

# *A framework toward understanding the characterization of holomorphic dynamics*

**Yunping Jiang**

with an appendix by Tao Chen,  
Yunping Jiang, and Linda Keen

ABSTRACT. This paper gives a review of our work on the characterization of geometrically finite rational maps and then outlines a framework for characterizing holomorphic maps. Whereas Thurston's methods are based on estimates of hyperbolic distortion in hyperbolic geometry, the framework suggested here is based on controlling conformal distortion in spherical geometry. The new framework enables one to relax two of Thurston's assumptions: first, that the iterated map has finite degree and, second, that its post-critical set is finite. Thus, it makes possible to characterize certain rational maps for which the post-critical set is not finite as well as certain classes of entire and meromorphic coverings for which the iterated map has infinite degree.

replaced comma after  
assumptions by colon

## 1 CHARACTERIZATION

Suppose  $f: S^2 \rightarrow S^2$  is an orientation-preserving branched covering of the two-sphere  $S^2$ , often simply referred to as a "branched covering." We use the notation  $f^n = \underbrace{f \circ \dots \circ f}_n$  for the  $n$ -fold composition. Let  $d = \deg f > 1$  be the degree of  $f$  and let

$$\Omega_f = \{c \mid \deg_c f \geq 2\}$$

be the set of all branched points, where  $\deg_c f$  means the local degree of  $f$  at  $c$ . Let

$$P_f = \overline{\cup_{n \geq 1} f^n(\Omega_f)}$$

be the post-critical set. A rational map which is a quotient of two polynomials is a holomorphic branched covering.

DEFINITION 1.1 (Combinatorial equivalence). *Two branched coverings  $f$  and  $g$  are said to be combinatorially equivalent if there are two homeomorphisms  $\phi, \psi: S^2 \rightarrow S^2$  such that*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (S^2, P_f) & \xrightarrow{\phi} & (S^2, P_g) \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow g \\ (S^2, P_f) & \xrightarrow{\psi} & (S^2, P_g) \end{array}$$

*commutes and  $\phi \stackrel{\text{homotopy}}{\sim} \psi \text{ rel. } P_f$ . (The term "rel.  $P_f$ " means that  $\psi|_{P_f} = \phi|_{P_f}$  and the homotopy preserves this equation, refer to Definition 4.1.)*

The following is a basic problem in complex dynamics.

PROBLEM 1. *When is a branched covering  $f$  combinatorially equivalent to a rational map?*

Consider the complex plane  $\mathbb{C}$  and consider the Riemann sphere  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$  which is the two-sphere equipped with the standard conformal structure. Let

$$M(\mathbb{C}) = \{\mu \mid \mu \text{ is a measurable function on } \mathbb{C} \text{ such that } \|\mu\|_\infty < 1\}$$

be the open unit ball of the complex Banach space  $\mathcal{L}^\infty(\mathbb{C})$ . Each  $\mu$  in  $M(\mathbb{C})$  is called a Beltrami coefficient and can be viewed as a conformal structure on  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ . The Beltrami equation

$$w_{\bar{z}} = \mu w_z \tag{1.1}$$

has a unique quasiconformal homeomorphism solution fixing  $0, 1, \infty$  (see, for example, [Ahlfors-Bers]). We always use  $w^\mu$  to denote this solution.

Assume  $f$  is locally quasiconformal except on  $\Omega_f$ . In other words, we assume that  $f$  is quasiregular, that is,  $f = R \circ g$ , where  $g$  is a quasiconformal homeomorphism and  $R$  is a rational map. Given a Beltrami coefficient  $\mu$  (viewed as a conformal structure on  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ ), the pull-back  $f^*\mu$  of  $\mu$  by  $f$  can be calculated as

$$f^*\mu(z) = \frac{\mu_f(z) + \mu(f(z))\theta(z)}{1 + \overline{\mu_f(z)}\mu(f(z))\theta(z)},$$

where  $\mu_f(z) = \overline{f_z(z)}/f_z(z)$  is a Beltrami coefficient and where  $\theta(z) = \overline{f_z(z)}/f_z(z)$ .

Let  $E \supseteq P_f$  be a closed subset of  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$  such that  $f(E) \subseteq E$ . Suppose  $0, 1, \infty \in E$ .

Then  $f^*\mu \sim_E \mu$  means that  $(w^{f^*\mu})^{-1} \circ w^\mu \stackrel{\text{homotopy}}{\sim} id$  rel.  $E$  (the term “rel.  $E$ ” means that  $(w^{f^*\mu})^{-1} \circ w^\mu|_E = id$  and the homotopy preserves this equation; refer to Definition 4.1).

PROBLEM 2. *Can we view  $f: (\widehat{\mathbb{C}}, E) \rightarrow (\widehat{\mathbb{C}}, E)$  as a holomorphic map? More precisely, can we find a Beltrami coefficient  $\mu$  such that  $f^*\mu \sim_E \mu$  rel.  $E$ ?*

A special case is when  $E = \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ . The answer to Problem 2 in this special case is the uniform quasiconformality.

THEOREM 1.2 ([Sullivan;2]). *There is a Beltrami coefficient  $\mu$  (in other words, a conformal structure on  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ ) such that*

$$f^*\mu = \mu \text{ if and only if } \sup_{n \geq 0} K(f^n) \leq K_0 < \infty,$$

where  $K(f^n)$  means the maximal quasiconformal dilatation of  $f^n$ .

REMARK 1.3. Sullivan proved Theorem 1.2 for two-dimensional quasiconformal semi-groups acting on the Riemann sphere. Hinkkanen [Hinkkanen] showed that a similar method can also be applied to prove the theorem for any quasi-entire function,  $f = e \circ g$ , and any quasi-meromorphic function,  $f = m \circ g$ , where  $g$  is a quasiconformal homeomorphism and  $e$  and  $m$  are an entire function and a meromorphic function on the complex plane, as a two-dimensional semi-group acting on the complex plane. Sullivan [Sullivan;1] and Tukia [Tukia] also proved the theorem for two-dimensional quasiconformal groups acting on the Riemann sphere.

replaced “for” by “on”; was except for  $\Omega_f$ .

STET keeping pull-back with hyphen. It can go either way.

STET: not hyphenating quasiconformal.

replaced “It was proved by Hinkkanen” by “Hinkkanen showed” for linebreak, and to make less passive

## 2 OBSTRUCTION

In general, answers to Problems 1 and 2 are not easy. There is a topological obstruction which we call a Thurston obstruction in this study.

Suppose  $E \supseteq P_f$  is a closed subset of the Riemann sphere (it is not necessary to assume that  $0, 1, \infty \in E$ ). A simple closed curve  $\gamma$  in  $S^2 \setminus E$  is called non-peripheral if every component of  $S^2 \setminus \gamma$  contains at least two points from  $E$ . A *multi-curve*  $\Gamma = \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n\}$  is a set of finitely many pairwise disjoint, non-homotopic, and non-peripheral curves in  $S^2 \setminus E$ .

Since  $E \supseteq P_f$ ,  $\Omega_f \subseteq f^{-1}(E)$  and  $f: S^2 \setminus f^{-1}(E) \rightarrow S^2 \setminus E$  is a covering map of finite degree and every component of  $f^{-1}(\gamma)$  is a simple closed curve. A multi-curve  $\Gamma$  is said to be *f-stable* if for any  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ , every non-peripheral component of  $f^{-1}(\gamma)$  is homotopic to an element of  $\Gamma$  rel.  $E$ .

For a stable multi-curve  $\Gamma$ , define  $f_\Gamma$  as follows: For each  $\gamma_j \in \Gamma$ , let  $\gamma_{i,j,\alpha}$  denote the components of  $f^{-1}(\gamma_j)$  homotopic to  $\gamma_i$  in  $S^2 \setminus E$  and  $d_{i,j,\alpha}$  be the degree of  $f|_{\gamma_{i,j,\alpha}}: \gamma_{i,j,\alpha} \rightarrow \gamma_j$ . Define

$$f_\Gamma(\gamma_j) = \sum_i \left( \sum_\alpha \frac{1}{d_{i,j,\alpha}} \right) \gamma_i.$$

Then  $f_\Gamma: \mathbb{R}^\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\Gamma$  is a linear transformation with a non-negative matrix  $A = (f_\Gamma)$ . There exists a largest non-negative eigenvalue  $\lambda(A)$  of  $A$  with a non-negative vector.

**DEFINITION 2.1 (Thurston obstruction).** *A stable multi-curve  $\Gamma$  is called a Thurston obstruction if the largest eigenvalue  $\lambda(A)$  is greater than or equal to 1.*

**DEFINITION 2.2 (Levy cycle).** *If there is a f-invariant finite set of non-peripheral curves  $\Gamma = \{\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_n\}$  then  $\Gamma$  is called a Levy cycle. Here, f-invariant means that ~~that~~ there is a component  $\gamma'_i$  of  $f^{-1}(\gamma_{i+1})$  such that  $\gamma'_i \sim \gamma_i$  rel  $P_f$  and  $f: \gamma'_i \rightarrow \gamma_{i+1}$ , with  $i$  taken mod  $n$ , is a homeomorphism.*

Made definition of f-invariant a separate sentence, both to fix linebreak and also to make more readable.

**REMARK 2.3.** Usually a Levy cycle is only a multi-curve but it can be extended to a stable multi-curve. A stable Levy cycle is a special kind of Thurston obstruction. On the other hand, for a topological polynomial (not necessarily post-critically finite) or a post-critically finite branched covering of degree two, a Thurston obstruction always contains a Levy cycle (see [Levy] and [Rees]; also refer to [Tan] and [Godillon]). Among all Thurston obstructions (if they exist), the canonical obstruction is the most interesting one (see Definition 4.7).

## 3 REVIEW

A branched covering  $f$  is called post-critically finite if  $P_f$  is a finite subset. In this case, an answer to Problems 1 and 2 is Thurston's theorem, as follows.

