

ORDERINGS ON k -MARKOV NUMBERS

ESTHER BANAIA

ABSTRACT. The k -Markov numbers, introduced by Gyoda and Matsushita, are those which appear in positive integral solutions to $x^2 + y^2 + z^2 + k(xy + xz + yz) = (3 + 3k)xyz$. When $k = 0$, this recovers the ordinary Markov numbers. A long-standing question in the theory of Markov numbers is Frobenius's unicity conjecture, concerning whether every Markov number is the maximum in a unique solution triple. Aigner gave a series of weaker, related conjectures which were confirmed to be true by Lee, Li, Rabideau, and Schiffler using techniques from the theory of cluster algebras. We show here that k -Markov numbers also satisfy Aigner's conjectures.

1. INTRODUCTION

A triple of positive integers $(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ satisfying

$$x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = 3xyz$$

is known as a *Markov triple*. The equation itself is known as the *Markov equation*. Examples of Markov triples include $(1, 1, 1)$, $(1, 1, 2)$, and $(2, 5, 29)$. A number which appears in a Markov triple is a *Markov number*. For instance, 1, 2, 5, and 29 are Markov numbers while one can show that 3 is not.

Markov numbers first appeared in the study of Diophantine approximation [22]. In particular, they index points in the discrete interval of the Lagrange spectrum. Since their introduction to the world, Markov numbers have proven to be of interest in many other areas of math, including hyperbolic geometry, algebraic geometry, number theory, and combinatorics. One area of research concerns Frobenius' unicity conjecture, which states that each Markov number is the maximum in a unique Markov triple. As is the case with many long-standing open problems, Frobenius' conjecture has motivated much interesting work on Markov numbers; Aigner's book [1] provides a lovely summary.

There is a well-known method of indexing Markov numbers with rational numbers in the interval $[0, 1]$ (see Section 2.1). Formally, we can view this as a function from $\mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]$ to the set of Markov numbers, sending $\frac{p}{q} \rightarrow m_{\frac{p}{q}}$. Frobenius' conjecture is equivalent to stating that this map is injective. If this conjecture is true, then we recover a total order on $\mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]$ by setting $\frac{p}{q} < \frac{r}{s}$ if $m_{\frac{p}{q}} < m_{\frac{r}{s}}$. Aigner provided a triple of conjectures using this perspective, that is, predicting features of this total ordering.

Conjecture 1 (Aigner [1]). *Let p, q be positive integers such that $1 \leq p < q$ and $\gcd(p, q) = 1$.*

- (1) (*Fixed Numerator*) *If $q < q'$ and $\gcd(p, q') = 1$, then $m_{\frac{p}{q}} < m_{\frac{p}{q'}}$.*
- (2) (*Fixed Denominator*) *If $p < p' < q$ and $\gcd(p', q) = 1$, then $m_{\frac{p}{q}} < m_{\frac{p'}{q}}$.*
- (3) (*Fixed Sum*) *If $0 < i < p$ is such that $\gcd(p - i, q + i) = 1$, then $m_{\frac{p}{q}} < m_{\frac{p-i}{q+i}}$.*

Key words and phrases. Markov Numbers, Continued Fractions, Fence Posets, Skein Relations.

A modern lens through which some have studied Markov numbers is *cluster theory*. A cluster algebra is a commutative ring with a distinguished set of generators, *cluster variables*, which sit in overlapping sets called *clusters* [14]. One can already see parallels to the definition of Markov numbers and triples respectively. The similarities run deeper, which the following key result illuminates.

Theorem 1. *If (x, y, z) is a Markov triple, so is (x, y, z') where z' is defined by*

$$(1) \quad z' = \frac{x^2 + y^2}{z},$$

and similarly for (x', y, z) and (x, y', z) . Every Markov triple is the result of applying finitely many such moves to the triple $(1, 1, 1)$.

The positivity of z' evident from Equation 1 while integrality follows from the fact that, if (x, y, z) is a Markov triple, then $\frac{x^2 + y^2}{z} = 3xy - z$. Equation 1 resembles one specific form of (*cluster*) *mutation*, which connects different clusters in a cluster algebra. Indeed, there is one specific cluster algebra, aptly called the Markov cluster algebra, whose cluster variables specialize to Markov numbers [6, 27].

This identification of Markov numbers as specializations of cluster variables has been used to make progress towards the unicity conjecture [21, 28]. The Markov cluster algebra is also a cluster algebra of surface type, as discussed in [12, 13]; the relevant surface is a once-punctured torus. Musiker, Schiffler, and Williams introduced a direct, combinatorial method of computing cluster variables for cluster algebras of surface type in order to demonstrate the coefficients are always positive [24]. This construction associates to each cluster variable x a weighted, bipartite graph G such that x can be expressed as a dimer partition function of G . A corollary in the present setting is that Markov numbers can be interpreted as the number of dimer-covers (or, *perfect matchings*) of a family of graphs [27]. Indeed, perhaps the earliest instance of a snake graph (predating the definition of cluster algebras) appears in work of Cohn on Markov numbers [10]. These graphs also are closely related to Christoffel words, another combinatorial tool used in the study of Markov numbers [29].

Interpreting Markov numbers as cardinalities of sets of dimer covers has been useful in two, related directions. Firstly, Çanakçı and Schiffler showed that the number of dimer covers of a snake graph can be expressed as the numerator of a *continued fraction* [8]. Therefore, one can use machinery related to continued fractions in order to study Markov numbers. (We remark that one could circumvent the cluster algebra connection to link Markov numbers and continued fractions.) This approach was taken by Rabideau and Schiffler in [28] to show the Fixed Numerator conjecture (i.e. Conjecture 1 part 1). The second approach uses *snake graph calculus* [7, 9], a combinatorial method of realizing *skein relations* through the combinatorial formula of Musiker, Schiffler, and Williams [24]. This approach was taken by Lee, Li, Rabideau, and Schiffler in [21] to show that the three statements in Conjecture 1 follow from a more general set of inequalities on the numbers $m_{\frac{p}{q}}$. We note that similar results were shown with other methods in [15, 20, 23].

Here, we will apply both approaches to study solutions to a family of equations which generalize the Markov equation. Given $k \geq 0$, we define the *k-Markov equation* to be

$$(2) \quad x^2 + y^2 + z^2 + k(xy + xz + yz) = (3 + 3k)xyz.$$

Triples of positive integers satisfying Equation 2 are called *k-Markov triples*, which are comprised of *k-Markov numbers*. Notice that ordinary Markov triples coincide with 0-Markov

triples in our language, allowing us to simultaneously discuss the ordinary and generalized case.

Equation 2 was first defined and studied by Gyoda and Matsushita [18]. In particular, they showed that Vieta jumps connect all k -Markov triples.

Theorem 2 (Theorem 1.1 [18]). *If (x, y, z) is a k -Markov triple, so is (x, y, z') where z' is given by*

$$(3) \quad z' = \frac{x^2 + kxy + y^2}{z}$$

and similarly for (x', y, z) and (x, y', z) . Every k -Markov triple is the result of applying finitely many such moves to the triple $(1, 1, 1)$.

The definition of the k -Markov equation is motivated by Chekhov and Shapiro's *generalized cluster algebras*, which have the same structure as (ordinary) cluster algebras but allow more general mutation relations. Indeed, for each choice of k , there is a specific generalized cluster algebra whose cluster variables specialize to k -Markov numbers.

We remark that Gyoda and Matsushita studied the more general equation

$$(4) \quad x^2 + y^2 + z^2 + k_1yz + k_2xz + k_3xy = (3 + k_1 + k_2 + k_3)xyz$$

with three nonnegative integral parameters k_1, k_2, k_3 [18]. An appropriately defined analogue of Theorem 2 is true here and the connection to generalized cluster algebras remains. However, the uniqueness conjecture is known to not be true in this widest setting of generality (see [18, Remark 2.8]), and the asymmetry forces one to use a more complex indexing system (see [2, Section 3.4]). These two complications convince us to only consider the case $k_1 = k_2 = k_3$ here. However, we remark that the results in Sections 3 and 4 could be extended to the distinct k_i case.

Our main result is that Aigner's conjectures holds for k -Markov numbers as well.

Theorem 3. *Conjecture 1 holds for the k -Markov numbers for all $k \geq 0$.*

Theorem 2 for $k = 1$ (i.e. 1-Markov numbers) was independently shown by the author and Sen in [5]. In this case, the generalized cluster algebra can be seen as arising from a once-punctured sphere with three orbifold points of order 3. The main focus in this previous work was to use a generalization of the snake graph construction to orbifolds from previous work with Kelley [4] to study 1-Markov numbers, largely through continued fractions.

In joint work with Gyoda [2], we repackaged the construction from [4] into the language of *fence posets* and used it to study the generalized cluster algebras in the backdrop of the k -Markov numbers and the more general solutions to Equation 4. These posets come with labels and weights which are scalar multiples of monomials; we can use this construction to study the k -Markov numbers as well by setting the initial variables to 1 in the weights and labels. The resulting posets can still come with weights other than 1, so that we are no longer interpreting k -Markov numbers as cardinalities. However, we use a simple trick (Lemma 4) to “extend” the weighted posets to those with all elements with weight 1. Our main proof technique is to apply the poset skein relations from joint work with Kang and Kelley [3] to these extended posets. In Section 2.4, we highlight how these poset skein relations can be used to deduce relations on numerators of continued fractions, which may be of independent interest.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we complete our survey of the background as well as give more precise details regarding the combinatorial tools discussed

here. The poset construction from [2] (in the specialized case) as well as the extended version is given in Section 3. Section 4 describes a distance function we put on \mathbb{Z}^2 , ℓ_k , using the combinatorial constructions in the previous section and following the ordinary case from [21]. Finally, Section 5 contains the proof of the main result, using properties of ℓ_k , and culminates with a discussion regarding future directions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is deeply grateful to Yasuaki Gyoda for providing both the initial inspiration for this work and valuable feedback during the writing process.


2. TOOLS

In this section, we summarize necessary background for the main result. Many topics are inspired by cluster theory, which we point out for continuity and motivation. However, knowledge of cluster algebras is not necessary to understand any results in this article.

2.1. Rational Labeling. Theorem 2 endows k -Markov triples with the structure of a rooted tree. It is most convenient to omit the first triple, $(1, 1, 1)$, from the construction.

Definition 1. Define the k -Markov tree, MT^k , to be the rooted tree whose vertices are labeled by triples of positive integers with root $(1, k+2, 1)$ and such that each vertex (a, b, c) has left child $(b, \frac{b^2+kbc+c^2}{a}, c)$ and right child $(a, \frac{a^2+kab+b^2}{c}, c)$.


Notice that there is symmetry between the left and right side of the tree, up to reordering. We draw a neighborhood of the root of the 1-Markov tree below.



We will label k -Markov numbers with rational numbers by comparing the k -Markov tree with the Farey tree.

