

**Zeitschrift:** L'Enseignement Mathématique  
**Herausgeber:** Commission Internationale de l'Enseignement Mathématique  
**Band:** 42 (1996)  
**Heft:** 3-4: L'ENSEIGNEMENT MATHÉMATIQUE

**Artikel:** SYSTEMS OF CURVES ON A CLOSED ORIENTABLE SURFACE  
**Autor:** EDMONDS, Allan L.  
**Kapitel:** 6. SUFFICIENCY IN THEOREM 3  
**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-87881>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

**Download PDF:** 09.12.2025

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**



Now, proceeding inductively, consider the case of  $k > 1$  homology classes. One of these homology classes, say  $\alpha_k$ , has a minimal partition  $C_k, D_k$ , in the sense that  $C_k$  contains no other  $C_j$  or  $D_j$  for  $j < k$ . By the preceding argument we may assume that  $A_k = A'_k$ . One side of  $A_k$  contains no other simple closed curves  $A_j$  or  $A'_j$ . Excise this side to obtain a new planar surface  $H$  containing the remaining simple closed curves. By induction there is a homeomorphism  $h$  of  $H$  moving  $A_j$  onto  $A'_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq k-1$ , and mapping each boundary curve into itself. We can then reinsert the excised domain to complete the argument.

The results of this section, with the exception of Theorem 5.6 above, hold *mutatis mutandi* for compact non-planar surfaces  $G$  with boundary, provided one only considers homology classes given as linear combinations of the classes represented by the boundary curves. Each such simple closed curve in the interior of  $G$  would separate  $G$ . Uniqueness, however, is obstructed by needing to know the genus of each complementary domain.

## 6. SUFFICIENCY IN THEOREM 3

Let  $S \subset H_1(F)$  denote a finite set of distinct homology classes satisfying the Intersection Condition, the Summand Condition, and the Size Condition of Theorem 1, which we wish to represent by pairwise disjoint simple closed curves. Suppose that the linear span of  $S$  has rank  $n$  and extract from  $S$   $n$  elements  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$  that form a basis for this span. Now each element  $\gamma_i$  in the remaining subset  $T$  of  $S$  can be expressed as a linear combination

$$\gamma_i = \sum_j \varepsilon_{ij} \alpha_j.$$

We refer to the  $\gamma_i$  as “composite classes.”

**LEMMA 6.1.** *Each coefficient  $\varepsilon_{ij}$  in the linear combination  $\gamma_i = \sum_j \varepsilon_{ij} \alpha_j$  is 1, -1, or 0.*

*Proof.* To see this, consider the span of the set consisting of any one  $\gamma_i$  together with all  $\alpha_k$ ,  $k \neq j$ . Elementary change of basis operations show that this span is the same as the span of  $\varepsilon_{ij} \alpha_j$  and the  $\alpha_k$ ,  $k \neq j$ . By the Summand Condition, this span must be a summand, and it therefore follows that  $\varepsilon_{ij} = \pm 1$  or 0.



If  $\text{card } T = m$ , then the collection of all  $\gamma_i \in T$  can be described by an  $m$  by  $n$  matrix  $M$  of 0's, 1's, and  $-1$ 's. Then the proof of Lemma 6.1 extends to give the following consequence of the Summand Condition.

LEMMA 6.2. *Each square submatrix  $N$  of  $M$  has  $|\det N| \leq 1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $N$  be a  $k \times k$  submatrix. Up to relabeling we may assume that  $N$  consists of the  $\varepsilon_{ij}$ ,  $1 \leq i, j \leq k$ . Now consider the span of  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k, \alpha_{k+1}, \dots, \alpha_n$ . On the one hand, the Summand Condition says that this span must be a direct summand. On the other hand, the span is the same as the span of  $\tilde{\gamma}_1, \dots, \tilde{\gamma}_k, \alpha_{k+1}, \dots, \alpha_n$ , where  $\tilde{\gamma}_i = \sum_{j \leq k} \varepsilon_{ij} \alpha_j$  is the projection of  $\gamma_i$  into the span of  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ . But this span is clearly the direct sum of the span of  $\tilde{\gamma}_1, \dots, \tilde{\gamma}_k$  and of  $\alpha_{k+1}, \dots, \alpha_n$ . It follows that the span of  $\tilde{\gamma}_1, \dots, \tilde{\gamma}_k$  is a direct summand of the span of  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ . Standard matrix theory then implies that the determinant of the matrix of coefficients of  $\tilde{\gamma}_1, \dots, \tilde{\gamma}_k$  is  $\pm 1$  or 0. But this matrix is the upper left matrix  $N$ .

