

Convex Equipartitions via Equivariant Obstruction Theory*

Pavle V. M. Blagojević
 Matematički Institut SANU
 Knez Mihailova 36
 11001 Beograd, Serbia
 pavleb@mi.sanu.ac.rs

Günter M. Ziegler
 Institut für Mathematik, FU Berlin
 Arnimallee 2
 14195 Berlin, Germany
 ziegler@math.fu-berlin.de

and
 Institut für Mathematik, FU Berlin
 Arnimallee 2
 14195 Berlin, Germany
 blagojevic@math.fu-berlin.de

September 2012; revised, January 2013

Abstract

We describe a regular cell complex model for the configuration space $F(\mathbb{R}^d, n)$. Based on this, we use Equivariant Obstruction Theory to prove the prime power case of the conjecture by Nandakumar and Ramana Rao that every polygon can be partitioned into n convex parts of equal area and perimeter.

1 Introduction

R. Nandakumar and N. Ramana Rao in June 2006 posed the following problem, which in [7] was characterized as “interesting and annoyingly resistant”:

Conjecture 1.1 (Nandakumar & Ramana Rao [42]). *Every convex polygon P in the plane can be partitioned into any prescribed number n of convex pieces that have equal area and equal perimeter.*

The conjecture was proved by Nandakumar & Ramana Rao [43] for $n = 2$, where it follows from the intermediate value theorem, that is, the Borsuk–Ulam theorem for maps $f : S^1 \rightarrow S^0$; the same authors also gave elementary arguments for the result for $n = 2^k$. For $n = 3$ the conjecture was proven by Bárány, Blagojević & Szűcs [7] via advanced topological methods.

For general n , it was noted by Karasev [34] and Hubard & Aronov [30] that the conjecture would follow from the non-existence of an \mathfrak{S}_n -equivariant map $F(\mathbb{R}^2, n) \rightarrow S(W_n)$, where $F(\mathbb{R}^2, n)$ denotes the configuration space of n distinct labeled points in the plane, that is, the set of all real $2 \times n$ matrices with pairwise distinct columns, and $W_n := \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_1 + \dots + x_n = 0\}$ is the set of all row vectors in \mathbb{R}^n with vanishing sum of coordinates. Both $F(\mathbb{R}^2, n)$ and W_n have the obvious action of \mathfrak{S}_n by permuting columns. Indeed, assume that a

*The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC Grant agreement no. 247029-SDModels. The first author was also supported by the grant ON 174008 of the Serbian Ministry of Education and Science.

convex polygon $P \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ yields a counterexample to the Nandakumar and Ramana Rao conjecture for some $n \geq 2$. Then we get an \mathfrak{S}_n -equivariant map

$$\text{EAP}(P, n) \longrightarrow_{\mathfrak{S}_n} S(W_n)$$

from a suitably defined (metric) *space of equal area partitions* of P , denoted $\text{EAP}(P, n)$, to the sphere $S(W_n)$: It maps the partition (P_1, \dots, P_n) to the vector of perimeters $(p(P_1), \dots, p(P_n))$, then subtracts the average perimeter $\frac{1}{n}(p(P_1) + \dots + p(P_n))$ from each component of this vector, and finally normalizes the resulting vector to have length 1. Moreover, mapping each piece P_i to its barycenter results in a continuous \mathfrak{S}_n -equivariant map

$$\text{EAP}(P, n) \longrightarrow_{\mathfrak{S}_n} F(\mathbb{R}^2, n),$$

while the theory of Optimal Transport (see Section 2) yields a continuous \mathfrak{S}_n -equivariant map

$$F(\mathbb{R}^2, n) \longrightarrow_{\mathfrak{S}_n} \text{EAP}(P, n).$$

Thus the existence of an \mathfrak{S}_n -equivariant map $\text{EAP}(P, n) \longrightarrow_{\mathfrak{S}_n} S(W_n)$ is equivalent to the existence of an \mathfrak{S}_n -equivariant map

$$F(\mathbb{R}^2, n) \longrightarrow_{\mathfrak{S}_n} S(W_n).$$

Similarly, for d -dimensional generalizations of the Nandakumar and Ramana Rao problem, asking for partition of a d -dimensional polytope, or a sufficiently continuous measure on \mathbb{R}^d , into n convex pieces on which $d - 1$ continuous functions are equalized, one would try to prove the non-existence of \mathfrak{S}_n -equivariant maps

$$F(\mathbb{R}^d, n) \longrightarrow_{\mathfrak{S}_n} S(W_n^{\oplus(d-1)}).$$

First Karasev [34] and later Hubard & Aronov [30] proposed to show this non-existence for prime power $n = p^k$ and $d \geq 2$ based on a cell decomposition of the one-point compactification of the configuration space that appears in work by Fuks [25] and Vassiliev [50]. Thus they have to deal with twisted Euler classes on non-compact manifolds resp. on compactifications that are not manifolds; no complete treatment for this has been given yet.

Indeed, to see that the situation is not easily handled with Euler class arguments, let $E \rightarrow M$ be a vector bundle over an orientable open manifold M , let E_0 be the corresponding zero section, and let $s : M \rightarrow E$ be a generic cross section. This means that $s(M)$ intersects E_0 transversally, and consequently the singular set $s(M) \cap E_0$ is a manifold. The fundamental class of the singular set lives in the homology with closed supports (or Borel–Moore homology) $H_*^{\text{cl}}(M)$, [14]. The homology with closed supports is not a homotopy invariant of the space [45, Remark on p. 48]. Therefore, the Poincaré duality isomorphism, which relates the homology with closed supports $H_*^{\text{cl}}(M)$ with the relative cohomology of the one-point compactification $H^*(\hat{X}, \text{pt})$, needs not map the fundamental class of the singular set to the Euler class of the vector bundle $E \rightarrow M$. In particular, the fundamental classes of singular sets of two different generic cross sections do not need to coincide in $H_*^{\text{cl}}(M)$.

In this paper we obtain the desired result, while avoiding these difficulties, via Equivariant Obstruction Theory. Moreover, this approach yields an “if and only if” statement:

Theorem 1.2. *For $d, n \geq 2$, an \mathfrak{S}_n -equivariant map*

$$F(\mathbb{R}^d, n) \longrightarrow_{\mathfrak{S}_n} S(W_n^{\oplus(d-1)})$$

exists if and only if n is not a prime power.

For this, we describe in Section 3 a beautiful \mathfrak{S}_n -equivariant $(d-1)(n-1)$ -dimensional cell complex with $n!$ vertices and $n!$ facets that is an \mathfrak{S}_n -equivariant strong deformation retract of $F(\mathbb{R}^d, n)$. For $d = 2$ this complex is implicit in work by Deligne [20] and explicit in Salvetti's work [47]. For $d \geq 2$ we obtain it by specialization of a construction due to Björner & Ziegler [11].

Theorem 1.2 in particular resolves the original problem by Nandakumar & Ramana Rao for prime powers n .

Theorem 1.3. *Let $d \geq 2$ and let μ_d be an absolutely continuous probability measure on \mathbb{R}^d (given by a nonnegative Lebesgue integrable density function with convex support).*

If n is a prime power, then for any $d-1$ continuous functions f_i , $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, on the space of nonempty convex bodies there is a partition of \mathbb{R}^d into n convex regions $C_1, \dots, C_n \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ that equiparts μ_d ,

$$\mu_d(C_1) = \dots = \mu_d(C_n) = \frac{1}{n},$$

and that at the same time equalizes the functions f_1, \dots, f_{d-1} :

$$f_i(C_1) = \dots = f_i(C_n) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq d-1.$$

We note that this solves the Nandakumar and Ramana Rao Conjecture for all $d \geq 2$ and all prime powers $n \geq 2$, and the problem is quite easily solved for $d = 1$, while the original problem remains open already for $d = 2$ and $n = 6$.