Definition 2. Define the Farey tree, FT , to be the rooted tree whose vertices are labeled with triples from $\mathbb{Q} \cup \{\frac{1}{0}\}$ with root $(\frac{0}{1}, \frac{1}{1}, \frac{1}{0})$ and such that each vertex $(\frac{r}{s}, \frac{p}{q}, \frac{t}{u})$ has left child $(\frac{p}{q}, \frac{p+t}{q+u}, \frac{t}{u})$ and right child $(\frac{r}{s}, \frac{r+p}{s+q}, \frac{p}{q})$.

We draw a neighborhood of the root of the Farey tree below. Notice that the rooted sub-tree with root $(\frac{0}{1}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{1})$ is labeled by triples coming from the interval $[0, 1]$.



It is well-known that every positive rational number appears as the middle entry of a unique vertex in FT.

There is a canonical bijection of trees $\bar{\iota} : \text{FT} \rightarrow \text{MT}^k$. We use this to define a map $\iota : \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ by focusing on the middle entries of each,

$$\iota\left(\frac{p}{q}\right) = b \text{ where } \bar{\iota}\left(\frac{r}{s}, \frac{p}{q}, \frac{t}{u}\right) = (a, b, c).$$

Using this comparison of trees, given $\frac{p}{q} \in \mathbb{Q}_{[0,1]}$, we define $m_{\frac{p}{q}}^{(k)}$ as

$$m_{\frac{p}{q}}^{(k)} := \begin{cases} 1 & \frac{p}{q} = \frac{0}{1} \\ k+2 & \frac{p}{q} = \frac{1}{1} \\ \iota(\frac{p}{q}) & 0 < \frac{p}{q} < 1. \end{cases}$$

For example, $m_{\frac{2}{5}}^{(1)} = 4683$. In Section 3, we will give an explicit method to construct $m_{\frac{p}{q}}^{(k)}$.

2.2. Continued Fractions. This section discusses an important computational tool which is intricately linked to both Markov numbers and fence posets.

Definition 3. Given a finite list a_1, \dots, a_n of nonnegative integers, with $a_i > 0$ for $i > 1$, the continued fraction, $[a_1, \dots, a_n]$ is given by

$$[a_1, \dots, a_n] = a_1 + \frac{1}{a_2 + \frac{1}{a_3 + \frac{1}{\ddots + \frac{1}{a_n}}}}.$$

Every rational number $\frac{p}{q}$ can be expressed as a continued fraction; this expression is unique if we insist $a_n > 1$. It will be advantageous for us later to compute continued fractions in an alternate way.

Lemma 1. Let a_1, \dots, a_n be a list of nonnegative integers with $a_n > 0$. If p, q, r, s are integers defined by

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_2 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdots \begin{pmatrix} a_n & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} p & r \\ q & s \end{pmatrix},$$

then

$$[a_1, \dots, a_n] = \frac{p}{q} \quad \text{and} \quad [a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}] = \frac{r}{s}$$


One can replace the definition of a continued fraction with the matrix formula in Lemma 1. Next, we use Lemma 1 to relate numerators of continued fractions. These formulas will be useful in later sections. Let $\mathcal{N}[a_1, \dots, a_n]$ denote the numerator of the resulting (reduced) fraction $[a_1, \dots, a_n]$. That is, if $[a_1, \dots, a_n] = \frac{p}{q}$, $\mathcal{N}[a_1, \dots, a_n] = p$.

Lemma 2. Let μ_1, μ_2 be possibly empty lists of nonnegative integers and let a, b, k be nonnegative integers. We have

$$(5) \quad \mathcal{N}[\mu_1, a, k, b, \mu_2] = \mathcal{N}[\mu_1, a + k + b, \mu_2] + k\mathcal{N}[\mu_1, a - 1, 1, b - 1, \mu_2]$$

and

$$(6) \quad \mathcal{N}[\mu_1, a, k + 1, b, \mu_2] = \mathcal{N}[\mu_1, a, 1, b + k, \mu_2] + k\mathcal{N}[\mu_1, a - 1, 1, b - 2, \mu_2]$$


$$\begin{pmatrix} a & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} k & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} b & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} akb + a + b & ak + 1 \\ bk + 1 & k \end{pmatrix}.$$
$$(7) \quad \begin{pmatrix} k & 0 \\ 0 & k \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a-1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} b-1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} akb-k & ak \\ bk & k \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} a+k+b & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

One more useful result is the following, which is well-known.

$$\mathcal{N}[a_1, \dots, a_n] = \mathcal{N}[a_n, \dots, a_1].$$

A *tile* is another name for a cycle graph on 4 vertices. We will draw tiles as squares and will refer to the four sides as North, East, South, and West in the natural way. If the tile is named G , then the north edge will be labeled $N(G)$, and similarly for the other cardinal directions.

There are many ways to glue a set of tiles together. In order to distinguish these, we use a *sign function*, f , as in [8]. This is a function from the edge set of a snake graph to the size two set $\{\pm\}$, which satisfies the following rules.

- (1) For each tile G_i , $S(G_i)$ and $E(G_i)$ are labeled the same way and similarly for $N(G_i)$ and $W(G_i)$.

- (2) For each tile G_i , $S(G_i)$ and $N(G_i)$ are labeled in the opposite way.
- (3) The label of $S(G_1)$ is $-$.

The final condition assigns a unique sign function to each snake graph; otherwise, there would be two sign functions associated to each snake graph. See the middle of Figure 1 for an example of a sign function.

An *internal edge* of a snake graph is one which borders two tiles. A snake graph with d tiles has $d - 1$ internal edges. Label these e_1, \dots, e_{d-1} . Let e_0 denote $S(G_1)$. The *sign sequence* of a snake graph is $f(e_0), f(e_1), \dots, f(e_{d-1}), f(e_{d-1})$; we emphasize that we repeat $f(e_{d-1})$ at the end. Let a_1, \dots, a_n denote the lengths of maximal constant subsequences of the sign sequence; necessarily, $a_n > 1$. We call the sequence a_1, \dots, a_n the *shape* of \mathcal{G} . Indeed the data of the shape uniquely determines \mathcal{G} . For instance, the shape of the snake graph in Figure 1 is 3,2,2.

Recall a *perfect matching* of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a $M \subseteq E$ such that every $v \in V$ is incident to exactly one $e \in M$. Weighted perfect matchings of snake graphs can be used to compute cluster variables in a cluster algebra of surface type [24]. The following beautiful result by Çanakçı and Schiffler shows how the shape of a snake graph also encodes the number of perfect matchings.

Theorem 4 ([8]). *If \mathcal{G} is a snake graph of shape a_1, \dots, a_n , then the number of perfect matchings of \mathcal{G} is $\mathcal{N}[a_1, \dots, a_n]$.*

For example, the continued fraction $[3, 2, 2]$ is equal to the rational number $\frac{17}{5}$, from which we see that the snake graph in Figure 1 has 17 perfect matchings.

Cluster variables are Laurent polynomials in two variables. Computing one of these variables in terms of snake graphs can be done by putting the set of perfect matchings into a partial order. The resulting poset turns out to be a distributive lattice, and its underlying poset of join-irreducible elements is a *fence poset*; see [25, Theorem 5.4]. A fence poset is a poset whose Hasse diagram is a path graph. In other words, a fence poset \mathcal{P} on h elements, denoted $\mathcal{P}(1), \dots, \mathcal{P}(h)$, is a poset of the form

$$(8) \quad \mathcal{P}(1) \prec \mathcal{P}(2) \prec \dots \prec \mathcal{P}(c_1) \succ \mathcal{P}(c_1 + 1) \succ \dots \succ \mathcal{P}(c_2) \prec \mathcal{P}(c_2 + 1) \dots \mathcal{P}(c_n) = \mathcal{P}(h).$$

Notice that by our indexing, an element $\mathcal{P}(i)$ only has cover relations with $\mathcal{P}(i - 1)$ and $\mathcal{P}(i + 1)$, when these elements exist. We refer to this as a *chronological labeling*, as in [3]. See the fence poset on the right in Figure 1. We use boxes to denote the use of chronological labeling and to distinguish these from other labels which will be used in later sections.

Every poset with more than one element has two chronological labelings. Given a poset \mathcal{P} with one chronological labeling, let $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$ denote the same poset with reverse chronological labeling. In a drawing, this means taking a mirror image of the Hasse diagram. The notion of chronological labeling also invites a notion of interval notation, $\mathcal{P}[a, b] := \{\mathcal{P}(i) : a \leq i \leq b\}$. If $a > b$, define $\mathcal{P}[a, b] = \emptyset$.

We return to discussions of shape. If n , as in Equation 8, is 1, so that \mathcal{P} is a chain which increases with the chronological labeling, we define the *shape* of \mathcal{P} to be $a_1 = c_1 + 1$. Otherwise, we define the shape of \mathcal{P} to be the sequence of positive integers a_1, \dots, a_n defined by

$$a_i = \begin{cases} c_1 & i = 1 \\ c_i - c_{i-1} & 1 < i < n \\ c_n - c_{n-1} + 1 & i = n. \end{cases}$$

Notice that $a_1 = 1$ if and only if $\mathcal{P}(1)$ is maximal, and $a_n > 1$.

For example, consider the fence poset on the right of Figure 1. The numbers c_i are $c_1 = 3, c_2 = 5$ and $c_3 = 6$. Therefore, the shape is $3, 2, 2$.

An *order ideal* of a poset \mathcal{P} is a subset $I \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ satisfying if $x \in I$ and $y \preceq x$, then $y \in I$. In other words, an order ideal is “closed going down”. The set of all order ideals of a poset \mathcal{P} is denoted $J(\mathcal{P})$. The empty set is an order ideal, so here we say an empty poset has one order ideal. Given $x \in \mathcal{P}$, let $\langle x \rangle$ denote the smallest order ideal containing x . An order ideal of the form $\langle x \rangle$ is sometimes called a *principal order ideal*.

We have now indexed both snake graphs and posets with finite sequences of positive integers whose last entry is greater than 1. The connection is the following.

Theorem 5. *Given a_1, \dots, a_n , a list of positive integers with $a_n > 1$, let \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{P} be the snake graph and poset of shape a_1, \dots, a_n respectively. There is a bijection between the set of perfect matchings of \mathcal{G} and the set of order ideals of \mathcal{P} .*

Proof. This is a corollary of [25, Theorem 5.4]. □

More recently, a weighted version of Theorem 5 was given in [19] which allows one to compute cluster variables directly from fence posets. The same result was independently shown in [26]. Here, we only need the fact that these sets have the same size. Combining Theorems 4 and 5 allows us to quickly compute the number of order ideals of a fence poset.

Corollary 1. *If \mathcal{P} is a fence poset of shape a_1, \dots, a_n , then the number of order ideals of \mathcal{P} is $\mathcal{N}[a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n]$.*

For example, since we previously computed that the snake graph in Figure 1 has $\mathcal{N}[3, 2, 2] = 17$ perfect matchings, we also know the fence poset on the righthand side has 17 order ideals.