In what follows here we will assume that  $F$  has genus  $n$ . By this we mean that there is a corresponding set of homology classes in a surface of genus  $n$ , and that we may view the given surface as being obtained from the genus  $n$  surface by attaching handles. It is clear that if the homology classes can be realized in the surface of genus  $n$ , then they can be realized in the given surface. The converse of this statement is also true, but less obvious. We will prove it in a subsequent section.

We may also assume that we have already represented elements  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$  by disjoint simple closed curves elements  $A_1, \dots, A_n$ , by Proposition 4.2. We attempt to represent the remaining classes in  $T$ , the complement of  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$  in  $S$ . Let  $\hat{F}$  denote  $F$  cut open along the  $A_i$ . Then  $\hat{F}$  is a 2-sphere with  $2n$  holes, with orientable boundary consisting of one copy  $A_i^+$  of each  $A_i$  and one copy  $A_i^-$  of each  $A_i$  with its orientation reversed.

By the results in Section 5 we understand completely when a family of homology classes in  $\hat{F}$  can be realized by pairwise disjoint simple closed curves. We need to see how to lift the classes in  $T$  to realizable class in  $\hat{F}$ . Now  $H_1(\hat{F})$  is generated by the classes  $[A_i^+]$  and  $[A_i^-]$  subject to the single relation  $\sum_i ([A_i^+] + [A_i^-]) = 0$ . The natural inclusion of  $\hat{F}$  in  $F$  induces a homomorphism  $H_1(\hat{F}) \rightarrow H_1(F)$  where  $[A_i^+] \rightarrow [A_i]$  and  $[A_i^-] \rightarrow -[A_i]$ . This homomorphism maps surjectively onto the subgroup generated by  $A_1, \dots, A_n$ . Its kernel is generated by terms of the form  $[A_i^+] + [A_i^-]$  subject to the single



global relation  $\sum_i ([A_i^+] + [A_i^-]) = 0$ . We will slightly abuse notation and suppress the square brackets from such formulas below.

LEMMA 6.3. *Any single element  $\gamma_1 \in T$  can be realized by a simple closed curve in  $\widehat{F}$ .*

*Proof.* Write  $\gamma_1 = \sum_j \varepsilon_{1j} \alpha_j$  as above, with  $\varepsilon_{1j} \in \{0, \pm 1\}$ . By replacing some of the  $\alpha_j$  with  $-\alpha_j$  as necessary, we can assume that  $\gamma_1 = \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j$ . The corresponding homology class  $\widehat{\gamma}_1 = \sum_{j=1}^k A_j^+$  in  $\widehat{F}$  is then represented by a simple closed curve, as required.

LEMMA 6.4. *If  $\alpha_j$  and  $\alpha_k$  both have nonzero coefficients in the expansions of both of  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$ , then either  $\varepsilon_{1j} = \varepsilon_{2j}$  and  $\varepsilon_{1k} = \varepsilon_{2k}$  or  $\varepsilon_{1j} = -\varepsilon_{2j}$  and  $\varepsilon_{1k} = -\varepsilon_{2k}$ . That is, the coefficients either agree or disagree.*

*Proof.* If not, the matrix  $M$  representing the  $\gamma_i$  has a 2 by 2 submatrix of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

up to multiplying rows and/or columns by  $-1$ , contradicting the matrix interpretation of the Summand Condition as given in Lemma 6.2.

For  $\gamma_i \in T$  define its *support* (with respect to  $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$ ) to be the set of  $\alpha_j$  with nonzero coefficient in the expression  $\gamma_i = \sum_j \varepsilon_{ij} \alpha_j$ . Note that up to relabeling there are just three ways for the supports of  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  in  $T$  to relate to one another. The two classes may have nested supports, disjoint supports, or properly overlapping supports.

