_0$  and nearly locally isometric on  $S \setminus \mathcal{C}_0$  if the induced map  $f_* : \pi_1(S) \rightarrow \Gamma$  is of the form  $\rho_{\tau,1}$  for some  $|\tau| \leq \hat{\epsilon}$ .

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $S$  be a closed surface. Suppose that  $f : S \rightarrow \mathbf{M}^3$  is a  $\pi_1$ -injective and quasifuchsian, and  $\mathcal{C}_0$  is a collection of disjoint simple closed curves on  $S$ , such that  $f$  is bent along each curve of  $\mathcal{C}_0$  and nearly locally isometric on  $S \setminus \mathcal{C}_0$ . Suppose that  $f = g \circ \pi$ , where  $\pi : S \rightarrow Q$  is a covering, and  $g : Q \rightarrow \mathbf{M}^3$  is  $\pi_1$ -injective and quasifuchsian. Then we can find a collection of simple closed curves  $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_0$  on  $Q$  such that  $\mathcal{C}_0 = \pi^{-1}(\hat{\mathcal{C}}_0)$ .*

*Proof.* We get a discrete lamination  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_0$  on  $\mathbb{H}^2$ , which we push forward by  $\tilde{f} = \tilde{g}$  to  $\mathbb{H}^3$ . We find a homomorphism  $\sigma : \text{Deck}(\mathbb{H}^2/Q) \rightarrow \Gamma$  such that  $\tilde{f}(\gamma(x)) = \sigma(\gamma)(\tilde{f}(x))$  for every  $x \in \mathbb{H}^2$  and  $\gamma \in \text{Deck}(\mathbb{H}^2/Q)$ .

We let  $G = \sigma(\text{Deck}(\mathbb{H}^2/Q))$ , and  $H = \sigma(\text{Deck}(\mathbb{H}^2/S)) < G$ . Then  $[G : H] < \infty$ , and  $G$  and  $H$  are quasifuchsian groups, and they have the same limit set, so by Theorem 3.3 every element of  $G$  maps  $\tilde{g}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_0)$  to itself. Hence  $\text{Deck}(\mathbb{H}^2/Q)$  maps  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_0$  to itself, so  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_0$  is a lift of  $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_0$  on  $Q$ , and hence  $\mathcal{C}_0$  is.

□

**Theorem 4.2.** *The quasifuchsian group  $\rho_n(\pi_1(S_n)) < \Gamma$  is a maximal surface subgroup of  $\Gamma$ , that is, if  $\rho_n(\pi_1(S_n)) < G$  for a surface subgroup  $G < \Gamma$ , then  $G = \rho_n(\pi_1(S_n))$ .*

*Proof.* For simplicity let  $G_n = \rho_n(\pi_1(S_n))$  and  $G(1) = \rho(1)(\pi_1(S(1)))$ . Also set  $G_n(1) = \rho_n(\pi_1(\bar{S}_n(1)))$ , where we consider  $\pi_1(\bar{S}_n(1))$  as a subgroup of  $\pi_1(S_n)$ .

Let  $f_n : S_n \rightarrow \mathbf{M}^3$  denote the continuous map that corresponds to the representation  $\rho_n$ . We claim that  $f_n : S_n \rightarrow \mathbf{M}^3$  is primitive. If not, we can find a Riemann surface  $Q$  and  $\pi : S_n \rightarrow Q$  and  $g : Q \rightarrow \mathbf{M}^3$  such that  $g \circ \pi = f_n$  and  $d > 1$  where  $d$  is the degree of the cover  $\pi$ . We recall that  $f_n$  is bent along  $C_n^1$  and  $C_n^2$ , and nearly isometric on the complement. So by Theorem 4.1,  $\{C_n^1, C_n^2\}$  are the lifts by  $\pi$  of some set  $\mathcal{C}_Q$  of simple closed curves on  $Q$ . So  $|\mathcal{C}_Q| = 1$  or  $|\mathcal{C}_Q| = 2$ .