Corollary 1 gives another perspective for [11, Lemma 2], which gave a recursion on the cardinality of the set of order ideals of a fence poset.

2.4. Skein Relations. Let a *multicurve* denote a (multi) set of curves on a surface. Given two curves with a designated point of intersection, the *resolution* of this intersection is the pair of multicurves resulting from replacing the point of intersection, locally \mathbf{X} , with \asymp and with \succ . Understanding skein relations has been important in the study of cluster algebras from surfaces as cluster variables satisfy an algebraic version of skein relations [13]. That is, if x and x' are cluster variables associated to curves which intersect, and the resolution of this intersection is the pair of multicurves Γ^+ and Γ^- , each of which corresponds to a product of elements of the cluster algebra, then we have

$$xx' = x_{\Gamma^+} + x_{\Gamma^-}.$$

Indeed, Vieta jumping for ordinary Markov numbers (Equation 1) can be seen as a special case of a skein relation in the surface model for the Markov cluster algebra.

There have been multiple approaches to studying skein relations for cluster algebras. One, given by Çanakçı and Schiffler, uses the snake graph construction and is combinatorial in nature [9]. In joint work with Kang and Kelley, we gave poset versions of these results, working in the more general setting of “tagged arcs” [3], which results in considering a slightly larger class than fence posets. We will be interested in the enumerative consequences of these results. Here, we do not need this wider generality and only consider fence posets. Therefore, while we use the language from [3] for convenience, every result discussed also comes from simply translating [9] to the land of fence posets. From here on, all posets will be assumed to be fence posets.

Let a subset S of elements in a poset \mathcal{P} be on *bottom* if for any $\rho \in S, \sigma \in \mathcal{P} \setminus S, \rho \not\preceq \sigma$; this is equivalent to the condition of being an order ideal. Define a set to be on *top* in a parallel way. Such sets are sometimes called “order filters.”

If two posets \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 have isomorphic subposets of the form $R_1 = \mathcal{P}_1[c, d]$ and $R_2 = \mathcal{P}_2[c', d']$, we say they have an *overlap*. We emphasize that this isomorphism must be consistent with the two chronological orderings. We say this is moreover a *crossing overlap* if

- R_1 is on top of \mathcal{P}_1 and R_2 is on bottom of \mathcal{P}_2 ;
- we do not have both $c = 1$ and $c' = 1$; and
- we do not have both $d = h_1$ and $d' = h_2$ where $h_i = |\mathcal{P}_i|$.

Definition 4. Given a pair of posets \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 with a crossing overlap $R_1 = \mathcal{P}_1[c, d] \cong \mathcal{P}_2[c', d'] = R_2$, define the Type 0 resolution of \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 to be $\{\mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4\} \cup \{\mathcal{P}_5, \mathcal{P}_6\}$ where these new posets are defined as follows.

- Let \mathcal{P}_3 be the poset on $\mathcal{P}_1[1, d] \cup \mathcal{P}_2[d' + 1, h_1]$ with all induced relations as well as $\mathcal{P}_1(d) \prec \mathcal{P}_2(d' + 1)$.
- Let \mathcal{P}_4 be the poset on $\mathcal{P}_2[1, d'] \cup \mathcal{P}_1[d + 1, h_2]$ with all induced relations as well as $\mathcal{P}_2(d') \succ \mathcal{P}_1(d + 1)$.
- The construction of \mathcal{P}_5 depends on c and c' .
 - If $c > 1$ and $c' > 1$, then \mathcal{P}_5 is the poset on $\mathcal{P}_1[1, c - 1] \cup \mathcal{P}_2[1, c' - 1]$ with all induced relations as well as $\mathcal{P}_1(c - 1) \succ \mathcal{P}_2(c' - 1)$.
 - If $c = 1$, implying $c' > 1$, let $v < c' - 1$ be the largest integer such that $\mathcal{P}_2(v) \not\preceq \mathcal{P}_2(c' - 1)$, if it exists, and otherwise let $v = 0$. Let \mathcal{P}_5 be the induced subposet $\mathcal{P}_2[1, v]$.
 - If $c' = 1$, implying $c > 1$, let $u < c - 1$ be the largest integer such that $\mathcal{P}_1(u) \not\preceq \mathcal{P}_1(c - 1)$, if it exists, and otherwise let $u = 0$. Let \mathcal{P}_5 be the induced subposet $\mathcal{P}_1[1, u]$.
- There are three parallel cases to construct \mathcal{P}_6 , analyzing d and d' . See [2, Definition 8.2], where “ s ” denotes c here and “ t ” denotes d here.

Definition 4 was called a “Type 0 resolution” as it corresponds to a certain type of geometric intersection with respect to a triangulation; see Section 5. There are several other ways in which two curves can intersect. These are only apparent from the posets when the elements are labeled with curves from a triangulation. Any pair of abstract fence posets of given shape can realize such intersections. Therefore, here we discuss them without referencing when they apply.

Definition 5. Given a pair of posets \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 , choose $1 \leq i < h_2 := |\mathcal{P}_2|$. Chronologically label \mathcal{P}_2 such that $\mathcal{P}_2(i) \succ \mathcal{P}_2(i + 1)$. Define the Type 1 resolution of \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 with respect to i to be $\{\mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4\} \cup \{\mathcal{P}_5, \mathcal{P}_6\}$ where these new posets are defined as follows.

- Let \mathcal{P}_3 be the poset on $\mathcal{P}_1 \cup \mathcal{P}_2[1, i]$ with all induced relations as well as $\mathcal{P}_2(i) \prec \mathcal{P}_1(1)$.
- Let $v > i$ be the smallest integer such that $\mathcal{P}_2(i) \not\preceq \mathcal{P}_2(v)$, if it exists; otherwise let $v = h_2 + 1$. Let \mathcal{P}_4 be the induced poset on $\mathcal{P}_2[v, h_2]$.
- Let \mathcal{P}_5 be the poset on $\mathcal{P}_1 \cup \mathcal{P}_2[i + 1, h_2]$ with all induced relations as well as $\mathcal{P}_2(i + 1) \succ \mathcal{P}_1(1)$.
- Let $u < i$ be the largest integer such that $\mathcal{P}_i(i) \not\preceq \mathcal{P}_2(u)$, if it exists; otherwise let $u = 0$. Let \mathcal{P}_6 be the induced poset on $\mathcal{P}_2[1, u]$.

Definition 6. Given a pair of posets \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 , define the Type 2 resolution of \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 to be $\{\mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4\} \cup \{\mathcal{P}_5, \mathcal{P}_6\}$ where these new posets are defined as follows.

- Let \mathcal{P}_3 be poset on $\mathcal{P}_1 \cup \mathcal{P}_2$ with all induced relations as well as $\mathcal{P}_1(1) \succ \mathcal{P}_2(1)$.
- Let \mathcal{P}_4 be the empty poset.
- Let v be the smallest integer such that $\mathcal{P}_1(1) \not\leq \mathcal{P}_1(v)$, if it exists; otherwise set $v = |\mathcal{P}_1| =: h_1$. Let \mathcal{P}_5 be the induced poset on $\mathcal{P}_1[v, h_1]$.
- Let u be the smallest integer such that $\mathcal{P}_2(1) \not\leq \mathcal{P}_2(u)$, if it exists; otherwise set $u = |\mathcal{P}_2| =: h_2$. Let \mathcal{P}_6 be the induced poset on $\mathcal{P}_2[u, h_2]$.

Proposition 1. Let \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 be a pair of posets. Suppose $\mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4, \mathcal{P}_5$ and \mathcal{P}_6 are four posets satisfying one of the following conditions.


- (1) The pair \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 has a crossing overlap and $\{\mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4\} \cup \{\mathcal{P}_5, \mathcal{P}_6\}$ is the Type 0 resolution.
- (2) The set $\{\mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4\} \cup \{\mathcal{P}_5, \mathcal{P}_6\}$ is the Type 1 resolution of \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 with respect to some $1 \leq i < |\mathcal{P}_2|$.
- (3) The set $\{\mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4\} \cup \{\mathcal{P}_5, \mathcal{P}_6\}$ is the Type 2 resolution of \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 .

Then,


$$|J(\mathcal{P}_1)| \cdot |J(\mathcal{P}_2)| = |J(\mathcal{P}_3)| \cdot |J(\mathcal{P}_4)| + |J(\mathcal{P}_5)| \cdot |J(\mathcal{P}_6)|.$$

Proof. This is the consequence of specializing all variables in [3, Propositions 6,7,8] to 1, or equivalently from translating the results from [9] to statements concerning posets. \square

Example 1. First, consider the two posets \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 below. We denote elements in each with their chronological label, using primes for \mathcal{P}_2 . These two posets have a crossing overlap in $\mathcal{P}_1[2, 4] \cong \mathcal{P}_2[1', 3']$.




The resolution consists of the following posets. We do not draw \mathcal{P}_5 as it is empty.




One can check the existence of a bijection using Corollary 1. As previously noted, \mathcal{P}_1 has 17 order ideals. One can further compute \mathcal{P}_2 has $\mathcal{N}[2, 1, 2] = 8$ order ideals and similarly \mathcal{P}_3 has 11, \mathcal{P}_4 has 12, \mathcal{P}_5 has 1, and \mathcal{P}_6 has 4. Indeed, $17 \cdot 8 = 136 = 11 \cdot 12 + 1 \cdot 4$.

Example 2. We demonstrate the application of Definition 6 to \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 from Example 1. First, we draw \mathcal{P}_3 .



Now, the number v from Definition 6 is 2 since $\mathcal{P}_1(1) \not\preceq \mathcal{P}_1(2)$. The number u is 3 since $\mathcal{P}_2(1) \preceq \mathcal{P}_2(2)$ but $\mathcal{P}_2(1) \not\preceq \mathcal{P}_2(3)$. Therefore, the posets \mathcal{P}_5 and \mathcal{P}_6 are as below.



Using continued fractions, we can numerically verify Proposition 1. In Example 1, we saw $|J(\mathcal{P}_1)| \cdot |J(\mathcal{P}_2)| = 17 \cdot 8 = 136$. The shape of \mathcal{P}_3 is 1, 1, 1, 1, 3, 2, 2, the shape of \mathcal{P}_5 is 2, 2, 2, and the shape of \mathcal{P}_6 is 3. Indeed, we have

$$\mathcal{N}[1, 1, 1, 1, 3, 2, 2] + \mathcal{N}[2, 2, 2] \cdot \mathcal{N}[3] = 100 + 12 \cdot 3 = 136.$$

From the point of view of Corollary 1, Proposition 1 can alternately be viewed as a family of relations on numerators of continued fractions. There are many such formulas, based on the various local configurations of these poset families. We present two of these formulas.