**PROPOSITION 3.1.** *Any post-critically finite branched covering  $f$  is combinatorially equivalent to a quasi-regular post-critically finite branched covering  $g = R \circ h$ , where  $R$  is a rational map and  $h$  is a quasiconformal homeomorphism; in other words,  $g$  is locally quasiconformal except on  $\Omega_g$ .*

STET on hyphenating q.c. replaced "for" by "on" (was except for  $\Omega_g$ )

PROOF. Recall that  $\Omega_f$  is the set of branched points of  $f$  in  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ . Consider the topological surface  $S = \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \Omega_f$ . For every  $p \in S$ , let  $U_p$  be a small neighborhood about  $p$  such that  $\phi_p = f|_U: U \rightarrow f(U) \subset \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$  is injective. Then  $\alpha = \{(U_p, \phi_p)\}_{p \in S}$  defines an atlas on  $S$  with charts  $(U_p, \phi_p)$ . If  $U_p \cap U_q \neq \emptyset$ , then

$$\phi_p \circ \phi_q^{-1}(z) = z: \phi_q(U_p \cap U_q) \rightarrow \phi_p(U_p \cap U_q).$$

Thus all transition maps are conformal (one-to-one and analytic) and the atlas  $\alpha$  defines a Riemann surface structure on  $S$  which we again denote by  $\alpha$ . Denote this Riemann surface by  $(S, \alpha)$ . From the uniformization theorem,  $(S, \alpha)$  is conformally equivalent to the Riemann surface  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus A$  with the standard complex structure induced by  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ , where  $A$  consists of  $\#(\Omega_f)$  points. Thus we have a homeomorphism  $\widehat{h}: \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$  such that  $\widehat{h}: (S, \alpha) \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus A$  is conformal. Thus  $R = f \circ \widehat{h}^{-1}: \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$  is holomorphic with critical points at  $\widehat{h}(\Omega_f)$ . Since the set  $P_f$  is finite, following the standard procedure in quasiconformal mapping theory, there is a  $K$ -quasiconformal homeomorphism  $h: \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$  such that  $h$  is isotopic to  $\widehat{h}$  rel.  $P_f$ . The map  $g = R \circ h$  is a quasi-regular map and combinatorially equivalent to  $f$ . This completes the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

Associated to the finite set  $E = P_f$ , one can introduce an orbifold structure as follows:

Define the signature  $\nu_f: S^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  as

$$\nu_f(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \notin \cup_{n \geq 1} f^{on}(\Omega_f); \\ \text{lcm}\{\deg_y f^n \mid n > 0, f^n(y) = x\}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where lcm means the least common multiple and  $\deg_y f^n$  means the local degree of  $f^n$  at  $y$ . The orbifold associated to  $f$  is  $\mathcal{O}_f = (S^2, \nu_f)$  and the Euler characteristic of  $\mathcal{O}_f$  is defined as

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_f) = 2 - \sum_{x \in S^2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\nu_f(x)}\right).$$

It is known that  $\chi(\mathcal{O}_f) \leq 0$  for any post-critically finite branched covering  $f$ . The orbifold  $\mathcal{O}_f$  is called hyperbolic if  $\chi(\mathcal{O}_f) < 0$  and parabolic if  $\chi(\mathcal{O}_f) = 0$ .

**THEOREM 3.2** ([Thurston], in [Douady-Hubbard]). *A post-critically finite branched covering  $f$  with hyperbolic orbifold is combinatorially equivalent to a rational map if and only if it has no Thurston obstruction. Moreover, the rational map is unique up to conjugation by an automorphism of the Riemann sphere.*

**REMARK 3.3.** The paper [Douady-Hubbard] is a good source to learn Thurston's theorem, where a complete, detailed, and comprehensive proof is presented. The video recordings of Sullivan's lectures given at the CUNY Graduate Center in 1981–1986 [Sullivan;3] are another source for learning this theorem.

Furthermore, we have the following.

**THEOREM 3.4** ([Pilgrim]). *If a post-critically finite branched covering  $f$  is not combinatorially equivalent to a rational map (i.e., a negative answer to Problem 1), then it must have the canonical obstruction (see Definition 4.7). The canonical obstruction is a Thurston obstruction.*

made display for linebreak reasons

wrote "one-to-one" instead of 1-1

Things become very different when one turns to geometrically finite branched coverings. We started this study in [Cui-Jiang-Sullivan;M] and then summarized it in [Cui-Jiang-Sullivan]. The latter divides our study into two parts; the first part concentrates on a local combinatorial theory, and the second part focus on a global combinatorial theory. A branched covering  $f$  is called geometrically finite if the cardinality of  $P_f$  is infinite but the accumulation set  $P'_f$  is finite. In this case,  $P'_f = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$  consists of finitely many periodic orbits. In [Cui-Jiang], it is proved that this definition of a geometrically finite branched covering is equivalent to the traditional definition of a geometrically finite rational map when the branched covering is holomorphic. Recall that the traditional definition of a geometrically finite rational map is that a rational map is geometrically finite if the intersection of the post-critical set and the Julia set is a finite set. There was little progress towards the understanding of the characterization of geometrically finite rational maps (for example, [Brown]) until our work, which we will discuss shortly. Note that for a general rational map  $R$ , we have the following.

**THEOREM 3.5** ([McMullen]). *Suppose  $R$  is a rational map. Take  $E = P_R$ . Let  $\Gamma$  be a  $f$ -stable multi-curve on  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E$ . Then  $\lambda(\Gamma) \leq 1$ . Only in the following two cases,  $\lambda(\Gamma)$  may be 1:*

1.  $R$  is post-critically finite with  $\#(E) = 4$  and the orbifold  $\mathcal{O}_f$  is  $(2, 2, 2, 2)$ . Moreover,  $R$  is double covered by an integral torus endomorphism.
2.  $E$  is an infinite set and  $\Gamma$  includes the essential curves in a finite system of annuli permuted by  $R$ . These annuli lie in Siegel disks or Herman rings (refer to [Milnor]) for  $R$  and each annulus is a connected component of  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E$ .

removed "a" from "R is a double covered by..."

A geometrically finite rational map has no Thurston obstruction (refer to the proof of [Douady-Hubbard, Theorem 4.1] or refer to Theorem 3.5 since it has no Siegel disks and Herman rings). Furthermore, we found a counterexample in the geometrically finite case which prevents a similar theorem to Thurston's theorem under the combinatorial equivalence.

**THEOREM 3.6** (Counterexample [Cui-Jiang]). *There is a geometrically finite branched covering  $f$  having no Thurston obstruction and giving a negative answer to Problem 1 (i.e., it is not combinatorially equivalent to a rational map).*

The idea to construct this counterexample is to start with  $q(z) = \lambda z + z^2$ ,  $0 < |\lambda| < 1$ . Then 0 is its attractive fixed point such that the critical point  $c = -\lambda/2$  is in the immediate basin of 0. The post-critical orbit  $\{q(c), \dots, q^n(c), \dots\}$  has a limiting point 0. Since  $q(z)$  is a geometrically finite rational map, it has no Thurston obstruction. Apply Dehn twists along this post-critical orbit such that the topological structure near this limiting point has infinite complexity and such that there is no new Thurston obstruction being introduced. Remember that according to Koenig's theorem (see [Milnor]), the topological structure of a holomorphic map near an attractive fixed point must be very simple. Thus the newly constructed geometrically finite branched covering can not be combinatorially equivalent to a rational map. Pictures in [Cui-Jiang, Figures 1–3] provide further ideas about this construction.

replaced "provide the further idea" with "provide further ideas"

Based on this counterexample, we define a semi-rational branched covering and a sub-hyperbolic semi-rational branched covering.

DEFINITION 3.7 (Semi-rational and sub-hyperbolic [Cui-Jiang]). Suppose  $f: \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$  is a geometrically finite branched covering of degree  $d \geq 2$ . We say  $f$  is semi-rational if

1.  $f$  is holomorphic in a neighborhood of  $P'_f$ ;
2. each cycle  $\langle p_0, \dots, p_{k-1} \rangle$  of period  $k \geq 1$  in  $P'_f$  is either attracting (that is,  $0 < |(f^k)'(p_0)| < 1$ ), super-attracting (that is,  $(f^k)'(p_0) = 0$ ), or parabolic (that is,  $|(f^k)'(p_0)|^q = 1$  for some integer  $1 \leq q < \infty$ );
3. for each parabolic cycle in  $P'_f$ , every attracting petal associated to this cycle contains at least one point in a critical orbit.

Furthermore, if in addition  $P'_f$  contains only attracting and super-attracting periodic cycles, then we call  $f$  sub-hyperbolic semi-rational.

Furthermore, we proved the following.

THEOREM 3.8 ([Cui-Jiang]). Any semi-rational branched covering is always combinatorially equivalent to a sub-hyperbolic semi-rational branched covering.

Therefore, we concentrated our study on the sub-hyperbolic semi-rational case. In the same paper [Cui-Jiang], we gave the following definition of the CLH-equivalence (combinatorial and locally holomorphic equivalence) among all sub-hyperbolic semi-rational branched coverings.

DEFINITION 3.9 (The CLH-equivalence [Cui-Jiang]). Suppose  $f$  and  $g$  are two sub-hyperbolic semi-rational branched coverings. We say that they are CLH-equivalent if there are two homeomorphisms  $\phi, \varphi: \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$  such that

1.  $\phi$  is isotopic to  $\varphi$  rel.  $P_f$ ;
2.  $\phi \circ f = g \circ \varphi$ ; and
3.  $\phi|_{U_f} = \varphi|_{U_g}$  is holomorphic on some open set  $U_f \supset P'_f$ .

REMARK 3.10. In the study of the family  $x \mapsto x + a + \frac{b}{2\pi} \sin(2\pi x)$ , a similar concept called strong combinatorial equivalence is defined in [Epstein-Keen-Tresser], but the meaning is a little different from the preceding definition.

Similar to Proposition 3.1, we have the following.

PROPOSITION 3.11. Any sub-hyperbolic semi-rational branched covering  $f$  is CLH-equivalent to a quasi-regular sub-hyperbolic semi-rational branched covering  $g = R \circ h$ , where  $R$  is a rational map and  $h$  is a quasiconformal homeomorphism; in other words,  $g$  is locally quasiconformal except on  $\Omega_g$ .

PROOF. Suppose  $P'_f = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ . Let  $D_i$  be a round disk of radius  $r_i > 0$  centered at  $a_i$  such that there is no point  $P_f$  on  $\partial D_i$  and such that  $f|_{D_i}$  is holomorphic. Let  $U = \cup_{i=1}^n D_i$ . Let  $P = \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus U$ . Then  $\#(P) < \infty$ .