If  $|\mathcal{C}_Q| = 2$ , then each component of  $S_n \setminus \cup C_n^i$  maps by degree  $d$  to a component of  $Q \setminus \mathcal{C}_Q$ . We can then write  $Q \setminus \mathcal{C}_Q = \bar{Q}(1) \cup \bar{Q}(2)$  such that  $\pi : \bar{S}_n(i) \rightarrow \bar{Q}(i)$  is a degree  $d$  cover, and then by Lemma 4.1 we can rejoin the boundary curves of  $\bar{Q}(1)$  to form  $Q'(1)$  such that  $S_n(1)$  is a cover of  $Q'(1)$ . But then we get a subgroup  $G_{Q'}$  of  $G_n(1)$  ( $G_{Q'} = \pi_1(Q'(1))$ ), and  $G_n(1) < G_{Q'} \cap G(1) < G(1)$ , where both inclusions are proper. The first inclusion is proper because  $A^{\frac{k}{d}} \in G_{Q'} \cap G(1) \setminus G_n(1)$ , and the second is proper because  $k < n$ . This contradicts the assumption on the maximality of  $G_n(1)$ .

If  $|\mathcal{C}_Q| = 1$ , we let  $\mathcal{C}_Q = \{C_Q\}$ . First suppose that  $C_Q$  is non-separating. Then writing  $Q \setminus C_Q = \bar{Q}$  we find that  $\bar{S}_n(1)$  and  $\bar{S}_n(2)$  are both degree  $\frac{d}{2}$  covers of  $\bar{Q}$ . But then we can reassemble  $\bar{Q}$  to make  $Q'$  (by Lemma 4.1) such that  $S_n(1)$  is a degree  $\frac{d}{2}$  cover of  $Q'$ , when  $\frac{d}{2} \leq k$ . Then we arrive at a contradiction by the same reasoning as before.

Finally, suppose that  $C_Q$  is separating. Then we can write  $Q \setminus C_Q = \bar{Q}(1) \cup \bar{Q}(2)$  so that the restriction of  $\pi$  to  $\bar{S}_n(i)$  is a cover of  $\bar{Q}(i)$ . Then the conjugacy classes for  $C_n^1$  and  $C_n^2$ , oriented as curves covered by the axis of  $A$ , are both in  $[A^k]$ , but  $C_n^1$  and  $C_n^2$  both cover  $C_Q$  with opposite orientations, so the conjugacy class for  $C_Q$  must be both  $[A^l]$  and  $[A^{-l}]$ , where  $l = \frac{2k}{d}$ . But then  $B^{-1}A^lB = A^{-l}$  for some  $B \in \Gamma$ , which means that  $B$  preserves the axis of  $A$  and reverses its orientation; such  $B$  would have a fixed point in  $\mathbb{H}^3$ , which is a contradiction.

□

**4.2. The lower bound.** We now proceed to prove the lower bound

$$(7) \quad (c_1g)^{2g} \leq s_1(\mathbf{M}^3, g),$$

for  $g$  large enough, from Theorem 1.1.

By the above theorem the representation  $\rho_n : \pi_1(S_n) \rightarrow \Gamma$ , is maximal. It remains to count the number of such representations. Let  $g_n$  denote the

genus of the surface  $S_n$ . If  $g_0$  denotes the genus of the surfaces  $S(1)$  and  $S(2)$ , we have

$$g_n = n(2g_0 - 1).$$

Given a closed surface  $S_0$ , Let  $m_n(S_0)$  denote the number of maximal degree  $n$  covers of  $S_0$ . Let  $C_0$  denote a simple closed and non-separating curve in  $S_0$ . For  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , by  $m_n(S_0, C_0, k)$  we denote the number of maximal  $n$  degree covers of  $S_0$  such that the curve  $C_0$  has at least one lift of degree  $k$ . Clearly the number  $m_n(S_0, C_0, k)$  does not depend on the choice of the simple closed and non-separating curve  $C_0$ , so we sometimes write  $m_n(S_0, k) = m_n(S_0, C_0, k)$ .

**Theorem 4.3.** *Let  $g_0$  denote the genus of  $S_0$ . Then for  $n$  large we have:*

$$m_n(S_0) = (n!)^{g_0-2}(1 + o(1)),$$

where  $o(1) \rightarrow 0$  when  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover, for some  $1 \leq k \leq (n-1)$ ,  $k = k(n, g_0)$ , we have

$$m_n(S_0, k) > ((n-1)!)^{g_0-2}(1 + o(1)).$$

*Proof.* The first equality directly follows from Corollary 3 and the formula in Section 4.4 in [7], which shows that a random finite cover of a closed surface is maximal. It remains to prove the second inequality.