Corollary 2. *Let a_1, \dots, a_n and b_1, \dots, b_m be two finite sequences of positive integers. Let α denote the sequence a_1, \dots, a_n , β denote the sequence b_1, \dots, b_m , and $\bar{\alpha}$ denote the reverse sequence a_n, \dots, a_1 .*

- (1) *Let $1 < i < m$ and let $b', b'' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ satisfy $b' + b'' + i = b_i$. Let β' denote the sequence b_1, \dots, b_{i-2} and β'' the sequence b_{i+2}, \dots, b_m . We have*

$$\mathcal{N}[\alpha]\mathcal{N}[\beta] = \mathcal{N}[\beta', b_{i-1}, b', \alpha]\mathcal{N}[b_{i+1} + 1, \beta''] + \mathcal{N}[\bar{\alpha}, 1, b'', b_{i+1}, \beta'']\mathcal{N}[\beta', b_{i-1} + 1]$$

- (2) *Suppose $a_1 = 1$ and $b_1 > 1$. We have*

$$\mathcal{N}[\alpha]\mathcal{N}[\beta] = \mathcal{N}[\bar{\alpha}, \beta] + \mathcal{N}[a_2, \dots, a_n]\mathcal{N}[b_2, \dots, b_n]$$

Proof. Part 1 comes from applying Proposition 1 for a resolution of Type 1 when the element $\mathcal{P}_2(i)$ is incomparable with $\mathcal{P}_2(1)$ and $\mathcal{P}_2(|\mathcal{P}_2|)$, i.e., this element does not lie on the first or last maximal chain of \mathcal{P}_2 . Part 2 comes from applying the same Proposition for a resolution of Type 2 where $\mathcal{P}_1(1)$ is maximal and $\mathcal{P}_2(1)$ is minimal. \square

3. TWO POSET CONSTRUCTIONS

In [2] we constructed a labeled, weighted fence poset \mathcal{P}_γ associated to any curve γ on the lattice \mathbb{Z}^2 with integral endpoints which does not contain integral points in its interior. Refer to such a curve as an *arc*; we will also orient each arc in one of two directions. Whereas therein elements were labeled with Laurent monomials, here we will specialize all formal variables to 1 and have rational weights. For book-keeping, we will retain the labels. When the weights can vary, we will refer to poset elements by (l, w) where l is the label and w is the weight.

Soon, we will focus on posets with all elements weighted with 1, and then we will just refer to labels. We emphasize that this is distinct from the chronological labeling discussed in the previous section and in particular multiple elements of a poset can have the same label.

Let \mathcal{L} be the lattice of all arcs (or, “line segments”) in \mathbb{R}^2 of slope 0, ∞ , and -1 with endpoints being integral. Given a line segment τ in \mathcal{L} , let $l(\tau) = x$ if τ has slope -1 , $l(\tau) = y$ if τ has slope ∞ , and $l(\tau) = z$ if τ has slope 0. The labels of all line segments in \mathcal{L} are marked in Example 3.

We will assume all arcs have a minimal set of intersections with \mathcal{L} . In particular, an arc will never cross the same arc (or, line segment) in \mathcal{L} two consecutive times. We will also always choose one of two possible orientations for an arc. This induces an indexing on the arc’s intersections with \mathcal{L} .

Algorithm 1. Let γ be an arc on \mathbb{Z}^2 . If γ does not intersect any line segments in \mathcal{L} , then \mathcal{P}_γ is empty.


Otherwise, suppose the first line segment crossed by γ is τ_a . If $k = 0$, then introduce one new element $\mathcal{P}_\gamma(1) = (l(\tau_a), 1)$ to \mathcal{P}_γ . Otherwise, introduce two new elements $\mathcal{P}_\gamma(1)$ and $\mathcal{P}_\gamma(2)$. If the intersection point of γ and τ_a lies strictly closer to the right endpoint of τ_a than the left (with respect to the orientation of γ), then set $\mathcal{P}_\gamma(1) \succ \mathcal{P}_\gamma(2)$; otherwise set $\mathcal{P}_\gamma(1) \prec \mathcal{P}_\gamma(2)$. Give both elements the label $l(\tau_a)$, weight the smaller with k and weight larger with $\frac{1}{k}$.

The remainder of the poset is constructed by performing the following.


- (1) Let τ_a be the last arc from \mathcal{L} which we have accounted for. If τ_a is also the last arc crossed by γ , then we return the poset constructed. Otherwise, let τ_b be the next arc crossed by γ , and let $\mathcal{P}_\gamma(j)$ be the last element of \mathcal{P}_γ constructed so far.
- (2) Introduce an element $\mathcal{P}_\gamma(j+1)$ which has label $l(\tau_b)$. If τ_a and τ_b share an endpoint to the right of γ , set $\mathcal{P}_\gamma(j) \succ \mathcal{P}_\gamma(j+1)$; otherwise, set $\mathcal{P}_\gamma(j) \prec \mathcal{P}_\gamma(j+1)$.
- (3) If $k = 0$, then weight $\mathcal{P}_\gamma(j+1)$ with 1 and return to step 1.
- (4) If $k > 0$, then introduce another element $\mathcal{P}_\gamma(j+2)$ which is also labeled $l(\tau_b)$. If the intersection point of γ and τ_b lies strictly closer to the right endpoint of τ_b than the left (with respect to the orientation of γ), then set $\mathcal{P}_\gamma(j+1) \succ \mathcal{P}_\gamma(j+2)$; otherwise set $\mathcal{P}_\gamma(j+1) \prec \mathcal{P}_\gamma(j+2)$. In either case, weight the smaller element with k and weight larger with $\frac{1}{k}$. Return to Step (1).

Notice that even if γ and δ are homotopic arcs and have the same sequence of intersections with \mathcal{L} , the posets \mathcal{P}_γ and \mathcal{P}_δ can be different. This is illustrated in the following Example.

Example 3. Consider the following two arcs, γ_1 and γ_2 .



Assume first that $k > 0$. Then, the two posets, \mathcal{P}_{γ_1} and \mathcal{P}_{γ_2} are drawn on the left and right below, respectively. Each element is denoted with as (label, weight).



If $k = 0$, the resulting posets are in fact the same. They are given by $(x, 1) \succ (y, 1) \prec (x, 1)$.

Let $\gamma_{\frac{p}{q}}$ denote the a straight line between $(0, 0)$ and (q, p) where p and q are coprime positive integers. For instance, γ_1 in Example 3 is $\gamma_{\frac{1}{2}}$. Each such arc intersects one line segment at its midpoint. Note that our algorithm is *left-biased* in that even when γ crosses a line segment τ at its midpoint, we treat the intersection as if it is closer to the left endpoint. A corollary from the work in [2] is that the posets $\mathcal{P}_{\frac{p}{q}}$ can be used to compute the k -Markov numbers.

Given a poset \mathcal{P} with a weight function on its elements, $w : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, define

$$\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{P}) := \sum_{I \in J(\mathcal{P})} \prod_{\rho \in I} w(\rho).$$

As a convention, extend an unweighted poset \mathcal{P} to a weighted one by defining $w(\rho) = 1$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$.

Theorem 6. *If $0 < p < q$ satisfy $\gcd(p, q) = 1$ and $k \geq 0$, then*

$$\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{\frac{p}{q}}}) = m_{\frac{p}{q}}^{(k)}.$$

Proof. This is a consequence of setting all variables x_i and y_i to 1 in [2, Theorem 8.30]. \square


The statement of Theorem 6 points out that the parameter k is implicit in our notation of the poset $\mathcal{P}_{\frac{p}{q}}$. Since we will not vary k , this should not cause confusion.

We will be interested in a wider family of curves. Let $A, B \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. Define γ_{AB}^L to be the result of taking the line segment \overline{AB} and deforming each intersection of \overline{AB} with points in \mathbb{Z}^2 other than A and B an infinitesimal amount to the left. Define γ_{AB}^R similarly to γ_{AB}^L , using a right deformation instead.

Convention 1. The arcs γ_{AB}^L and γ_{AB}^R each have the form of a series of arcs $\gamma_{\frac{p}{q}}$ for the same fraction $\frac{p}{q}$ connected by semicircles. While the arcs $\gamma_{\frac{p}{q}}$ each intersect a line segment in \mathcal{L} at its midpoint, we imagine that in γ_{AB}^L , these intersections have moved slightly to the left and in γ_{AB}^R these have moved slightly to the right.

In particular, $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{\frac{p}{q}}} = \mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{(0,0)(q,p)}^L}$, and this is distinct from $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{(0,0)(q,p)}^R}$ unless $k = 0$.

Example 4. Here, we consider γ_{AB}^L and γ_{AB}^R where $A = (0, 0)$ and $B = (2, 4)$. These are drawn on the left and right below.



The diagram shows a poset with 10 nodes. The nodes are labeled with pairs (x, y) where $x \in \{x, y, z\}$ and $y \in \{1/k, k\}$. The nodes are arranged in four levels: Level 0 (bottom) has (y, k) , (x, k) , and $(y, 1/k)$; Level 1 has $(x, 1/k)$, (y, k) , and (x, k) ; Level 2 has (x, k) , $(y, 1/k)$, and $(x, 1/k)$; Level 3 (top) has $(z, 1/k)$. Edges connect (y, k) to $(x, 1/k)$ and (x, k) ; (x, k) to $(x, 1/k)$ and (y, k) ; $(y, 1/k)$ to (x, k) ; $(x, 1/k)$ to $(z, 1/k)$; and $(x, 1/k)$ to (x, k) .

Our goal is to show that, in this setting, we can replace the posets constructed in [2] with different posets, called *extended posets*, in which every element has weight 1. Therefore, we can recognize all k -Markov numbers as enumerating order ideals and as numerators of continued fractions.

Algorithm 2. Let \mathcal{P} be a balanced poset. We construct the *extended poset*, \mathcal{P}^{ex} by performing the following. If every element of \mathcal{P} has weight 1, then $\mathcal{P}^{\text{ex}} = \mathcal{P}$. Otherwise, we do the following as long as elements with weights other than 1 remain in \mathcal{P} .

- (1) If we are in case (1), introduce elements $\mathcal{P}(i+j)$ for $2 \leq j \leq k$ such that $\mathcal{P}(i+j) \prec \mathcal{P}(i+j+1)$ for all $1 \leq j < k$. Shift the chronological ordering on all later elements. If $\mathcal{P}(a)$ is such that $\mathcal{P}(a) \prec \mathcal{P}(i+1)$, we remove this relation and replace it with





FIGURE 2. The main process in Algorithm 2


- $\mathcal{P}(a) \prec \mathcal{P}(i+k)$. If $\mathcal{P}(a)$ is such that $\mathcal{P}(a) \succ \mathcal{P}(i+1)$, we also set $\mathcal{P}(a) \succ \mathcal{P}(i+k)$. For all $0 \leq j \leq k$, we set the weight of $\mathcal{P}(i+j)$ to 1. Return to step 2.
- (2) If we are in case (2), we perform a dual construction to the previous. Return to step 2.