Recall that  $\Omega_f$  is the set of branched points of  $f$  in  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ . Consider the topological surface  $S = \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \Omega_f$ . For every  $p \in S$ , let  $U_p$  be a small neighborhood about  $p$  such that  $\phi_p = f|_{U_p}: U_p \rightarrow f(U_p) \subset \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$  is injective. When  $p \in D_i$ , we pick  $U_p \subset D_i$ . Then  $\alpha = \{(U_p, \phi_p)\}_{p \in S}$  defines an atlas on  $S$  with charts  $(U_p, \phi_p)$ . If  $U_p \cap U_q \neq \emptyset$ ,

rewrote definitions with parentheses

STET on hyphenating q.c.  
wrote "on" instead of for in "except on"

wrote "one-to-one" instead  
of 1 - 1

then  $\phi_p \circ \phi_q^{-1}(z) = z: \phi_q(U_p \cap U_q) \rightarrow \phi_p(U_p \cap U_q)$ . Thus all transition maps are conformal (one-to-one and analytic) and the atlas  $\alpha$  defines a Riemann surface structure on  $S$  which we again denote by  $\alpha$ . Denote this Riemann surface by  $(S, \alpha)$ . From the uniformization theorem,  $(S, \alpha)$  is conformally equivalent to the Riemann surface  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus A$  with the standard complex structure induced by  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ , where  $A$  consists of  $\#(\Omega_f)$  points. Thus we have a homeomorphism  $\widehat{h}: \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$  such that  $\widehat{h}: (S, \alpha) \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus A$  is conformal. Moreover,  $\widehat{h}|_U: U \rightarrow h(U)$  is also conformal. Thus  $R = f \circ \widehat{h}^{-1}: \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$  is holomorphic with critical points at  $\widehat{h}(\Omega_f)$ . Since the set  $P$  is finite, following the standard procedure in quasiconformal mapping theory, there is a  $K$ -quasiconformal homeomorphism  $h: \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$  such that  $h$  is isotopic to  $\widehat{h}$  rel.  $P \cup U$ . The map  $g = R \circ h$  is a quasi-regular map and CLH-equivalent to  $f$ . This completes the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

Furthermore, we proved the following theorem.

**THEOREM 3.12** ([Cui-Jiang-Sullivan] ([Cui-Tan]), [Zhang-Jiang]). *Suppose  $f$  is a sub-hyperbolic semi-rational branched covering. Then it is CLH-equivalent to a rational map if and only if  $f$  has no Thurston obstruction. Moreover, the rational map is unique up to the conjugation by an automorphism of the Riemann sphere.*

**REMARK 3.13.** The idea in the proof given in [Cui-Jiang-Sullivan] and the idea in the proof given in [Zhang-Jiang] are very different. The former is to decompose a sub-hyperbolic semi-rational branched covering along a stable multi-curve into finitely many post-critically finite branched coverings and to check they have no Thurston obstruction if the original map does not have a Thurston obstruction, and then to apply Thurston's theorem. A good source to learn this proof is [Cui-Tan], where the proof was rewritten with more detailed and comprehensive explanations.

The main idea in the latter proof is first to develop Thurston's idea, working on an induced map from the associated Teichmüller space into itself. In this case, we have an infinite dimensional Teichmüller space. Similar to Thurston's idea, we study an iterated sequence by the induced map. Each element in this iterated sequence represents a punctured Riemann sphere with infinitely many punctures. We then compare the geometry of this punctured Riemann sphere with the geometry of another Riemann sphere with finitely many punctures (see [Zhang-Jiang, Lemma5.6]). Here, the shielding ring lemma (Lemma 4.4) guarantees this comparison. Note that the punctured Riemann sphere with finitely many punctures, which is used in the comparison, has no dynamical relationship with the punctured Riemann sphere with infinitely many punctures. This comparison enables us to eventually prove that the induced map strongly contracts the Teichmüller distance along this iterated sequence.

Both methods in [Cui-Jiang-Sullivan] (see also [Cui-Tan]) and in [Zhang-Jiang] can be further developed. The former method of "decomposition along a stable multi-curve" can be used to study the renormalization of rational maps as well as their combinatorics (for example: trees, wandering continuum) and branched coverings with "Siegel disks" and "Herman rings," for example, the recent work in [Zhang;1], [Zhang;2], and [Wang] for the characterization of rational maps with Siegel disks and Herman rings. The latter method of "iterations in the Teichmüller space" can be used to characterize several kinds of holomorphic maps beyond post-critically finite rational maps, including hyperbolic maps, exponential maps,

replaced "does not have  
(Thurston obstruction)"  
replaced "the former" with  
this

inserted "main idea in"

moved "dynamically" at the  
end of the sentence to  
"dynamical" in the middle.

and some other meromorphic maps, and maps with “Siegel disks” and “Herman rings” (see §4).

Furthermore, we proved the following in a later paper.

**THEOREM 3.14** ([Chen-Jiang]). *If a sub-hyperbolic semi-rational branched covering  $f$  is not CLH-equivalent to a rational map (i.e., a negative answer to Problem 1 under the CLH-equivalence), then it must have the canonical Thurston obstruction (see Definition 4.7). The canonical obstruction is a Thurston obstruction.*

#### 4 GEOMETRY

In this section, a framework is outlined for the further study of Problems 1 and 2 (under either the combinatorial equivalence or the CLH-equivalence). We divide this study into three steps. The first step is to introduce the important concept of *bounded geometry*, and to study Problems 1 and 2 under this condition. The second step is to prove the equivalence between the bounded geometry condition and Thurston’s topological condition. The third step is to prove that the equivalence between the bounded geometry condition and the canonical topological condition.

The bounded geometry condition is useful in the study of this direction and should be fully developed. It is an analytic condition but can be very well connected with Thurston’s topological condition and the canonical topological condition in the critically finite case and in the sub-hyperbolic semi-rational case, as we will show. With the bounded geometry condition we will be able to work in this direction based on calculations in *spherical geometry*. This enables us to work directly on Teichmüller spaces  $T(E)$  of closed subsets  $E$  on the Riemann sphere. This is different from Thurston’s original work based on calculations in hyperbolic geometry (refer to [Douady-Hubbard]), which first works on moduli spaces and then lifts results obtained on moduli spaces to Teichmüller spaces (this process needs assumptions that finite degree and finiteness on the post-critical set (refer to [Douady-Hubbard, Lemma 5.2])). The bounded geometry condition can be also defined for quasi-entire functions or quasi-meromorphic functions and used in the study of Problems 1 and 2 (under either the combinatorial equivalence or the CLH-equivalence) for these maps without involving moduli spaces and [Douady-Hubbard, Lemma 5.2] directly.

The idea of bounded geometry is very important in complex dynamics. Besides its application to single dynamics, it could be applied to the parameter space (for example, infinitely renormalizable quadratic polynomials and hyperbolic rational maps with Sierpinsky curve Julia sets).

Since our definition of bounded geometry relates to Teichmüller spaces  $T(E)$  of closed subsets  $E$  on the Riemann sphere, let us briefly mention the definition of  $T(E)$  and some related properties.

Suppose  $E$  is a closed subset of  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ . Suppose  $0, 1, \infty \in E$  (which allows us to consider it as a subset in spherical geometry rather than consider it as a subset in hyperbolic geometry which treats two subsets are the same if one is the image of another one under a Möbius transformation). Recall that we use  $w^\mu$  to denote the unique quasiconformal homeomorphism with  $0, 1, \infty$  fixed and with Beltrami coefficient  $\mu$  in  $M(\mathbb{C})$  (refer to the Beltrami equation (1.1)).

DEFINITION 4.1 (Teichmüller space of a closed subset). *Two elements  $\mu, \nu \in M(\mathbb{C})$  are said to be  $E$ -equivalent, denoted as  $\mu \sim_E \nu$ , if*

$$(w^\mu)^{-1} \circ w^\nu \stackrel{\text{homotopy}}{\sim} id \text{ rel. } E.$$

(The term “rel.  $E$ ” means that we have a continuous map  $H(t, z): [0, 1] \times \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$  such that (a)  $H(0, z) = z$  and  $H(1, z) = (w^\mu)^{-1} \circ w^\nu(z)$  for all  $z \in \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$  and (b)  $H(t, z) = z$  for all  $0 \leq t \leq 1$  and all  $z \in E$ .) The Teichmüller space of  $E$  is defined as

$$T(E) = \{[\mu]_E\},$$

the space of all  $E$ -equivalence classes.

The space  $T(E)$  is very useful for people working on complex dynamics, and the study of  $T(E)$  is closely related to the study of holomorphic motions of  $E$ . Much is currently known about  $T(E)$  (see [Earle-McMullen], [Lieb], [Epstein], [Earle-Mitra], [Mitra], [Gardiner-Lakic], [Jiang-Mitra], [Beck-Jiang-Mitra-Shiga], [Gardiner-Jiang-Wang], [Jiang-Mitra-Shiga], and [Jiang-Mitra-Wang]). The reader may find many similarities and differences between  $T(E)$  and classical Teichmüller spaces of Riemann surfaces. An excellent book on the classical Teichmüller theory which is comprehensive for people working on complex dynamics is [Hubbard]. We now give a very brief summary of some basic properties of  $T(E)$ .

- i.  $T(E)$  has a complex manifold structure such that the projection

$$P_E(\mu) = [\mu]_E: M(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow T(E)$$

is holomorphic.

- ii. The projection  $P_E$  is a holomorphic split submersion, that is, for any  $\tau \in T(E)$ ,  $\exists U$  (neighborhood) about  $\tau$  and a holomorphic section  $s_\tau: U \rightarrow M(\mathbb{C})$  such that  $P_E \circ s_\tau = id$ .
- iii.  $\exists$  a continuous global section  $S: T(E) \rightarrow M(\mathbb{C})$  such that  $P_E \circ S = id$ . Therefore,  $T(E)$  is contractible.
- iv. If  $\dim T(E) \geq 2$ , there is no global holomorphic section.
- v.  $T(E)$  is biholomorphically equivalent to  $\prod_i T(S_i, \partial S_i) \times M(E)$ , where  $S_i$  are components of  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E$  and  $T(S_i, \partial S_i)$  is the Teichmüller space of the hyperbolic Riemann surface  $S_i$  with the ideal boundary  $\partial S_i$ .
- vi. We have the lifting property for  $T(E)$ . Let  $\Delta$  be the open disk  $\{z \mid |z| < 1\}$ . Then any holomorphic map  $f: \Delta \rightarrow T(E)$  can be lifted to a holomorphic map  $\tilde{f}: \Delta \rightarrow M(\mathbb{C})$  such that  $P_E \circ \tilde{f} = f$ , that is, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{C}) \\ & \nearrow \tilde{f} & \downarrow P_E \\ \Delta & \xrightarrow{f} & T(E) \end{array}$$

commutes.

vii. Teichmüller's metric  $d_T$  on  $T(E)$  coincides with Kobayashi's pseudo-metric  $d_K$  on  $T(E)$ .

