

The free complex of a two-dimensional generalized convex shelling

Yoshio Okamoto*

Abstract

In this article, we study two open problems posed by Edelman & Reiner about topology of certain simplicial complexes associated with abstract convex geometries. As a special case, we concentrate on generalized convex shellings, which were introduced by Kashiwabara, Nakamura & Okamoto for their representation theorem of abstract convex geometries. We answer one of the problems affirmatively for 2-dimensional separable generalized convex shellings, and the other problem negatively already for this case.

1 Introduction

An (abstract) convex geometry was introduced by Edelman & Jamison [2] as a combinatorial abstraction of “convexity” appearing in a lot of objects. Recently, a representation theorem for convex geometries has been established by Kashiwabara, Nakamura & Okamoto [6], which states that any convex geometry is isomorphic to some “separable generalized convex shelling.” A generalized convex shelling is defined via two finite point sets in a certain dimension. Therefore, their representation theorem gives a stratification of the convex geometries by the minimum dimension in which a convex geometry can be realized as a generalized convex shelling. We will study the topology of the free complex of a 2-dimensional generalized convex shelling.

The motivation of this work stems from Edelman & Reiner [3]. An Euler-Poincaré type formula for the number of interior points in a d -dimensional point configuration was proved by Ahrens, Gordon & McMahon [1] when $d = 2$, and proved by Edelman & Reiner [3] and Klain [7] independently for any d . The approach by Klain [7] used a more general theorem on valuation, while that by

*Institute of Theoretical Computer Science, ETH Zurich, CH-8092 Zurich, Switzerland. E-mail: okamotoy@inf.ethz.ch. Supported by the Berlin-Zürich Joint Graduate Program “Combinatorics, Geometry, and Computation” (CGC), financed by ETH Zürich and the German Science Foundation (DFG).

Edelman & Reiner [3] was topological. (Their topological proof was later simplified with use of oriented matroids by Edelman, Reiner & Welker [4].) In the paper by Edelman & Reiner [3], they studied the topology of deletions in the free complex of a convex shelling (which arises from a point configuration), and also asked a possible generalization to any convex geometry, i.e., the following problems.

Open Problems 1 (Edelman & Reiner [3]). *Let \mathcal{L} be a convex geometry on E and denote the free complex of \mathcal{L} by $\text{Free}(\mathcal{L})$.*

1. *Is $\text{del}_{\text{Free}(\mathcal{L})}(x)$ of $x \in E$ contractible if $\text{Dep}_{\mathcal{L}}(x) \neq E$?*
2. *Is $\text{del}_{\text{Free}(\mathcal{L})}(x)$ homotopy equivalent to a bouquet of some equidimensional spheres¹ if $\text{Dep}_{\mathcal{L}}(x) = E$? Does $\text{del}_{\text{Free}(\mathcal{L})}(x)$ have the same homology type as a bouquet of some equidimensional spheres for such a case?*

Edelman & Reiner showed, in the same paper [3], that Open Problems 1 are valid for some special cases and conjectured that the first part of the problems is valid for all convex geometries. Later, Edelman, Reiner & Welker [4] showed that Open Problems 1 are also valid for another special case.

Open Problems 1 ask for a generalization to all convex geometries, and thanks to Kashiwabara, Nakamura & Okamoto [6] every convex geometry is isomorphic to some separable generalized convex shelling. That is why it is worth looking at 2-dimensional separable generalized convex shellings as a simpler case. Our result states that Open Problem 1.1 is valid for 2-dimensional separable generalized convex shellings, but Open Problem 1.2 is not valid. Namely, to be more precise for the first statement, we will prove the following.

Theorem 2. *Let P and Q be nonempty finite point sets in \mathbb{R}^2 such that $\text{conv}(P) \cap \text{conv}(Q) = \emptyset$. In addition, let \mathcal{L} be the generalized convex shelling on P with respect to Q . Consider the free complex $\text{Free}(\mathcal{L})$ of \mathcal{L} . Then the deletion $\text{del}_{\text{Free}(\mathcal{L})}(x)$ of an element $x \in P$ is contractible if $\text{Dep}_{\mathcal{L}}(x) \neq P$.*

2 Preliminaries

Due to the space limitation, we omit the necessary definitions of graph theory and topology.

A *convex geometry* on a nonempty finite set E is a family \mathcal{L} of subsets of E satisfying the following three conditions: (1) $\emptyset, E \in \mathcal{L}$, (2) if $X, Y \in \mathcal{L}$ then

¹Note that a contractible complex is not considered as a bouquet of some equidimensional spheres.