LEMMA 6.5. *Any two distinct elements  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in T$  can be realized by disjoint simple closed curves in  $\widehat{F}$ .*

*Proof.* There are three cases to consider, organized by the relative placement of the supports. Without loss of generality we can assume that  $\text{card supp } \gamma_1 \geq \text{card supp } \gamma_2$ . Then either

- (1)  $\text{supp } \gamma_2 \subset \text{supp } \gamma_1$  or
- (2)  $\text{supp } \gamma_1 \cap \text{supp } \gamma_2 = \emptyset$  or
- (3)  $\text{supp } \gamma_1 \cap \text{supp } \gamma_2 \neq \emptyset$  and  $\text{supp } \gamma_1 \cap \text{supp } \gamma_2 \neq \text{supp } \gamma_2$ .

As in the proof of Lemma 6.3 we may assume that  $\gamma_1 = \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j$ .



In case (1) we may, by Lemma 6.4, assume that  $\gamma_2$  has the form  $\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \alpha_j$  for some  $\ell < k$ . Then the two corresponding classes  $\hat{\gamma}_1 = \sum_{j=1}^k A_j^+$  and  $\hat{\gamma}_2 = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} A_j^+$  can be realized disjointly in  $\hat{F}$  as required, by Proposition 5.2.

In case (2) we may assume that  $\gamma_2$  has the form  $\sum_{j=k+1}^{\ell} \alpha_j$  for some  $\ell > k$ . Then the two corresponding classes  $\hat{\gamma}_1 = \sum_{j=1}^k A_j^+$  and  $\hat{\gamma}_2 = \sum_{j=k+1}^{\ell} A_j^+$  can be realized disjointly in  $\hat{F}$  as required.

In case (3) we may assume, again by Lemma 6.4, that  $\gamma_2$  has the form  $\sum_{j=r}^s \alpha_j$  for some  $r \leq k$  and  $s > k$ . Then the two corresponding classes  $\hat{\gamma}_1 = \sum_{j=1}^k A_j^+$  and  $\hat{\gamma}_2 = \sum_{j=r}^s A_j^-$  can be realized disjointly in  $\hat{F}$  as required.

**PROPOSITION 6.6.** *Any three distinct elements  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$  in  $T$  can be realized by disjoint simple closed curves in  $\hat{F}$ .*

*Proof.* Once again we organize the analysis according to the relative positions of the supports of the three homology classes. There are several cases to consider. In each of several cases we shall normalize the expressions for the  $\gamma_i$  in terms of the  $\alpha_j$ . The operations we will use are permutation of the  $\gamma_i$ , permutation of the  $\alpha_j$ , changing the sign of one or more  $\gamma_i$ , and changing the sign of one or more  $\alpha_j$ .

Suppose that the support of one class is contained in the support of another class. Without loss of generality we may assume that

$$\gamma_1 = \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_2 = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \alpha_j \quad \text{for some } \ell < k.$$

Now the signs of all coefficients of  $\gamma_3$  involved in  $\gamma_1$  may be assumed to be negative, by Lemma 6.4. So we may assume that

$$\gamma_3 = \sum_{j=u}^v -\alpha_j$$

Then the three preferred lifts

$$\hat{\gamma}_1 = \sum_{j=1}^k A_j^+, \quad \hat{\gamma}_2 = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} A_j^+, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\gamma}_3 = \sum_{j=u}^v A_j^-$$

can clearly be realized disjointly in  $\hat{F}$ . Henceforth we may assume that no one of the three given homology classes has its support contained in the support of one of the others.



If the underlying support of one of the 3 classes, say of  $\gamma_3$ , is disjoint from the supports of both of the other two, then this is easy. Realize  $\hat{\gamma}_1$  and  $\hat{\gamma}_2$  as above; then realize the preferred lift  $\hat{\gamma}_3$  of  $\gamma_3$ , which has support disjoint from those of  $\hat{\gamma}_1$  and  $\hat{\gamma}_2$ .