PROPOSITION 4.2. *Suppose  $f: \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$  is quasiregular (or a quasi-entire or a quasi-meromorphic). Suppose  $E$  is a closed subset of  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$  such that  $E \supseteq V_f = f(\Omega_f)$  and  $E \subseteq f^{-1}(E)$  (in the quasi-entire and quasi-meromorphic case,  $V_f$  must contain all asymptotic values and essential singularities). If  $\mu \sim_E \nu$ , then  $f^*\mu \sim_E f^*\nu$ .* STET on hyphenating quasiregular

PROOF. By the assumption  $\mu \sim_E \nu$ , we can find

$$H(t, z): [0, 1] \times \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$$

such that

1.  $H(0, z) = z$  for all  $z \in \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ ;
2.  $H(1, z) = (w^\mu)^{-1} \circ w^\nu(z)$  for all  $z \in \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ ; and
3.  $H(t, z) = z$  for all  $z \in E$  and all  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ .

Since  $V_f \subseteq E$ , we have that  $\Omega_f \subseteq f^{-1}(E)$ . This implies  $f: \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus f^{-1}(E) \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E$  is a covering map. The homotopy  $H(t, z): [0, 1] \times (\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E) \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E$  rel.  $\partial E$  can be lift to a homotopy  $\widetilde{H}(t, z): [0, 1] \times (\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus f^{-1}(E)) \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus f^{-1}(E)$  rel.  $\partial f^{-1}(E)$  such that

$$H(t, f(z)) = f(\widetilde{H}(t, z)), \quad \forall z \in \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus f^{-1}(E), \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1$$

and

$$\widetilde{H}(t, z) = z, \quad \forall z \in \partial f^{-1}(E), \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1.$$

Define  $\widetilde{H}(t, z) = z$  for all  $z \in f^{-1}(E)$  and  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ . Then the new defined map, which we still denote as  $\widetilde{H}$ , is a continuous map  $\widetilde{H}(t, z): [0, 1] \times \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$  such that

- a.  $\widetilde{H}(z, 0) = z$  for all  $z \in \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ ; and
- b.  $\widetilde{H}(z, t) = z$  for all  $z \in E$  and all  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ .

Therefore, it is a homotopy from the identity to  $\widetilde{H}_1(z) = \widetilde{H}(1, z)$ .

Let  $H_1(z) = H(1, z)$ . Since  $H_1 \circ f = f \circ \widetilde{H}_1$  and  $H_1 = (w^\mu)^{-1} \circ w^\nu$  is quasiconformal,  $\widetilde{H}_1$  is quasiconformal.

Now by using two commuting equations,

$$(w^\mu)^{-1} \circ w^\nu(z) \circ f = f \circ \widetilde{H}_1 \quad \text{and} \quad g \circ w^{f^*\mu} = w^\mu \circ f,$$

where  $g$  is holomorphic, we have that

$$g \circ w^{f^*\mu} \circ \widetilde{H}_1 = w^\mu \circ f \circ \widetilde{H}_1 = w^\mu \circ (w^\mu)^{-1} \circ w^\nu(z) \circ f = w^\nu(z) \circ f.$$

Since  $g$  is holomorphic,

$$\mu_{w^{f^*\mu} \circ \widetilde{H}_1} = \mu_{g \circ w^{f^*\mu} \circ \widetilde{H}_1} = \mu_{w^\nu(z) \circ f} = f^*\nu.$$

made display for linebreak

removed "that" after "implies" for linebreak

STET on hyphenating q.c.

Since both  $w^{f^*\mu} \circ \tilde{H}_1$  and  $w^{f^*\nu}$  fix  $0, 1, \infty$ , we get

$$w^{f^*\mu} \circ \tilde{H}_1 = w^{f^*\nu}.$$

In other words,

$$\tilde{H}_1 = (w^{f^*\mu})^{-1} \circ w^{f^*\nu}.$$

Thus  $\tilde{H}(t, z): [0, 1] \times \hat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \hat{\mathbb{C}}$  is a homotopy from the identity to  $(w^{f^*\mu})^{-1} \circ w^{f^*\nu}$  rel.  $f^{-1}(E)$ . But  $E \subseteq f^{-1}(E)$ , so the last statement implies that  $f^*\mu \sim_E f^*\nu$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

From the previous proposition, we can induce a map

$$\sigma_f(\tau) = [f^*\mu]_E: T(E) \rightarrow T(E), \quad \mu \in \tau.$$

Since

$$\sigma_f(\tau) = P_E \circ f^* \circ s_\tau,$$

$\sigma_f$  is holomorphic. Thus it is weakly contracting due to the property that the Kobayashi metric and the Teichmüller metric are the same. That is,

$$d_T(\sigma_f(\tau), \sigma_f(\tau')) \leq d_T(\tau, \tau'), \quad \forall \tau, \tau' \in T(E).$$

Suppose  $f$  is holomorphic on  $E$  and  $\{0, 1, \infty\} \subset E \subseteq f^{-1}(E)$ . For any  $\mu$  with  $\mu|_E = 0$ , we have that  $f^*\mu|_E = 0$ .

PROBLEM 3. *Can we find a (unique) fixed point  $\tau = [\mu]_E$  with  $\mu|_E = 0$  of  $\sigma_f$ ?*

A positive answer to Problem 2 (under either combinatorially equivalence or CLH-equivalence) is equivalent to a positive answer to Problem 3 (by recalling Theorem 1.2).

For any  $\tau_0 = [\mu_0]_E \in T(E)$  with  $\mu_0|_E = 0$ , let  $\tau_n = \sigma_f(\tau_{n-1}) = [\mu_n]_E \in T(E)$ , where  $\mu_n = f^*\mu_{n-1}$  with  $\mu_n|_E = 0$  for all  $n \geq 1$ . Let  $w^{\mu_n}$  be the corresponding quasiconformal homeomorphism solution of the Beltrami equation (1.1) with  $0, 1, \infty$  fixed. Then we can define a sequence of subsets  $E_n = w^{\mu_n}(E)$  such that  $0, 1, \infty \in E_n$ . Roughly speaking,  $f$  has bounded geometry if we have a subsequence  $E_{n_i}$  "converging" to  $E_\infty$  as  $i$  goes to  $\infty$  such that  $E_\infty$  is homeomorphic to  $E$ . We will give a more precise definition in the critically finite case and in the sub-hyperbolic semi-rational case. We use  $d_{SP}$  to mean the spherical distance on  $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ .

DEFINITION 4.3 (Bounded geometry in the critically finite case). *Suppose  $f$  is a critically finite branched covering. Suppose  $E = P_f = \{0, 1, \infty, p_1, \dots, p_{k-3}\}$ . We say  $f$  has bounded geometry if there are a constant  $C > 0$  and a point  $\tau_0 \in T(E)$  such that*

$$d_{SP}(a, b) \geq C, \quad \forall a, b \in E_n = w^{\mu_n}(E), \quad n \geq 0.$$

LEMMA 4.4 (Shielding ring lemma [Zhang-Jiang]). *Suppose  $f$  is a sub-hyperbolic semi-rational branched covering. Let  $P'_f = \{a_i\}$  be the set of accumulation points of  $P_f$ . There exists a collection of finite number of open disks  $\{D_i\}$  centered at  $a_i$  and a collection of finite number of annuli  $\{A_i\}$  (we call them the shielding rings) such that*

- i.  $\overline{A_i} \cap P_f = \emptyset$ ;
- ii.  $A_i \cap D_i = \emptyset$ , but one components of  $\partial A_i$  is the boundary of  $D_i$ ;

- iii.  $(\overline{D_i \cup A_i}) \cap (\overline{D_j \cup A_j}) = \emptyset$  for  $i \neq j$ ;
- iv.  $f$  is holomorphic on  $\overline{D_i} \cup A_i$ ; and
- v. every  $f(\overline{D_i} \cup A_i)$  is contained in  $D_{i+1}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k-1$  and  $f(\overline{D_k} \cup A_k)$  is contained in  $D_1$ , where  $k$  is the period of  $a_i$ .

Suppose  $\{(D_i, A_i)\}$  are domains and annuli constructed in the shielding ring lemma. Take

$$\mathcal{D}_0 = \cup_{i=1}^k \overline{D_i} \quad \text{and} \quad P_0 = P_f \setminus \mathcal{D}_0.$$

Then  $\#(P_0) < \infty$ . Take

$$E = P_0 \cup \mathcal{D}_0. \quad (4.1)$$

For any  $\tau_0 = [\mu_0]_E$  such that  $\mu_0|_{\mathcal{D}_0} = 0$ , we have that  $\mu_n|_{\mathcal{D}_0} = 0$  for all  $n \geq 1$ . Then  $E_n = w^{\mu_n}(E)$  for  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ . Note that

$$E_n = P_n \cup \mathcal{D}_n,$$

where

$$P_n = w^{\mu_n}(P_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_n = w^{\mu_n}(\mathcal{D}_0).$$

Every component  $D$  in  $\mathcal{D}_0$  is a round disk with center  $a$ . The image  $D_n = w^{\mu_n}(D)$  is a topological disk in  $\mathcal{D}_n$ . We call  $a_n = w^{\mu_n}(a)$  the center of  $D_n$ . Then  $\mathcal{D}_n$  consists of finitely many disjoint topological disks. Suppose  $0, 1, \infty \in E$ . Then  $0, 1, \infty \in E_n$  for all  $n > 0$ .

**DEFINITION 4.5** (Bounded geometry in the sub-hyperbolic semi-rational case). *We say  $f$  has bounded geometry if there are a constant  $C > 0$  and a point  $\tau_0 = [\mu_0]_E \in T(E)$  with  $\mu_0|_{\mathcal{D}_0} = 0$  such that*

- i.  $d_{SP}(a, b) \geq C$ , for any two points  $a, b \in P_n = w^{\mu_n}(P_0)$  and for all  $n \geq 0$ ;
- ii.  $d_{SP}(A, B) \geq C$ , for any two different components  $A$  and  $B$  of  $\mathcal{D}_n = w^{\mu_n}(\mathcal{D}_0)$  and for all  $n \geq 0$ ;
- iii.  $d_{SP}(a, A) \geq C$ , for any point  $a \in P_n$  and any component  $A$  of  $\mathcal{D}_n$  and for all  $n \geq 0$ ;
- iv. each component  $D_n$  of  $\mathcal{D}_n$  contains a round disk of radius  $C$  centered at the center point  $a_n$  of  $D_n$ .