$X \cap Y \in \mathcal{L}$, and (3) if $X \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \{E\}$ then there exists $e \in E \setminus X$ such that $X \cup \{e\} \in \mathcal{L}$. For a convex geometry \mathcal{L} on E , we define an operator $\tau_{\mathcal{L}} : 2^E \rightarrow 2^E$ as $\tau_{\mathcal{L}}(A) = \bigcap \{X \in \mathcal{L} : A \subseteq X\}$. The operator $\tau_{\mathcal{L}}$ is called the *closure operator* of \mathcal{L} .

For a set $A \subseteq E$, an element $e \in A$ is called an *extreme point* if $e \notin \tau_{\mathcal{L}}(A \setminus \{e\})$. We denote the set of extreme points of A by $\text{ex}_{\mathcal{L}}(A)$. Namely, define the operator $\text{ex}_{\mathcal{L}} : 2^E \rightarrow 2^E$ as $\text{ex}_{\mathcal{L}}(A) = \{e \in A : e \text{ is an extreme point of } A\}$. We call $\text{ex}_{\mathcal{L}}$ the *extreme point operator*.

A set $A \subseteq E$ is called *independent* if $\text{ex}_{\mathcal{L}}(A) = A$. We say that e *depends on* f if there exists an independent set A such that $f \in A$, $e \in \tau_{\mathcal{L}}(A)$ and $e \notin \tau_{\mathcal{L}}(A \setminus \{f\})$. We denote the set of all elements f on which e depends by $\text{Dep}_{\mathcal{L}}(e)$ and call it the *dependency set* of e . A set $X \subseteq E$ is called *free* if $X \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\text{ex}_{\mathcal{L}}(X) = X$. We denote the family of free sets of a convex geometry \mathcal{L} by $\text{Free}(\mathcal{L})$. Note that $\text{Free}(\mathcal{L})$ forms a simplicial complex for any convex geometry \mathcal{L} . Thus, it is natural that we call $\text{Free}(\mathcal{L})$ the *free complex* of a convex geometry \mathcal{L} .

Now we will define a generalized convex shelling. Let P and Q be finite point sets in \mathbb{R}^d (where d is a positive integer) such that $P \cap \text{conv}(Q) = \emptyset$. Then the *generalized convex shelling* on P with respect to Q is a convex geometry \mathcal{L} defined as follows: $\mathcal{L} = \{X \subseteq P : P \cap \text{conv}(X \cup Q) = X\}$.² We also call a convex geometry \mathcal{L} a *d-dimensional generalized convex shelling* if there exist finite point sets P and Q in \mathbb{R}^d such that $P \cap \text{conv}(Q) = \emptyset$ and \mathcal{L} is isomorphic to the generalized convex shelling on P with respect to Q . A generalized convex shelling on P with respect to Q is called *separable* if $\text{conv}(P) \cap \text{conv}(Q) = \emptyset$; otherwise it is *non-separable*. The next lemma tells us the closure operator and the extreme point operator of a generalized convex shelling.

Lemma 3. *Let \mathcal{L} be a generalized convex shelling on P with respect to Q . Then, for a set $X \subseteq P$ we have $\tau_{\mathcal{L}}(X) = P \cap \text{conv}(X \cup Q)$ and $\text{ex}_{\mathcal{L}}(X) = \{x \in X : x \text{ is an extreme point of } \text{conv}(X \cup Q)\}$.³ In particular, $X \subseteq P$ is free if and only if $P \cap \text{conv}(X \cup Q) = X$ and every element of X is an extreme point of $\text{conv}(X \cup Q)$.*

In this paper, we study the free complex of a 2-dimensional separable generalized convex shelling. Since Open Problems 1 are valid if $Q = \emptyset$ [3], we want to concentrate on the case in which $Q \neq \emptyset$. Let us state that as an assumption.

²Actually, Q does not have to be a finite point set. It can be any subset of \mathbb{R}^d satisfying that $P \cap \text{conv}(Q) = \emptyset$. But for the simplicity, we will require Q to be a finite set.

³Here, you would notice that we are using the words ‘‘extreme point’’ in two different ways. One for an extreme point of a convex geometry, one for an extreme point of the convex hull. But they should be clear from the context.

Assumption 4. *When we talk about the generalized convex shelling on P with respect to Q in the rest of this paper, Q is always nonempty unless stated otherwise.*

Here, we define the clique complex of a graph. Let G be a graph. A *clique* of G is a vertex subset of G which induces a complete subgraph. The *clique complex* of G is the family of cliques of G . We treat the empty set and the single vertices as cliques, so the clique complex is actually a simplicial complex. In the literature, a clique complex is also called a *flag complex*.