Nevertheless, from Theorem 1.2 we also get a much stronger theorem for the prime power case, for continuous functions on the *space of equal measure partitions*, whose components need not depend only on the corresponding pieces. This generalization *fails* if n is not a prime power.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $d \geq 2$ and let μ_d be an absolutely continuous probability measure on \mathbb{R}^d .*

If n is a prime power, then for any $d-1$ continuous \mathfrak{S}_n -equivariant functions $F_i = (f_{1,i}, \dots, f_{n,i})$, $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, on the space $\text{EMP}(\mu_d, n)$ of partitions of \mathbb{R}^d into n convex regions $C_1, \dots, C_n \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ that equipart μ_d ,

$$\mu_d(C_1) = \dots = \mu_d(C_n) = \frac{1}{n},$$

there is such a partition $(C_1, \dots, C_n) \in \text{EMP}(\mu_d, n)$ which at the same time equalizes the components of each of the functions F_1, \dots, F_{d-1} :

$$f_{1,i}(C_1, \dots, C_n) = \dots = f_{n,i}(C_1, \dots, C_n) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq d-1.$$

*If n is not a prime power, then this is false: For any given $d \geq 2$, **any** continuous positive probability measure μ_d on \mathbb{R}^d , and n not a prime power, there are \mathfrak{S}_n -equivariant continuous functions $F_1 = (f_{1,1}, \dots, f_{n,1}), \dots, F_{d-1} = (f_{1,d-1}, \dots, f_{n,d-1})$ on the space $\text{EMP}(\mu_d, n)$ of equal measure partitions of \mathbb{R}^d into n convex polyhedra such that no such partition equalizes the components for all $d-1$ functions F_1, \dots, F_{d-1} .*

An example of a function $F_1 = (f_{1,1}, \dots, f_{n,1})$ that satisfies the conditions of Theorem 1.4 is given by

$$f_{i,1}(C_1, \dots, C_n) := \text{diam}(C_i) - \frac{1}{n}(\text{diam}(C_1) + \dots + \text{diam}(C_n)),$$

as the components $f_{i,1}$ of this function F_1 do not depend on C_1 alone.

Our proof of Theorem 1.2 relies on Equivariant Obstruction Theory as formulated by tom Dieck [21, Sec. II.3]. We happen to be in the fortunate situation where we have to deal only with primary obstructions, for mapping a cell complex of dimension $(d-1)(n-1)$ to a sphere of dimension $(d-1)(n-1)-1$. Moreover, the cell complex has a single orbit of maximal cells

(“facets”), on which the obstruction cocycle evaluates to 1. At the same time, we have $n - 1$ orbits of cells of dimension $(d - 1)(n - 1) - 1$ (called “subfacets” or “ridges”); these orbits have cardinalities $\binom{n}{i}$. The proof is completed via a number theoretic fact about the n -th row of the Pascal triangle:

$$\gcd\left\{\binom{n}{1}, \binom{n}{2}, \dots, \binom{n}{n-1}\right\} = \begin{cases} p & \text{if } n \text{ is a prime power, } n = p^k, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This may be derived from the work by Legendre and Kummer on prime factors in factorials and binomial coefficients, apparently was first proved by Ram [46] in 1909, extended by Joris et al. [31], and was later rediscovered by A. Granville (see Soulé [49] and Kaplan & Levy [33]).

2 From Convex Partitions to Configuration Spaces

In this section we briefly sketch the provenance of the \mathfrak{S}_n -equivariant map

$$F(\mathbb{R}^d, n) \longrightarrow_{\mathfrak{S}_n} \text{EMP}(\mu_d, n)$$

used in our proof of the first half of Theorem 1.2 (following Hubard & Aronov [30]). It maps point configurations to convex partitions that are “regular” in the sense of Gelfand, Kapranov & Zelevinsky [27] [53, Lect. 4], that is, which arise from piecewise-linear convex functions. In Computational Geometry such partitions are known as *generalized Voronoi diagrams* or *power diagrams*. The equivalence between partitions induced by Optimal Transport and those given by the domains of linearity of a minimum of n linear functions was proved by Aurenhammer [2], and certainly also by others; see Siersma & van Manen [48]. Theorem 1.3 yields Theorem 1.2 as regular equipartitions are parametrized by $F(\mathbb{R}^d, n)$. This remarkable observation can be traced back to Minkowski [39, 40]. It was independently developed in Optimal Transport (see Villani [52, Chap. 2]) and in Computational Geometry (see Aurenhammer, Hoffmann & Aronov [3, 4]).

A classical case of regular partitions is known in Computational Geometry as *Voronoi diagrams* and in Number Theory as *Dirichlet tessellations*. These are obtained as $\mathcal{V}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (C_1, \dots, C_n)$ via

$$\begin{aligned} C_i &:= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x - x_i\| \leq \|x - x_j\| \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq n\} \\ &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x - x_i\|^2 - \|x\|^2 \leq \|x - x_j\|^2 - \|x\|^2 \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq n\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus C_i is the domain in \mathbb{R}^d where the linear (!) function $f_i(x) = \|x - x_i\|^2 - \|x\|^2$ yields the minimum among all functions $f_j(x)$ of the same type, and thus the Voronoi diagram is given by the domains of linearity of the piecewise-linear convex function $f(x) = \min\{\|x - x_i\|^2 - \|x\|^2 : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$.

For *generalized Voronoi diagrams* or *power diagrams* we introduce additional real weights $w_1, \dots, w_n \in \mathbb{R}$, and set $\mathcal{P}(x_1, \dots, x_n; w_1, \dots, w_n) = (P_1, \dots, P_n)$ with

$$P_i := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x - x_i\|^2 - w_i \leq \|x - x_j\|^2 - w_j \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq n\}.$$

As an additive constant does not change the partition, we may without loss of generality replace w_i by $w_i - \frac{1}{n}(w_1 + \dots + w_n)$, and thus assume that $w_1 + \dots + w_n = 0$, that is, $(w_1, \dots, w_n) \in W_n$.

Again, the partition of space given by a generalized Voronoi diagram is a regular subdivision. However, now some of the parts P_i may be empty, and $x_i \in P_i$ does not hold in general. We refer to Aurenhammer & Klein [5] and Siersma & van Manen [48] for further background.

The major part of the following theorem (except for the continuity, which of course is essential for us) was provided by Aurenhammer, Hoffmann & Aronov [3] in 1992. The 1998 journal version [4] of their paper noted the connection to Optimal Transport; thus, the proof can be done using optimal assignment and linear programming duality, as developed (for this purpose) by Kantorovich in 1939 [32], with the “double convexification” trick. For a modern exposition see Villani [52, Chap. 2]. Evans [23] provides a nice account based on discretization. Alternatively, Geiß et al. [26] obtain the optimal weights from minimizing a quadratic objective function.

