

TRIANGULATING SURFACES QUASI-ISOMETRICALLY

AGELOS GEORGAKOPOULOS AND FEDERICO VIGOLO

ABSTRACT. We prove that every complete Riemannian surface (Σ, d_Σ) admits a triangulation D whose 1-skeleton, when endowed with the inherited length metric, is quasi-isometric to (Σ, d_Σ) . Moreover, the faces of D have intrinsic diameters uniformly bounded by an arbitrarily small constant. We also prove that (Σ, d_Σ) admits a uniform net if and only if it has a triangulation whose 1-skeleton is quasi-isometric to it when equipped with the simplicial metric.

Keywords: complete Riemannian surface, triangulation, quasi-isometry, planar graph, mapping class group, flip graph.

MSC 2020 Classification: 51F30, 57M15, 57Q15, 57R05, 05C10

1. INTRODUCTION

A classical result of Rado states that every closed topological surface admits a triangulation, and it is well-known that this extends to the non-compact case [1]. If a surface Σ has additional structure, such as a metric or conformal structure, finding triangulations of Σ with desirable properties can have far-reaching consequences about Σ . For instance, there are connections between equilateral triangulations and conformal structures [3]; thick triangulations and quasimeromorphic mappings [23]; triangulations with bounded edge-length and large-scale geometry/geometric group theory [21],[18, Lemma 2.2].

In this paper we focus on the large-scale geometric structure of surfaces equipped with a complete Riemannian metric. It is known that such a surface (Σ, d_Σ) contains a subspace G homeomorphic to a graph, such that the metric that G inherits from Σ via the lengths of its edges is quasi-isometric to (Σ, d_Σ) [5, Lemma 8.2]. Our main result shows that G can be chosen so as to triangulate Σ . Moreover, we can ensure that the faces of the triangulation have arbitrarily small diameters.

To formally state our results, let us first recall that any rectifiable, arc-connected, subspace X of a Riemannian manifold (Σ, d_Σ) inherits a *length metric* d_ℓ^X via

$$(1.1) \quad d_\ell^X(x, y) := \inf\{\ell(\gamma) \mid \gamma \text{ is a } x\text{-}y \text{ arc in } X\},$$

whereby $\ell(\gamma)$ denotes the length of γ with respect to d_Σ . Our main theorem is

Theorem A. *Let (Σ, d_Σ) be a complete Riemannian surface, and $\Xi \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Then there is a triangulation \mathcal{D} of (Σ, d_Σ) each 2-cell C of which has diameter at most Ξ with respect to its length metric d_ℓ^C . Moreover, the identity map from the 1-skeleton (G, d_ℓ^G) of \mathcal{D} to (Σ, d_Σ) is (1-Lipschitz and) a quasi-isometry.*

AG is supported by EPSRC grant EP/V009044/1.

The lengths of the edges of this G obey a uniform upper-bound $c\Xi$, but no uniform lower bound. In particular, [Theorem A](#) does *not* imply that the embedding of G in Σ is a quasi-isometry when G is equipped with its simplicial graph-metric.

Understanding whether metric graphs with desirable properties are quasi-isometric to simplicial graphs with analogous properties is generally an interesting and hard problem. For instance, the first author & Papasoglu [\[15\]](#) asked whether for every graph G embedded into a Riemannian plane (Σ, d_Σ) , the metric (G, d_ℓ) is quasi-isometric to that of a simplicial planar graph. An equivalent formulation is whether every planar metric graph is quasi-isometric to a simplicial planar graph. This question was answered in the affirmative by Davies [\[9\]](#).

In turn, it is natural to ask whether every Riemannian surface can be triangulated in such a way that the embedding of the 1-skeleton is a quasi-isometry when the latter is given its simplicial graph metric. As it turns out this cannot be done in general: James Davies (private communication) constructed complete Riemannian surfaces which are not quasi-isometric to any embedded *simplicial graph*. That is, he exhibited a surface (Σ, d_Σ) so that there does not exist a graph with all edges having length 1, with an embedding into Σ that is also a quasi-isometry with (Σ, d_Σ) .

This shows that [Theorem A](#) is sharp. However, if we also assume that (Σ, d_Σ) is quasi-isometric to some graph of bounded degree, equivalently, if (Σ, d_Σ) has a uniform net [\[19\]](#) (defined in [Section 2.1](#)), then we can strengthen [Theorem A](#) to ensure that G has its edge-lengths uniformly bounded above and below, and therefore its simplicial graph metric is quasi-isometric to (Σ, d_Σ) :

Theorem B. *If a complete Riemannian surface (Σ, d_Σ) has a uniform net, then Σ admits a triangulation whose (simplicial) 1-skeleton is quasi-isometric to (Σ, d_Σ) .*

By allowing degenerate triangles in such a ‘triangulation’ we can ensure that the 0-skeleton (i.e. the vertices) of the triangulation constructed in [Theorem B](#) coincides with any given uniform net of Σ . Moreover, the 1-skeleton of our triangulation will have bounded vertex degrees up to ignoring parallel edges. Similar statements had been proved by Maillot [\[21\]](#), and our techniques provide simpler proofs and strengthenings of said results (see [Theorem 4.1](#) and the discussion following it).

1.1. Generalising the setup. Although we have been focusing on unbounded surfaces, our results and proofs can be applied essentially verbatim to families of compact surfaces with increasing diameter and genus, providing triangulations with uniform distortion bounds. On the other hand, we do not know if our results extend to higher-dimensional manifolds, see [Section 5.4](#) for more.

We prove our results for surfaces with boundary (with slightly more technical formulations): the precise statements we prove are [Theorem 3.1](#) and [Theorem 4.1](#), which directly imply [Theorem A](#) and [Theorem B](#). Moreover, almost all the techniques we use do not rely on the fact that the metric is Riemannian, so they apply to topological surfaces equipped with complete length metrics (in this setup one can use the metric Hopf–Rinow Theorem [\[7, I.3\]](#) to construct geodesics, which is all we really need). The Riemannian setting has the advantage of allowing us to use piecewise smooth paths and variations thereof, which simplifies some of our technical steps.

1.2. Eliminating the multiplicative or additive distortion. Having obtained quasi-isometric triangulation theorems, it is natural to ask if we need to have

both the multiplicative and the additive distortion involved in our quasi-isometries. Questions of this type currently attract interest in the context of coarse graph theory. Nguyen, Scott & Seymour [22] observe that there are planar (simplicial) graphs G, H such that there is a (M, A) -quasi-isometry from G to H for some (multiplicative, resp. additive) constants M, A , but no $(1, A')$ -quasi-isometry. It is thus natural to ask whether [Theorem A](#) can be sharpened by imposing that (G, d_ℓ^G) be $(1, A)$ -quasi-isometric to (Σ, d_Σ) . James Davies (private communication) pointed out that our construction can be refined to achieve this:

Corollary C. *The triangulation of [Theorem A](#) can be chosen so that (G, d_ℓ^G) is $(1, A)$ -quasi-isometric to (Σ, d_Σ) .*

Remark 1.1. Even if Σ has a uniform net, the construction of [Corollary C](#) will always contain arbitrarily short edges. We expect that it is not true in general that one can find a triangulation whose simplicial 1-skeleton is $(1, A)$ -quasi-isometric to (Σ, d_Σ) .

Similarly, one can ask whether the additive constant A can be set to 0 by modifying the quasi-isometry between fixed planar graphs G, H , i.e. whether G, H are bi-Lipschitz equivalent. In [Section 5.2](#) we combine our results with a theorem of Burago & Kleiner [8] to provide a strong negative answer:

Corollary D. *There are plane graphs G, H (with bounded degrees and face-boundary sizes, potentially with parallel edges) which are quasi-isometric but not bi-Lipschitz equivalent.*

An interesting open question is whether every (non-planar) graph G which is quasi-isometric to a planar graph H must be $(1, A)$ -quasi-isometric to some planar graph H' ; see [22] for more.

1.3. On mapping class groups and flip graphs. This work also provides an interesting perspective on ‘asymptotic’ mapping class groups and flip graphs. The mapping class group $\text{MSC}(\Sigma, X)$ of a marked surface Σ, X is a central topic in geometric topology. Computing it directly is generally hard, and therefore it is often studied by constructing a graph G whose group of graph-automorphisms is naturally isomorphic to $\text{MSC}(\Sigma, X)$. One such graph is the *flip-graph* \mathcal{F} of (Σ, X) , the vertices of which are certain triangulations of Σ . The fruitful relation between $\text{MSC}(\Sigma, X)$ and $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{F})$ is known to break down when (Σ, X) is of infinite type. As we explain in [Section 5.3](#), our triangulations can be used to adapt the definitions of the flip-graph (and the mapping class group) so that the aforementioned relation may be preserved.

Acknowledgments. We are very grateful to James Davies for various comments and the proof of [Corollary C](#).

2. NOTATION AND PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Quasi-isometries and nets. Let (X, d_X) and (Y, d_Y) be metric spaces. For $M \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$ and $A \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, an (M, A) -quasi-isometry from (X, d_X) to (Y, d_Y) is a map $\varphi: X \rightarrow Y$ such that

(1) for every $x, y \in X$ we have

$$\frac{1}{M} \cdot d_X(x, y) - A \leq d_Y(\varphi(x), \varphi(y)) \leq M \cdot d_X(x, y) + A,$$

(2) for every $y \in Y$ there is $x \in X$ such that $d_Y(y, \varphi(x)) \leq A$.

If there is such a map, (X, d_X) and (Y, d_Y) are *quasi-isometric*. It is well-known, and not hard to see, that this relation is symmetric and transitive.

Given $x \in X$ and $r > 0$, let $B(x; r)$ denote the open ball of radius r around x . Call a set $Y \subset \Sigma$ *locally finite*, if $Y \cap B$ is finite for each ball $B \subset \Sigma$ with finite radius.

A subset $Y \subset X$ is θ -separated if $d_X(x, x') > \theta$ for every $x \neq x' \in Y$. It is θ -dense if for every $y \in X$ there is $x \in Y$ with $d_X(x, y) \leq \theta$. It is a *net* if it is θ -separated and θ' -dense for some $\theta' \geq \theta > 0$. Easily, the inclusion $(Y, d_X) \hookrightarrow (X, d_X)$ is a quasi-isometry if and only if Y is θ -dense for some $\theta > 0$. We say that a net Y of X is *uniform*, if for all $R \in \mathbb{R}$ there is a $n(R) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $x \in X$, the cardinality of $Y \cap B(x; R)$ is at most $n(R)$.