When we apply this Algorithm to \mathcal{P}_γ , the elements in each “balanced” pair will be labeled in the same way, so we can unambiguously label the extended version with this common label. Figure 2 succinctly illustrates Algorithm 2 along with this labeling convention.

Example 5. Suppose $k = 2$. Then, the extended posets $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_1}^{\text{ex}}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_2}^{\text{ex}}$ associated to posets \mathcal{P}_{γ_1} and \mathcal{P}_{γ_2} built in Example 3 are below, on the left and right respectively. Since the weight of each element is one, we suppress weight and only write the label of each element.



Remark 1. Following the correspondence between snake graphs and posets, we can realize Algorithm 2 as taking a snake graph with some internal edges weighted by integers and expanding this to a snake graph with unweighted edges.



Next, we show an important compatibility between the posets \mathcal{P}_γ and $\mathcal{P}_\gamma^{\text{ex}}$.

Lemma 4. *If \mathcal{P} be a balanced poset with associated extended poset \mathcal{P}^{ex} , then*

$$\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{P}) = \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{P}^{\text{ex}}) = |J(\mathcal{P}^{\text{ex}})|$$

Proof. Notice the second equality is trivial since every order ideal in \mathcal{P}^{ex} has weight 1. It suffices to show that if \mathcal{P}' is the result of applying one iteration of step 2 in Algorithm 2 to the balanced poset \mathcal{P} , then $\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{P}) = \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{P}')$.

Let i be the index such that we perform step 2 from Algorithm 2 at $\mathcal{P}(i)$ and $\mathcal{P}(i+1)$. Up to possibly reversing chronological ordering, we can assume $\text{wt}(\mathcal{P}(i)) = k$, so that by the balanced condition $\text{wt}(\mathcal{P}(i+1)) = \frac{1}{k}$ and $\mathcal{P}(i) \prec \mathcal{P}(i+1)$.

Define the following subsets of $J(\mathcal{P})$ and $J(\mathcal{P}')$.

- Let \mathcal{A}_0 (resp. \mathcal{B}_0) denote the set of order ideals $I \in J(\mathcal{P})$ ($I \in J(\mathcal{P}')$) such that $\mathcal{P}(i) \notin I$ ($\mathcal{P}'(i) \notin I$).
- Let \mathcal{A}_1 denote the set of order ideals $I \in J(\mathcal{P})$ such that $\mathcal{P}(i) \in I$ and $\mathcal{P}(i+1) \notin I$.
- For each $1 \leq j \leq k$, let \mathcal{B}_j denote the set of order ideals $I \in J(\mathcal{P}')$ such that $\mathcal{P}'(i+j-1) \in I$ and $\mathcal{P}'(i+j) \notin I$.
- Let \mathcal{A}_2 (resp. \mathcal{B}_{k+1}) denote the set of order ideals $I \in J(\mathcal{P})$ ($I \in J(\mathcal{P}')$) such that $\mathcal{P}(i+1) \in I$ ($\mathcal{P}'(i+k) \in I$).

The sets $\mathcal{A}_0, \mathcal{A}_1$, and \mathcal{A}_2 partition $J(\mathcal{P})$ and the sets $\mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_{k+1}$ partition $J(\mathcal{P}')$. Let $\sigma : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}'$ be defined by

$$\sigma(\mathcal{P}(j)) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{P}'(j) & j \leq i \\ \mathcal{P}'(j+k-1) & j > i \end{cases}$$

Extend σ to subsets S of \mathcal{P} by defining $\sigma(S) := \{\sigma(\rho) : \rho \in S\}$. Notice that if $j \notin \{i, i+1\}$, then $\text{wt}(\mathcal{P}(j)) = \text{wt}(\sigma(\mathcal{P}(j)))$.

We define a family of bijections between the parts of our partition of $J(\mathcal{P})$ and $J(\mathcal{P}')$.

- Let $\Phi_0 : \mathcal{A}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_0$ be defined by $\Phi_0(I) = \sigma(I) := \{\sigma(\rho) : \rho \in I\}$.
- For each $1 \leq j \leq k$, define $\Phi_j : \mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_j$ by $\Phi_j(I) = \sigma(I) \cup \langle \mathcal{P}'(i+j-1) \rangle$.
- Let $\Phi_{k+1} : \mathcal{A}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{k+1}$ by defined by $\Phi_{k+1}(I) = \sigma(I) \cup \langle \mathcal{P}'(i+k) \rangle$.

The map Φ_0 is clearly weight-preserving. Since $\text{wt}(\langle \mathcal{P}(i+1) \rangle) = \text{wt}(\langle \mathcal{P}'(i+k) \rangle)$, Φ_{k+1} is also weight-preserving.

Fix $I \in \mathcal{A}_1$ and let $W = \text{wt}(I)/k = \text{wt}(I \setminus \{\mathcal{P}(i)\})$. For all $1 \leq j \leq k$, we have $\text{wt}(\Phi_j(I)) = W$, so that $\sum_{j=1}^k \text{wt}(\Phi_j(I)) = \text{wt}(I)$.

Now, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{P}) &= \sum_{I \in J(\mathcal{P})} \text{wt}(I) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{A}_0} \text{wt}(I) + \sum_{I \in \mathcal{A}_1} \text{wt}(I) + \sum_{I \in \mathcal{A}_2} \text{wt}(I) \\ &= \sum_{I \in \mathcal{A}_0} \text{wt}(\Phi_0(I)) + \sum_{I \in \mathcal{A}_1} \sum_{j=1}^k \text{wt}(\Phi_j(I)) + \sum_{I \in \mathcal{A}_2} \text{wt}(\Phi_{k+1}(I)) \\ &= \sum_{I \in \mathcal{B}_0} \text{wt}(I) + \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{I \in \mathcal{B}_j} \text{wt}(I) + \sum_{I \in \mathcal{B}_{k+1}} \text{wt}(I) = \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{P}'). \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 2. One could alternatively prove Theorem 6 by combining Lemma 4 with the work in [17], whose snake graph construction mirrors the extended posets considered here.

A consequence of Lemma 4 is that the posets $\mathcal{P}_\gamma^{\text{ex}}$ have a nearly-palindromic symmetry.

Lemma 5. *Let p, q be coprime integers. If the shape of $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma \frac{p}{q}}^{\text{ex}}$ is given by a_1, \dots, a_n , then*

- (1) n is even,
- (2) $a_i = a_{n+1-i}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq \frac{n}{2} - 1$, and
- (3) $a_{\frac{n}{2}} = a_{\frac{n}{2}+1} \pm k$.

Proof. Each claim is a consequence of combining [2, Lemma 8.21] with Lemma 4. □

4. MARKOV DISTANCE

We will use the construction of the posets \mathcal{P}_γ and $\mathcal{P}_\gamma^{\text{ex}}$ to define a distance function on \mathbb{Z}^2 .

Definition 7. (1) *Given an arc γ on \mathbb{Z}^2 , define the k -Markov length of γ by $\ell_k(\gamma) = \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{P}_\gamma)$.*
 (2) *Given $A, B \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, if $A = B$, $|AB|_k = 0$. Otherwise, define the k -Markov distance between two integral points A, B to be $|AB|_k = \min_\delta \ell_k(\delta)$ where we range over all (possibly generalized) arcs δ with endpoints in A and B .*

Remark 3. As discussed in [21, Remark 3.7], 0-Markov distance is not a metric, and it is not a metric for higher k for similar reasons.

Out of convenience, we will shift all line segments \overline{AB} to the origin. This will not affect our calculations.

Lemma 6. *If k is a nonnegative integer, $A = (q, p), B = (s, r), A' = (0, 0)$, and $B' = (s - q, r - p)$, then $|AB|_k = |A'B'|_k$.*

Proof. Any arc γ with endpoints at A and B can be translated to an arc γ' with endpoints at A' and B' . This translation does not affect the crossing behavior, hence \mathcal{P}_γ and $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma'}$ are the same as weighted posets. In particular, any arc δ with endpoints in A and B minimizing ℓ_k can be translated, and conversely for δ' with endpoints in A' and B' . □

Lemma 6 allows us to safely always set $A = (0, 0)$ throughout this section. Next, relating the posets \mathcal{P}_γ and $\mathcal{P}_\gamma^{\text{ex}}$ allows us to express k -Markov length in terms of continued fractions.

Corollary 3. *Let γ be an arc on \mathbb{Z}^2 . We have*

$$\ell_k(\gamma) = \mathcal{N}[a_1, \dots, a_n],$$

where a_1, \dots, a_n is the shape of $\mathcal{P}_\gamma^{\text{ex}}$.

Proof. This follows from combining Lemma 4 and Corollary 1. □


For instance, given γ_1 and γ_2 as in Example 3, by computing the shape of each poset and using Corollary 1, we have $\ell_k(\gamma_1) = 25$ and $\ell_k(\gamma_2) = 49$. This example points out that k -Markov length is not constant across the homotopy class of an arc, even when restricting to homotopic arcs with the same crossing sequence. This is a unique feature of the $k > 0$ setting.

Our goal is to study which arcs γ with endpoints A, B satisfy $\ell_k(\gamma) = |AB|_k$. When searching for an arc with a fixed pair of endpoints which minimizes ℓ_k , we can restrict ourself to arcs which, within their homotopy class, minimize the number of intersections with line segments in \mathcal{L} and the number of self-intersections. We begin by showing that such a minimizing arc cannot have any self-intersection.


Lemma 7. *If γ is an arc with endpoints A, B which has a non-contractible self-intersection, then $\ell_k(\gamma) > |AB|_k$.*

Proof. The claim is trivial if $A = B$, since $|AA|_k = 0$, so we assume A and B are distinct. Let γ be an arc with a point of self-intersection. Call this point C . Since γ visits C twice, we can divide γ into three curves $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$ consisting of the portion of γ before the first time it passes through C , the portion between its two instances of passing through C , and the portion after the last instance. In particular, giving each γ_i the orientation inherited from γ , γ_1 starts at A and γ_3 ends at B . Let γ' be the result of concatenating γ_1 and γ_3 and removing unnecessary intersections of the resulting arc with \mathcal{L} . Do this in such a way to preserve the location of the intersection points of all unaffected crossings between the γ_1 and \mathcal{L} and similarly for γ_3 .

Removing the unnecessary intersections is akin to pulling C , the point of self-intersection, back to an extreme triangle. Assume first that C cannot be pulled back to the first or last triangle which γ passes through. Then, the configuration of γ and γ' is as below.




Let $h = |\mathcal{P}_\gamma^{\text{ex}}|$. By our construction of γ' , there are values $u < v$ such that $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma'}^{\text{ex}}$ is the result of taking the induced subposet on $\mathcal{P}_\gamma[1, u] \cup \mathcal{P}_\gamma[v, h]$ and adding a relation between $\mathcal{P}_\gamma(u)$ and $\mathcal{P}_\gamma(v)$. If γ has the orientation as above, inducing an orientation on γ' as well, then the posets \mathcal{P}_γ and $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma'}$ are as below. By abuse of notation, we will retain the chronological labeling from $\mathcal{P}_\gamma^{\text{ex}}$ when referencing elements of $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma'}^{\text{ex}}$.