**REMARK 4.6.** Both Definition 4.3 and Definition 4.5 are not preserved under actions of Möbius transformations.

Consider  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E$  with the standard conformal structure  $\tau_0 = [0]_E$  as the hyperbolic Riemann surface  $R_0$  and consider  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E$  with the conformal structure  $\tau_n = [\mu_n]_E$  as the hyperbolic Riemann surface  $R_n$ . Then  $R_n$  is Teichmüller equivalent to  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E_n$ .

For any non-peripheral simple closed curve  $\gamma$  in  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E$ ,  $w^{\mu_n}(\gamma)$  is a non-peripheral simple closed curve in  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E_n$ . We use  $l_n(\gamma)$  to denote the hyperbolic length of a unique geodesic which is homotopic to  $w^{\mu_n}(\gamma)$  in  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E_n$ . Under the condition of bounded geometry, we can find a positive constant  $b > 0$  such that

$$l_n(\gamma) \geq b, \quad \forall n \geq 0, \quad \forall \gamma \text{ (non-peripheral simple closed curve)}. \quad (4.2)$$

However, to get from (4.2) to bounded geometry, we need the assumption that  $0, 1, \infty \in E$  (consequently,  $0, 1, \infty \in E_n$ ).

In both the critically finite and the sub-hyperbolic semi-rational cases, *non-bounded geometry* is equivalent to saying that there is a sequence of non-peripheral simple closed curves  $\gamma_{n_i}$  in  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E$  such that

$$l_{n_i}(\gamma_{n_i}) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } i \rightarrow \infty.$$

In particular, we have the following definition. (Refer to [Pilgrim] for the post-critically finite case and to [Chen-Jiang] for the sub-hyperbolic semi-rational case.)

DEFINITION 4.7 (Canonical obstruction). *Let*

$$\Gamma_c = \{\gamma \mid l_n(\gamma) \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty\}$$

where  $\gamma$  is a non-peripheral simple closed curve in  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E$ . If  $\Gamma_c \neq \emptyset$ , then it is called the *canonical obstruction* for  $f$ .

Clearly, if  $\Gamma_c \neq \emptyset$ , then  $f$  has no bounded geometry. Moreover, we have that

THEOREM 4.8 (Equivalent statements for the critically finite case). *Suppose  $f$  is a critically finite branched covering with  $\#(P_f) \geq 4$  and has a hyperbolic orbifold. Then the following are equivalent:*

1.  $f$  can be viewed as a holomorphic map (i.e, it is combinatorially equivalent to a unique rational map).
2.  $f$  has bounded geometry.
3.  $\Gamma_c = \emptyset$ .
4.  $f$  has no Thurston obstruction.

Similarly, we have that

THEOREM 4.9 (Equivalent statements for the sub-hyperbolic semi-rational case). *Suppose  $f$  is a sub-hyperbolic semi-rational branched covering. Then the following are equivalent:*

1.  $f$  can be viewed as a holomorphic map (i.e, it is CLH-equivalent to a unique rational map).
2.  $f$  has bounded geometry.
3.  $\Gamma_c = \emptyset$ .
4.  $f$  has no Thurston obstruction.

Proofs of these two theorems can now be put into one framework through bounded geometry. Let  $E = P_f$  in the post-critically finite case and let  $E = P_0 \cup \mathcal{D}_0$  as defined in Equation (4.1) in the sub-hyperbolic semi-rational case.

First, prove that  $\sigma_f^k: T(E) \rightarrow T(E)$  is contracting for some  $k \geq 1$ , i.e., that we have  $d_T(\sigma_f^k(\tau), \sigma_f^k(\tau')) < d_T(\tau, \tau')$  for any  $\tau, \tau' \in T(E)$ . In the post-critically finite case,  $k = 2$ , and in the sub-hyperbolic semi-rational case,  $k = 1$ . Secondly, prove the family of rational maps  $\{g_n = w^{n_n} \circ f \circ (w^{n_{n+1}})^{-1}\}$  forms a compact subset in the space of all rational maps of degree  $d = \deg(f)$  with the uniform convergence

inserted "that we have" for  
linebreak

topology under the assumption of bounded geometry. Thirdly, consider the operator  $d\sigma_f^k$  from the cotangent space  $T_{\tau_{n+k}}^*T(E)$  to the cotangent space  $T_{\tau_n}^*T(E)$  and show that it is strictly contracting by using bounded geometry and the formula for  $d\sigma_f: T_{\sigma_f(\tau)}^*T(E) \rightarrow T_{\tau}^*T(E)$  defined as a transfer operator

$$\mathcal{L}q(z) = \sum_{g_n(w)=z} \frac{q(w)}{(g_n'(w))^2},$$

where  $q(w)$  is the coefficient of an integrable holomorphic quadratic differential on the hyperbolic Riemann surface  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E_{n+1}$ . All the preceding steps imply that  $\sigma_f^k$  is strongly contracting on the sequence  $\{\tau_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$  in  $T(E)$ ; that is, there is a constant  $0 < c < 1$  such that

$$d_T(\sigma_f^k(\tau_{n+1}), \sigma_f^k(\tau_n)) \leq cd_T(\tau_{n+1}, \tau_n).$$

Then prove that the bounded geometry is equivalent to the no Thurston obstruction condition. And finally, by using some properties of Thurston obstructions (if they exist), prove that  $\Gamma_c$  is not empty.

In this framework, we first prove the equivalence (1)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (2) and then prove (2)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (3) and (2)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (4). A detailed explanation will be given in a later expository paper.

The existing proof of (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) (see [Pilgrim], [Chen-Jiang]) uses a Thurston obstruction as a bridge to argue that if  $f$  has no bounded geometry, then  $f$  has a Thurston obstruction; furthermore, by using this Thurston obstruction, prove that  $\Gamma_c \neq \emptyset$ . However, we are more interested in a proof without using those properties of Thurston obstructions.

**PROBLEM 4.** Find a direct proof of (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) in both Theorem 4.8 and Theorem 4.9. In other words, without using a Thurston obstruction as a bridge, show that if  $f$  has no bounded geometry, then  $\Gamma_c \neq \emptyset$ .

This is an interesting problem because, for a quasi-entire or a quasi-meromorphic function, it is not clear to us that the equivalence between the bounded geometry condition and the no Thurston obstruction condition due to infinite degree and the existence of asymptotic values and essential singularities (refer to section 6).

## 5 GEOMETRIZATION

Given the canonical obstruction  $\Gamma_c = \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n\} \neq \emptyset$  for a map  $f$  which is either (i) a critically finite branched covering or (ii) a sub-hyperbolic semi-rational branched covering, we can use curves in  $\Gamma_c$  (up to homotopy) to divide the sphere  $S^2$  into finitely many topological surfaces, which are topological two-spheres removing a finite number of disks as follows.

Let  $E$  be the post-critical set  $P_f$  in case (i) or the set defined in Equation (4.1) in case (ii). Consider the Riemann surface  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E$ . Suppose  $A_{0,i}$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ) are a collection of disjoint annuli whose core curves are  $\gamma_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ), respectively. Set

$$A_0 = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n_0} A_{0,i} \quad \text{and} \quad n_0 = n.$$

Let

$$A_1 = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n_1} A_{1,i}$$

be the union of preimage of elements of  $A_0$  such that every element of  $A_1$  is homotopic to some element in  $A_0$  rel.  $E$  since  $\Gamma_c$  is a stable and full multi-curve. Up to homotopy, we can assume that

1. every curve  $\gamma_i$  is the core curve of the annulus  $A_{0,i}$ ;
2. every  $A_{1,k}$  is a component of the preimage of some  $A_{0,j}$  and homotopic to some  $A_{0,i}$ , denote by  $A_{1,j,i}$ ;
3. the union  $\cup_{j,\alpha} A_{1,j,i,\alpha}$  of elements of  $A_1$  which are homotopic to  $\gamma_i$ , denote by  $B_{1,i}$ , is contained inside  $A_{0,i}$ ;
4. the two outmost annuli of  $B_{1,i}$  share their outer boundary curves with  $A_{0,i}$ ; and
5. restricted to a boundary curve  $\chi$  of  $A_{0,i}$ , the map  $f: \chi \rightarrow f(\chi)$  is conjugated to  $z \mapsto z^d: \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^1$  for some  $d$ . Note that  $f(\chi)$  is a boundary of  $A_{0,j}$ .

Each component  $A_{0,i}$  of  $A_0$  is called a thin part, and each component of  $\bar{\mathbb{C}} \setminus A_0$  is called a thick part.

Let  $\mathfrak{P}_0 = \{P_i^0\}_{i=1}^{n_0}$  be the collection of all thick parts. The pull-back of all thick parts by  $f^k$  is denoted as  $\mathfrak{P}_k = f^{-k}(\mathfrak{P}_0)$ . Each element of  $\mathfrak{P}_k$  belongs to one and only one of the following four classes:

STET on hyphenation of pull-back.

- i. Disk component: if it is a topological disk  $D$  and  $D \cap P_f = \emptyset$ .
- ii. Punctured disk component: if it is a topological disk  $P$  and  $\sharp(P \cap P_f) = 1$ .
- iii. Annulus component: if it is an annulus  $A$  and  $A \cap P_f = \emptyset$ .
- iv. Complex component: if it is not in (i), (ii), and (iii).

Since all elements of  $\Gamma_c$  are non-peripheral and non-homotopic to each other, the thick parts  $P_0^0, \dots, P_n^0$  are all complex components.

For each  $P_i^0 \in \mathfrak{P}_0$  and any  $k$ , since  $P_i^0$  is a component of  $\hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus A_0$  satisfying assumptions (1)–(5), there exists a unique component of  $\mathfrak{P}_k$ , denoted by  $P_i^k$ , such that each component of  $\partial P_i^k$  is either peripheral or some component of  $\partial P_i^0$  and such that each component of  $\partial P_i^0$  is some component of  $\partial P_i^k$ . This gives a relationship between  $P_i^0$  and  $P_i^k$ . We use  $P_i^0 \approx P_i^k$  to denote this relation. Therefore,  $P_i^k$  and  $f(P_i^k)$  are complex components and, furthermore, if  $f(P_i^k) = P_j^{k-1}$ , then  $f(P_i^l) = P_j^{l-1}$  for any  $l$ . By using the action of the branched covering  $f$ , for each  $P_i^0$ , we have a unique  $P_i^k$  such that  $P_i^0 \approx P_i^k$ ; then  $f(P_i^k) = P_j^{k-1}$  and so there is a unique  $P_j^0$  such that  $P_j^0 \approx P_j^k$ . Let  $n = n_0$ . This defines a map  $\tau: \{0, 1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $\tau(i) = j$  if  $f(P_i^k) = P_j^{k-1}$ . Under the relationship  $\approx$ , each component of  $\mathfrak{P}_0$  is eventually periodic and at least one is periodic. Thus we conclude the following.

inserted "assumptions" before (1)–(5)

inserted "so there is" before "a unique"

**Decomposition.** *Suppose  $f$  is a post-critically finite or a sub-hyperbolic semi-rational branched covering not combinatorially equivalent or CLH-equivalent to a rational map.*

Then  $f$  can be decomposed into thin parts and thick parts according to the canonical obstruction. Furthermore, an **equivalent** relationship can be introduced on thick parts such that every thick part is eventually periodic and at least one is periodic.