2.2. Curves. A *curve* in a metric space (X, d_X) is a continuous map $\gamma: I \rightarrow X$ where $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is some interval. If $I = [a, b]$, we call $\gamma(a)$ and $\gamma(b)$ the *endpoints* of γ . A curve is *simple* if it is injective, and it is a *simple closed curve* if its endpoints coincide but it is injective otherwise.

A curve γ is *rectifiable* if its length $|\gamma|$ is finite. By a *geodesic* we mean a curve $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow X$ that realizes the distance between its endpoints, i.e. $|\gamma| = d_X(\gamma(a), \gamma(b))$. We will often omit the parametrization and identify a curve with its image $\gamma(I) \subseteq X$. If we do refer to a parametrization for a rectifiable curve, we will generally mean the arc-length parametrization.

2.3. Riemannian surfaces. A *surface (with boundary and corners)* is a topological surface X (with boundary ∂X) together with a smooth atlas so that every point has a neighbourhood that is diffeomorphic to an open set in $[0, \infty) \times [0, \infty) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. A curve $\gamma: I \rightarrow X$ is *piecewise smooth* if it is smooth except perhaps at a *discrete* set of points in I , where a set is discrete if it has no accumulation points. In particular, every connected component of ∂X is (the image of) a piecewise smooth curve in X .

Convention 2.1. Throughout the paper (Σ, d_Σ) stands for a complete connected Riemannian surface, possibly with boundary and corners.

We will sometimes need to work with contours of subsets of Σ , and we will need them to consist of unions of simple curves. This can be problematic in general, but one can always find arbitrarily small neighbourhoods that do have this property. This fact is well-known but we did not find an appropriate reference and so we provide the following proof.

Lemma 2.2. *For every subset $S \subset \Sigma$ and every $\epsilon > 0$ there is a subsurface $\Sigma' \subseteq \Sigma$ that contains S and is contained in its ϵ -neighbourhood.*

Sketch of proof. For every $s \in S$ there is a small neighbourhood $B_s \subset B(s; \epsilon)$ that is diffeomorphic to the radius-one ball $B(0; 1)$ in \mathbb{R}^2 , or $[0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}$, or $[0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)$. For $t \leq 1$, let $B_s^t \subseteq B_s$ be the subset corresponding to $B(0; t)$ via this diffeomorphism. Since Σ is locally compact, there is a locally finite set $\{s_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq S$ such that $S \subseteq \bigcup_{\mathbb{N}} B_{s_n}^{1/2}$. We may then exploit the local finiteness of $\{s_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ to choose radii $1/2 < t_n < \epsilon$ so that the closures of the neighbourhoods $B_{s_n}^{t_n}$ may only intersect in a generic way. That is, the boundary curves of the

$B_{s_n}^{t_n}$'s are never tangent to one another. The union $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_{s_n}^{t_n}$ is then a surface as required. \square

2.4. Graphs and triangulations. A *graph* is a pair $G = (V, E)$ where V is a set, called the *vertices*, and E is a multiset of non-empty subsets of V with at most two elements, called the *edges*. In other words, our graphs may have *loops* (edges with a single end-vertex) and several *parallel* edges with the same pair of end-vertices. We can consider G as a topological space by turning it into a 1-complex, i.e. by replacing each edge by a homeomorph of a unit interval with the same end-points.

A *metric graph* is a connected graph G together with an assignment of positive lengths to each edge. Such a graph is a metric space when equipped with the natural path metric. A metric graph G is *locally finite* if it is proper as a metric space; equivalently, if every ball of finite radius meets finitely many edges.

An embedding of a graph G in a surface Σ is a topological embedding of the corresponding 1-complex. In the presence of an embedding, we will sometime abuse notation and treat G as a subset of Σ , and say that $G \subset \Sigma$ is an *embedded graph*. A *face* of an embedded graph G is a connected component of $\Sigma \setminus G$. The *intrinsic metric* of a face F is the length metric d_ℓ^F inherited from Σ via (1.1), and the *intrinsic diameter* is the diameter with respect to the intrinsic metric. Note that the intrinsic metric may be arbitrarily larger than the restriction of the metric of Σ to F , since there may be shortcuts via $\Sigma - F$.

Remark 2.3. If $G \subset \Sigma$ is an embedded graph such that every edge $e \in E(G)$ is a rectifiable curve, then G can be made into a metric graph by assigning to every $e \in E(G)$ its length $|e|$ in (Σ, d_Σ) . The arc-length parametrizations of the edges then define a 1-Lipschitz embedding $G \hookrightarrow \Sigma$. In particular, the difficult part in finding embeddings that are quasi-isometric is the uniform lower bound on the metric distortion (1).

Remark 2.4. Let G be a metric graph and $\sigma: G \rightarrow \Sigma$ an embedding that is also Lipschitz. If the family of edges $\{\sigma(e) \mid e \in E(G)\}$ is *locally finite* (i.e. for every ball of finite radius $B \subseteq \Sigma$ there are only finitely many $e \in E(G)$ with $\sigma(e) \cap B \neq \emptyset$), then G is locally finite as a metric graph. If σ is also a quasi-isometric embedding, then the converse holds as well.

A *cell decomposition* of Σ is a locally finite embedded graph $G \subset \Sigma$ such that $\partial\Sigma \subseteq G$ and every face F is homeomorphic to the unit open ball $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ via a homeomorphism $B_1 \rightarrow \Sigma$ that extends to a continuous map of the disc $\mathbb{D}^2 = \overline{B_1}$ mapping $\partial\mathbb{D}^2$ into G (the image of $\partial\mathbb{D}^2$ is ∂F). This mapping defines a *boundary path* in G , and the *boundary size* of F is the number of edges in its boundary path, counted with multiplicity. We say that F is a *n-gon* if it has boundary size n . A *n-gon* F is *non-degenerate* if the boundary path is a simple closed curve (i.e. it consists of n distinct vertices and edges), otherwise it is *degenerate*. A cell decomposition is a *3-gonal decomposition* if every face is a 3-gon. By a *triangulation* we mean a 3-gonal decomposition where every face is non-degenerate.

Remark 2.5. 3-gonal decomposition are called *pseudo-triangulations* in [21]. We preferred to use the former because pseudo-triangulations of surfaces have a different meaning in computational geometry. In Hatcher's notation [17], choosing a 3-gonal decomposition would be equivalent to realizing Σ as a (unordered) Δ -complex. Other authors would call this a "generalized triangulation", or even a "triangulation".

Remark 2.6. If $G \subset \Sigma$ is a 3-gonal decomposition, we can realize the barycentric subdivision G' as an embedded graph $G \subset G' \subset \Sigma$, so that G' is a (simplicial) triangulation of Σ . Moreover, if G is a metric graph such that the embedding $G \hookrightarrow \Sigma$ is a quasi-isometry, then we can achieve that the same holds for $G' \hookrightarrow \Sigma$.

The following simple lemma converts any cell decomposition $G \subset \Sigma$ where every face has boundary size at most three into one where every face has boundary size exactly three. This is going to be very convenient in the sequel. However, when working with surfaces with boundary, we will need to assume that the intrinsic metric of the boundary is well-behaved with respect to the metric of the surface. That is, we need that (Σ, d_Σ) satisfies the following:

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} & d_\ell^{\partial\Sigma} \text{ and } d_\Sigma|_{\partial\Sigma} \text{ are locally Lipschitz-equivalent metrics. That is, for every} \\ & R > 0 \text{ there is some } M_R \geq 1 \text{ such that } d_\ell^{\partial\Sigma}(x, y) \leq M_R d_\Sigma(x, y) \text{ for every} \\ & x, y \in \partial\Sigma \text{ with } d_\Sigma(x, y) \leq R \text{ that belong to the same connected component} \\ & \text{of } \partial\Sigma. \end{aligned}$$

(This condition is obviously vacuous if $\partial\Sigma = \emptyset$.)

Lemma 2.7. *Given a cell decomposition $G \subset \Sigma$ where every face has boundary of size at most three and $|V(G)| \geq 3$, there is a subgraph $H \subset G$ that defines a 3-gonal decomposition of Σ . Moreover, if Σ satisfies (2.1), the following metric statements hold:*

- (1) *if G is a metric graph with edges of bounded length and $G \hookrightarrow \Sigma$ is a quasi-isometric embedding, then $H \hookrightarrow \Sigma$ is a quasi-isometric embedding as well;*
- (2) *if each face of G has intrinsic diameter at most R , then each face of H has intrinsic diameter at most $3R$.*

Proof. We proceed by removing parallel edges and loops bounding faces until no more are left. To do so, we enumerate $V(G)$ as v_1, v_2, \dots , and perform the following procedure for $i = 1, 2, \dots$, inductively assuming that after step $i - 1$ each face incident with v_1, \dots, v_{i-1} has boundary of size at least three.

Note that an edge e is contained in only one face with multiplicity 1 if and only if $e \subseteq \partial\Sigma$. Otherwise it belongs with multiplicity 1 to two distinct faces or with multiplicity 2 to one single face.

We would like to remove all the *bad* faces with boundary of size 0, 1 or 2; these can come in the following six types:

- (1) 0-gons (∂F is one vertex);
- (2) 1-gons;
- (3) 2-gons traversing a single loop twice;
- (4) 2-gons traversing two distinct loops on the same vertex;
- (5) 2-gons traversing a single edge in both directions;
- (6) 2-gons on two distinct, parallel, edges.

We start by observing that we will never meet faces of type (1), (3) or (5), because each of those cases implies that $\bar{F} = \Sigma$, and hence $|V(G)| \leq 2$ (cases (1) and (5) only happen if $\Sigma = \mathbb{S}^2$, while (3) implies that $\Sigma = \mathbb{P}R^2$).

We may now describe the inductive step. Suppose there is a bad face F incident with v_i . It must be of type (2), (4), or (6). If F is of type (2), we simply remove the loop e contained in ∂F . Since e is only traversed once in ∂F , by removing it we are merging F with another face F' having e on its boundary (e cannot be a boundary

edge, as this would imply that $\Sigma = \overline{F}$ is a disk and $|V(G)| = 1$). This results in a face F'' that is still homeomorphic to an open ball, and has smaller boundary size than F' . This F'' is not a 3-gon yet, but since it is still incident with v_i it will be dealt with in a subsequent step of this process.

If F is of type (4) or (6), let e, e' be the two parallel edges in ∂F . As before, it cannot be that both of them are boundary edges, because this would imply $|V(G)| \leq 2$. We are going to remove one of the non-boundary edges, say e' . If both e and e' are internal edges, we can assume that e' is the longest one. As before, this merges F with another face F' having e' on its boundary. Note that the resulting face is an open ball that has the same boundary size as F' .