We claim $\ell_k(\gamma) > \ell_k(\gamma')$. We can show this by exhibiting an injection from $J(\mathcal{P}_{\gamma'}^{\text{ex}})$ to $J(\mathcal{P}_\gamma^{\text{ex}})$ which has a nonempty cokernel.

Every order ideal I' of $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma'}^{\text{ex}}$ can naturally be viewed as an order ideal I of $\mathcal{P}_\gamma^{\text{ex}}$ where we include $\langle \mathcal{P}_\gamma^{\text{ex}}(v-1) \rangle$ if $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma'}^{\text{ex}}(v) \in I'$. Our geometric set-up implies that $\mathcal{P}_\gamma^{\text{ex}}(u+1) \notin \langle \mathcal{P}_\gamma^{\text{ex}}(v-1) \rangle$. Indeed, if our values u and v were such that $\mathcal{P}_\gamma^{\text{ex}}[u+1, v-1]$ was totally ordered, then the intersection of γ with the arc labeled x above would be unnecessary. Therefore, our correspondence of sending $I' \in J(\mathcal{P}_{\gamma'}^{\text{ex}})$ to $I \in J(\mathcal{P}_\gamma^{\text{ex}})$ is a non-surjective injection, implying $|J(\mathcal{P}_{\gamma'}^{\text{ex}})| < |J(\mathcal{P}_\gamma^{\text{ex}})|$.

Now, suppose that C can be pulled back to the first triangle with γ passes through.



In this case, $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma'}^{\text{ex}}$ is of the form $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma}^{\text{ex}}[v, h]$ where again h denotes the cardinality of $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma}^{\text{ex}}$. Our set-up here implies that there exists at least one value $i < v$ such that $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma}^{\text{ex}}(i)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma}^{\text{ex}}(v)$ are incomparable, and therefore it is clear that $|J(\mathcal{P}_{\gamma'}^{\text{ex}})| < |J(\mathcal{P}_{\gamma}^{\text{ex}})|$. \square

Remark 4. The arc γ' constructed in the proof of Lemma 7 is one of the arcs which appears when resolving the self-intersection of γ . This result could have been shown more generally by discussing skein relations on posets, as in [3] and, in the language of snake graphs, in [7]. However, our construction of the poset $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma}^{\text{ex}}$ is different from the one used for cluster algebras. In order to use skein relations here, we would have to verify that every self-intersection gives rise to the correct type of configuration of the poset. Moreover, to completely discuss skein relations from self-intersections, we must associate a poset to a closed curve. Our current proof bypasses these difficulties.

Looking forward, in Lemma 9 we are able to classify the intersections needed (with help from Proposition 2, and hence there we can use skein relations without difficulty.

Our next step will be to identify an arc in each homotopy class which is minimal under ℓ_k . Even though this step is trivial in the $k = 0$, our description closely follows a construction within the proof of [21, Theorem 3.5]. Given an arc γ on \mathbb{R}^2 with endpoints $A, B \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, imagine pulling γ tight so that γ nearly meets a set of points in \mathbb{Z}^2 . Call this “straightened” arc γ^{str} . The path of γ^{str} can be broken up into a set of $r > 1$ line segments between (ϵ neighborhoods around) points in \mathbb{Z}^2 , $A = Q_0, Q_1, \dots, Q_r = B$, and $r - 1$ angles, $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{r-1}$, which γ^{str} takes around these points. These angles necessarily have values in $[-2\pi, -\pi] \cup [\pi, 2\pi]$; otherwise, the arc could be pulled even tighter. If γ is homotopic to γ_{AB}^L , then $\gamma^{\text{str}} = \gamma_{AB}^L$, and similarly for γ_{AB}^R . For example, the red arc, γ_2 , in Example 3 straightens to the blue arc, γ_1 .

In the following, we extend Convention 1 to all arcs γ^{str} . This is necessary to make the construction of the posets $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma^{\text{str}}}$ well-defined.

Convention 2. Let δ be the i -th straight line segment comprising a straightened arc γ^{str} . Since δ is of the form γ_q^{str} , it crosses a line from \mathcal{L} , say τ , at its midpoint. If θ_{i-1} and θ_i are both negative (positive), we perturb δ to intersect τ slightly to the left (right) of its midpoint. The same holds true if one of the angles θ_{i-1} and θ_i does not exist. If $\theta_{i-1}\theta_i < 0$, then we have δ intersect τ exactly at its midpoint.

Proposition 2. *Given γ , an arc on \mathbb{R}^2 with endpoints in \mathbb{Z}^2 , we have*

$$\ell_k(\gamma) \geq \ell_k(\gamma^{\text{str}})$$

Proof. If $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma} = \mathcal{P}_{\gamma^{\text{str}}}$, then by definition $\ell_k(\gamma) = \ell_k(\gamma^{\text{str}})$. If $k = 0$, then the statement also holds without further proof.





FIGURE 3. An example of an arc γ^{str} . This arc consists of 4 line segments and three angles, θ_1, θ_2 and θ_3 . The first two angles are negative whereas the last is positive. We have perturbed the central intersections of the straight line segments to highlight Convention 2.

So suppose $k > 0$ and that $\mathcal{P}_\gamma \neq \mathcal{P}_{\gamma^{\text{str}}}$. Assign to each poset a compatible chronological ordering and consider the first place where the posets differ with respect to this ordering. This means that there is an arc τ from \mathcal{L} such that γ crosses τ closer to its left endpoint and γ^{str} crosses τ closer to its right endpoint or vice versa. Two prototypical examples are drawn below. The difference is whether the intersections before or after the intersection of disagreement are with arcs with different labels or the same labels.



Suppose we have γ as on the left above. Then, the shape of $\mathcal{P}_\gamma^{\text{ex}}$ is of the form $a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, k, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n$. Applying Equation 5 from Lemma 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}[a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, k, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n] &= \mathcal{N}[a_1, \dots, a_{i-1} + k + a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n] \\ &\quad + k\mathcal{N}[a_1, \dots, a_{i-1} - 1, 1, a_{i+1} - 1, \dots, a_n]. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $a_1, \dots, a_{i-1} + k + a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n$ is the shape of the poset $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma'}^{\text{ex}}$ where γ' follows γ_{AB}^L through its intersection with y then after follows γ . We have shown that $\ell_k(\gamma) \geq \ell_k(\gamma')$, and so we can continue the argument with γ' instead.

We can handle disagreements as on the right above using Equation 6 from Lemma 2 instead. Using these relations a finite number of times, we conclude $\ell_k(\gamma) \geq \ell_k(\gamma^{\text{str}})$. \square

Remark 5. In joint work with Sen [5], we discuss how the construction of $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{\frac{p}{q}}}$ when $k = 1$ is equivalent to the construction of a snake graph from a once-punctured sphere with three orbifold points, using [4]. In particular, see [5, Theorem 5]. In this framework, non-straightened arcs would correspond to arcs on an orbifold which have self-intersections, and the arc γ' constructed in the proof of Proposition 2 would be one arc resulting from resolving this self-intersection.

Now, we will focus on straightened arcs. Our final goal will be to show that γ_{AB}^L satisfies $\ell_k(\gamma_{AB}^L) = |AB|_k$ and similarly for γ_{AB}^R . It will be helpful to record that these two arcs have the same k -Markov length.


Lemma 8. *Given $A, B \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, the posets $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{AB}^L}^{\text{ex}}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{AB}^R}^{\text{ex}}$ are the same up to reversal. In particular, $\ell_k(\gamma_{AB}^L) = \ell_k(\gamma_{AB}^R)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 6, it suffices to set $A = (0, 0)$. Let $B = (q, p)$. If $k = 0$, then we are done by the proof of [21, Lemma 3.2]. So suppose $k > 0$. We will induct on $g := \gcd(p, q)$.

First, suppose $g = 1$. Let $h_{\frac{p}{q}} := |\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{\frac{p}{q}}}^{\text{ex}}|$. Let a_1, \dots, a_n denote the shape of $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{\frac{p}{q}}}^{\text{ex}}$. Note the only difference between the set of cover relations of $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{AB}^L} = \mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{\frac{p}{q}}}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{AB}^R}$ is that we have $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{AB}^L}(\frac{1}{2}h_{\frac{p}{q}}) \prec \mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{AB}^L}(\frac{1}{2}h_{\frac{p}{q}} + 1)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{AB}^R}(\frac{1}{2}h_{\frac{p}{q}}) \succ \mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{AB}^R}(\frac{1}{2}h_{\frac{p}{q}} + 1)$ (see Convention 1). As a consequence, the shape of $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{AB}^R}^{\text{ex}}$ is $a_1, \dots, a_{\frac{n}{2}-1}, a_{\frac{n}{2}+1}, a_{\frac{n}{2}}, a_{\frac{n}{2}+2}, \dots, a_n$. By Lemma 5, this is equal to the reversal of a_1, \dots, a_n . Therefore, by Lemma 3 and Corollary 3, $\ell_k(\gamma_{AB}^L) = \ell_k(\gamma_{AB}^R)$ in this case.

Now, suppose we have shown our claim for all pairs of positive integers with greatest common divisor less than g , and suppose $\gcd(p, q) = g$. Let r and s be such that $p = gr$ and $q = gs$, and let $p' = (g-1)r$ and $q' = (g-1)s$. Set $B = (q', p')$.

The poset $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{AB}^L}^{\text{ex}}$ has $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{AB'}^L}^{\text{ex}}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{\frac{p}{q}}^L}^{\text{ex}}$ as subposets, connected as below on the left. The latter is true because, as in the base case, $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{(0,0)(s,r)}^L}$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{\frac{r}{s}}}$. The vertical dots represent a chain consisting of, in decreasing order, k elements with label z , k elements with label x , and k elements with label y . This chain comes from traveling clockwise in a semicircle around B' , from $\pi + \epsilon$ to ϵ for $\epsilon > 0$. Similarly, the poset $(\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{AB}^R})^{\text{ex}}$ has $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{(q,p)B}^R}^{\text{ex}}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{\frac{p}{q}}^R}^{\text{ex}}}$ as subposets, as below on the right. By Lemma 6, $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{(q,p)B}^R}^{\text{ex}}$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{AB'}^R}^{\text{ex}}$.



By the inductive hypothesis, $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{AB'}^L}^{\text{ex}}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{AB'}^R}^{\text{ex}}$ are related by reversal, which implies the same for $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{AB}^L}^{\text{ex}}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{AB}^R}^{\text{ex}}$. \square

Our final step will be showing that straightened arcs other than those of the form γ_{AB}^L or γ_{AB}^R do not minimize ℓ_k .