Since

$$\sum_{k=1}^n m_n(S_0, k) \geq m_n(S_0),$$

it follows that for some  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , the second inequality in the statement of the theorem holds. The following lemma implies that this inequality holds for some  $1 \leq k \leq (n-1)$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** *The inequality  $m_n(S_0, 1) \geq m_n(S_0, n)$ , holds for every  $n$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $C_0$  and  $D_0$  be two simple closed and non-separating curves on  $S_0$ , that intersect exactly once. Let  $S_n$  be a degree  $n$  cover of  $S_0$ , such that the curve  $C_0$  has a degree  $n$  lift which we denote by  $C_n$ . Then  $C_n$  is the only lift of  $C_0$ . We show that in this case, every lift of the curve  $D_0$  is a degree one lift. Let  $\tilde{S}_0 = S_0 \setminus C_0$  and  $\tilde{S}_n = S_n \setminus C_n$ , denote the two surfaces each having exactly two boundary components. Then  $\tilde{S}_n$  covers  $\tilde{S}_0$ , because  $C_n$  is the only lift of  $C_0$  to  $S_n$ . After removing the curve  $C_0$  from  $S_0$ , the closed curve  $D_0$  becomes an interval  $I_0 \subset \tilde{S}_0$ , whose endpoints lie on different boundary components of  $\tilde{S}_0$ . Therefore, every lift of  $I_0$  to  $\tilde{S}_n$  is a degree one lift. This proves the statement.

Restricting to the cases when  $S_n$  is a maximal cover, yields the inequality  $m_n(S_0, C_0, n) \leq m_n(S_0, D_0, 1)$ . Since  $m_n(S_0, C_0, k) = m_n(S_0, D_0, k) = m_n(S_0, k)$ , it follows that  $m_n(S_0, 1) \geq m_n(S_0, n)$ , and we have proved the lemma.

□

This proves the theorem.

□

Now fix a large  $n$  and choose  $1 \leq k \leq (n-1)$  so that the second inequality in Theorem 4.3 holds. We then amalgamate any two maximal covers  $S_n(1)$  and  $S_n(2)$  along the curves  $C_n(1)$  and  $C_n(2)$  that are both  $k$  degree lifts of the curves  $C(1)$  and  $C(2)$  respectively (there may be more than one such  $k$  degree lift, but we choose arbitrarily). Then the corresponding group  $\rho_n(\pi_1(S_n)) < \Gamma$  is maximal surface subgroup of  $\Gamma$ . Combining the above formula for  $g_n$  with the Theorem 4.3, we derive the estimate (7) for some  $c_1 > 0$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] E. Bender, R. Canfield, *The asymptotic number of rooted maps on a surface*. J. Combin. Theory Ser. A 43 (1986), no. 2, 244–257.
- [2] A. Douady, C. Earle, *Conformally natural extension of homeomorphism of the circle*. Acta Mathematica 157 (1986), no. 1-2, 23-48
- [3] D. Epstein, A. Marden, V. Markovic, *Quasiconformal homeomorphisms and the convex hull boundary*. Ann. of Math. (2) 159 (2004), no. 1, 305–336.
- [4] C. Kourouniotis, *Complex length coordinates for quasifuchsian groups*. Mathematika, 41 (1994), 173–188.
- [5] J. Kahn, V. Markovic, *Immersing almost geodesic surfaces in a closed hyperbolic three manifold* arXiv:0910.5501
- [6] J. Masters, *Counting immersed surfaces in hyperbolic 3-manifolds*. Algebr. Geom. Topol. 5 (2005), 835–864
- [7] T. Muller, J-C. Puchta, *Character theory of symmetric groups and subgroup growth of surface groups*. Journal London Math. Soc. (2) 66 (2002) 623-640
- [8] S. Tan, *Complex Fenchel-Nielsen coordinates for quasi-Fuchsian structures*. Internat. J. Math. 5 (1994), no. 2, 239–251
- [9] C. Series, *An extension of Wolpert’s derivative formula*. Pacific J. Math. 197 (2001), no. 1, 223–239.

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, STONY BROOK UNIVERSITY, STONY BROOK, NY 11794  
*E-mail address:* kahn@math.sunysb.edu

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, PASADENA,  
 CA 91105, USA  
*E-mail address:* markovic@caltech.edu