We repeat this procedure until there are no more bad faces incident with v_i . Note that eventually we must stop, because G is locally finite and hence v_i is incident with only finitely many edges, and hence faces. At that point all faces incident with v_i (including those incident with any v_j , with $j < i$) are 3-gons. As the process goes through all i , it converges to a subgraph $H \subseteq G$ which is a 3-gonal decomposition of Σ .

Our two metric statements follow easily: for (1) we claim that there exists $M \geq 1$ such that $d_G(v_i, v_j) \leq d_H(v_i, v_j) \leq M d_G(v_i, v_j)$ for any choice of vertices v_i, v_j . Indeed, the leftmost inequality is obvious. For the rightmost inequality it suffices to observe that to obtain H from G we have:

- (1) removed loops;
- (2) removed non-loop edges e' leaving there a shorter parallel edge e ;
- (3) removed non-loop edges e' connecting two vertices in a connected component of $\partial\Sigma$.

The first two operations do not increase the path-distance between v_i and v_j . The third operation may increase it, but by a bounded amount, because $\partial\Sigma$ is contained in H and (2.1) ensures that the $d_t^{\partial\Sigma}$ -distance between the endpoints of e' is bounded by $M_R|e'|$, where R is an upper bound on the length of the edges in G .

For (2), observe that a face F of H with vertices v_1, v_2, v_3 is obtained by glueing (finitely many) faces F_i of G whose vertex-sets are contained in $\{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$. Since all the F_i have intrinsic diameter at most R , we deduce that $d(v_i, v_j) \leq R$ for every $i, j = 1, 2, 3$ and that $\{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ is R -dense in F . Our claim now follows from the triangle inequality. \square

2.5. Resolving intersections of curves. We will later need to control how curves in a surface intersect. The following lemma allows us to push certain intersecting, but non-crossing, curves away from each other by taking a small perturbation in their neighbourhood as depicted in Figure 1.

Lemma 2.8. *Let Σ be a complete Riemannian surface, possibly with boundary and corners, and let $T \subset \Sigma$ be an embedded finite rooted tree consisting of piecewise smooth curves of finite length. Let o be the root and $\{p_i \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$ be the leaves. Then for every $\epsilon > 0$ we may find piecewise smooth curves γ_i joining p_i to o such that:*

- (1) distinct γ_i only meet at o ;
- (2) $\bigcup_i \gamma_i$ is within Hausdorff distance ϵ from T ;
- (3) $|\gamma_i| - d_T(x_i, o) \leq \epsilon$;
- (4) the curves γ_i can only meet $\partial\Sigma$ at o .




FIGURE 1. Transforming a rooted tree T into a collection of disjoint paths meeting at the root (blue lines in the picture).

Moreover, if $T \cap \partial\Sigma$ consists of leaves and (possibly) the root, we may also replace (4) by

$$(4') \quad (\bigcup_i \gamma_i) \cap \partial\Sigma = T \cap \partial\Sigma.$$

The proof of this is one of the few occasions in the paper where the Riemannian structure is helpful.

Proof of Lemma 2.8. Orient the edges of T so that they point away from o . Subdividing edges in T if necessary, we may assume that every edge $e \subseteq T$ is smooth. Moreover, we may assume that e only meets $\partial\Sigma$ on one side, so that we can construct a nearby path completely contained in the interior of Σ by “pushing it” in the other direction. Formally, this can be done by appropriately choosing a smooth variation of e . Say that e is given a constant speed parametrization $e: [0, 1] \rightarrow \Sigma$, with $e(0)$ closer to the root $o \in T$. We consider a unit vector field $V(t)$ along e that is perpendicular to $\dot{e}(t)$ and points towards the interior of Σ . Fix a very small $\epsilon' > 0$ (to be determined later). For every $t \in [0, 1 - \epsilon']$, if s is small enough, $\exp(stV(t))$ is a point in Σ .¹ It follows that if we fix $0 < \delta \leq \epsilon'$ small enough, the mapping $(s, t) \mapsto \exp(stV(t))$ defines a smooth variation $E: [0, 1 - \epsilon'] \times [0, \delta) \rightarrow \Sigma$ ([12, Chapter 5-4]) such that if we let $e_s(t) := E(t, s)$ then:

- E is a smooth embedding on $(0, 1 - \epsilon'] \times [0, \delta)$;
- $e(t) = e_0(t)$ for every $t \in [0, 1 - \epsilon']$;
- $E(0, s) = e(0)$ for every $s \in [0, \delta)$;
- e_s is at Hausdorff distance at most $2\epsilon'$ from e ;
- $||e_s| - |e|| < 2\epsilon'$.

Note that, as $s > 0$ varies, the smooth curves e_s only meet at $e(0)$ and are disjoint from $\partial\Sigma$ except perhaps at $e(0)$. Moreover, taking δ small enough we may also arrange that the curves e_s and e'_s are disjoint as the edges e, e' vary.

Pick $0 < s_1 < \dots < s_{n_e}$, where n_e is the number of paths in T going from the leaves to the root o that cross e . As $e \in E(T)$ and $i = 0, \dots, n_e$ vary, we may now arbitrarily join up all the curves e_{s_i} with appropriately chosen piecewise smooth

¹We only define the variation on $(0, 1 - \epsilon']$ to avoid difficulties if $e(1)$ is a sharp corner in $\partial\Sigma$ and to ensure that different edges give rise to disjoint variations.

paths contained in $2\epsilon'$ -balls around the vertices of T (see [Figure 1](#)). The difference in length between these new paths and the paths in T is bounded by $6|V(T)|\epsilon'$.

The “moreover” part of the statement is proven by letting $s_1 = 0$ for every edge e and judiciously joining the curves at their endpoints. \square

2.6. Arcs in minimal positions and ϵ -geodesics. Suppose that Σ is homeomorphic to the disc \mathbb{D}^2 . A curve $\gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow \Sigma$ is an *arc* if $\{0, 1\} = \gamma^{-1}(\partial\Sigma)$. A *simple arc* is an arc that is a simple curve (it may be a simple closed curve meeting $\partial\Sigma$ at its endpoint). We say that two simple arcs α, β are in *minimal position* if $\alpha \cap \beta \setminus \partial\Sigma$ consists of one point if the endpoints of α and β separate each other in $\partial\Sigma \cong \mathbb{S}^1$, and empty otherwise (this includes the case where α and β share an endpoint).

A curve γ connecting two points $x, y \in \Sigma$ is an ϵ -geodesic if it is piecewise smooth and $|\gamma| < d(x, y) + \epsilon$.

Proposition 2.9. *Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ be arcs in a surface Σ homeomorphic to \mathbb{D}^2 . Then there exist piecewise smooth ϵ -geodesics β_i which are simple arcs with the same endpoints as α_i and are pairwise in minimal position.*

For the proof of this we will need

Lemma 2.10. *Let Σ be homeomorphic to \mathbb{D}^2 and α, β be piecewise smooth simple arcs that are ϵ_α resp. ϵ_β -geodesics. Let $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n$ be simple arcs that are in minimal position with respect to both α and β . Then for every $\delta > 0$ there is a piecewise smooth simple arc β' with the same endpoints as β that is an $(\epsilon_\alpha + \epsilon_\beta + \delta)$ -geodesic and is in minimal position with α and all the γ_i .*

Proof. If $\alpha \cap \beta \setminus \partial\Sigma$ is empty there is nothing to do. Otherwise, let β'' be the arc obtained by following β until it first meets α , then following α until its last intersection with β , and then resuming to follow β until its other end. This is an $(\epsilon_\alpha + \epsilon_\beta)$ -geodesic that intersects α in one subsegment $\xi \subseteq \alpha$.

We claim that β'' is in minimal position with each γ_i . Let $\beta'' = \beta_- \cup \xi \cup \beta_+$, and $\beta = \beta_- \cup \beta_0 \cup \beta_+$. If $\gamma_i \cap \xi = \emptyset$, then $\beta'' \cap \gamma_i \subseteq \beta \cap \gamma_i$ and there is nothing to show. Otherwise, $\gamma_i \cap \xi = \gamma_i \cap \alpha$ consists of exactly one point and the endpoints of α separate those of γ_i . But then γ_i must intersect β_0 , because the path following α until it reaches β_0 , then β_0 , and then α again separates the endpoints of γ_i . Since β is in minimal position with γ_i , the same is true for β'' .

We can now apply the technique of [Lemma 2.8](#) to “push β'' away from α ”: we thus find an arbitrarily small variation β' of β'' that is in minimal position with α . This can be done so that $|\beta' \cap \gamma_i| = |\beta'' \cap \gamma_i|$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. \square

Proof of [Proposition 2.9](#). Let $\bar{\alpha}_i$ be geodesics in Σ with the same endpoints of α_i . To begin with, we apply [Lemma 2.8](#) to each $\bar{\alpha}_i$ separately find arbitrarily small variations thereof that only meet ∂P at their endpoints. These are simple arcs that are δ -geodesic for arbitrarily small $\delta > 0$.

We may then iteratively fix $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and apply [Lemma 2.10](#) to each pair $\bar{\alpha}_i, \bar{\alpha}_j$ with $j > i$ to put all the $\bar{\alpha}_j$ in minimal position with $\bar{\alpha}_i$, while maintaining it in minimal position with all the $\bar{\alpha}_k$ with $k < i$. Doing this for every i concludes the proof. \square

3. THE MAIN RESULT

The following is our main technical result.

Theorem 3.1. *Let Σ be a complete Riemannian surface, possibly with boundary and corners. For every $\Xi > 0$ there exists a locally finite metric graph G with a 1-Lipschitz embedding $G \hookrightarrow \Sigma$ such that:*

- (1) G defines a 3-gonal decomposition of Σ ;
- (2) every edge of G has length at most Ξ ;
- (3) every face F of G has diameter at most Ξ with respect to its intrinsic metric d_F^F .

Moreover, if $\partial\Sigma$ satisfies (2.1), then

- (4) $G \hookrightarrow \Sigma$ is a quasi-isometry.

By Remark 2.6, applying a barycentric subdivision to the 3-gonal decomposition of Theorem 3.1, we obtain:

Corollary 3.2. *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 3.1, we can further achieve that G induces a triangulation of Σ .*

Remark 3.3. It is plausible that Theorem 3.1 remains true without the assumption (2.1), but this would introduce substantial technical difficulties. We thus decided to work under this restriction, which is satisfied by all natural surfaces we could think of.

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 3.1.

3.1. Constructing a quasi-isometrically embedded metric graph. The construction of our graph begins with a choice of two constants:

- (3.1) Fix (small) parameters θ and Θ with $0 < \theta < \Theta/2$.