Theorem 2.1 (Kantorovich 1939, etc.). *Let μ_d be an absolutely continuous probability measure on \mathbb{R}^d and $n \geq 2$. Then for any $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $x_i \neq x_j$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ there are weights $w_1, \dots, w_n \in \mathbb{R}$, $w_1 + \dots + w_n = 0$, such that the power diagram $\mathcal{P}(x_1, \dots, x_n; w_1, \dots, w_n)$ equiparts the measure μ_d . Moreover, the weights w_1, \dots, w_n*

- *are unique,*
- *depend continuously on x_1, \dots, x_n , and*
- *can be characterized/computed via optimal assignment with respect to quadratic cost functions.*

In short, this theorem yields a continuous, \mathfrak{S}_n -equivariant map $F(\mathbb{R}^d, n) \rightarrow_{\mathfrak{S}_n} \text{EMP}(\mu_d, n)$. Moreover, mapping to the barycenters (with respect to the measure μ_d) of the pieces yields an \mathfrak{S}_n -equivariant map $\text{EMP}(\mu_d, n) \rightarrow_{\mathfrak{S}_n} F(\mathbb{R}^d, n)$. Thus the claim of Theorem 1.4 is equivalent to the fact that an \mathfrak{S}_n -equivariant continuous map

$$F(\mathbb{R}^d, n) \longrightarrow_{\mathfrak{S}_n} W_n^{\oplus(d-1)} \setminus \{0\}.$$

exists if and only if n is not a prime power. This will be established in the following.

3 A Cell Complex Model for $F(\mathbb{R}^d, n)$

In order to apply obstruction theory to $F(\mathbb{R}^d, n)$, we specialize the cell complex models given for complements of real subspace arrangements by Björner & Ziegler [11]. For $d = 2$, the barycentric subdivision of this cell complex is treated implicitly in Deligne [20]. The cell complex for a general complement of a complexified hyperplane arrangements is developed in more detail by Salvetti [47] and thus known as the “Salvetti complex.” These cell complex models are closely related to the cell complex structures described already in 1962 by Fox & Neuwirth [24], and later by Fuks [25] for $S^{2n} = \mathbb{R}^{2n} \cup \{*\} \supset F(\mathbb{R}^2, n)$. The analogous constructions for $F(\mathbb{R}^d, n)$ were done by Vassiliev [51]. See also de Concini & Salvetti [19] and Basabe et al. [8], as well as very recently Guisti & Sinha [28] and Ayala & Hepworth [6].

To obtain our cell complex model, we first retract $F(\mathbb{R}^d, n)$ by $\bar{x}_i := x_i - \frac{1}{n}(x_1 + \dots + x_n)$ to

$$\bar{F}(\mathbb{R}^d, n) := \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n} : x_1 + \dots + x_n = 0, x_i \neq x_j \text{ for } 1 \leq i < j \leq n\},$$

which is the complement of an essential arrangement of linear subspaces of codimension d in the vector space $W_n^{\oplus d} = \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n} : x_1 + \dots + x_n = 0\}$ of dimension $d(n - 1)$. (An arrangement of linear subspaces is *essential* if the intersection of all the subspaces is the origin.) All the subspaces in the arrangement have codimension d and all their intersections have codimensions that are multiples of d , so this is a d -arrangement in the sense of Goresky & MacPherson [29, Sect. III.4]. See Björner [9] for more background on subspace arrangements.

To construct the *Fox–Neuwirth stratification* of this essential arrangement of linear subspaces (which, except for the ordering of the coordinates, is equivalent to the “ $s^{(1)}$ -stratification” of [11, Sect. 9.3]), we order the n columns of the matrix $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in W_n^{\oplus d}$ in lexicographic order. That is, we find a unique permutation $\sigma : i \mapsto \sigma_i$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$), which we denote by $\sigma = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \dots \sigma_n \in \mathfrak{S}_n$, such that for $1 \leq j < n$,

- either for some i_j , $1 \leq i_j \leq d$, we have $x_{i_j, \sigma_j} < x_{i_j, \sigma_{j+1}}$ with $x_{i', \sigma_j} = x_{i', \sigma_{j+1}}$ for all $i' < i_j$,
 - or $x_{\sigma_j} = x_{\sigma_{j+1}}$; in this case we set $i_j = d + 1$ and impose the extra condition that $\sigma_j < \sigma_{j+1}$.
- Then we assign to (x_1, \dots, x_n) the combinatorial data

$$(\sigma_1 <_{i_1} \sigma_2 <_{i_2} \dots <_{i_{n-1}} \sigma_n),$$

where $\sigma = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \dots \sigma_n \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ is a permutation and $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_{n-1}) \in \{1, \dots, d, d + 1\}^{n-1}$ is a vector of coordinate indices.

Example 3.1. Let $d = 2$, $n = 8$: The 8 points $x_1, \dots, x_8 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ in the left part of Figure 1 correspond to the permutation $\sigma = 38147652$. The combinatorial data for this configuration




Figure 1: Two point configurations for $d = 2$, $n = 8$

are $(\sigma, \mathbf{i}) = (3 <_2 8 <_1 1 <_2 4 <_1 7 <_1 6 <_2 5 <_2 2)$. For the point configuration on the right we get the permutation $\sigma' = 31847652$ and the combinatorial data $(\sigma', \mathbf{i}') = (3 <_2 1 <_2 8 <_2 4 <_1 7 <_1 6 <_2 5 <_2 2)$.

All the points in $W_n^{\oplus d}$ with the same combinatorial data (σ, \mathbf{i}) make up a *stratum* that we denote by $C(\sigma, \mathbf{i})$. This stratum is the relative interior of a polyhedral cone of codimension $(i_1 - 1) + \dots + (i_{n-1} - 1)$, that is, of dimension $(d + 1)(n - 1) - (i_1 + \dots + i_{n-1})$ in $W_n^{\oplus d}$.

Example 3.2. The stratum $C(\sigma, \mathbf{i}) = (3 <_2 8 <_1 1 <_2 4 <_1 7 <_1 6 <_2 5 <_2 2)$ of Example 3.1 has dimension 10. It is

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & x_{12} & \dots & x_{18} \\ x_{21} & x_{22} & \dots & x_{28} \end{pmatrix} \in W_8^{\oplus 2} \subset \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 8} : \begin{array}{l} x_{13} = x_{18} < x_{11} = x_{14} < x_{17} < x_{16} = x_{15} = x_{12} \\ x_{23} < x_{28} \quad x_{21} < x_{24} \quad x_{27} \quad x_{26} < x_{25} < x_{22} \end{array} \right\}.$$

Lemma 3.3. *The closure of each stratum $C(\sigma, \mathbf{i}) \subset W_n^{\oplus d}$ is a union of strata, namely of all strata $C(\sigma', \mathbf{i}')$ such that*

- (*) *If $\dots \sigma_k \dots <_{i'_p} \dots \sigma_\ell \dots$ appear in this order in (σ', \mathbf{i}') , then either $\dots \sigma_k \dots <_{i_p} \dots \sigma_\ell \dots$ appear in this order in (σ, \mathbf{i}) with $i_p \leq i'_p$, or $\dots \sigma_\ell \dots <_{i_p} \dots \sigma_k \dots$ appear in this order in (σ, \mathbf{i}) with $i_p < i'_p$.*

Proof. Let (x_1, \dots, x_n) be a configuration of points that lies in the stratum $C(\sigma, \mathbf{i})$, which is a relatively open polyhedral cone characterized by equations and strict inequalities. The closure of the cone is given by the condition that the equations still hold, and the inequalities still hold weakly. Thus the smallest index of a coordinate in which two points x_{σ_k} and x_{σ_ℓ} differ may not go down when moving to x'_{σ_k} and x'_{σ_ℓ} , and if it stays the same, then the order in this coordinate must be preserved.