3 On Open Problem 1.1 (proof of Theorem 2)

Now we concentrate on 2-dimensional separable generalized convex shellings. Namely, P and Q are nonempty finite point sets in \mathbb{R}^2 satisfying that $\text{conv}(P) \cap \text{conv}(Q) = \emptyset$ and \mathcal{L} is the generalized convex shelling on P with respect to Q .

To prove Theorem 2, we will use the following fact, which is a consequence of a proposition by Hachimori & Nakamura [5].

Lemma 5. *A minimal nonface of the free complex $\text{Free}(\mathcal{L})$ of a d -dimensional generalized convex shelling is of size at most d .*

It is well known that a simplicial complex whose minimal nonfaces are of size 2 is a clique complex of some graph. Therefore, so is the free complex of a 2-dimensional generalized convex shelling \mathcal{L} by Lemma 5 (and this graph is actually the 1-dimensional skeleton of $\text{Free}(\mathcal{L})$). Denote by $G(\mathcal{L})$ a unique graph whose clique complex is $\text{Free}(\mathcal{L})$. The next is a key lemma.

Lemma 6. *$G(\mathcal{L})$ is chordal and connected.*

Note that Lemma 6 fails for a non-separable case. Since the clique complex of a connected chordal graph is contractible (not difficult to show), we can immediately find that the free complex of a 2-dimensional separable generalized convex shelling is contractible. Note that this holds for all d -dimensional (possibly non-separable) generalized convex shellings even if $Q = \emptyset$. A proof of this fact has already been given by Edelman & Reiner [3] (based on a theorem in Edelman & Jamison [2]). Notice that our approach is discrete-geometric while they used tools from combinatorial topology. However, we are not aware of a discrete-geometric proof for the higher-dimensional case.


Since an induced subgraph of a chordal graph is also chordal, we can immediately see that if x be a vertex of $G(\mathcal{L})$ and c_x be the number of connected components of $G(\mathcal{L}) - x$ then $\text{del}_{\text{Free}(\mathcal{L})}(x)$ is homotopy equivalent to c_x distinct points. Therefore, to prove Theorem 2, we only have to show the following lemma.

Lemma 7. *A vertex x of $G(\mathcal{L})$ is not a cut-vertex of $G(\mathcal{L})$ if $\text{Dep}_{\mathcal{L}}(x) \neq P$.*

Thus, we are able to finish the proof of Theorem 2. Note that the converse of Lemma 7 does not hold in general. That is exactly the reason why Open Problem 1.2 is invalid, as we will see in the next section.

4 On Open Problem 1.2 (a negative answer)

Here we will give an example which answers Open Problem 1.2 negatively. Look at the figure. In this example, $P = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ and $Q = \{q_1, q_2\}$. Let \mathcal{L} be the generalized convex shelling on P with respect to Q . The solid lines show the edges of $G(\mathcal{L})$. We can observe that $\text{Dep}_{\mathcal{L}}(4) = P$. However, the deletion of 4 from $G(\mathcal{L})$ results in a connected graph, therefore $\text{del}_{\text{Free}(\mathcal{L})}(4)$ is contractible, which implies that this is not homotopy equivalent to (or does not have the same homology type as) a bouquet of equidimensional spheres.



References

- [1] C. Ahrens, G. Gordon and E.W. McMahon: Convexity and the beta invariant. *Discrete & Computational Geometry* **22** (1999) 411–424.
- [2] P.H. Edelman and R. Jamison: The theory of convex geometries. *Geometriae Dedicata* **19** (1985) 247–270.
- [3] P.H. Edelman and V. Reiner: Counting the interior points of a point configuration. *Discrete & Computational Geometry* **23** (2000) 1–13.
- [4] P.H. Edelman, V. Reiner and V. Welker: Convex, acyclic, and free sets of an oriented matroid. *Discrete & Computational Geometry* **27** (2002) 99–116.
- [5] M. Hachimori and M. Nakamura: Rooted circuits of closed-set systems and a max-flow min-cut theorem for stem clutters of affine convex geometries. Submitted.
- [6] K. Kashiwabara, M. Nakamura and Y. Okamoto: The affine representation theorem for abstract convex geometries. Submitted.
- [7] D.A. Klain: An Euler relation for valuations on polytopes. *Advances in Mathematics* **147** (1999) 1–14.