We could once and for all fix *e.g.* $\theta = \Theta/3$ (and take $\Theta = \Xi/138$, where Ξ is the constant of Theorem 3.1), but we prefer to keep the parameters independent as they represent two different quantities: the density of vertices vs. the maximal length of edges.

Our next choice is a pre-selection of vertices:

- (3.2) let $X \subset \Sigma$ be a locally finite subset that is θ -dense and such that $X \cap \partial\Sigma$ is θ -dense on each connected component of $\partial\Sigma$ with respect to the intrinsic metric (the last condition is vacuous if $\partial\Sigma = \emptyset$).

It is easy to see that such a set X exists, for instance by choosing a θ -net in Σ (*e.g.* picking a maximal θ -separated subset) and adding to it a θ -net of each connected component of $\partial\Sigma$. The resulting set is locally finite because every point in Σ has a neighbourhood that intersects at most one component C of $\partial\Sigma$ and this intersection has finite diameter in (C, d_C^C) .

We will construct a graph \overline{G} obtained by uniting $\partial\Sigma$ with a family of curves of length at most Θ joining points in X . The key point is to choose sufficiently many curves to represent every (local) homotopy type of short curves.

Formally, enumerate the pairs of points $\{x, y\} \subset X$ with $d_\Sigma(x, y) < \Theta$, and for every such pair choose some compact subsurface (with boundary) $\Sigma_{\{x, y\}} \subseteq \Sigma$ that contains $B(x; \Theta) \cap B(y; \Theta)$ and is itself contained in a $\theta/2$ -neighbourhood of it (Lemma 2.2). Consider homotopy classes of curves $\gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow \Sigma_{\{x, y\}}$ joining x to y . Observe that there are only finitely many such classes, because $\Sigma_{\{x, y\}}$ is a compact surface. Enumerate the homotopy classes that contain a curve γ of length less than Θ .

We will now iteratively choose a family $\Gamma_{\{x,y\}}$ of representatives for these homotopy classes. Specifically, for every such homotopy class, we choose a representative $\bar{\gamma}$ that is a piecewise smooth curve of length less than Θ which may only meet $\partial\Sigma$ at its endpoints and intersects all the previously chosen representatives (including those belonging to $\Gamma_{\{x',y'\}}$ for previously considered pairs $\{x',y'\} \subset X$) in finitely many points. Such a representative can be found *e.g.* by perturbing a shortest representative of the homotopy class using [Lemma 2.8](#).

Let

$$\Gamma_\Sigma := \bigcup \{ \Gamma_{\{x,y\}} \mid \{x,y\} \subset X, d_\Sigma(x,y) < \Theta \}.$$

Since X is locally finite, and each $\Gamma_{\{x,y\}}$ is a finite collection of curves, the collection Γ_Σ is locally finite in Σ .

We let \bar{G} be the graph traced by $\Gamma \cup \partial\Sigma$. More precisely, we let

$$V(\bar{G}) := X \cup \bigcup \{ \bar{\gamma} \cap \bar{\gamma}' \mid \bar{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}' \in \Gamma \} \subset \Sigma$$

and let $E(\bar{G})$ be the set of all the subsegments of curves in Γ or $\partial\Sigma$ that connect points in $V(\bar{G})$ and do not contain any other vertex in their interior. Note that the edges coming from $\partial\Sigma$ have length bounded by Θ because $X \cap \partial\Sigma$ is θ -dense in the intrinsic metric.

The graph \bar{G} will generally have loops and multiple edges (especially if Θ is large). By construction, \bar{G} is embedded in Σ . When equipped with its arc-length metric, \bar{G} is a locally finite metric graph with a 1-Lipschitz embedding $\bar{G} \hookrightarrow \Sigma$ ([Remark 2.3](#)), and edge-lengths at most Θ . The graph G of [Theorem 3.1](#) will be eventually obtained from \bar{G} by adding more edges to it and then removing some redundancy using [Lemma 2.7](#).

Remark 3.4. Observe that, by construction, $V(\bar{G}) \cap \partial\Sigma = X \cap \partial\Sigma$.

The following is the key property of \bar{G} that will allow us to prove (4).

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow \Sigma$ be a rectifiable curve with endpoints in $X \subseteq V(\bar{G})$. Then there exists a path $\bar{\gamma}$ in $\bar{G} \subset \Sigma$ such that*

- (1) γ and $\bar{\gamma}$ are homotopic within the 2Θ -neighbourhood of γ ;
- (2) $|\bar{\gamma}|$ satisfies

$$|\bar{\gamma}| \leq \frac{\Theta}{\Theta - 2\theta} |\gamma| + \Theta.$$

Proof. Parameterise γ by arc length. Let $n = \lfloor |\gamma| / (\Theta - 2\theta) \rfloor$ and for every $0 \leq k \leq n$ let $p_k := \gamma(k(\Theta - 2\theta))$. Finally, let $p_{n+1} := y$. For every $0 \leq k \leq n+1$ let x_k be a point in X nearest to p_k (in particular, $x_0 = p_0$ and $x_{n+1} = p_{n+1}$). Further let α_k be a geodesic path from p_k to x_k , and note that $|\alpha_k| \leq \theta$ since X is θ -dense in Σ .

Let γ_k denote the segment of γ between p_k and p_{k+1} . The curve $\alpha_k^{-1} \gamma_k \alpha_{k+1}$ has length at most Θ . By construction, $\alpha_k^{-1} \gamma_k \alpha_{k+1}$ is contained in the subsurface $\Sigma_{\{x_k, x_{k+1}\}}$, and is hence homotopic within $\Sigma_{\{x_k, x_{k+1}\}}$ to one of the fixed representatives $\bar{\gamma}_k \in \Gamma_{\{x_k, x_{k+1}\}}$. In particular, the homotopy between $\alpha_k^{-1} \gamma_k \alpha_{k+1}$ and $\bar{\gamma}_k$ is entirely contained in the $(\Theta + \theta)$ -ball centered at p_k . By construction, $\bar{\gamma}_k$ is contained in \bar{G} .

We may then join the curves $\bar{\gamma}_k$ to obtain a curve $\bar{\gamma}$ that is homotopic to γ . Moreover, we have

$$|\bar{\gamma}| = \sum_{k < n} |\bar{\gamma}_k| \leq (n+1)\Theta \leq \frac{\Theta}{\Theta - 2\theta} |\gamma| + \Theta. \quad \square$$

We can now prove claim (4) of [Theorem 3.1](#):

Corollary 3.6. *The embedding $\overline{G} \hookrightarrow \Sigma$ is a quasi-isometry.*

Proof. Let x, y be points in X . Applying [Lemma 3.5](#) to a geodesic connecting them in Σ , we deduce that

$$(3.3) \quad (1 - 2\theta/\Theta)d_{\overline{G}}(x, y) - \Theta + 2\theta \leq d_{\Sigma}(x, y) \leq d_{\overline{G}}(x, y).$$

The claim follows, because X is coarsely dense in both \overline{G} and Σ . \square

Remark 3.7. We observe that when the parameter θ goes to zero the quasi-isometry constants improve and the embedding becomes ever closer to be a rough isometry. On the other hand, the resulting graph \overline{G} will have many more vertices and edges.

Remark 3.8. If Σ is a surface where the surfaces $\Sigma_{\{x,y\}}$ can be chosen to be simply connected (*e.g.* because they are convex), and X is a uniform net, then the graph \overline{G} has bounded degree.

3.2. Bounding the extrinsic diameter of the faces. We shall now show that $\Sigma \setminus \overline{G}$ has connected components of uniformly bounded diameter, which hence have compact closure.

Proposition 3.9. *Each face of $\overline{G} \subset \Sigma$ has d_{Σ} -diameter at most 13Θ .*

Note that this does not yet prove that the intrinsic diameter is bounded as claimed in [\(3\)](#); but it is an important intermediate step towards that statement.

Proof. Suppose to the contrary there is a face F containing two points p, p' with $d_{\Sigma}(p, p') = 13\Theta$ and pick a smooth, simple curve $c \subset F$ joining p to p' . We will reach a contradiction by showing that there is an edge in \overline{G} crossing c .

The constant 13Θ is large enough that we can split c into sub-segments as $c = c_- \cup c_m \cup c_+$ such that

- (1) $d_{\Sigma}(c_-, c_+) \geq 2\theta$;
- (2) both the endpoints of c_- and those of c_+ are at d_{Σ} -distance greater than $(4\Theta + 3\theta)$ from one another.

Let N_0 be the closed 2θ -neighbourhood of c_m . Enlarging N_0 a little if necessary, we may assume that it is a (compact) subsurface of Σ ([Lemma 2.2](#)). Let c_0 be the closure of the connected component of $c \setminus \partial N_0$ containing c_m .

Let N_1 be the closed $(2\Theta + \theta)$ -neighbourhood of N_0 ([Figure 2](#)). We again assume that it is a submanifold of Σ and let c_1 be the closure of the connected component of $c \setminus \partial N_1$ containing c_0 . Similarly, N_2 is the 2Θ -neighbourhood of N_1 and c_2 is the closure of the component of $c \setminus \partial N_2$ containing c_1 . Note that condition (2) implies that the curves c_i are properly nested, and that for each $i = 0, 1, 2$ the curve c_i meets the boundary ∂N_i in two points $p_i^- \in c_-$ and $p_i^+ \in c_+$.

We now distinguish two cases depending on whether $N_1 \setminus c_1$ is connected.

Case I. Assume $N_1 \setminus c_1$ is connected. Since $X = V(\overline{G})$ is θ -dense, we can choose a point $x \in X \cap N_1$. We can also choose a simple closed curve $\gamma \subset N_1$ that starts at x and intersects c_1 at exactly one point (head towards c_1 , cross it, and return to x using that $N_1 \setminus c_1$ is path connected). Let $\bar{\gamma}$ be the path in \overline{G} given by [Lemma 3.5](#). By construction, the homotopy between γ and $\bar{\gamma}$ takes place within N_2 . Since c_2 is a simple arc joining two points in ∂N_2 and $\gamma \cap c_2 = \gamma \cap c_1$ is one point, it follows that $\bar{\gamma}$ must also intersect c_2 in an odd number of points (this can be seen in several




FIGURE 2. Constructing nested surfaces around the middle portion of a very long curve c .




FIGURE 3. Constructing a curve γ with endpoints in X that cut c in the case that $N_1 \setminus c_1$ is disconnected.

ways, for instance with a homological argument, or by taking the double of N_2 in order to prolong c_2 to a closed curve and apply standard intersection theory see e.g. [16, Section 2.4]). Hence c crosses an edge of \bar{G} , contradiction.