Suppose now that two classes have disjoint support, but that no homology class has support disjoint from the supports of both of the other two. Without loss of generality we may assume that

$$\gamma_1 = \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_2 = \sum_{j=k+1}^{\ell} \alpha_j$$

for some  $\ell > k + 1$ . Now  $\gamma_3$  involves some, but not all, of the support of  $\gamma_1$ , some, but not all, of the support of  $\gamma_2$ , and, perhaps, some terms not involved in either of  $\gamma_1$  or  $\gamma_2$ . After permuting basis elements we have  $\gamma_3 = \sum_{j=r}^s \varepsilon_{3j} \alpha_j + \sum_{j=\ell+1}^n \varepsilon_{3j} \alpha_j$ , where  $2 \leq r \leq k - 1$ ,  $k + 1 \leq s \leq \ell - 1$ . Now the Summand Condition implies that all  $\varepsilon_{3j}$ ,  $r \leq j \leq k$ , have the same sign; and all  $\varepsilon_{3j}$ ,  $k + 1 \leq j \leq s$ , have the same sign. By changing the global sign of  $\gamma_3$  if necessary we may assume that  $\varepsilon_{3j} = -1$  for  $r \leq j \leq k$ . Further, by changing the sign of  $\alpha_i$ ,  $i > \ell$  as needed we may assume that  $\varepsilon_{3j} \leq 0$  for  $i > \ell$ . Thus at this point we have arranged that

$$\gamma_3 = - \sum_{j=r}^k \alpha_j \pm \sum_{j=k+1}^s \alpha_j - \sum_{j=\ell+1}^t \alpha_j$$

where  $2 \leq r \leq k - 1$ ,  $k + 1 \leq s \leq \ell - 1$ , and  $\ell + 1 \leq t \leq n$ , and the third sum might not actually appear at all. If the “ $-$ ” sign prevails in the formula for  $\gamma_3$ , then the preferred lifts of  $\gamma_1$ ,  $\gamma_2$ , and  $\gamma_3$  are disjointly realizable in  $\hat{F}$  as required. On the other hand, if the “ $+$ ” sign prevails we can reduce to the previous case by first replacing  $\alpha_{k+1}, \dots, \alpha_{\ell}$  with their negatives, and then replacing  $\gamma_2$  with its negative.

Now we may suppose for the rest of the argument that no two classes have disjoint support, and that no class has support contained in the support of one of the other two classes.

For the penultimate case suppose that the intersection of all three supports is empty. We divide the supports of the  $\gamma_i$  three pieces:  $S_{ij} = \text{supp } \gamma_i \cap \text{supp } \gamma_j$  and  $T_i = \text{supp } \gamma_i - \text{supp } \gamma_j \cup \text{supp } \gamma_k$ , where  $\{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$ . In what follows we will, for notational simplicity, sometimes identify  $\alpha_j$  with its index  $j$ . Then, without loss of generality, after changing the signs of various  $\alpha_i$  as necessary, we can assume that

$$\gamma_1 = \sum_{i \in S_{12}} \alpha_i + \sum_{i \in S_{13}} \alpha_i + \sum_{i \in T_1} \alpha_i.$$



Then, replacing  $\gamma_2$  by its negative if necessary, and changing the sign of  $\alpha_i$ ,  $i \in S_{23} \cup T_2$  as necessary, and invoking the  $2 \times 2$  Summand Condition, we can assume that

$$\gamma_2 = - \sum_{i \in S_{12}} \alpha_i - \sum_{i \in S_{23}} \alpha_i - \sum_{i \in T_2} \alpha_i.$$

Similarly, we can arrange that

$$\gamma_3 = - \sum_{i \in S_{13}} \alpha_i \pm \sum_{i \in S_{23}} \alpha_i + \sum_{i \in T_3} \alpha_i.$$

Now the  $3 \times 3$  Summand Condition tells us that the  $+$  sign must prevail in the expansion of  $\gamma_3$ . For otherwise the matrix  $M$  would contain a  $3 \times 3$  submatrix of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

which has determinant  $-2$ . Now with all these normalizations, the preferred lifts of  $\gamma_1$ ,  $\gamma_2$ , and  $\gamma_3$  are disjointly realizable in  $\hat{F}$  as required.