Thus if $\dots \sigma_k \dots <_{i'_p} \dots \sigma_\ell \dots$ appear in this order in (σ', \mathbf{i}') and i'_p is not the smallest such index, then no condition is posed. If i'_p is the smallest such index, then we either have the same

in (σ, \mathbf{i}) , or there is a smaller index i_p . If there is no smaller index, then we still require that $\dots\sigma_k\dots < i'_p \dots\sigma_\ell\dots$ appear in this order in (σ, \mathbf{i}) . If there is a smaller index $i_p < i'_p$ between σ_k and σ_ℓ , then the order is arbitrary.

Condition (*) describes this. □

Example 3.4. For the point configurations of Example 3.1, the 9-dimensional stratum $C(\sigma', \mathbf{i}')$ lies in the boundary of the 10-dimensional stratum $C(\sigma, \mathbf{i})$.

Definition 3.5. For $d \geq 1$, $n \geq 2$ the set of pairs (σ, \mathbf{i}) with the partial order $(\sigma, \mathbf{i}) \geq (\sigma', \mathbf{i}')$ described by Condition (*) in Lemma 3.3 is denoted by $S(d, n)$. Its minimal element $(1 <_{d+1} 2 <_{d+1} \dots <_{d+1} n)$ is denoted by $\hat{0}$.

Example 3.6. The face poset of $S(2, 3)$ is displayed in Figure 2. (Compare [11, Fig. 2.3].) Here black dots denote cells in the complement of the arrangement given by the codimension 2 subspaces “ $x_i = x_j$ ” (that is, lying in the configuration space $F(\mathbb{R}^2, 3)$), while the white dots correspond to cells on the arrangement.

By Lemma 3.3, the intersection of the strata of the Fox–Neuwirth stratification of $W_n^{\oplus d}$ with the unit sphere $S(W_n^{\oplus d})$ yields a regular CW decomposition of this sphere of dimension $d(n-1) - 1$, whose face poset is given by $S(d, n)$. (Here the stratum $\{0\}$ corresponds to $\hat{0} \in S(d, n)$; it corresponds to the empty cell in the cellular sphere.)

The union of the arrangement is composed of all the strata with at least one entry $<_{d+1}$, while the strata where all comparisons $<_k$ have $k \leq d$ lie in the complement. In particular, the link of the arrangement (its intersection with the unit sphere) is given by a subcomplex of the cell decomposition of the unit sphere in $W_n^{\oplus d}$ induced by the stratification.

Example 3.7. For $d \geq 1$, $n = 2$ the CW decomposition of the unit sphere in $W_2^{\oplus d} \cong \mathbb{R}^d$ we obtain is the minimal, centrally-symmetric cell decomposition of the $(d-1)$ -sphere that has two vertices, two edges, two 2-cells, etc.: The two i -cells are $C(1 <_{d-i} 2) \cap S(W_2^{\oplus d})$ and $C(2 <_{d-i} 1) \cap S(W_2^{\oplus d})$, for $0 \leq i < d$. Both i -cells lie in the boundary of both j -cells, for $0 \leq i < j < d$.

Example 3.8. For $d = 1$, $n \geq 2$ the stratification of W_n is given by the real arrangement of $\binom{n}{2}$ hyperplanes $x_i = x_j$ in W_n . The CW decomposition of the unit sphere in W_n has $2^n - 2$ vertices, indexed by $(\sigma_1 <_2 \dots <_2 \sigma_{k-1} <_1 \sigma_k <_2 \dots <_2 \sigma_n)$ with $1 \leq k < n$, $\sigma_1 < \dots < \sigma_{k-1}$ and $\sigma_k < \dots < \sigma_n$, and $n!$ facets corresponding to the regions of the hyperplane arrangement, indexed by $(\sigma_1 <_1 \dots <_1 \sigma_n)$ for permutations $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$.

We are dealing with a partition (“stratification”) of a Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^m into a finite number of relative-open polyhedral cones such that the relative boundary of each cone C (i.e. its boundary in the affine hull) is a union of (necessarily: finitely many, lower-dimensional) cones of the stratification. Furthermore the stratification is *weakly essential* in the following sense: some of the strata may not be pointed (i.e., have $\{0\}$ as a face of the closure), but $\{0\}$ is a stratum that lies in the boundary of all other strata, which thus are proper subsets of their affine hulls. In this situation any selection of points v_C in the relative interiors of the strata C induces a PL homeomorphism between the order complex of the face poset of the stratification to a star-shaped PL ball that is a neighborhood of the origin in \mathbb{R}^m .

Example 3.9. Figure 3 shows a weakly essential stratification of \mathbb{R}^2 , its face poset, and a realization of the order complex of its face poset.

We now implement this construction for our specific stratification of $W_n^{\oplus d}$:

Lemma 3.10. For $d \geq 1$, $n \geq 2$, in each stratum $C(\sigma, \mathbf{i})$ a relative-interior point $v(\sigma, \mathbf{i}) = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in W_n^{\oplus d}$ is obtained as follows: Set

$$\tilde{x}_{\sigma(1)} := 0, \quad \tilde{x}_{\sigma(j+1)} := \tilde{x}_{\sigma(j)} + e_{i_j},$$




Figure 2: The face poset $S(2, 3)$




Figure 3: A stratification of \mathbb{R}^2 , its face poset, and a realization of its order complex

where e_i denotes the i th standard unit vector in \mathbb{R}^d , with $e_{d+1} := 0$. The point $v(\sigma, \mathbf{i})$ is the image of this $\tilde{x}(\sigma, \mathbf{i})$ under the orthogonal projection map ν from $\mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ to the subspace $W_n^{\oplus d}$, which translates the barycenter of the configuration to the origin, given by $x_j := \nu(\tilde{x}_j) = \tilde{x}_j - \frac{1}{n}(\tilde{x}_1 + \cdots + \tilde{x}_n)$.

These points $v(\sigma, \mathbf{i})$ yield the vertices of a geometric realization of the order complex $\Delta S(d, n)$ by a star-shaped PL neighborhood $\text{sd } \mathcal{B}(d, n)$ of the origin in $W_n^{\oplus d}$. Its boundary is a geometric realization of the barycentric subdivision of the cell decomposition $\mathcal{S}(d, n)$ of $S(W_n^{\oplus d})$ that is induced by the Fox–Newirth stratification.

Example 3.11. For the data $(\sigma, \mathbf{i}) = (3 <_2 8 <_1 1 <_2 4 <_1 7 <_1 6 <_2 5 <_2 2)$ of the first configuration in Example 3.1, Lemma 3.10 yields the following configuration of Figure 4, which is then normalized by the map ν .




Figure 4: The coordinates of Lemma 3.10 for the first configuration of Example 3.1

Example 3.12. For $n = 3$, $d = 1$ the star-shaped PL neighborhood $\text{sd } \mathcal{B}(1, 3)$ of $W_3 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ has 13 vertices, some of whose coordinates according to Lemma 3.10 are indicated in Figure 5.




Figure 5: Coordinates for the realization of $\text{sd } \mathcal{B}(1, 3)$ in W_3 according to Lemma 3.10

In particular, the boundary of the star-shaped PL neighborhood $\text{sd } \mathcal{B}(d, n)$ is an \mathfrak{S}_n -invariant PL sphere. The link of the arrangement is represented by an induced subcomplex of this sphere. The dual cell complex of the sphere contains, as a subcomplex, a cellular model for the complement of the arrangement – that is, a simplicial complex that is a strong deformation retract of the configuration space $F(\mathbb{R}^d, n)$. The cell complex is *regular* in the sense that the attaching maps of cells do not make identifications on the boundary; in particular, the barycentric subdivision of any such complex is a simplicial complex, given by the order complex of the face poset (see e.g. Björner et al. [10, Sect. 4.7], Cooke & Finney [18], Munkres [41]).