Case II (Figure 3). Assume $N_1 \setminus c_1$ is disconnected. Then $N_0 \setminus c_0$ is a fortiori disconnected (every point in N_1 is connected to N_0 via a path avoiding c). It follows that p_0^+ and p_0^- must belong to the same component C of ∂N_0 (if a simple arc c' in a connected surface Σ' meets a boundary component C' at a single point, then $\Sigma' \setminus c'$ is path connected because so is $C' \setminus c'$).

Note that C is a circle and p_0^+ and p_0^- cut it into two segments, each of which connects c_- to c_+ . By continuity, (1) implies that each of these segments contain points that are at distance greater than θ from both c_- and c_+ . Let q and q' be two such points, one for each segment. Since every point on C is at distance greater than θ from c_m , it follows that q and q' are at distance greater than θ from $c = c_- \cup c_m \cup c_+$. Let x_- and x_+ be points in X closest to q_- and q_+ respectively. Since the balls $B(q; \theta)$ and $B(q'; \theta)$ are contained in $N_1 \setminus c$, the points x and x' belong to different components of $N_1 \setminus c_1$.

We arbitrarily choose a curve γ joining x_- with x_+ without leaving the (closed) θ -neighbourhood of N_0 , and apply Lemma 3.5 to obtain a curve $\bar{\gamma}$ in \bar{G} homotopic to it. The homotopy between γ and $\bar{\gamma}$ takes place in N_1 by construction, and in

particular $\bar{\gamma}$ is a curve connecting x and x' in N_1 . Since x and x' are in two distinct components of $N_1 \setminus c_1$, it follows that $\bar{\gamma}$ intersects c . \square

3.3. Proving that faces are discs. The construction of $\bar{G} \subset \Sigma$ of [Section 3.1](#) is designed to give rise to a cell decomposition of Σ ([Section 2.4](#)). To prove this, we start with a few preliminary observations, which will be of use both here and in the next section.

Suppose $G \subset \Sigma$ is some embedded graph whose edges are piecewise smooth and have finite length. Given a face F of G with compact closure, we can consider it with its own intrinsic path-metric d_F^F and denote by \hat{F} its completion. Observe that \hat{F} will generally differ from the closure $\bar{F} \subseteq \Sigma$, and it is a compact Riemannian surface with boundary and corners (taking the completion of the interior with respect to the intrinsic metric has the effect of “opening up” non-trivial glueings of the boundary). In particular, $\partial\hat{F} := \hat{F} \setminus F$ is homeomorphic to a disjoint union of loops. Note that the inclusion $F \hookrightarrow \Sigma$ extends to a 1-Lipschitz surjective map $p: (\hat{F}, d_F) \rightarrow (\bar{F}, d_\Sigma)$ such that $p^{-1}(\partial F) = \partial\hat{F}$. In turn, p descends to a homeomorphism when quotienting out the boundary

$$\hat{F}/\partial\hat{F} \cong \bar{F}/\partial F \cong \Sigma/(\Sigma \setminus F).$$

Let now F be a face of the embedded graph \bar{G} constructed in [Section 3.1](#). To prove that \bar{G} is a cell decomposition it is enough to show that \hat{F} is homeomorphic to the disc \mathbb{D}^2 . Let $\pi: \hat{F} \rightarrow \hat{F}/\partial\hat{F}$ be the quotient map. We observe the following.

Lemma 3.10. *If $\gamma: I \rightarrow \hat{F}$ is a path with endpoints in $\partial\hat{F}$, then the closed loop $\pi \circ \gamma: I \rightarrow \hat{F}/\partial\hat{F}$ is null-homotopic.*

Proof. Consider the path $p \circ \gamma$ in Σ and note that if we identify $\hat{F}/\partial\hat{F} \cong \Sigma/(\Sigma \setminus F)$ then $\pi \circ \gamma = \pi_\Sigma \circ p \circ \gamma$, where π_Σ is the quotient map $\Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma/(\Sigma \setminus F)$. We may prolong $p \circ \gamma$ along \bar{G} to obtain a path γ' with endpoints in X , and we observe that $\pi \circ p \circ \gamma$ and $\pi \circ \gamma'$ are homotopic as closed loops. By [Lemma 3.5](#), γ' is homotopic to a path $\bar{\gamma}' \subseteq \bar{G} \subseteq \Sigma \setminus F$. But then we are done, because $\pi \circ \bar{\gamma}'$ is constant in $\Sigma/(\Sigma \setminus F)$. \square

Given the the classification of compact surfaces, the following fact is an exercise in algebraic topology (which can be solved using either fundamental groups or homology computations).

Fact 3.11. *A connected compact surface Δ with $\partial\Delta \neq \emptyset$ is homeomorphic to a disk if and only if the image of every path $\gamma: I \rightarrow \Delta$ with endpoints in $\partial\Delta$ under the quotient map $\pi: \Delta \rightarrow \Delta/\partial\Delta$ is null-homotopic (i.e. $\pi \circ \gamma = 0 \in \pi_1(\Delta/\partial\Delta)$).*

Combining [Fact 3.11](#) with [Lemma 3.10](#), we obtain:

Corollary 3.12. *$\bar{G} \subset \Sigma$ defines a cell decomposition of Σ .*

3.4. Cutting into a 3-gonal decomposition. Having just proved that $\bar{G} \subset \Sigma$ induces a cell decomposition, it is now straightforward to obtain a 3-gonal decomposition $G \subset \Sigma$ by adding extra edges if necessary. However, since [Proposition 3.9](#) does not bound the *intrinsic* diameter, the newly added edges may be too long, thus spoiling the metric properties of the embedding. The aim of this subsection is to address this difficulty and establish (3) of [Theorem 3.1](#) while preserving (2).

Let F be a face of \overline{G} , let \widehat{F} be its completion with respect to the intrinsic metric d_ℓ^F , and $p: \widehat{F} \rightarrow \overline{F}$ as in [Section 3.3](#). Observe that the graph structure of $\partial F \subseteq \overline{G}$ lifts to a graph structure on $\partial \widehat{F}$, where vertices are preimages of vertices and edges are lifts of edges. Moreover, every edge $e \in \partial \widehat{F}$ has the same length as its image $p(e) \in E(\overline{G})$. Note that \widehat{F} is a *piecewise smooth polygon* with edge-lengths bounded by Θ . That is, it is a disc whose boundary (considered as a graph) is a cycle consisting of finitely many edges, each of which is piecewise smooth and has length bounded by Θ . Moreover, since X is θ -dense, the polygon \widehat{F} is also θ -thin; that is, every point in \widehat{F} is within distance θ from $\partial \widehat{F}$. To conclude the proof of [Theorem 3.1](#), it is then enough to triangulate such a polygon by edges of controlled length.

Recall that a curve is an ϵ -geodesic if its length realizes the distance of its endpoints up to ϵ ([Section 2.6](#)).

Lemma 3.13. *If $e \subset \partial P$ is an edge of a θ -thin polygon P , and e is an ϵ -geodesic, then every point in e is within distance $2\epsilon + 3\theta$ from $\partial P \setminus e$.*

Proof. Given $x \in e$, let N be a subsurface with $B(x; \epsilon + 2\theta) \subseteq N \subseteq B(x; 2\epsilon + 2\theta)$, provided by [Lemma 2.2](#). If N intersects $\partial P \setminus e$, there is nothing to do. If that is not the case, note that ∂N is contained in $e \cup (P \setminus B(x; \epsilon + 2\theta))$ (here ∂N denotes the surface boundary, not the topological boundary of the subset $N \subset P$). Let e_0 be the component of $e \cap B(x; \epsilon/2 + \theta)$ containing x , and decompose e into (non-empty) segments as $e = e_- \cup e_0 \cup e_+$.

Observe that no point in $\partial N \setminus e$ can be within distance θ from both e_- and e_+ , because otherwise e would not be an ϵ -geodesic since $|e_0| \geq 2\theta + \epsilon$. On the other hand the component of ∂N containing x is a simple closed curve γ that contains e_0 . It follows that $\gamma \setminus e$ must have a component γ' that joins a point in e_- to a point in e_+ . Since γ' is contained in $P \setminus B(x; \epsilon + 2\theta)$, it contains points at distance greater than θ from e_- and e_+ respectively, and since it is connected it must also contain a point that is at distance greater than θ from both e_- and e_+ simultaneously. That point is also at distance greater than θ from $e_0 \subset B(x; \epsilon/2 + \theta)$, so it is not θ -close to e , and must hence be in the θ -neighbourhood of $\partial P \setminus e$. \square

Proposition 3.14. *Let $\theta < \Theta/2$ and let P be a θ -thin piecewise smooth n -gon with edge-length bounded by Θ and $n > 3$. We may triangulate P by adding finitely many arcs of length at most $12(3\theta + \Theta)$ and no new vertices.*

Proof. Let $\kappa := 3\theta + \Theta$. We arbitrarily fix a small $0 < \epsilon < \Theta/4$. Let $A = \{\alpha_i \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$ be a family of curves of maximal cardinality such that

- each α_i is a piecewise smooth ϵ -geodesic of length less than 12κ that join non-adjacent vertices in ∂P and is otherwise contained in the interior of P ;
- no pair of vertices in ∂P is joined by more than one curve in A ;
- the curves α_i do not intersect in the interior of P .

We claim that A yields the required triangulation of P .

We prove the claim by contradiction, assuming that $P \setminus A$ has a face F that is not a triangle. Observe that

$$(3.4) \quad \partial F \text{ must contain an edge } \alpha_0 \text{ of length at least } 6\kappa,$$

because otherwise we may dissect F further using ϵ -geodesics of length less than 12κ by joining non-consecutive vertices in ∂P at distance less than 12κ ([Proposition 2.9](#)).




FIGURE 4. The thick lines are disjoint ϵ -geodesics. In the case where the curves crossing the short path β_m are not connected, removing them and adding ϵ -geodesics from their endpoints to v_m increases the cardinality of the family

Since the edges in ∂P have length at most Θ , we deduce that α_0 must be one of the curves in A .

The ϵ -geodesic α_0 cuts P into two piecewise smooth polygons, P' and P'' , both of which are θ -thin. We may assume that F is contained in P' . Let $v_-, v_+ \in \partial P'$ be the endpoints of α_0 . By [Lemma 3.13](#) applied to P' , every point $m \in \alpha_0$ is within distance $3\theta + \epsilon$ from $\partial P' \setminus \alpha_0$. Therefore, there must be a vertex in $\partial P'$ that is at distance at most

$$(3.5) \quad 3\theta + \Theta/2 + \epsilon < \kappa$$

from m . Let w_m be a vertex of P' that is closest to m .