Finally, at last, we have the case that the intersection of all three supports is nonempty but that no support set is contained in one of the other supports. Let  $S_i = \text{supp } \gamma_i$ ,  $S_{ij} = S_i \cap S_j$ , and  $S_{123} = S_1 \cap S_2 \cap S_3 \neq \emptyset$ . Now as always we can assume one of our homology classes, say  $\gamma_1$  has all nonnegative coefficients, i.e.,  $\gamma_1 = \sum_{j \in S_1} \alpha_j$ . Next we can assume by the 2 by 2 Summand Condition that  $\gamma_2$  has positive coefficients on  $S_{12}$ , and of course that it has positive coefficients on  $S_2 - S_{12}$ . In particular, then, we have  $\gamma_2 = \sum_{j \in S_2} \alpha_j$ . Since  $S_{123} \neq \emptyset$ , all coefficients of elements of  $S_3 \cap (S_1 \cup S_2)$  must have the same sign, which we may assume is positive. It follows that we may arrange that  $\gamma_3 = \sum_{j \in S_3} \alpha_j$ . In this case the preferred lifts of the  $\gamma_i$  will not be disjointly realizable and we have to choose other lifts as follows. For  $\gamma_1$  we do use the preferred lift

$$\hat{\gamma}_1 = \sum_{j \in S_1} A_j^+.$$

For  $\gamma_2$ , however, we add on to the preferred lift canceling pairs corresponding to elements of  $S_1 - S_2$  and define

$$\hat{\gamma}_2 = \sum_{j \in S_2} A_j^+ + \sum_{j \in S_1 - S_2} (A_j^+ + A_j^-)$$

and, finally, for  $\gamma_3$  we define

$$\hat{\gamma}_3 = \sum_{j \in S_3} A_j^+ + \sum_{j \in S_1 \cup S_2 - S_3} (A_j^+ + A_j^-).$$



These choices of lifts of the  $\gamma_i$  to homology classes in  $\widehat{F}$  satisfy the conditions for disjoint realizability given in Section 5. (We emphasize again that the conditions for realizability in planar surfaces continue to hold for homology classes in nonplanar compact surfaces with boundary provided the homology classes in question are all linear combinations of the classes of the boundary curves.)

The one remaining aspect to consider in the proof of the sufficiency part of the Theorem 3 is given by the following result.

**PROPOSITION 6.7.** *If  $\text{rank } S \leq 4$ , then  $S$  can be realized by disjoint simple closed curves in  $\widehat{F}$ .*

*Proof sketch.* We will only outline the proof, which is a tedious case-by-case check. In light of the preceding results, we may assume that  $F$  has genus 4 and that  $S$  consists of  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_4$  together with 4 or 5 additional classes  $\gamma_i$ . We describe the system of  $\gamma_i$  by a matrix with 4 or 5 rows and 4 columns, consisting of entries 1,  $-1$ , or 0. (Conversely, any such matrix determines a collection of homology classes which one can try to realize.) We can normalize each such matrix according to the following principles: First of all we can arrange that the rows have monotonically nonincreasing size of support as one goes down the rows. Next, within any collection of rows with supports of the same size we can assume that the rows appear in lexicographical ordering according to the alphabet ordering  $+1, -1, 0$ . Next, by changing signs of the elements of  $S$  as required we can assume that the first nonzero element in each row and in each column is  $+1$ . A computer can easily crank out a list of all such matrices in lexicographical order. (It follows from the Summand Condition that there is at most one element of length 4 (i.e., involving all 4 classes  $\alpha_i$ ). Similarly, there are at most 2 elements of length 3. Again this follows from the Summand Condition, since two elements of length 3 must have two support elements in common and since the coefficients of the  $\alpha_i$  appearing in the overlap of the supports of two classes must all have the same signs. The remaining classes must have support size 2.) At this point one should check the Summand Condition by checking that the determinant of every square submatrix is also  $+1, -1$ , or 0 and throw out those that do not meet this condition. Finally, in any particular case there may be extra symmetries at hand, exchanging pairs of rows or pairs of columns so as to produce a matrix higher up on our list. This last step is done by hand. Ultimately in this way we produce a list of 36 such matrices which one must show are realizable by actually drawing



an appropriate planar diagram as above. (There is some redundancy in that some of the 4 by 4 matrices appear as submatrices of 5 by 4 matrices later in the list.) Although some of the required diagrams were a little difficult to discover, in the end all 36 were shown to be realizable. As just one example, here is one of the trickier realizable families :