“equivalent relationship” or “equivalence relation”?

Suppose  $P_0^0 \in \mathfrak{P}_0$  is a periodic component of period  $k > 0$ . Suppose that  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_p$  are boundary curves of  $P_0^0$  and that  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_p, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_q$  are boundary curves of  $P_0^k$ , where  $\beta_j (j = 1, \dots, q)$  are peripheral curves. For any  $\beta_j$ , it must be a component of  $f^{-k}(\gamma_i)$  for some  $\gamma_i$ . For any  $\gamma_i$ , it must be a component of  $f^{-k}(\gamma_l)$  for some  $\gamma_l$ . Denote

$$P_0^0 \setminus P_0^k = \bigcup_{j=1}^q D(\beta_j), \quad \bar{C} \setminus P_0^0 = \bigcup_{i=1}^p D(\gamma_i).$$

Let

$$d_{\beta_j} = \deg(f^k: \beta_j \rightarrow \gamma_i), \quad d_{\gamma_i} = \deg(f^k: \gamma_i \rightarrow \gamma_l = f^k(\gamma_i)).$$

Define a new branched covering by

$$\tilde{f} = \tilde{f}_{P_0^0} = \begin{cases} f^k, & z \in P_0^k, \\ \varphi_j \circ z^{d_{\beta_j}} \circ \psi_j, & z \in D(\beta_j) \quad (j = 1, \dots, q), \\ \varphi_i \circ z^{d_{\gamma_i}} \circ \psi_i, & z \in D(\gamma_i) \quad (i = 1, \dots, p), \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

where  $\psi_j, \varphi_j^{-1}$  are homeomorphisms from  $D(\beta_j)$  and  $D(\gamma_i)$  to unit disk  $\mathbb{D}$ , respectively, and  $\psi_i, \varphi_i^{-1}$  are homeomorphisms from  $D(\gamma_i)$  and  $D(\gamma_l) = D(f^k(\gamma_i))$  to unit disk  $\mathbb{D}$ , respectively, such that  $\tilde{f}$  is continuous. Marking a point in each  $D(\gamma_i)$ , say  $z_i$ , we set

$$P_{\tilde{f}} = P_f|_{P_0^0} \cup \left( \bigcup_{j=1}^q z_j \right).$$

If  $D(\beta_j)$  contains a point, say  $z^*$ , belonging to  $P_f$  and  $f^k(\beta_j) = \gamma_i$ , we can select  $\varphi_j, \varphi_i$  and  $\psi_j, \psi_i$  such that  $\tilde{f}(z^*) = z_i$ . Also, if  $f^k(\gamma_i) = \gamma_l$ , we can select  $\varphi_i, \varphi_l, \psi_i, \psi_l$  such that  $\tilde{f}(z_i) = z_l$ . So  $\tilde{f}(P_{\tilde{f}}) \subseteq P_{\tilde{f}}$ .

**Extension.** Any periodic thick part  $P_i^0$  of period  $k$  can be extended to a topological two-sphere with finitely many marked points, and the restriction  $f^k|_{P_i^k}$  can be extended to either a critically finite-type branched covering or a sub-hyperbolic semi-rational-type branched covering  $\tilde{f} = \tilde{f}_{P_i^0}$  such that

$$\tilde{f}|_{P_i^k} = f^k|_{P_i^k}.$$

**THEOREM 5.1 ([Selinger]).** Suppose  $f$  is a post-critically finite branched covering which is not combinatorially equivalent to a rational map. Then every  $\tilde{f}$  associated to a hyperbolic orbifold is combinatorially equivalent to a unique rational map (up to conjugation of an automorphism of the Riemann sphere).

**REMARK 5.2.** Actually, the paper [Selinger] contains more. In the post-critically finite case, let  $E = P_f$ , then the Riemann surface  $\hat{C} \setminus E$  is a punctured sphere

with finitely many punctures. The Teichmüller space  $T(E)$  is the same as the Teichmüller space  $T(\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E)$  of Riemann surfaces with basepoint  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E$ . Thus, one can define its augmented Teichmüller space  $\overline{T}(E)$ , which is the space of all Teichmüller equivalent classes but allows an equivalent class with a representation of continuous maps from  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E$  to a Riemann surface with nodes that are allowed to send a whole non-trivial closed annulus or a whole non-trivial closed curve in the complement of marked points to a node. From [Masur], we know that the closure of the Teichmüller space  $T(E)$  under the Weil-Petersson metric is its augmented Teichmüller space. Selinger proved that  $\sigma_f$  from  $T(E)$  into itself can be extended to a continuous self-map of  $\overline{T}(E)$  such that it either has a fixed point in  $T(E)$  or a fixed point in the boundary  $\partial\overline{T}(E) = \overline{T}(E) \setminus T(E)$ .

REMARK 5.3. In [Bonnot-Yampolsky], one can find an alternative proof of Theorem 5.1, which applies a result in [Minsky] and a result in [Hassinsky].

In our latest study, we worked on the geometrization of a sub-hyperbolic semi-rational type branched covering as follows.

THEOREM 5.4 ([Cheng-Jiang]). *Suppose  $f$  is a sub-hyperbolic semi-rational branched covering which is not CLH-equivalent to a rational map. Then every  $\tilde{f} = \tilde{f}_{P^0}$  is either a post-critically finite type branched covering or a sub-hyperbolic semi-rational type branched covering. In the post-critically finite type case, if the orbifold associated to  $\tilde{f}$  is hyperbolic, then  $\tilde{f}$  is combinatorially equivalent to a rational map; in the sub-hyperbolic semi-rational type case,  $\tilde{f}$  is CLH-equivalent to a rational map. Moreover, in the both cases, the realized rational map is unique up to conjugation of an automorphism of the Riemann sphere.*

Unlike in the post-critically finite case, in the sub-hyperbolic semi-rational case, we work on an infinite-dimensional Teichmüller space of the Riemann sphere minus a set of finitely many points and a set of finitely many topological disks. A major work in [Cheng-Jiang] is to overcome this difficulty. First, we proved the following proposition in [Cheng-Jiang], which is useful in general.

PROPOSITION 5.5. *Suppose  $R_1$  is a Riemann surface, which is the Riemann sphere minus a set  $E$  consisting of finite number of points and finite number of disks, with complex structure  $\tau_1 = [\mu_1]$ . Suppose  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n$  are non-peripheral non-homotopic simple closed curves on  $R_1$  with  $l_{\tau_1}(\gamma_i) < \varepsilon$  ( $\varepsilon$  sufficiently small). Let  $R_2$  be a Riemann surface with complex structure  $\tau_2 = [\mu_2]$  obtained from  $R_1$  by cutting along  $\gamma_i$  and capping every hole by a puncture disk. If there exists a constant  $K > 0$  such that for every non-peripheral simple closed curve  $\beta$  other than  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n$ ,  $l_{\tau_1}(\beta) \geq K$ , then there exists a constant  $\tilde{K} = \tilde{K}(K, \varepsilon) > 0$  such that for every non-peripheral simple closed curve  $\tilde{\beta}$  of  $R_2$ ,  $l_{\tau_2}(\tilde{\beta}) \geq \tilde{K}$ .*

Secondly, for any initial conformal structure  $\tau_0 = [\mu_0]_E$  on the Riemann sphere, by using the decomposition and the extension, we have a conformal structure  $\tilde{\tau}_0 = [\tilde{\mu}_0]$  which is  $\mu_0$  on  $P_i^k$  and 0 on other places. Then we have two iterated sequences  $\{\tau_n = \sigma_f^n(\tau_0)\}$  and  $\{\tilde{\tau}_n = \sigma_{\tilde{f}}^n(\tilde{\tau}_0)\}$ . Compare these two iterated sequences and other three modified sequences of conformal structures (refer to [Cheng-Jiang, Proposition 5]) and then compare the geometry of punctured Riemann spheres with infinitely many punctures with the geometry of punctured Riemann spheres

with finitely many punctures (refer to [Zhang-Jiang, Lemma 5.6] and [Cheng-Jiang, Lemma 5 and Proposition 4]). After we constructed these five different, but related, punctured Riemann spheres, we then used some of the methods and ideas from [Douady-Hubbard] and [Selinger] to complete the proof.

REMARK 5.6. From Theorem 5.4, we know  $\tilde{f}$  has bounded geometry as defined for  $\{\tilde{\tau}_n\}$ . However, we are still interested in a direct proof of the bounded geometry property for  $\tilde{f}$ . With this direct proof, we can have a proof of Theorem 5.4 using our framework in the previous section.

REMARK 5.7. In the sub-hyperbolic semi-rational case,  $E$  defined in Equation (4.1) has finitely many points and finitely many disks. The Riemann surface  $\hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E$  is the Riemann sphere with finitely many points and finitely many disks removed. The Teichmüller space  $T(E)$  is biholomorphically equivalent to the Teichmüller space  $T(\hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E)$  of Riemann surfaces with basepoint  $\hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E$  times the open unit ball  $M(E)$  of the complex Banach space  $\mathcal{L}^\infty(E)$ . It is an interesting problem to understand how to study the augmented Teichmüller space and how to generalize the result in [Masur] for this case. After that we could study a full version of the result in [Selinger] in the sub-hyperbolic semi-rational case. One possibility for us is to define  $T_0(E)$  as follows. For each disk component  $D_i$  of  $E$ , consider a ring  $A_i$  attaching to it such that  $D_i \cup A_i$  is a bigger disk and such that  $\{D_i \cup A_i\}$  and all point components of  $E$  are pairwise disjoint. Let  $\tilde{E} = E \cup \cup_i A_i$ . Consider  $M_0(\mathbb{C}) = \{\mu \in M(\mathbb{C}) \mid \mu|_{\tilde{E}} = 0\}$ . Define  $T_0(E) = \{[\mu]_E \mid \mu \in M_0(\mathbb{C})\}$  as the space of all  $E$ -equivalence classes of elements in  $M_0(\mathbb{C})$ . We would like to understand the augmented Teichmüller space  $\bar{T}_0(E)$ . It is still an interesting project for us.