Observe that if m is chosen so that both $d(v_-, m)$ and $d(m, v_+)$ are at least κ , then w_m is neither v_- nor v_+ , and is hence some other vertex in $\partial P' \setminus \alpha_0$. Given such a point m , let β_m be a piecewise smooth δ -geodesic connecting m and w_m in P' , where $\delta > 0$ is small enough that we may apply [Proposition 2.9](#) to modify curves in $A \setminus \{\alpha_0\}$ so that they are still ϵ -geodesic and are in minimal position with respect to β_m . Moreover, by (3.5), δ can be chosen small enough that

$$(3.6) \quad |\beta_m| + \epsilon \leq (3\theta + \Theta/2 + \epsilon) + \delta + \epsilon < \kappa = 3\theta + \Theta.$$

Let $B_m \subseteq A$ be the set of curves that intersect β_m outside ∂P . We observe that, as a graph, B_m contains no closed loop, *i.e.* it is a forest, and it is non-empty because α_0 belongs to it. By Euler's formula, we thus have

$$|V(B_m)| = |B_m| + |\{\text{components of } B_m\}| \geq |B_m| + 1.$$

Also note that if $\alpha \in B_m$ intersects β_m in some point x which splits α as $\alpha_- \cup \alpha_+$, then

$$(3.7) \quad \text{both } |\alpha_-| \text{ and } |\alpha_+| \text{ are at least } d(x, w_m),$$

because otherwise w_m would not be a closest vertex to m . One can hence perform the following construction:

- Remove every curve in B_m from A . In their place, add for every vertex in $V(B_m)$ which is not adjacent to w_m in $\partial P'$ one arc connecting it with w_m .
- (3.8) Then add back α_0 and apply [Proposition 2.9](#), to make these curves into piecewise smooth ϵ -geodesic arcs in minimal position ([Figure 4](#)). Denote by A_m be the resulting family of curves.

By (3.7), the curves in A_m can be taken to have length less than 12κ : if v is an endpoint of $\alpha \in B_m$, it can be joined to w_m by following α until it reaches β_m and then following the latter until w_m . We would like to reach a contraction by showing that $|A_m| > |A|$.

We argue by cases. If $w_m \in \partial F$ then B_m consisted uniquely of the curve α_0 . Since F is not a triangle, at least one between v_- and v_+ is not adjacent to w_m in ∂F , thus A_m now has strictly more curves than A , so we are done. We may hence assume that $w_m \notin \partial F$, and hence $|B_m| > 1$. Since w_m is adjacent to at most two vertices, we see that

$$(3.9) \quad |A_m| \geq |A \setminus B_m| + (|V(B_m)| + 1) - 2 \geq |A|.$$

If B_m is not connected, the above inequality is strict.

It remains to deal with the case where $|B_m| > 1$ and B_m is connected. This case is the most delicate, and to deal with it we may have to make different choices of m (see below).

Let $\alpha_m \in A_m$ be the first curve encountered by β after α_0 . Since α_m disconnects P' and β intersects it exactly once (because they are in minimal position), we deduce that α_m must meet α_0 at one of its endpoints, for otherwise B_m would not be connected. Let $v_m \in \partial F$ denote the other end point of α_m .

If $\alpha_m \cap \alpha_0 = v_+$, then v_m is not adjacent to v_- in ∂F , so if $d_F(v_-, v_m)$ was less than 12κ we could add another curve to A_m and conclude the proof. A symmetric argument applies if $\alpha_m \cap \alpha_0 = v_-$. This reduces to the following case: for every $m \in \alpha_0$ with $d(v_-, m), d(m, v_+) \geq \kappa$, the curve β_m meets some $\alpha_m \subset \partial F$ connecting one of v_- or v_+ to a point v_m at d_F -distance at least 12κ from the other one.

We claim that if $d_F(v_-, m) = \kappa$, then α_m must intersect α_0 at v_- . Suppose this is not the case, and let $x_m = \alpha_m \cap \beta_m$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} d_F(x_m, v_+) &\geq d_F(v_+, m) - d_F(x_m, m) \\ &\geq (|\alpha_0| - \epsilon - \kappa) - |\beta_m| \\ &\geq 6\kappa - \kappa - (|\beta| + \epsilon) \geq 4\kappa, \end{aligned}$$

where we used ϵ -geodesicity of α_0 at the second step. But then

$$\begin{aligned} d_F(v_-, v_m) &\leq d_F(v_-, x_m) + d_F(x_m, v_m) \\ &\leq (d_F(v_-, m) + d_F(m, x_m)) + (|\alpha_m| - d_F(x_m, v_+)) \\ &\leq (\kappa + |\beta|) + (12\kappa - 4\kappa) < 12\kappa. \end{aligned}$$

The symmetric holds if $d_F(v_+, m) = \kappa$.

By continuity, this implies that there must be some point $m \in \alpha_0$ for which there are two possible choices of w_m , one of which yields as α_m a curve $\alpha_- \in A$ containing v_- , and the other yields as α_m a curve $\alpha_+ \in A$ containing v_+ . We denote those vertices w_m^- and w_m^+ respectively, and define β_m^-, β_m^+ similarly (Figure 5).

We may assume that $d(m, v_+) \leq d(m, v_-)$, which implies that

$$d(m, v_-) \geq (6\kappa - \epsilon)/2.$$

We then perform the construction (3.8) with respect to w_m^+ to obtain A_m . Let x_m^- be the intersection point of α_- and β_m^- , and let v_m^- be the endpoint of α_- away




FIGURE 5. The thick lines are disjoint ϵ -geodesics. If there is a point m connected to ∂P via two short paths β_m^\pm that intersect ϵ -geodesics connected to the starting curve α_0 , we increase the number of disjoint ϵ -geodesic by removing one of them and adding ϵ -geodesics from the endpoints of the other one.

from v_- . Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
 d_F(v_m^-, x_m^-) &\leq |\alpha_m^-| - d_F(v_-, x_m^-) \\
 &\leq |\alpha_m^-| - (d_F(v_-, m) - d_F(m, x_m^-)) \\
 &\leq |\alpha_m^-| - (6\kappa - \epsilon)/2 + |\beta_m^-| \\
 &\leq |\alpha_m^-| - 2\kappa.
 \end{aligned}$$

The curve following α_- from v_m^- to x_m^- and then going to w_m following β_m^- and β_m^+ has length at most

$$d_F(v_m^-, x_m^-) + |\beta_m^-| + |\beta_m^+| \leq |\alpha_m^-|.$$

This means we can add one extra curve to A_m , which contradicts the maximality of A . \square

We now have all ingredients to complete the proof of [Theorem 3.1](#).

Proof of [Theorem 3.1](#). The construction in [Section 3.1](#) yields a locally finite embedded graph $\overline{G} \subset \Sigma$ such that $\overline{G} \subset \Sigma$ is a cell-decomposition ([Corollary 3.12](#)), and \overline{G} is a metric graph with edge lengths bounded by Θ , and the embedding $\overline{G} \hookrightarrow \Sigma$ is a 1-Lipschitz ([Remark 2.3](#)) quasi-isometry ([Corollary 3.6](#)).

For every face F of $\overline{G} \subset \Sigma$, the completion \widehat{F} with respect to the intrinsic metric is a θ -thin piecewise smooth polygon $P := \widehat{F}$ with edge-length bounded by Θ . Apply [Proposition 3.14](#) to every such polygon to obtain a new piecewise smoothly embedded graph $G' \subset \Sigma$ whose edges are ϵ -geodesic (for any arbitrarily fixed $0 < \epsilon < \Theta/4$) of length at most $12(3\theta + \Theta) < 30\Theta$, and such that $G' \subset \Sigma$ is a cell decomposition where all the faces are θ -thin polygons with boundary of size at most 3. In particular, the intrinsic diameter of every face is bounded by $3/2 \cdot 30\Theta + \theta < 46\Theta$.

Observe that G' remains locally finite, because each face contributes finitely many new edges. Since G' is obtained from \overline{G} by adding extra edges, the 1-Lipschitz embedding $G' \hookrightarrow \Sigma$ must be a quasi-isometry as well (adding new edges in this

fashion can only improve the lower bound in (3.3)). Finally, we apply Lemma 2.7 to obtain a 3-gonal decomposition $G \subseteq G' \subset \Sigma$ so that the embedding $G' \hookrightarrow \Sigma$ is a quasi-isometry and the faces have intrinsic diameter bounded by 138Θ . \square

Remark 3.15. Note that at no point in the above construction of G we needed to add extra vertices to \bar{G} . In particular, every vertex in G is at distance at most $\Theta/2$ from a point in the original locally finite set X .

4. ACHIEVING $V(G) = X$, AND COMPARISON TO MAILLOT'S RESULTS

In Theorem 3.1 we started our construction of G by picking a net X of Σ which became a subset of $V(G)$, but we also added further vertices to G . Maillot [21] used a similar construction in order to prove that virtual surface groups are exactly the groups quasi-isometric to a complete simply-connected Riemannian surface. In [21], it was important that the vertex set of the 3-gonal decomposition G coincides with a fixed net. The aim of this section is to adapt our above construction to achieve this restriction. We will thereby improve on some of Maillot's results.

The *modulus* of a cell decomposition $G \subset \Sigma$ is defined to be the supremum of the length of the 1-cells. In particular, if $G \hookrightarrow \Sigma$ is a 1-Lipschitz embedded metric graph with edge lengths bounded by Θ and defining a cell decomposition, then the decomposition has modulus bounded by Θ .

Theorem 4.1. *Let (Σ, d_Σ) be a complete Riemannian surface possibly with boundary and corners. For each net X in (Σ, d_Σ) such that $X \cap \partial\Sigma$ is a net in each component of $\partial\Sigma$ with its intrinsic metric, there exists a 3-gonal decomposition \mathcal{D} of Σ that has finite modulus and whose 0-skeleton is exactly X .*

Moreover, if $\partial\Sigma$ satisfies (2.1) and X is uniform, then \mathcal{D} can be chosen so that its 1-skeleton equipped with the simplicial metric is quasi-isometric to (Σ, d_Σ) .

If $\partial\Sigma = \emptyset$, the first statement is [21, Theorem 4.4] (called the ‘main technical result’ of that paper). The analogous fact with $\partial\Sigma \neq \emptyset$ is used in [21, Theorem 8.1], where it is remarked that their proof of [21, Theorem 4.4] works in this case as well as in the boundary-free case, but details are missing.