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

This corresponds to the family

$$S = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4, \alpha_1 + \alpha_2, \alpha_1 + \alpha_3, \alpha_1 + \alpha_4, \alpha_2 - \alpha_3, \alpha_2 - \alpha_4\}$$

The following classes on the  $4 \times 2$ -punctured sphere lift the five composite classes :

$$A_1^+ + A_2^+ + A_3^+ + A_3^-, A_1^+ + A_3^+, A_1^+ + A_4^+, A_2^+ + A_3^-, A_2^- + A_4^+$$

This collection of classes can be realized by pairwise disjoint simple closed curves on the punctured sphere, and this realization then descends to give a realization of the given homology classes.

*Discussion of the proof of Theorem 6, an algorithmic solution to the realizability problem.* The results of Section 5 on realizing curves on a planar surface and of the first part of this Section 6, combine to provide a finite algorithm for realizing any family of homology classes by pairwise disjoint simple closed curves. As usual, let  $S \subset H_1(F)$  denote a finite set of distinct homology classes satisfying the Intersection Condition, the Summand Condition, and the Size Condition of the Main Theorem, which we wish to represent by pairwise disjoint simple closed curves. Suppose that the linear span of  $S$  has rank  $n$  and extract from  $S$   $n$  elements  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$  that form a basis for this span. Now each element  $\gamma_i$  in the remaining part of  $S$  can be expressed as a linear combination

$$\gamma_i = \sum_j \varepsilon_{ij} \alpha_j$$

in which we know by Lemma 6.1 that the coefficients satisfy  $|\varepsilon_{ij}| \leq 1$ . Moreover, we may also assume that we have already represented elements  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$  by disjoint simple closed curves  $A_1, \dots, A_n$ , by Proposition 4.2.



We attempt to represent the remaining classes in  $T$ , the complement of  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$  in  $S$ . Let  $\widehat{F}$  denote  $F$  cut open along the  $A_i$ . Then  $\widehat{F}$  is a 2-sphere with  $2n$  holes (possibly with some additional handles attached, which play no role in the present discussion and which can safely be ignored), with orientable boundary consisting of one copy  $A_i^+$  of each  $A_i$  and one copy  $A_i^-$  of each  $A_i$  with its orientation reversed. As in Section 5, the relevant homology  $\mathcal{B} \subset H_1(\widehat{F})$  is generated by the homology classes of the boundary curves. Now the set  $S$  of homology classes can be realized by pairwise disjoint simple closed curves in  $F$  if and only if the classes in  $T$  can be lifted to a set  $\widehat{T}$  of homology classes in  $\mathcal{B} \subset H_1(\widehat{F})$  that can be realized by pairwise disjoint simple closed curves in  $\widehat{F}$ . Now, the classes  $\gamma_i$  have infinitely many pre-images in  $H_1(\widehat{F})$ , but only finitely many pre-images can be represented by simple closed curves, since by Lemma 5.1 the coefficients of the classes of the boundary curves must have absolute value at most 1, and all must have the same sign. There are only finitely many such lifts of each homology class and they may all be considered one-by-one for realizability using Proposition 5.3, which is itself finitely verifiable.

## 7. VARIOUS INSTRUCTIVE EXAMPLES

Here we present three interesting examples that point to some of the difficulties in finding necessary *and sufficient* conditions for realizability of a system of homology classes by pairwise disjoint simple closed curves. To start with we give an example showing that even when a system is realizable it is possible to get stuck, in the sense that one might realize all but one class and then have no way to realize the last class so as to be disjoint from the other curves. In particular, one might have to go back and change the curves already realized in order to complete the construction.

**EXAMPLE 7.1.** Non-extendable partial realizations of a realizable family of homology classes.

Let  $S = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4, \alpha_1 + \alpha_2, \alpha_3 + \alpha_4, \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3, \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4\}$  be a system of homology classes on a surface of genus 4, in which  $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4\}$  is part of a standard symplectic basis. One can check that this collection satisfies all the necessary conditions in the Theorem 1. By Theorem 3, it is realizable by a system of pairwise disjoint simple closed curves. Explicitly, we can first realize  $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4\}$  by standard curves  $A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4$  in the