Lemma 9. *Let γ^{str} be a straightened arc with endpoints in distinct points $A, B \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. If γ^{str} is not homotopic to γ_{AB}^L or γ_{AB}^R , then $\ell_k(\gamma^{\text{str}}) > \ell_k(\gamma_{AB}^L)$.*




FIGURE 4. One case of a straightened arc $\gamma^{\text{str}} = \gamma$ with endpoints in A and B which is not homotopic to γ_{AB}^L or γ_{AB}^R . We intersect this arc with another, δ , and resolve the intersection, yielding a shorter arc, γ' , with endpoints A and B . See the proof of Lemma 9.

Proof. Set $\gamma = \gamma^{\text{str}}$ throughout. This statement is shown for $k = 0$ in the proof of [21, Theorem 3.5]. Our task will be to show that we can follow the same reasoning for $k > 0$. This in particular will mean demonstrating that we can still apply skein relations in this case.

Recall that we let $r > 0$ denote the number of straight line segments comprising γ^{str} , interspersed between $r - 1$ angles θ_i . If $r = 1$, then necessarily $\gamma^{\text{str}} = \gamma_q^L = \gamma_{(0,0)(q,p)}^L$ for coprime integers p and q , and we are done. So we will assume $r > 1$ and will assume γ^{str} is not homotopic to γ_{AB}^L or γ_{AB}^R .

Notice that γ^{str} is homotopic to γ_{AB}^L (γ_{AB}^R) if and only if every $\theta_i = -\pi$ ($\theta_i = \pi$). Assume A and B are positioned such that γ_{AB}^L has every angle $\theta_i = -\pi$. Without loss of generality, let γ^{str} be such that $\theta_1 > 0$. Let i be the smallest nonnegative integer such that $\theta_{i+1} \neq \pi$.

In [21], the authors break this into three cases based on the value of θ_i : (1) $\theta_{i+1} \in [-2\pi, -\pi]$, (2) $\theta_{i+1} \in (\pi, 2\pi)$, and (3) $\theta_{i+1} = 2\pi$. In each of these cases, they describe a second arc, δ , which intersects γ . There will be an arc, γ' , in the resolution of this intersection which has endpoints in A and B . Using skein relations allows them to conclude $\ell_k(\gamma) > \ell_k(\gamma')$.

We will show how Case (1) still results in a situation for which we can apply skein relations. Notice that by our assumption that $\theta_1 > 0$, we know $i > 0$. Since each $\theta_j = \pi$ for $j \leq i$, there exists a pair of coprime integers p, q such that $Q_{j+1} = Q_j + (q, p)$ for all $0 \leq j \leq i$.

Now, consider the arc $\delta := \gamma_{AQ_{i+1}}^L$. In Figure 4, we zoom in on the behavior of these two arcs near Q_i and Q_{i+1} and see that γ and δ intersect.

Let s_1 be the chronological label of the first element in $\mathcal{P}_\gamma^{\text{ex}}$ associated to the crossing of τ (as in Figure 4) and let t_1 be the chronological label of the last element in this poset associated to the crossing of τ' near Q_{i+1} . Let s_2 and t_2 be the analogous indices in $\mathcal{P}_\delta^{\text{ex}}$; in particular, $t_2 = |\mathcal{P}_\delta^{\text{ex}}|$. By our construction of straightened arcs, we see that $\mathcal{P}_\gamma^{\text{ex}}[s_1, t_1]$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{P}_\delta^{\text{ex}}[s_2, t_2]$. Here, we are using Conventions 1 and the fact that θ_i and θ_{i+1} are opposite signs. Moreover, we have $\mathcal{P}_\gamma^{\text{ex}}(s_1 - 1) \succ \mathcal{P}_\gamma^{\text{ex}}(s_1)$, $\mathcal{P}_\gamma^{\text{ex}}(t_1 + 1) \succ \mathcal{P}_\gamma^{\text{ex}}(t_1)$ and $\mathcal{P}_\delta^{\text{ex}}(s_1 - 1) \prec \mathcal{P}_\delta^{\text{ex}}(s_1)$.

Therefore, this pair of isomorphic subposets is a crossing overlap. Proposition 1 implies that there are four nonempty posets, $\mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4, \mathcal{P}_5, \mathcal{P}_6$ such that

$$|J(\mathcal{P}_\gamma^{\text{ex}})| \cdot |J(\mathcal{P}_\delta^{\text{ex}})| = |J(\mathcal{P}_3)| \cdot |J(\mathcal{P}_4)| + |J(\mathcal{P}_5)| \cdot |J(\mathcal{P}_6)|.$$

Following Definition 4, \mathcal{P}_3 is equivalent to $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma'}^{\text{ex}}$, where γ' is the result of following δ from its start until its intersection point with γ and then following γ . Such an arc has endpoints in A and B . The poset \mathcal{P}_4 is associated to the portion of γ until its intersection with δ , which means $\mathcal{P}_4 = \mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{AQ_{i+1}}^{\text{ex}}}$ since $\theta_1 = \dots = \theta_i = \pi$. Therefore, we have

$$\ell_k(\gamma)\ell_k(\delta) = \ell_k(\gamma)\ell_k(\gamma_{AQ_{i+1}}^L) > \ell_k(\gamma')\ell_k(\gamma_{AQ_{i+1}}^R)$$

and by Lemma 8 we conclude $\ell_k(\gamma) > \ell_k(\gamma')$.

The other cases from [21] will again result in crossing overlaps in the extended posets, so that the remainder of the proof readily follows. \square

Set $m_{AB}^{(k)} := \ell_k(\gamma_{AB}^L)$. Note that in particular, if $A = (0, 0)$ and $B = (q, p)$ with $\gcd(p, q) = 1$, $m_{AB}^{(k)}$ is the k -Markov number $m_{\frac{p}{q}}^{(k)}$.

Theorem 7. *Given $A, B \in \mathbb{Z}^2$,*

$$|AB|_k = m_{AB}^{(k)}.$$

Proof. From Lemmas 7 and 9 and Proposition 2, we see that if γ is any arc with endpoints in A and B such that $\mathcal{P}_\gamma^{\text{ex}}$ is not isomorphic to $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{AB}^L}^{\text{ex}}$ or $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{AB}^R}^{\text{ex}}$, then $\ell_k(\gamma) > \ell_k(\gamma_{AB}^L)$. Therefore, we conclude γ_{AB}^L minimizes ℓ_k , and the statement follows from the definition of $m_{AB}^{(k)}$. \square


5. INDUCED ORDERING ON RATIONAL NUMBERS

5.1. The Generalized Aigner's Conjectures. In [21], the key tool for showing Aigner's conjectures is establishing a “Ptolemy Inequality” for 0-Markov distance. We will establish this for general k -Markov distance.

Proposition 3. *If $A, B, C, D \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ are four distinct points such that the segments $\overline{AB}, \overline{BC}, \overline{CD}$ and \overline{AD} form a convex quadrilateral with diagonals \overline{AC} and \overline{BD} , then*

$$|AC|_k \cdot |BD|_k \geq |AB|_k \cdot |CD|_k + |AD|_k \cdot |BC|_k$$


The key to showing Proposition 3 is to use skein relations on crossings between arcs of the form γ_{XY}^L and γ_{XY}^R . We introduced three variants of skein relations in Section 2.4; we now give three analogous ways in which two arcs can intersect. We distinguish these by saying an intersection of Type i occurs in an extreme (first or last) triangle for i of the two arcs involved.



Lemma 10. *If two arcs γ_{AC}^L and γ_{BD}^L have an intersection point of Type 0, then their corresponding extended posets have a crossing overlap.*

Proof. Let $\gamma_1 := \gamma_{AC}^L$ and $\gamma_2 := \gamma_{BD}^L$. When two arcs have an intersection of Type 0, they have at least one common intersection, which shows that the posets \mathcal{P}_{γ_1} and \mathcal{P}_{γ_2} will have an overlap. This further implies that $\mathcal{P}_1 := \mathcal{P}_{\gamma_1}^{\text{ex}}$ and $\mathcal{P}_2 := \mathcal{P}_{\gamma_2}^{\text{ex}}$ will have an overlap, say $R := \mathcal{P}_1[c, d] \cong \mathcal{P}_2[c', d']$.

It remains to show that, up to relabeling, this overlap is on top in \mathcal{P}_1 and on bottom in \mathcal{P}_2 . This can be done by analyzing a few cases near the intersections which correspond to $\mathcal{P}_1(c-1)$ and $\mathcal{P}_2(c'-1)$, when they exist. If $c > 1$ and $c' > 1$, then this will either correspond to γ_1 and γ_2 crossing distinct arcs before the overlap or crossing the same arc, say τ , but with one intersection point closer to the left endpoint of τ and the other closer to the right (using consistent orientations with respect to the overlap).



If $c = 1$ or $c' = 1$, this means that γ_1 or γ_2 begins “in” the overlap. The same three cases are possible for d and d' . In all such cases, one can check that the fact that γ_1 and γ_2 intersect implies that the overlap is on top in \mathcal{P}_1 and on bottom in \mathcal{P}_2 , up to indexing. \square

Lemma 11. *Let $A, B, C, D \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ be four distinct points such that the segments $\overline{AB}, \overline{BC}, \overline{CD}$ and \overline{AD} form a convex quadrilateral with diagonals \overline{AC} and \overline{BD} . There is a resolution of the posets $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{AC}^L}^{\text{ex}}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{BD}^L}^{\text{ex}}$, say $\{\mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4\} \cup \{\mathcal{P}_5, \mathcal{P}_6\}$ such that, up to reordering, $\mathcal{P}_3 = \mathcal{P}_{\gamma_3}^{\text{ex}}$ for γ_3 an arc with endpoints in A, B and similarly for \mathcal{P}_4 and C, D ; \mathcal{P}_5 and A, D ; and \mathcal{P}_6 and B, C .*

Proof. Notice that the statement of the Lemma concerns straight line segments, such as \overline{AC} , and not the deformed arcs γ_{AC}^L . Therefore, the intersection point between \overline{AC} and \overline{BD} could occur at an integral point. When passing to the deformed arcs γ_{AC}^L and γ_{BD}^L , this intersection point will move slightly off the integral point, but will remain in the interior of the convex quadrilateral. Therefore, we can safely focus on the left-biased curves γ_{AC}^L and γ_{BD}^L .