The second statement bypasses Proposition 4.5 and Lemma 5.2 of [21] without assuming the additional conditions of planarity at infinity or lower-bounded curvature used there.

Proof. Suppose that X is a θ -dense net such that $X \cap \partial\Sigma$ is θ -dense in each component with its intrinsic metric. We use this X in the construction of Section 3.1 with some fixed $\Theta > 2\theta$. Then Theorem 3.1 yields a 3-gonal decomposition $G \subseteq \Sigma$ of finite modulus with $X \subseteq V(G)$ and such that $(G, d_G) \hookrightarrow (\Sigma, d_\Sigma)$ is a 1-Lipschitz quasi-isometry.

Let $\mathcal{V} = \{V_x \mid x \in X\}$ be the Voronoi decomposition of $V(G)$ with respect to X in the metric d_G , i.e. $V_x := \{v \in V(G) \mid d_G(v, X) = d_G(v, x)\}$. By perturbing d_G slightly we can break all ties, i.e. ensure that the V_x are pairwise disjoint.

Let G_x be the subgraph of G induced by the vertices in V_x . Note that each G_x is connected. Moreover, we have

$$(4.1) \quad \text{diam}(G_x) \leq \Theta \text{ for every } x \in X,$$

because each vertex of G has distance at most $\Theta/2$ from X (Remark 3.15).




FIGURE 6. Contracting the spanning tree T_x to the point x . The subgraph $G_x \subset G$ is the union of T_x with the red edges in the left hand side.

For each $x \in X$ we pick a *geodetic spanning tree* T_x of V_x .² Note that $T_x \cap \partial\Sigma$ is either empty or the single point x (if $x \in X \cap \partial\Sigma$). This is because at no point of the construction did we add extra vertices to $\partial\Sigma$ (Remark 3.4).

We can further choose a surface $N_x \subset \Sigma$ contained in an ϵ -neighbourhood of T_x so that $G \cap N_x$ is a tree (this has the effect of adding to T_x a final segment of each edge $e \in G$ which ends in T_x without being contained in it). If $x \in \partial\Sigma$, this tree will also contain a small segment in $\partial\Sigma$, which we do not wish to alter. Let then T'_x be the tree $G \cap N_x$ excluding the edges in $\partial\Sigma$ (if present). We can now apply Lemma 2.8 to the tree T'_x rooted at x in the surface N_x , in such a way that $\partial N_x \cap T'_x$ is preserved. For each edge e not contained in T_x nor in $\partial\Sigma$ but having an end-vertex in T_x , we then extend $e \setminus N_x$ by the x - ∂N_x curve returned by Lemma 2.8 ending at $e \cap \partial N_x$. Pictorially, this has the effect of ‘dragging’ T_x onto x inside a small enough neighbourhood N_x of T_x in Σ , pulling all edges incident with T_x as we drag (Figure 6).

By applying this procedure to each $x \in X$, we modify G into a graph \tilde{G} embedded into Σ with $V(\tilde{G}) = X$. Note that there is an one-to-one correspondence between the faces of G and the faces of \tilde{G} . The latter generally fails to be a 3-gonal decomposition, because contracting the edges of the T_x will decrease the boundary size of some of the faces. However, we may apply Lemma 2.7 to obtain a 3-gonal decomposition \mathcal{D} of Σ . Observe that

$$(4.2) \quad \text{the lengths of the edges in } \tilde{G} \text{ are uniformly bounded above.}$$

In fact, by construction every edge in \tilde{G} has length within ϵ from the length of a path consisting of the concatenation an edge in G and two branches in some spanning trees T_x (Lemma 2.8), and the latter is bounded because of (4.1). This completes the proof of the first statement. (Note that at this point it is not yet clear whether the embedding $\tilde{G} \hookrightarrow \Sigma$ is a quasi-isometry.)

For the second statement, let $\tilde{G}^{(1)}$ denote the 1-skeleton with its simplicial metric, *i.e.* the graph \tilde{G} where every edge is given length one. Observe that the lengths of the non-loop edges in \tilde{G} are uniformly bounded below because they join distinct

²This means that for each $y \in V_x$ we have $d_{V_x}(x, y) = d_{T_x}(x, y)$. Such a T_x can be obtained by ordering the vertices of V_x according to their distance from x , and recursively joining the next closest vertex to the tree constructed so far.

points in X , which is a net. Since the length of all the edges is uniformly bounded above by (4.2), we see that

$$(4.3) \quad \tilde{G}^{(1)} \text{ and } \tilde{G} \subset \Sigma \text{ are quasi-isometric via the identity map.}$$

Note that if we prove that $\tilde{G}^{(1)} \hookrightarrow \Sigma$ is a quasi-isometry then also the 3-gonal decomposition \mathcal{D} obtained by applying Lemma 2.7 is quasi-isometrically embedded.

By construction, the embedding $\tilde{G} \hookrightarrow \Sigma$ is a 1-Lipschitz map which is coarsely surjective. Together with (4.3), it is thus enough to show that if the net X is uniform, then there are constants M, A such that for every $x, y \in X$ we have a bound $d_{\tilde{G}^{(1)}}(x, y) \leq M d_{\Sigma}(x, y) + A$.

Observe that contracting each G_x into a vertex we obtain a minor H of G , which we equip with its simplicial metric. Note that, as abstract graphs, H is a subgraph of $\tilde{G}^{(1)}$ obtained by removing loops and some parallel edges. In particular, the identity map on X defines a quasi-isometry between H and $\tilde{G}^{(1)}$.

Given $x, y \in X$, let γ be a x - y geodesic in Σ , and $\bar{\gamma}$ a x - y geodesic in G . Lemma 3.5, gives a uniform affine upper bound on $|\bar{\gamma}|$ in terms of $d_{\Sigma}(x, y)$. Moreover, $\bar{\gamma}$ induces a x - y path p in H , and we have $|p| \leq C|\bar{\gamma}|$ for some constant C , because each unit of length of $\bar{\gamma}$ meets a uniformly bounded number of cells V_i by the uniformity of X . Thus $d_H(x, y) \leq |p| \leq C|\bar{\gamma}|$ has a uniform affine upper bound in terms of $d_{\Sigma}(x, y)$. The claim follows. \square

The *essential degree* of a vertex x of a graph G is the number of $y \in V(G)$ such that G contains an x - y edge (this is smaller than the degree of x if G has several x - y edges). The following refines Theorem B.

Corollary 4.2. *The following statements are equivalent for a complete Riemannian surface (Σ, d_{Σ}) :*

- (1) Σ is quasi-isometric to a graph of bounded degree;
- (2) Σ has a uniform net;
- (3) Σ has a 3-gonal decomposition of bounded essential degree whose 1-skeleton with the simplicial metric is quasi-isometric to Σ .

Proof. The equivalence of (1) and (2) is well-known, and holds in the greater generality where Σ is a geodesic metric space [19]. It is easy to deduce (1) from (3) by removing loops and all but one x - y edges for each pair of adjacent vertices x, y . The implication (2) \implies (3) is established by Theorem 4.1: the fact that \mathcal{D} is of bounded essential degree follows from the fact that all neighbours of $x \in X = V(\mathcal{D})$ in the 1-skeleton of \mathcal{D} are within bounded distance from x , and so their cardinality is bounded by the fact that X is uniform. \square

Using Remark 2.6, we can modify the 3-gonal decomposition of Corollary 4.2(3) into a triangulation by subdividing edges and adding vertices as needed. This suffices to complete the proof of Theorem B. (Note however that the essential degree may become unbounded in this process.)

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS AND FURTHER QUESTIONS

5.1. **(1, A)-quasi-isometric triangulations.** In this section we record the proof of Corollary C, which was communicated to us by James Davies. The precise statement we prove is the following.

Proposition 5.1. *Let (Σ, d_Σ) be a complete Riemannian surface without boundary. Then there is a 3-gonal decomposition $G \subset \Sigma$ as in [Theorem 3.1](#) and a constant $A \geq 0$, such that the embedding $(G, d_\ell^G) \hookrightarrow (\Sigma, d_\Sigma)$ is a $(1, A)$ -quasi-isometry.*

Proof. The idea is to choose a sufficiently dense locally finite set X in the construction of [Section 3.1](#). Arbitrarily pick sufficiently small $0 < \theta < \Theta/4$ (e.g. $\Theta = \Xi/138$ and $\theta = \Xi/600$, where Ξ is the desired size of triangles in [Theorem 3.1](#)), and cover Σ with a locally finite countable family of subsets U_n of diameter less than $\Theta/2$. In each U_n we choose a finite set of points X_n that is $\theta/2^n$ -dense. Let $X := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X_n$. This is a locally finite, θ -dense subset of Σ , so it can be used in the construction of the embedded graph \overline{G} as in [Section 3.1](#).

The key point now is that the set X is sufficiently dense to improve the strategy of proof of [Lemma 3.5](#) to obtain multiplicative constant one. Namely, let γ be a geodesic connecting two points $x, y \in X$, parameterised by arc length. Let $n = \lceil |\gamma|/(\Theta/2) \rceil$, and for every $0 \leq k \leq n$, let $p_k := \gamma(k\Theta/2)$, and let $p_{n+1} := y$.

For every $0 \leq k \leq n+1$, let x_k be a point in X nearest to p_k . In particular, if $p_k \in U_{n_k}$, then $d_\Sigma(x_k, p_k) \leq 2^{-n_k}$, hence

$$d_\ell^{\overline{G}}(x_k, x_{k+1}) = d_\Sigma(x_k, x_{k+1}) \leq 2^{-n_k} + d_\Sigma(p_k, p_{k+1}) + 2^{-n_{k+1}}$$

Crucially, the points p_k all belong to different sets U_k , because the latter have diameter less than $\Theta/2$ by assumption. By the triangle inequality, we obtain

$$d_\ell^{\overline{G}}(x, y) \leq \sum_{k=1}^n d_\ell^{\overline{G}}(x_k, x_{k+1}) \leq d_\Sigma(x, y) + 2 \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} 2^{-n}.$$

This completes the proof, because the other steps in the proof of [Theorem 3.1](#) do not change the multiplicative constant of the embedding $G \hookrightarrow \Sigma$; indeed, G is obtained by first adding edges to \overline{G} and then removing redundancies with [Lemma 2.7](#). (This last step could be problematic if $\partial\Sigma \neq \emptyset$, but since we are assuming that this is not the case, the proof of [Lemma 2.7](#) shows that the multiplicative constant does not worsen.) \square

5.2. Quasi-isometric planar graphs that are not bi-Lipschitz equivalent.

In this section we will combine [Theorem 4.1](#) with a construction of Burago & Kleiner [\[8\]](#) in order to prove [Corollary D](#), which we restate for convenience:

Corollary 5.2. *There are plane graphs H_1, H_2 , with bounded degrees and face-boundary sizes, which are quasi-isometric to each other but not bi-Lipschitz equivalent.*

Proof. Burago & Kleiner [\[8\]](#) constructed a net X_1 in \mathbb{R}^2 which is not bi-Lipschitz equivalent to the ‘integer’ net $X_2 := \mathbb{Z}^2$. It is not hard to see that every net in \mathbb{R}^2 is uniform by a volume argument. Thus, we can apply [Theorem 4.1](#) to obtain 3-gonal decompositions $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2$ of \mathbb{R}^2 with vertex sets X_1, X_2 and 1-skeletons H_1, H_2 quasi-isometric to \mathbb{R}^2 with their simplicial graph metric. (For H_2 we could also just use the standard Cayley graph of \mathbb{Z}^2 .) Thus, H_1, H_2 are quasi-isometric to each other. Easily, they have face-boundary sizes at most 3, and bounded degrees since X_i is uniform ([Remark 3.8](#)).