*Acknowledgements.* I would like to thank referees for their very useful comments, which I have included in this paper. I would like to thank all my collaborators mentioned in this paper who spent a lot of time with me to discuss this interesting subject. This research is partially supported by the collaboration grant (#199837) from the Simons Foundation, the CUNY collaborative incentive research grant (#1861), and awards from PSC-CUNY. This research is also partially supported by the collaboration grant (#11171121) from the NSF of China and a collaboration grant from Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science and the Morningside Center of Mathematics at the Chinese Academy of Sciences.

## 6 APPENDIX ON TRANSCENDENTAL FUNCTIONS BY TAO CHEN, YUNPING JIANG, AND LINDA KEEN

We believe that the framework described in the preceding sections also applies to the characterization problem for families of quasi-entire and quasi-meromorphic functions with certain finiteness properties. At present, we are interested in the characterization of meromorphic functions with a finite number of asymptotic values but no critical points and the characterization of general exponential functions of the form  $P(z)e^{Q(z)}$ , where  $P(z)$  and  $Q(z)$  are two polynomials.

More precisely, in [Chen-Jiang-Keen;1], we define two model spaces of maps we call  $\mathcal{AV}2$  and  $\mathcal{AV}3$ . These are universal covering maps of the two-sphere with

two or three removed points that we model on the space of meromorphic functions with two or three asymptotic values and no critical points. We call the spaces of meromorphic functions  $\mathcal{M}2$  and  $\mathcal{M}3$ . Examples of elements in  $\mathcal{M}2$  are the tangent map  $\lambda \tan z$  and the exponential map  $e^{\beta z}$ . Nevanlinna [Nevanlinna] characterized meromorphic maps with  $p$  asymptotic values and no critical values as functions whose Schwarzian derivative is a polynomial of degree  $p - 2$ . Thus, a meromorphic map in  $\mathcal{M}2$  has constant Schwarzian derivative and a meromorphic map in  $\mathcal{M}3$  has a linear function as its Schwarzian derivative. For a more detailed description, the reader is referred to our paper [Chen-Jiang-Keen;1].

STET: "Schwarzian derivative is a polynomial" is correct

The bounded geometry and canonical obstruction conditions can also be defined for post-singularly finite maps in  $\mathcal{AV}2$  and  $\mathcal{AV}3$ . We are now working on a proof of the following statement that characterizes post-singularly finite maps in  $\mathcal{M}2$  and  $\mathcal{M}3$ :

*A post-singularly finite map in  $\mathcal{AV}2$  or in  $\mathcal{AV}3$  is combinatorially equivalent to a post-singularly finite transcendental meromorphic function in  $\mathcal{M}2$  or  $\mathcal{M}3$  if and only if it has bounded geometry. The realization is unique up to conjugation by an affine map of the plane.*

The proof follows the framework described in the previous sections. The new ingredient here is the addition of a topological constraint, which we define in order to control the holomorphic maps obtained by the Thurston iteration process and show they remain in a compact subset of the parameter space.

In [Chen-Jiang-Keen;2], we study the characterization of entire post-singularly finite  $(p, q)$ -exponential maps of the form  $E(z) = P(z)e^{Q(z)}$  with  $P$  and  $Q$  polynomials of degrees  $p \geq 0$  and  $q \geq 0$ , respectively, and  $p + q \geq 1$ . We use the notation  $\mathcal{E}_{p,q}$  for this family. Again, we define a model space  $\mathcal{TE}_{p,q}$  of topological exponential maps of type  $p, q$ . These are infinite-degree branched coverings with a single finite asymptotic value, normalized to be at the origin, and modeled on the functions  $E(z) = P(z)e^{Q(z)}$ . For a more detailed description, the reader is referred to our paper [Chen-Jiang-Keen;2].

STET on comma after origin

The bounded geometry and canonical obstruction conditions can also be defined for post-singularly finite maps in  $\mathcal{TE}_{p,q}$ . We are now working on a proof of the following statement that characterizes post-singularly finite maps in  $\mathcal{TE}_{p,q}$ :

*A post-singularly finite map in  $\mathcal{TE}_{p,q}$  is combinatorially equivalent to a post-singularly finite entire map of the form  $Pe^Q$  if and only if it has bounded geometry.*

Again, the new ingredient is the addition of a topological constraint which we need in order to control the holomorphic maps obtained by the Thurston iteration process and show they remain in a compact subset of the parameter space.

The framework described in Sections 1–5 can also be extended to transcendental maps in another direction. We can define sub-hyperbolic semi-holomorphic topological exponential maps and sub-hyperbolic semi-holomorphic topological meromorphic maps with two asymptotic values (recall Definition 3.7). Some results have straightforward extensions to these maps and conjectures similar to those stated before also make sense in this context.

wrote "sections 1–5" instead of "above sections"

Our framework for rational functions involved the proof of the equivalence of statements (1)–(4) in the preceding sections. At present, for a post-singularly finite and post-critically finite map or a general map in  $\mathcal{AV}2$ ,  $\mathcal{AV}3$ , or  $\mathcal{TE}_{p,q}$ , it is premature for us to make any statement about the equivalence between (1) with

$f$  as a transcendental function and (4), that  $f$  has no Thurston obstruction. It is also premature for us to make any statement about the equivalence between (2) for a transcendental  $f$  with bounded geometry and (4). The reason is the following: If  $E$  has infinitely many components, the definition of a Thurston obstruction in Section 2 may not make sense because when the degree of  $f$  is infinite, a non-peripheral closed curve  $\gamma$  on  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E$ ,  $f^{-1}(\gamma)$  may contain infinitely many non-peripheral closed curves. If  $E$  has finitely many components in the complex plane and  $\infty$  is an isolated component, one may be able to define a Thurston obstruction formally, in a manner similar to that in Section 2, because even if the map  $f$  has infinite degree, all but finitely many preimages of a non-peripheral curve  $\gamma$  on  $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E$  are peripheral or null homotopic rel.  $E$ . Even in this case, however, if one would like to prove (4)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) by following the idea of the proof in [Douady-Hubbard], one needs first to find a new proof of Lemma 5.2 in [Douady-Hubbard], which is the key to the proof of Thurston's theorem (Theorem 3.2) and whose proof crucially depends on the finiteness of the degree of  $f$ . Furthermore, in order to prove (4)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) by following the ideas in this framework, one needs first to find a new proof of Theorem 7.1 in [Douady-Hubbard], which only works for maps of finite degree and which plays an important role in our proof of (4)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) in Theorems 4.8 and 4.9. Note that when a Thurston obstruction can be appropriately defined, (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (4) can be proved just by following the proof in [Douady-Hubbard, Theorem 4.1] and the proof of Theorem 3.5 in [McMullen]; (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (4) is currently being studied in [Chen-Jiang-Keen;1] and [Chen-Jiang-Keen;2].

In [Hubbard-Schleicher-Shishikura], the authors use a Levy cycle condition rather than a Thurston obstruction to characterize the non-existence of convergence. This is because, by the universal covering property of the map, every Thurston obstruction necessarily contains a Levy cycle. In fact, for general quasimeromorphic and quasi-entire functions, a "canonical Thurston obstruction" is more natural than a "Levy cycle." We are working on a characterization problem for  $f$  a post-singularly finite function in either  $\mathcal{AV}2$ ,  $\mathcal{AV}3$  or  $\mathcal{TE}_{p,q}$  in terms of canonical Thurston obstructions. The delicate part of the problem is the proof that (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) (see Problem 4).

## 7 Bibliography

- [Ahlfors-Bers] L. V. Ahlfors and L. Bers, Riemann's mapping theorem for variable metrics. *Annals of Math. (2)* **72** (1960), 385–404. MR 0115006 (22 #5813)
- [Beck-Jiang-Mitra-Shiga] M. Beck, Y. Jiang, S. Mitra, and H. Shiga, Extending holomorphic motions and monodromy. *Annales Academiæ Scientiarum Fennicæ Mathematica* **37** (2012), 53–67. MR 2920423
- [Bonnot-Yampolsky] S. Bonnot and M. Yampolsky, Geometrization of post-critically finite branched coverings. arXiv:1102.2247.
- [Brown] D. Brown, Using spider theory to explore parameter spaces. Ph.D. Dissertation, Cornell University, 2001. MR 2702308
- [Chen-Jiang] T. Chen and Y. Jiang, Canonical Thurston obstructions for sub-hyperbolic semi-rational branched coverings. *Conformal Geometry and Dynamics*, **17** (2013), 6–25.

- [Chen-Jiang-Keen;1] T. Chen, Y. Jiang and L. Keen, Bounded geometry and families of meromorphic functions with two and three asymptotic values. arXiv:1112.2557 [math.DS].
- [Chen-Jiang-Keen;2] T. Chen, Y. Jiang, and L. Keen, Bounded geometry and characterization of post-singularly finite  $(p, q)$ -exponential maps. Work in progress.
- [Cheng-Jiang] T. Cheng and Y. Jiang, Geometrization of sub-hyperbolic semi-rational branched coverings. arXiv:1207.1292
- [Cui-Jiang] G. Cui and Y. Jiang, Geometrically finite and semi-rational branched coverings of the two-sphere. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, **363**, (May 2011), 2701-2714. MR 2763733 (2012e:37090)
- [Cui-Jiang-Sullivan;M] G. Cui, Y. Jiang and D. Sullivan, On geometrically finite branched covering maps. Manuscript, 1996.
- [Cui-Jiang-Sullivan] G. Cui, Y. Jiang and D. Sullivan, On geometrically finite branched covering maps-I: Locally combinatorial attracting and II. Realization of rational maps (refer to its rewritten version [Cui-Tan]). *Complex Dynamics and Related Topics*, New Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 2004, The International Press, 1-14 and 15-29. MR 2504307 (2011c:37092) & MR 2504308 (2011c:37093)
- [Cui-Tan] G. Cui and L. Tan, A characterization of hyperbolic rational maps. *Invent Math.* **183** (2011), 451-516. MR 2772086 (2012c:37088)
- [Douady-Hubbard] A. Douady and J. Hubbard, A proof of Thurston's topological characterization of rational functions. *Acta. Math.* **171**, (1993), 263-297. MR 1251582 (94j:58143)
- [Earle-McMullen] C. J. Earle and C. McMullen, *Quasiconformal isotopies. Holomorphic Functions and Moduli*, Vol. I (Berkeley, CA, 1986), 143-154, Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ. **10**, Springer, New York, 1988. MR 0955816 (89h:30028)
- [Earle-Mitra] C.J. Earle and S. Mitra, Variation of moduli by holomorphic motions. *Contemp. Math.* **256** (2000), 39-67. MR 1759669 (2001f:30031)
- [Epstein] A. Epstein, Towers of finite type complex analytic maps. Ph.D. Dissertation, The CUNY Graduate Center, 1993. MR 2690048
- [Epstein-Keen-Tresser] A. Epstein, L. Keen, and C. Tresser, The set of maps  $F_{a,b} : x \mapsto x + a + \frac{b}{2\pi} \sin(2\pi x)$  with any given rotation interval is contractible. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **173** (1995), 313-333. MR 1355627 (97e:58129)
- [Gardiner-Jiang-Wang] F. Gardiner, Y. Jiang, and Z. Wang, Holomorphic motions and related topics. *Geometry of Riemann Surfaces*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series **368**, 2010, 156-193. MR 2665009 (2011j:37087)
- [Gardiner-Lakic] F. Gardiner and N. Lakic, *Quasiconformal Teichmüller Theory*. AMS, Providence, RI, 2000. MR 1730906 (2001d:32016)
- [Godillon] S. Godillon, Construction de fractions rationnelles à dynamique prescrite. Ph.D. Dissertation, Université de Cergy-Pontoise, Mai 2010.