Theorem 3.13 (Cell complex model for $F(\mathbb{R}^d, n)$). *Let $d \geq 1$ and $n \geq 2$. Then $F(\mathbb{R}^d, n)$ contains, as an equivariant strong deformation retract, a finite (and thus compact) regular CW complex $\mathcal{F}(d, n)$ of dimension $(d-1)(n-1)$ with $n!$ vertices, $n!$ facets, and $(n-1)n!$ ridges.*

The nonempty faces of $\mathcal{F}(d, n)$ are indexed by the data of the form

$$(\sigma, \mathbf{i}) := (\sigma_1 <_{i_1} \sigma_2 <_{i_2} \cdots <_{i_{n-1}} \sigma_n),$$

where $\sigma = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \dots \sigma_n \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ is a permutation, and $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_{n-1}) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^{n-1}$. Let $\mathcal{F}(d, n)$ be the set of these strings.

The dimension of the cell $\check{c}(\sigma, \mathbf{i})$ associated with (σ, \mathbf{i}) is $(i_1 + \dots + i_{n-1}) - (n-1)$.

The inclusion relation between cells $\check{c}(\sigma, \mathbf{i})$, and thus the partial order of the face poset $\mathcal{F}(d, n)$, is as follows:

$$(\sigma, \mathbf{i}) \preceq (\sigma', \mathbf{i}')$$

holds if and only if

- (**) whenever $\dots \sigma_k \dots <_{i'_p} \dots \sigma_\ell \dots$ appear in this order in (σ', \mathbf{i}') , then either $\dots \sigma_k \dots <_{i_p} \dots \sigma_\ell \dots$ appear in this order in (σ, \mathbf{i}) with $i_p \leq i'_p$, or $\dots \sigma_\ell \dots <_{i_p} \dots \sigma_k \dots$ appear in this order in (σ, \mathbf{i}) with $i_p < i'_p$.

The barycentric subdivision of the cell complex $\mathcal{F}(d, n)$ (that is, the order complex $\Delta\mathcal{F}(d, n)$ of its face poset) has a geometric realization in $W_n^{\oplus d}$ with vertices $v(\sigma, \mathbf{i}) = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in W_n^{\oplus d}$ placed according to

$$\tilde{x}_{\sigma(1)} := 0, \quad \tilde{x}_{\sigma(j+1)} := \tilde{x}_{\sigma(j)} + e_{i_j},$$

where e_i denotes the i th standard unit vector in \mathbb{R}^d , followed by orthogonal projection $\mathbb{R}^{d \times n} \rightarrow W_n^{\oplus d}$, given by $x_j := \tilde{x}_j - \frac{1}{n}(\tilde{x}_1 + \dots + \tilde{x}_n)$. This geometric realization in $W_n^{\oplus d} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ is an \mathfrak{S}_n -equivariant strong deformation retract of $F(\mathbb{R}^d, n)$.

The group \mathfrak{S}_n acts on the poset $\mathcal{F}(d, n)$ via $\pi \cdot (\sigma, \mathbf{i}) = (\pi\sigma, \mathbf{i})$, and correspondingly by $\pi \cdot v(\sigma, \mathbf{i}) = v(\pi\sigma, \mathbf{i})$ on the geometric realization $\text{sd}\mathcal{F}(d, n)$ with vertex set $\{v(\sigma, \mathbf{i}) : (\sigma, \mathbf{i}) \in \mathcal{F}(d, n)\}$.

Proof. Orthogonal projection \mathfrak{S}_n -equivariantly retracts $F(\mathbb{R}^d, n)$ to $\overline{F}(\mathbb{R}^d, n) \subset W_n^{\oplus d}$, and further radial projection \mathfrak{S}_n -equivariantly retracts this to a subset of the boundary of the star-shaped neighborhood of the origin, $\partial\text{sd}\mathcal{B}(d, n)$, which is a simplicial realization of the cell decomposition of the $(d(n-1)-1)$ -dimensional sphere $S(W_n^{\oplus d})$ given by the Fox–Neuwirth stratification.

The same maps identify the link of the arrangement (that is, the intersection of its union with the unit sphere) with the induced subcomplex of $\partial\text{sd}\mathcal{B}(d, n)$ on the vertices $v(\sigma, \mathbf{i})$ that have some index $i_j = d+1$.

As the cell decomposition of the $(d(n-1)-1)$ -sphere $S(W_n^{\oplus d})$ is PL, we can pass to the Poincaré–Alexander dual cell decomposition. Thus for every vertex in the sphere $S(W_n^{\oplus d})$, there is a corresponding facet in the dual cell decomposition, which is given by its star in the barycentric subdivision of the cell decomposition. More generally, any nonempty cell $C(\sigma, \mathbf{i})$ of dimension $(d+1)(n-1) - (i_1 + \dots + i_n) - 1$ has an associated dual cell $\check{c}(\sigma, \mathbf{i})$ of dimension $(d(n-1)-1) - ((d+1)(n-1) - (i_1 + \dots + i_{n-1}) - 1) = (i_1 + \dots + i_{n-1}) - (n-1)$, and the inclusion relation is just the opposite of the one in the primal complex, as described in Lemma 3.3. (Compare to Munkres [41, §64].)

According to the Retraction Lemma [10, Lemma 4.7.27] [41, Lemma 70.1], the complement admits a strong deformation retraction to the subcomplex whose cells are indexed by all pairs (σ, \mathbf{i}) with all indices $i_j \neq d+1$. (This retraction is easy to describe in barycentric coordinates in the barycentric subdivision of the cell complex, that is, on the order complex of the face poset. The \mathfrak{S}_n -action restricts to the subcomplex, and the retraction is canonical, and thus \mathfrak{S}_n -equivariant.)

So we obtain a strong deformation retract of $F(\mathbb{R}^d, n)$ that is a cell complex with cells indexed by (σ, \mathbf{i}) with all indices $i_j \neq 0$. The barycentric subdivision of this cell complex is realized as a simplicial complex in $W_n^{\oplus d}$ as the induced subcomplex of $\partial N(d, n)$ on the vertices $v(\sigma, \mathbf{i})$ with all indices $i_j \neq d+1$. Thus also the \mathfrak{S}_n -action restricts to this simplicial model for the complement. \square

Example 3.14. For $n = 2$ the cell complex $\mathcal{F}(d, 2)$ turns out to be the centrally-symmetric cell decomposition of S^{d-1} whose $(i-1)$ -cells are given by $\check{c}(1 <_i 2)$ and $\check{c}(2 <_i 1)$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$. (Compare to Example 3.7.)

Example 3.15. For $d = 1$ the configuration space $F(\mathbb{R}, n)$ is the complement of a real hyperplane arrangement in W_n . The cell complex $\mathcal{F}(1, n)$ is 0-dimensional, given by the $n!$ vertices $v(\sigma_1 <_1 \sigma_2 \dots <_1 \sigma_n) \in W_n$, one in each chamber of the arrangement. (Compare to Example 3.12.)

Example 3.16. For $d = 2$ the configuration space $F(\mathbb{R}^2, n) = F(\mathbb{C}, n)$ may be viewed as the complement of a complex hyperplane arrangement, known as the braid arrangement. This is the particular situation studied by Arnol'd [1], Deligne [20], and many others. The cell complex

that we obtain is a particularly interesting instance of the cell complex constructed by Salvetti [47] for the complements of complexified hyperplane arrangements (see also [11]).