By [\(4.3\)](#), the quasi-isometry to \mathbb{R}^2 is defined by the identity $(X_i, d_{H_i}) \rightarrow (X_i, d_{\mathbb{R}^2})$. Since this is a bijection, we deduce that (X_i, d_{H_i}) is bi-Lipschitz equivalent to $(X_i, d_{\mathbb{R}^2})$ for $i = 1, 2$. Thus if H_1, H_2 are bi-Lipschitz equivalent, then so are $(X_1, d_{\mathbb{R}^2}), (X_2, d_{\mathbb{R}^2})$, a contradiction. \square

5.3. Flip-graphs of triangulations of infinite type. Let $\Sigma_{g,n}$ be a closed surface of genus g with n marked points. An *ideal triangulation* of it is a 3-gonal decomposition whose vertex set coincides with the n marked points.³ A *flip* on a triangulation D is a modification of D obtained by choosing a quadrilateral in D —which must hence contain exactly one diagonal—and replacing its diagonal by a curve joining the other two vertices of the quadrilateral. This yields another ideal triangulation, uniquely defined up to *marked isotopy* (*i.e.* an isotopy that keeps the marked points fixed at all times).

A very interesting object associated with such a surface $\Sigma_{g,n}$ is its *flip-graph* $\mathcal{F}(\Sigma_{g,n})$. This is a graph whose vertices are the marked-isotopy equivalence classes of ideal triangulations of $\Sigma_{g,n}$, and where two classes are joined by an edge if they (have representatives that) only differ by a flip. This graph is connected, and an important reason for studying it is that its group of graph-theoretic automorphisms is isomorphic to the mapping class group of $\Sigma_{g,n}$ [20].

If one wishes to work with non compact surfaces, the situation becomes considerably more complicated. Let $X \subset \Sigma$ be a fixed set of marked points. One can analogously define a flip-graph $\mathcal{F}(\Sigma_X)$, but very simple examples show that if Σ is non compact or X is infinite then $\mathcal{F}(\Sigma_X)$ is not connected. One first remedy is to add edges to $\mathcal{F}(\Sigma_X)$ by declaring that two ideal triangulations are connected by an edge if they differ by a family of flips that can be performed simultaneously (*i.e.* so that no incident edges are flipped). But this does not suffice: it is proven in [14] that this graph remains disconnected, and this is used in [2] to show that its automorphism group is strictly larger than the mapping class group.

On the other hand, [14] also prove that two ideal triangulations D, D' belong to the same connected component of $\mathcal{F}(\Sigma_X)$ if and only every edge of D intersects boundedly many edges of D' and vice versa.

Suppose now that (Σ, d_Σ) is a complete Riemannian surface containing a uniform net X . Let $\mathcal{F}(\Sigma_X, d_\Sigma)$ be the graph having as vertices ideal triangulations⁴ that are quasi-isometric to (Σ, d_Σ) when equipped with their simplicial metric (they exist by Theorem 4.1) considered up to marked isotopy, and where two ideal triangulations are joined by an edge if they differ by a family of simultaneous flips. It then follows from the above criterion that $\mathcal{F}(\Sigma_X, d_\Sigma)$ is connected. It is natural to ask what the group of automorphisms of $\mathcal{F}(\Sigma_X, d_\Sigma)$ is. Note that not every marked homeomorphism ϕ of Σ defines an automorphism of $\mathcal{F}(\Sigma_X, d_\Sigma)$, because we are only admitting quasi-isometric triangulations. On the other hand, ϕ will induce an automorphism if it is also a quasi-isometry. Does every automorphism of $\mathcal{F}(\Sigma_X, d_\Sigma)$ arise this way?

Question 5.3. *Is the group of automorphisms of $\mathcal{F}(\Sigma_X, d_\Sigma)$ isomorphic to the group of quasi-isometric marked homeomorphisms of (Σ, d_Σ, X) ?*

The classical results show that this is the case if Σ is compact (and hence X is finite and the quasi-isometry requirements are vacuous).

Other natural questions arise *e.g.* when considering the quotient of the flip-graph by its group of automorphisms as in [10, 11].

³The naming comes from seeing the marked points as punctures, which are classically metrized as cusps. This is not the point of view we are going to take here though.

⁴As above, by an *ideal triangulation* we mean a 3-gonal decomposition of Σ the vertex set of which coincides with X .

5.4. Higher dimensions. Our proofs rely heavily on the fact that Σ is 2-dimensional. We would be interested to see extensions of the results of this paper, especially [Theorems A](#) and [B](#), to higher-dimensional manifolds:

Question 5.4. *Let (M, d_M) be a complete Riemannian manifold of dimension n . Must there exist a triangulation \mathcal{D} of (M, d_M) such that the identity map from the 1-skeleton (G, d_ℓ^G) of \mathcal{D} to (M, d_M) is a quasi-isometry? In case (M, d_M) admits a uniform net, can we choose \mathcal{D} so that the simplicial metric on G is quasi-isometric to (M, d_M) ?*

Can we choose \mathcal{D} so that, in addition to the above, its simplices have uniformly bounded intrinsic diameters? (we could restrict this to simplices of dimension n , or require it for all dimensions $m \leq n$).

Bowditch [\[6\]](#) obtained results of this flavour under stronger assumptions on (M, d_M) , namely bounded curvature and injectivity radius, with the stronger conclusion of bi-Lipschitz embedding of the triangulation into M ; see also [\[4, 13, 23\]](#) for related studies.

REFERENCES

- [1] Lars V. Ahlfors and Leo Sario, *Riemann Surfaces*, Princeton University Press, 1960.
- [2] Assaf Bar-Natan, Advay Goel, Brendan Halstead, Paul Hamrick, Sumedh Shenoy, and Rishi Verma, *Big flip graphs and their automorphism groups*, Glasnik matematički **58** (2023), no. 1, 125–134.
- [3] C.J. Bishop and L. Rempe, *Non-compact Riemann surfaces are equilaterally triangulable*, Invent. math. **244** (2026), 1–43.
- [4] Jean-Daniel Boissonnat, Ramsay Dyer, and Arijit Ghosh, *Delaunay triangulation of manifolds*, Foundations of Computational Mathematics **18** (2018), no. 2, 399–431.
- [5] M. Bonamy, N. Bousquet, L. Esperet, C. Groenland, C.-H. Liu, F. Pirot, and A. Scott, *Asymptotic Dimension of Minor-Closed Families and Assouad-Nagata Dimension of Surfaces*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. **26** (2023), no. 10, 3739–3791.
- [6] B. H. Bowditch, *Bilipschitz triangulations of Riemannian manifolds*. Preprint 2020, <http://bhbowditch.com/papers/triangulations.pdf>.
- [7] Martin R Bridson and André Haefliger, *Metric spaces of non-positive curvature*, Vol. 319, Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [8] D. Burago and B. Kleiner, *Separated nets in Euclidean space and Jacobians of bi-Lipschitz maps*, GAFA **8** (1998), 273–282.
- [9] J. Davies, *String graphs are quasi-isometric to planar graphs*. arXiv:2510.19602.
- [10] V. Disarlo and H. Parlier, *Simultaneous flips on triangulated surfaces*, Michigan Math. J. **67** (2018), no. 3, 451–464.
- [11] Valentina Disarlo and Hugo Parlier, *The geometry of flip graphs and mapping class groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **372** (2019), no. 6, 3809–3844.
- [12] Manfredo Perdigao do Carmo, *Differential geometry of curves and surfaces*, Prentice-Hall, Inc, 1976.
- [13] Ramsay Dyer, Gert Vegter, and Mathijs Wintraecken, *Riemannian simplices and triangulations*, Geometriae Dedicata **179** (2015), no. 1, 91–138.
- [14] A. Fossas and H. Parlier, *Flip graphs for infinite type surfaces*, Groups Geom. Dyn. **16** (2022), no. 4, 1165–1178.
- [15] A. Georgakopoulos and P. Papasoglu, *Graph minors and metric spaces*, Combinatorica **45** (2025), 33.
- [16] Victor Guillemin and Alan Pollack, *Differential topology*, Vol. 370, American Mathematical Society, 2025.
- [17] Allen Hatcher, *Algebraic Topology*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2002.
- [18] Jeremy Kahn and Vladimir Marković, *Counting essential surfaces in a closed hyperbolic three-manifold*, Geometry & Topology **16** (2012), no. 1, 601–624.
- [19] M. Kanai, *Rough isometries, and combinatorial approximations of geometries of non-compact Riemannian manifolds.*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **37** (1985), 391–413.

- [20] M. Korkmaz and A. Papadopoulos, *On the ideal triangulation graph of a punctured surface*, Annales de l'institut fourier, 2012, pp. 1367–1382.
- [21] S. Maillot, *Quasi-isometries of groups, graphs and surfaces*, Comment. Math. Helv. **76** (2001), no. 1, 29–60.
- [22] T. Nguyen, A. Scott, and P. Seymour, *Asymptotic structure. II. Path-width and additive quasi-isometry*. ArXiv:2509.09031.
- [23] Emil Saucan, *Note on a theorem of Munkres*, Mediterr. J. Math. **2** (2005), no. 2, 215–229.

(Agelos Georgakopoulos) MATHEMATICS INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK, CV4 7AL, UK.

(Federico Vigolo) MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT, GEORG-AUGUST-UNIVERSITÄT GÖTTINGEN, BUNSENSTR. 3-5, 37073 GÖTTINGEN, GERMANY.