- [Hassinsky] P. Haissinsky, Deformation localisee de surfaces de Riemann. *Publ. Math.* **49** (2005), 249–255. MR 2140209 (2006a:30047)
- [Hinkkanen] A. Hinkkanen, Uniformly quasiregular semigroups in two dimensions. *Annales Academiæ Scientiarum Fennicæ Mathematica* **21**, 1996, 205–222. MR 1375517 (96m:30029)
- [Hubbard] J. Hubbard, *Teichmüller Theory and Applications to Geometry, Topology, and Dynamics*, Volume I: *Teichmüller theory*. Matrix Edition, Ithaca, NY 14850. 2006. MR 2245223 (2008k:30055)
- [Hubbard-Schleicher-Shishikura] J. Hubbard, D. Schleicher, and M. Shishikura, Exponential Thurston maps and limits of quadratic differentials. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* **22** (2009), 77–117. MR 2449055 (2010c:37100)
- [Jiang-Mitra-Wang] Y. Jiang, S. Mitra, Z. Wang, Liftings of holomorphic maps into Teichmüller space. *Kodai Mathematical Journal* **32**, 544–560. MR 2582017 (2010m:32015)
- [Jiang-Mitra] Y. Jiang and S. Mitra, Some applications of universal holomorphic motions. *Kodai mathematical Journal* **30**, 85–96. MR 2319079 (2008c:32019)
- [Jiang-Mitra-Shiga] Y. Jiang, S. Mitra, H. Shiga, Quasiconformal motions and isomorphisms of continuous families of Möbius groups. *Israel Journal of Mathematics* **188** (2012), 177–194.
- [Levy] S. Levy, Critically finite rational maps. Ph.D. Dissertation, Princeton University, 1985. MR 2634168
- [Lieb] G. Lieb, Holomorphic motions and Teichmüller space, Ph.D. Dissertation, Cornell University 1990. MR 2638376
- [Masur] H. Masur, Extension of the Weil-Petersson metric to the boundary of Teichmüller space, *Duke Math. J.* **43**, (1976), 623–635. MR 0417456 (54 #5506)
- [McMullen] C. McMullen, *Complex dynamics and Renormalization*. Ann. of Math. Studies **79**, Princeton University Press, Princeton 1994. MR 1312365 (96b:58097)
- [Minsky] Y. Minsky, Extremal length estimates and product regions in Teichmüller space. *Duke Math. J.*, Vol. **83** (1996), 249–286. MR 1390649 (97b:32019)
- [Mitra] S. Mitra, Extensions of holomorphic motions. *Israel Journal of Mathematics* **159** (2007), 277–288. MR 2342482 (2009f:32025)
- [Milnor] J. Milnor, *Dynamics in One Complex Variable, Introductory Lectures*. Vieweg, 2nd ed., 2000. MR 1721240 (2002i:37057)
- [Nevanlinna] R. Nevanlinna, *Analytic Functions*. Translated from the second German edition by Phillip Emig. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band **162**, Springer-Verlag, New York–Berlin 1970. MR 0279280 (43 #5003)
- [Pilgrim] K. M. Pilgrim, Canonical Thurston obstruction. *Advances in Mathematics* **158** (2001), 154–168. MR 1822682 (2001m:57004)

- [Rees] M. Rees, A partial description of the parameter space of rational maps of degree two, Part 2. *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (1995) 644–690. MR 1317518 (96g:58161)
- [Selinger] N. Selinger, Thurston’s pullback map on the argmented Teichmüller space and applications. *Invent Math.* **189** (2012), 111–142.
- [Sullivan;1] D. Sullivan, The ergodic theory at infinity of an arbitrary discrete group of hyperbolic motions. *Riemann Surfaces and Related Topics, Proceedings of the 1978 Stony Brook Conference*. *Ann. of Math. Stud.* **97**, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1981, 465–496. MR 0624833 (83f:58052)
- [Sullivan;2] D. Sullivan, *Conformal dynamical systems. Geometric dynamics*, Lecture notes in Math. **1007**, Springer, Berlin, 1983, 725–752. MR 0730296 (85m:58112)
- [Sullivan;3] D. Sullivan, 11 lectures on Thurston’s geometric theorem and Thurston’s critical finite theorem #1–6 and #26 from 1981 to 1986. Einstein Chair Seminar Video Tape Collections, CUNY Graduate Center. <http://www.math.sunysb.edu/Videos/Einstein/>
- [Tan] L. Tan, Matings of quadratic polynomials. *Ergod. Th. Dynam. Sys.* **12** (1992), 589–620. MR 1182664 (93h:58129)
- [Thurston] W. Thurston, The combinatorics of iterated rational maps (1985), published in: *Complex dynamics: Families and Friends*, ed. by D. Schleicher, A. K. Peters (2008), 1–108.
- [Tukia] P. Tukia, On two-dimensional quasiconformal groups. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A. I. Math.* **5**, 1980, 73–78. MR 0595178 (82c:30031)
- [Wang] X. Wang, A decomposition theorem for Herman maps. arXiv:1203.5563.
- [Zhang-Jiang] G. Zhang and Y. Jiang, Combinatorial characterization of sub-hyperbolic rational maps. *Advances in Mathematics*, **221** (2009), 1990–2018. MR 2522834 (2010h:37095)
- [Zhang;1] G. Zhang, Topological models of polynomials of simple Siegel disk type. Ph.D. Dissertation, CUNY Graduate Center 2002.
- [Zhang;2] G. Zhang, Dynamics of Siegel rational maps with prescribed combinatorics. arXiv:0811.3043.

## *Contributors*

---

MARCO ABATE

Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Pisa, Largo Pontecorvo 5, 56127 Pisa, Italy

abate@dm.unipi.it

MARCO ARIZZI

marco.arizzi@gmail.com

ALEXANDER BLOKH

Department of Mathematics, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL 35294-1170, USA

ablokh@math.uab.edu

THIERRY BOUSCH

Laboratoire de Mathématique (UMR 8628 du CNRS), bât. 425/430, Université de Paris-Sud, 91405 Orsay Cedex, France

Thierry.Bousch@math.u-psud.fr

XAVIER BUFF

Université Paul Sabatier, Institut de Mathématiques de Toulouse, 118 route de Narbonne, 31062 Toulouse Cedex, France

xavier.buff@math.univ-toulouse.fr

SERGE CANTAT

Institut de Recherche Mathématique de Rennes (UMR 6625 du CNRS), Université de Rennes 1, Campus de Beaulieu, bâtiment 22-23, 35042 Rennes cedex, France

serge.cantat@univ-rennes1.fr

TAO CHEN

Department of Mathematics, CUNY Graduate School, New York, NY 10016, USA  
chentaofdh@gmail.com

ROBERT DEVANEY

Mathematics Department, 111 Cummington Street, Boston University, Boston MA 02215, USA

bob@math.bu.edu

ALEXANDRE DEZOTTI

Institut de Mathématiques de Toulouse, 118 route de Narbonne, F-31062 Toulouse Cedex 9, France

dezotti@math.univ-toulouse.fr

TIEN-CUONG DINH

Université Pierre et Marie Curie (Université Paris 6), UMR 7586, Institut de Mathématiques de Jussieu, 4 place Jussieu, F-75005 Paris, France

dinh@math.jussieu.fr

ROMAIN DUJARDIN

Laboratoire d'Analyse et de Mathématiques Appliquées, Université de Marne-la-Vallée, 5 boulevard Descartes, Cité Descartes – Champs-sur-Marne, 77454 Marne-la-Vallée cedex 2, France  
romain.dujardin@univ-mlv.fr

HUGO GARCÍA-COMPEÁN

Departamento de Física, Centro de Investigación y de Estudios Avanzados del IPN, P.O. Box 14-740, 07000 México D.F., México  
compean@fis.cinvestav.mx

WILLIAM GOLDMAN

3106 Math Building, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742 USA  
wmg@math.umd.edu

ROSTISLAV GRIGORCHUK

Department of Mathematics, Mailstop 3368, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-3368, USA  
grigorch@math.tamu.edu

JOHN HUBBARD

Department of Mathematics, 310 Malott Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853-4201, USA  
jhh8@cornell.edu

YUNPING JIANG

Department of Mathematics, Queens College of CUNY, Flushing, NY 11367, USA  
yunping.jiang@qc.cuny.edu

LINDA KEEN

Department of Mathematics, Lehman College of CUNY, Bronx, NY 10468, USA  
Linda.Keen@lehman.cuny.edu

JAN KIWI

Facultad de Matemáticas, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Casilla 306, Correo 22, Santiago, Chile  
jkiwi@puc.cl

GENADI LEVIN

Institute of Mathematics, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel  
levin@math.huji.ac.il

DANIEL MEYER

Jacobs University, School of Engineering and Science, Campus Ring 1, 28759 Bremen, Germany  
dmeyermail@gmail.com

JOHN MILNOR

Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook NY, 11794-3661, USA  
jack@math.sunysb.edu