In this case we may simplify our notation a bit: The non-empty cells of the complex are indexed by $(\sigma_1 <_{i_1} \cdots <_{i_{n-1}} \sigma_n)$ with $i_j \in \{1, 2\}$. Thus we can identify our cells uniquely if we just write a vertical bar instead of “ $<_1$ ”, no bar for “ $<_2$ ”. The inclusion of a cell into the boundary of a higher-dimensional cell is then represented in the partial order by (repeatedly) “removing a bar, and shuffling the two blocks that were separated by the bar”.

For example, for $n = 3$ we obtain the face poset $F(2, 3)$ displayed in Figure 6. It is obtained by taking the elements of the partial order $S(2, 3)$ displayed in Figure 2 that are marked by black dots, with labels simplified, and the partial order reversed.




Figure 6: The poset $F(2, 3)$

We see that the cell complex $\mathcal{F}(2, n)$ is particularly nice:

- The cell complex $\mathcal{F}(2, n)$ is a regular cell complex of dimension $n - 1$.
- It has $n!$ facets, given by permutations $\sigma_1 \sigma_2 \dots \sigma_n$, and $n!$ vertices, given by the barred permutations $\sigma_1 | \sigma_2 | \dots | \sigma_n$.
- It has $\binom{n-1}{i-1} n!$ cells of dimension i , given by permutations with $n - i - 1$ bars.
- The order relation is generated by the operation of “remove a bar, and merge the two adjacent blocks separated by the bar by a shuffle”.
- The maximal cells have the combinatorial structure of an $(n - 1)$ -dimensional permutahedron. (Thus all cells have the combinatorial structure of simple polytopes, namely of products of permutahedra.)

Figure 7 indicates the structure of the cell complex $\mathcal{F}(2, 3)$: This is a regular cell complex with $3! = 6$ vertices, $2 \cdot 3! = 12$ edges, and $3! = 6$ 2-cells, which are hexagons. The figure displays the six 2-cells shaded in separate drawings; for example, the 2-cell $\check{c}(123)$ is bounded by the six edges $\check{c}(1|23)$, $\check{c}(13|2)$, $\check{c}(3|12)$, $\check{c}(23|1)$, $\check{c}(2|13)$, $\check{c}(12|3)$. In the complex $\mathcal{F}(2, 3)$ each edge is contained in three of the six hexagon 2-cells. The six edges in the boundary of each 2-cell lie in two different orbits of the group \mathfrak{S}_3 ; for the 2-cell $\check{c}(123)$ displayed in Figure 7, the three edges $\check{c}(1|23)$, $\check{c}(3|12)$, $\check{c}(2|13)$ lie in one \mathfrak{S}_3 -orbit, while $\check{c}(13|2)$, $\check{c}(23|1)$, $\check{c}(12|3)$ lie in the other one.

Our drawing also specifies orientations of the cells that will be discussed in the next section (namely, the edges and 2-cells).




Figure 7: The six 2-cells of $\mathcal{F}(2,3)$

3.1 A short summary

We have constructed and described the following objects:

- $\mathcal{S}(d, n)$: the face poset of the Fox–Neuwirth stratification of $W_n^{\oplus d}$, with minimal element $\hat{0}$;
- $\mathcal{S}(d, n)$: a regular cell complex homeomorphic to $S(W_n^{\oplus d}) \cong S^{d(n-1)-1}$, a PL sphere; its face poset is $\mathcal{S}(d, n) \setminus \{\hat{0}\}$;
- $\mathcal{B}(d, n)$: a regular cell complex homeomorphic to $B(W_n^{\oplus d})$, a PL ball, given by $\mathcal{S}(d, n)$ plus one additional $d(n-1)$ -cell;
- $\text{sd } \mathcal{B}(d, n)$: the barycentric subdivision of $\mathcal{B}(d, n)$; a simplicial complex, geometrically embedded as a star-shaped neighborhood of the origin in $W_n^{\oplus d}$;
- $\mathcal{F}(d, n)$: the poset of all strata that lie in the complement of the arrangement (that is, have no $i_j = d+1$), ordered by reversed inclusion; it is the subposet of $\mathcal{S}(d, n)^{op}$ given by all (σ, \mathbf{i}) without any index $i_j = d+1$;
- $\mathcal{F}(d, n)$: a regular cell complex of dimension $(d-1)(n-1)$; it is a subcomplex of the dual cell complex to $\mathcal{S}(d, n)$; its poset of non-empty faces is $\mathcal{F}(d, n)$.
- $\text{sd } \mathcal{F}(d, n)$: the barycentric subdivision of $\mathcal{F}(d, n)$, the order complex $\Delta \mathcal{F}(d, n)$; a simplicial complex, geometrically embedded into the complement $\overline{F}(\mathbb{R}^d, n) \subset W_n^{\oplus d}$ as a subcomplex of the boundary of the ball $\text{sd } \mathcal{B}(d, n)$.

4 Equivariant Obstruction Theory

Our task now is to prove that for any $d \geq 1$ and $n \geq 2$ an equivariant map

$$\mathcal{F}(d, n) \longrightarrow_{\mathfrak{S}_n} S(W_n^{\oplus(d-1)})$$

exists if and only if n is not a prime power. Here

- $\mathcal{F}(d, n)$ is a finite regular CW complex of dimension $M := (d-1)(n-1)$ on which \mathfrak{S}_n acts freely (the action on the M -dimensional cells is described explicitly in Theorem 3.13);
- $S(W_n^{\oplus(d-1)})$ is the set of all $(d-1) \times n$ matrices of column sum 0 and sum of the squares of all entries equal to 1. This is a sphere of dimension $(d-1)(n-1) - 1 = M - 1$, on which \mathfrak{S}_n acts by permutation of columns; this action is not free for $n > 2$, but it has no stationary points.

We proceed to apply Equivariant Obstruction Theory, according to tom Dieck [21, Sect. II.3]: Since

- $\mathcal{F}(d, n)$ is a free \mathfrak{S}_n -cell complex of dimension M ,
- the dimension of the \mathfrak{S}_n -sphere $S(W_n^{\oplus(d-1)})$ is $M - 1$, and
- $S(W_n^{\oplus(d-1)})$ is $(M - 1)$ -simple and $(M - 2)$ -connected,

the existence of an \mathfrak{S}_n -equivariant map is equivalent to the vanishing of the primary obstruction

$$\mathfrak{o} = [c_f] \in H_{\mathfrak{S}_n}^M(\mathcal{F}(d, n); \pi_{M-1}(S(W_n^{\oplus(d-1)}))).$$

Here c_f denotes the obstruction cocycle associated with a general position equivariant map $f : \mathcal{F}(d, n) \rightarrow W_n^{\oplus(d-1)}$ (cf. [12, Def. 1.5, p. 2639]). Its values on the M -cells \check{c} are given by the degrees

$$c_f(\check{c}) = \deg(r \circ f : \partial \check{c} \rightarrow W_n^{\oplus(d-1)} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow S(W_n^{\oplus(d-1)})),$$

where r denotes the radial projection.