Assume first that $\gamma_1 := \gamma_{AC}^L$ and $\gamma_2 := \gamma_{BD}^L$ cross in a Type 0 intersection. Orient these arcs so that they pass through the overlap in the same direction (i.e., so that the overlap has a consistent chronological labeling in the two posets). Lemma 10 guarantees that the posets $\mathcal{P}_1 := \mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{AC}^L}^{\text{ex}}$ and $\mathcal{P}_2 := \mathcal{P}_{\gamma_{BD}^L}^{\text{ex}}$ have a crossing overlap. Comparing the resolution of a crossing overlap (Definition 4) with the construction of the poset associated to an arc (combining Algorithms 1 and 2), one can see that \mathcal{P}_3 is equivalent to \mathcal{P}_{γ_3} where γ_3 is the arc given by following γ_1 until the intersection point and then following γ_2 using its established orientation. This can be denoted $\gamma_1 \circ \gamma_2$; it is important to see we read this left-to-right. In this notation, similarly $\mathcal{P}_4 = \mathcal{P}_{\gamma_2 \circ \gamma_1}$. Let γ'_5 be the result of following γ_1 until the intersection point, then following γ_2 backwards, and let γ_5 be the result of pulling γ'_5 tight, removing any unnecessary intersections, but preserving the locations of all (necessary) intersections. This will exactly produce an arc such that $\mathcal{P}_5 = \mathcal{P}_{\gamma_5}$, and the description for \mathcal{P}_6 is similar.

Now, suppose γ_1 and γ_2 cross in a Type 1 intersection. Without loss of generality, assume that this intersection appears in the first face which γ_2 passes through. Let τ_a, τ_b , and τ_c be the arcs which border this triangle, such that γ_2 crosses τ_a and γ_1 crosses τ_b and τ_c , in this order. In order to satisfy the chronological labeling requirement in Definition 5, assume that γ_1 τ_b and τ_c have an endpoint to the right of γ_1 (with respect to its chosen orientation).

With this structure, we can see that $\mathcal{P}_3 = \mathcal{P}_{\gamma_1 \circ \gamma_2}$ and $\mathcal{P}_5 = \mathcal{P}_{\gamma_1^{-1} \circ \gamma_2}$. Meanwhile, \mathcal{P}_4 is associated to the arc γ_4 resulting from taking $\gamma_2 \circ \gamma_1$ and pulling this curve past all unnecessary crossings. The “unnecessary crossings” consist of τ_c and any arcs crossed afterwards by γ_1 which share an endpoint with τ_c . The poset \mathcal{P}_6 can be described similarly, using $\gamma_2 \circ \gamma^{-1}$.

Discussing a Type 2 intersection is similar, and we omit the details. The reason that \mathcal{P}_4 is set to \emptyset is that one arc in the geometric resolution will be homotopic to an arc in \mathcal{L} . \square

With these two Lemmas, we can prove the Ptolemy inequality.

Proof of Proposition 3. From Theorem 7, we have $|AC|_k = \ell_k(\gamma_{AC}^L)$ and similarly for $|BD|_k$. If $|AC|_k$ and $|BD|_k$ intersect, so do γ_{AC}^L and γ_{BD}^L . By Lemmas 10 and 11 and Proposition 1, we have

$$\ell_k(\gamma_{AC}^L) \ell_k(\gamma_{BD}^L) = \ell_k(\gamma_3) \ell_k(\gamma_4) + \ell_k(\gamma_5) \ell_k(\gamma_6)$$

where γ_3 has endpoints A, B , γ_4 has endpoints C, D , γ_5 has endpoints A, D , and γ_6 has endpoints B, C . Since $\ell_k(\gamma_3) \geq |AB|_k$ and similarly for the other γ_i , the claim follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 3. When $k = 0$, this result is [21, Theorem 4.1]. The proof only uses the Ptolemy inequality. Since we have shown the Ptolemy inequality holds for general k , we can conclude Aigner’s conjectures also hold in the k -Markov setting. \square

5.2. More Broadly. For each non-negative integer k , we have an induced partial order on $\mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]$ given by setting $\frac{p}{q} \leq_k \frac{r}{s}$ whenever $m_{\frac{p}{q}}^{(k)} \leq m_{\frac{r}{s}}^{(k)}$. If $k = 0$, then claiming that \leq_0 is a total order is equivalent to Frobenius’ conjecture. Indeed, [16, Conjecture 1.8] posits that each partial order \leq_k is a total order (i.e., a k -version of the uniqueness conjecture).

In [21], the authors widely generalize Aigner’s conjectures by exhibiting families of relations amongst Markov numbers whose rational labels sit on lines of various slopes. In this setting, Conjecture 1 concerns lines of slope 0, -1 , and ∞ .

It is natural to wonder if all these inequalities will hold for k -Markov numbers. The proof techniques used for the wider class of inequalities use more than just the Ptolemy inequality. For instance, the authors make use of the fact that the Markov numbers $m_{\frac{1}{n}}$ are the odd-indexed Fibonacci numbers and $m_{\frac{n-1}{n}}$ are odd-indexed Pell numbers. One can consider the k -versions of these families. These were considered for $k = 1$ in [5, Section 4]. For instance, compare the recurrences for Markov numbers and 1-Markov numbers indexed by rational numbers $\frac{1}{n}$. The former is a well-known relation on odd-indexed Fibonacci numbers and the latter comes from [5, Proposition 2].

$$m_{\frac{1}{n}} = 3m_{\frac{1}{n-1}} - m_{\frac{1}{n-2}} \qquad m_{\frac{1}{n}}^{(1)} = 5m_{\frac{1}{n-1}}^{(1)} - m_{\frac{1}{n-2}}^{(1)} - 1.$$

We expect that there will be similar patterns for such progressions of k -Markov numbers, and more generally numbers $m_{AB}^{(k)}$. [21, Remark 6.3] suggests an approach using skein relations involving closed curves, which follows the spirit of this article. This would be useful in making further progress towards understanding the partial order $(\mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1], \leq_k)$. However, the slight asymmetry in the combinatorial constructions related to k -Markov numbers when $k > 0$ (such

as in Lemma 5) yields non-homogeneous recurrence relations as above. This could increase the level of difficulty of directly following the methods from [21] for $k > 0$.

These considerations leads us to believe this avenue of exploration is interesting but outside the scope of the present article. We end with a question in this direction.

Question 1. *Does there exist $k, k' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\frac{p}{q}, \frac{r}{s} \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]$ such that $\frac{p}{q} \leq_k \frac{r}{s}$ but $\frac{p}{q} >_{k'} \frac{r}{s}$?*

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Aigner. *Markov's theorem and 100 years of the uniqueness conjecture*. Springer, Cham, 2013. A mathematical journey from irrational numbers to perfect matchings.
- [2] E. Banaian and Y. Gyoda. Cluster algebraic interpretation of generalized markov numbers and their matrixizations. arXiv:2507.06900, 2025.
- [3] E. Banaian, W. Kang, and E. Kelley. Skein relations for punctured surfaces. arXiv:2409.04957, 2024.
- [4] E. Banaian and E. Kelley. Snake graphs from triangulated orbifolds. *SIGMA Symmetry Integrability Geom. Methods Appl.*, 16:Paper No. 138, 50, 2020.
- [5] E. Banaian and A. Sen. A generalization of Markov numbers. *Ramanujan J.*, 63(4):1021–1055, 2024.
- [6] A. Beineke, T. Brüstle, and L. Hille. Cluster-cyclic quivers with three vertices and the Markov equation. *Algebr. Represent. Theory*, 14(1):97–112, 2011. With an appendix by Otto Kerner.
- [7] Í. Çanakçı and R. Schiffler. Snake graph calculus and cluster algebras from surfaces II: self-crossing snake graphs. *Math. Z.*, 281(1-2):55–102, 2015.
- [8] Í. Çanakçı and R. Schiffler. Cluster algebras and continued fractions. *Compos. Math.*, 154(3):565–593, 2018.
- [9] I. Canakci and R. Schiffler. Snake graph calculus and cluster algebras from surfaces. *J. Algebra*, 382:240–281, 2013.
- [10] H. Cohn. Representation of Markoff's binary quadratic forms by geodesics on a perforated torus. *Acta Arith.*, 18:125–136, 1971.
- [11] S. Elizalde, M. Plante, T. Roby, and B. E. Sagan. Rowmotion on fences. *Algebraic Combinatorics*, 6(1):17–36, 2023.
- [12] S. Fomin, M. Shapiro, and D. Thurston. Cluster algebras and triangulated surfaces. I. Cluster complexes. *Acta Math.*, 201(1):83–146, 2008.
- [13] S. Fomin and D. Thurston. Cluster algebras and triangulated surfaces Part II: Lambda lengths. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 255(1223):v+97, 2018.
- [14] S. Fomin and A. Zelevinsky. Cluster algebras I: Foundations. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 15:497–529, 2002.
- [15] J. Gaster. Boundary slopes for the Markov ordering on relatively prime pairs. *Adv. Math.*, 403:Paper No. 108377, 15, 2022.
- [16] Y. Gyoda and S. Maruyama. Uniqueness theorem of generalized markov numbers that are prime powers. arXiv:2312.07329, 2023.
- [17] Y. Gyoda, S. Maruyama, and Y. Sato. $Sl(2, \mathbb{Z})$ -matrixizations of generalized markov numbers. arXiv:2407.08203, 2024.
- [18] Y. Gyoda and K. Matsushita. Generalization of Markov Diophantine equation via generalized cluster algebra. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 30(4):Paper No. 4.10, 20, 2023.
- [19] E. Kantarcı Oğuz and E. Yıldırım. Cluster expansions: T -walks, labeled posets and matrix calculations. *J. Algebra*, 669:183–219, 2025.
- [20] C. Lagisquet, E. Pelantová, S. Tavenas, and L. Vuillon. On the Markov numbers: fixed numerator, denominator, and sum conjectures. *Adv. in Appl. Math.*, 130:Paper No. 102227, 28, 2021.
- [21] K. Lee, L. Li, M. Rabideau, and R. Schiffler. On the ordering of the Markov numbers. *Adv. in Appl. Math.*, 143:Paper No. 102453, 29, 2023.
- [22] A. Markoff. Sur les formes quadratiques binaires indéfinies. *Math. Ann.*, 17(3):379–399, 1880. (Sécond mémoire).
- [23] G. McShane. Convexity and aigner's conjectures. arXiv:2101.03316, 2021.
- [24] G. Musiker, R. Schiffler, and L. Williams. Positivity for cluster algebras from surfaces. *Adv. Math.*, 227(6):2241–2308, 2011.

- [25] G. Musiker, R. Schiffler, and L. Williams. Bases for cluster algebras from surfaces. *Compos. Math.*, 149(2):217–263, 2013.
- [26] V. Pilaud, N. Reading, and S. Schroll. Posets for f -polynomials in cluster algebras from surfaces. arXiv:2311.06033, 2023.
- [27] J. Propp. The combinatorics of frieze patterns and Markoff numbers. *INTEGERS*, 20:A12, 2020.
- [28] M. Rabideau and R. Schiffler. Continued fractions and orderings on the Markov numbers. *Adv. Math.*, 370:107231, 18, 2020.
- [29] C. Reutenauer. *From Christoffel words to Markoff numbers*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2019.

Email address: `estherbanaian@gmail.com`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE, RIVERSIDE, CA 92521