The Hurewicz isomorphism gives an isomorphism of the coefficient \mathfrak{S}_n -module with a homology group:

$$\pi_{M-1}(S(W_n^{\oplus(d-1)})) \cong H_{M-1}(S(W_n^{\oplus(d-1)}); \mathbb{Z}) =: \mathcal{Z}.$$

As an abelian group this \mathfrak{S}_n -module $\mathcal{Z} = \langle \xi \rangle$ is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} . The action of the permutations $\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ on the module \mathcal{Z} is given by

$$\tau \cdot \xi = (\text{sgn } \pi)^{d-1} \xi.$$

Indeed, each transposition τ_{ij} in \mathfrak{S}_n acts on W_n by reflection in the hyperplane $x_i = x_j$. Thus the action of \mathfrak{S}_n on W_n reverses orientations according to the sign character, and the action on $W_n^{\oplus(d-1)}$ is given by sgn^{d-1} .

4.1 Computing the obstruction cocycle

We will now compute the equivariant obstruction cocycle c_f in the cellular cochain group

$$C_{\mathfrak{S}_n}^M(\mathcal{F}(d, n); \mathcal{Z})$$

and then show that c_f is a coboundary of an equivariant $(M-1)$ -cochain if and only if n is not a power of a prime.

To compute the obstruction cocycle, we use the \mathfrak{S}_n -equivariant linear projection map

$$f : W_n^{\oplus d} \longrightarrow W_n^{\oplus(d-1)}$$

obtained by deleting the last row from any matrix $(y_1, \dots, y_n) \in W_n^{\oplus d}$ of row sum 0. This map clearly commutes with the projection map $\nu : \mathbb{R}^{d \times n} \rightarrow W_n^{\oplus d}$ which subtracts from each column the average of the columns.

Lemma 4.1. *The linear map f maps all M -cells of $\text{sd } \mathcal{F}(d, n) \subset W_n^{\oplus d}$ homeomorphically to the same star-shaped neighborhood $\text{sd } \mathcal{B}(d-1, n)$ of 0 in $W_n^{\oplus(d-1)}$.*

The symmetric group \mathfrak{S}_n acts on this neighborhood by homeomorphisms that reverse orientations according to sgn^{d-1} . Thus the M -cells and the $(M-1)$ -cells of the complex $\mathcal{F}(d, n)$ can be oriented in such a way that the \mathfrak{S}_n -action on the M -cells and on the $(M-1)$ -cells changes orientations according to sgn^{d-1} , while the boundary of any M -cell is the sum of all $(M-1)$ -cells in its boundary with $+1$ coefficients.

With these orientations, the obstruction cocycle c_f has the value $+1$ on all oriented M -cells of $\mathcal{F}(d, n)$.

Proof. The M -cells of $\mathcal{F}(d, n)$ are given as $\check{c}(\sigma_1 <_d \sigma_2 <_d \dots <_d \sigma_n)$ for some permutation $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$. The $(M-1)$ -cells are given by $\check{c}(\sigma_1 <_d \dots \sigma_i <_{d-1} \sigma_{i+1} \dots <_d \sigma_n)$ for some $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ and $1 \leq i < n$.

The vertices of the barycentric subdivision of the cell $\check{c}(\sigma_1 <_d \sigma_2 <_d \dots <_d \sigma_n)$ are exactly those vertices $v(\sigma'_1 <_{i_1} \dots <_{i_{n-1}} \sigma'_n)$ for which the letters σ'_j that are separated only by “ $<_d$ ”s appear in the same order in σ .

The projection f deletes the last row, and thus maps the vertex $v(\sigma_1 <_{i_1} \dots <_{i_{n-1}} \sigma_n)$ to the vertex with the same symbol $v(\sigma_1 <_{i_1} \dots <_{i_{n-1}} \sigma_n)$ of $\text{sd } \mathcal{B}(d-1, n)$, except for reordering of symbols separated only by $<_d$. Thus exactly the vertices which differ only by reordering letters σ'_j that are separated only by “ $<_d$ ”s are mapped by f to the same vertex of $\text{sd } \mathcal{B}(d-1, n)$.

Thus we get that the barycentric subdivision of each maximal cell (which is a simplicial complex, embedded in the higher-dimensional space $W_n^{\oplus d}$) is mapped isomorphically onto the star-shaped neighborhood $\text{sd } \mathcal{B}(d-1, n)$ of the origin in $W_n^{\oplus(d-1)}$ (as depicted for $n = 3$ in

Figure 3). In particular, the vertex $v(\sigma_1 <_d \sigma_2 <_d \cdots <_d \sigma_n)$ is the only point of the M -cell $\check{c}(\sigma_1 <_d \sigma_2 <_d \cdots <_d \sigma_n)$ that is mapped to $0 \in W_n^{\oplus(d-1)}$.

We interpret $\text{sd } \mathcal{B}(d-1, n)$ as the barycentric subdivision of a cellular M -ball $\mathcal{B}(d-1, n)$ with one M -cell. The $(M-1)$ -cells in its boundary are given by $\check{c}(\sigma_1 <_d \cdots \sigma_j <_{d-1} \sigma_{j+1} \cdots <_d \sigma_n)$ with exactly one index $i_j = d-1$ and all other i_k 's equal to d . Clearly there are $2^n - 2$ of those, as they are given by the proper nonempty subsets $\{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_j\} \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$.

As f induces a surjective cellular map from $\mathcal{F}(d, n)$ to $\mathcal{B}(d-1, n)$ that is a homeomorphism restricted to each cell, we can proceed as follows. We fix an orientation of the one M -cell of $\mathcal{B}(d-1, n)$. (This amounts to fixing an orientation of $W_n^{\oplus(d-1)}$.) We define orientations of the $(M-1)$ -cells in the boundary of the M -cell of $\mathcal{B}(d-1, n)$ by demanding that the cellular boundary of the M -cell is given by the formal sum of all the $(M-1)$ -cells with $+1$ coefficients. We then define the orientation for each of the $(M-1)$ -cells of $\mathcal{F}(d, n)$ by demanding that the map f , which maps it homeomorphically to an $(M-1)$ -cell in the boundary of $\mathcal{B}(d-1, n)$, preserves the orientation. \square

4.2 When is the obstruction cocycle a coboundary?

Lemma 4.2. *Let b be any equivariant $(M-1)$ -dimensional integral equivariant cellular cochain on $\mathcal{F}(d, n)$, then the value of its coboundary is*

$$x_1 \binom{n}{1} + x_1 \binom{n}{2} + \cdots + x_{n-1} \binom{n}{n-1}$$

on all M -cells, for integers x_1, \dots, x_{n-1} .

Proof. As b needs to be equivariant, we get the condition that the values are constant on orbits. (Indeed, this is since the boundary operator does not introduce any signs, and the symmetric group acts by introducing the same signs sgn^{d-1} both on the $(M-1)$ -cells and on the \mathfrak{S}_n -module \mathcal{Z} .)

Finally, the \mathfrak{S}_n -orbit of the $(M-1)$ -cell $\check{c}(\sigma_1 <_d \cdots \sigma_j <_{d-1} \sigma_{j+1} \cdots <_d \sigma_n)$ has size $\binom{n}{j}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2. By [21, Sect. II.3, pp. 119–120], the equivariant map exists if and only if the cohomology class $\mathfrak{o} = [c_f]$ vanishes, that is, if c_f is the coboundary $c_f = \delta b$ of some $(M-1)$ -dimensional equivariant cochain b . We have seen in Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 that this is the case if and only if

$$x_1 \binom{n}{1} + x_1 \binom{n}{2} + \cdots + x_{n-1} \binom{n}{n-1} = 1 \tag{1}$$

has a solution in integers. By the Chinese remainder theorem, this happens if and only if the binomial coefficients do not have a non-trivial common factor. By Ram's result, as quoted in the introduction and proved below, this holds if and only if n is not a prime power. \square

Proposition 4.3 (Ram [46]). *For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$\text{gcd} \left\{ \binom{n}{1}, \binom{n}{2}, \dots, \binom{n}{n-1} \right\} = \begin{cases} p & \text{if } n \text{ is a prime power, } n = p^k, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof (by M. Firsching and P. Landweber). For $n = p^k$, $k \geq 1$ and an indeterminate x we have $(1+x)^{p^k} \equiv 1 + x^{p^k} \pmod{p}$, so all the binomial coefficients we consider are divisible by p . Taking the equation

$$(1+x)^{p^{k-1}} \equiv 1 + x^{p^{k-1}} \pmod{p}$$

to the p th power, we obtain

$$(1+x)^{p^k} \equiv (1+x^{p^{k-1}})^p \pmod{p^2},$$

so $\binom{p^k}{p^{k-1}} \equiv \binom{p}{1} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p^2}$ and hence $\gcd\{p^k = \binom{n}{1}, \binom{n}{2}, \dots, \binom{n}{n-1}\} = p$.

If n is not a prime power, let $n = \prod_{i=1}^m p_i^{k_i}$ for $m > 1$, $k_i > 0$ and distinct primes p_i . Let p be any of the p_i and $k = k_i$, so that $n = p^k a$ and p does not divide a . Letting x be an indeterminate, we have

$$(1+x)^n = (1+x)^{p^k a} \equiv (1+x^{p^k})^a \pmod{p}$$

so $\binom{n}{p^k} \equiv \binom{a}{1} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. Therefore p_i does not divide $\binom{n}{p_i^{k_i}}$ for each i . Hence

$$\gcd\left\{n = \binom{n}{1}, \binom{n}{p_1^{k_1}}, \binom{n}{p_2^{k_2}}, \dots, \binom{n}{p_m^{k_m}}\right\} = 1.$$

and thus $\gcd\left\{\binom{n}{1}, \binom{n}{2}, \dots, \binom{n}{n-1}\right\} = 1$. □

Remark 4.4 (by P. Landweber). Ram's result (Proposition 4.3) is also useful in the determination of polynomial generators of the complex bordism ring, a graded polynomial ring over \mathbb{Z} with one generator in each positive even dimension. In dimension $2n$ for which $n+1$ is a prime, the bordism class of the complex projective space $\mathbb{C}P^n$ serves as a generator, but in other dimensions one needs to know Ram's result in order to exhibit generators made from complex projective spaces and Milnor hypersurfaces of type $(1,1)$ in products of two complex projective spaces. This result was known and used by Milnor and Novikov in the early 1960's, and is known to other authors working on complex bordism (cf. [37, pp. 249–252], [38, Problem 16-E on p. 196], [44, Appendix 2]), but usually no proof has been quoted or given in this context. One notable source is Lazard [35, Lemme 3].

In the case when n is a power of 2 the equation (1) has no solution modulo 2, which implies that the top Stiefel–Whitney class of the bundle

$$W_n \rightarrow F(\mathbb{R}^d, n) \times_{\mathfrak{S}_n} W_n \rightarrow F(\mathbb{R}^d, n)/\mathfrak{S}_n$$

is non-trivial. This fact was first proved by Cohen & Handel [17, Lemma 3.2, page 203] in the case $d = 2$, and by Chisholm [15, Lemma 3] in the case when d is a power of 2. For further application of this fact in the context of k -regular mappings of Euclidean spaces consult [13, Sect. 8.5].

Three corollaries

Our calculation above implies a complete calculation for the top equivariant cohomology group of the cell complex $\mathcal{F}(d, n)$.

Corollary 4.5. *For $d, n \geq 2$,*

$$H_{\mathfrak{S}_n}^M(\mathcal{F}(d, n); \pi_{M-1}(S(W_n^{\oplus(d-1)}))) = \langle [c_f] \rangle \cong \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z}/p & \text{if } n = p^k \text{ is a prime power,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Indeed, our cell complex model has only one orbit of maximal cells, thus the group of equivariant M -dimensional cochains is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} . Our calculation shows that the subgroup of coboundaries is generated by the element $\gcd\left\{\binom{n}{1}, \binom{n}{2}, \dots, \binom{n}{n-1}\right\}$.

Moreover, we note a stronger version of the non-existence part of Theorem 1.2.

Corollary 4.6. *For $d \geq 2$ and prime powers $n = p^k$, there is no G -equivariant map*

$$F(\mathbb{R}^d, n) \longrightarrow_G S(W_n^{\oplus(d-1)})$$

for any p -Sylow subgroup $G \subset \mathfrak{S}_n$.

This follows from our proof for Theorem 1.2 using transfer; see [13, Sect. 5.2]. Moreover, in [13, Thm. 8.3] we derive from equivariant cohomology calculations (the Fadell–Husseini index) that in the case when $n = p$ is a prime, the equivariant map does not exist for the cyclic (Sylow) subgroup $\mathbb{Z}/n \subset \mathfrak{S}_n$.

Finally, we obtain an extension of a Borsuk–Ulam type theorem by Cohen & Connett [16, Thm. 1], namely the generalization from a cyclic group of prime order to an arbitrary cyclic group. (See [13, Thm. 8.9] for corresponding result for elementary abelian groups, obtained with equivariant cohomology methods.)

Corollary 4.7. *Let $n \geq 2$ and $d \geq 2$ be integers, let X be a free Hausdorff \mathbb{Z}/n -space, and $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a continuous map. If X is $(d-1)(n-1)$ -connected, then there exist $x \in X$ and $a \in \mathbb{Z}/n$, $a \neq 0$, such that*

$$f(x) = f(a \cdot x).$$

Proof. If f is injective on \mathbb{Z}/n -orbits, then we obtain a continuous map

$$\psi: X \longrightarrow F(\mathbb{R}^d, n), \quad x \longmapsto (f(0 \cdot x), f(1 \cdot x), \dots, f((n-1) \cdot x)),$$

which is \mathbb{Z}/n -equivariant if we use the “left shift” cyclic \mathbb{Z}/n -action on $F(\mathbb{R}^d, n)$.

Combined with the equivariant retraction $r: F(\mathbb{R}^d, n) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(d, n)$ constructed above, this yields a \mathbb{Z}/n -equivariant map $r \circ \psi: X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(d, n)$ from a free $(d-1)(n-1)$ -connected \mathbb{Z}/n -space to a free \mathbb{Z}/n -space of dimension $(d-1)(n-1)$, which contradicts Dold’s theorem [22] [36, Thm. 6.2.6]. \square

Acknowledgements

When the first version of this paper was released on the `arXiv`, Dev Sinha pointed us to the recent preprints [28] and [6]. In response to this, we decided to change our notation to be in line with these papers, which continue the developments started by Fox & Neuwirth [24] and Fuks [25].

Thanks to Imre Bárány, Roman Karasev, Wolfgang Lück, and Jim Stasheff for interesting and useful discussions. In addition, we are grateful to Moritz Firsching and Peter Landweber for many valuable comments and improvements, including the reference to Ram’s result [46] and the proof we give for it above. Moreover, we thank the Israel Journal’s referee for very insightful and helpful remarks that have led to various improvements in the exposition.

Thanks to Till Tantau for `TikZ` and to Miriam Schlöter for the `TikZ` figures.

We are grateful to Aleksandra and Torsten for their constant support.

References

- [1] V. I. ARNOL’D, *The cohomology ring of the colored braid group*, *Mathematical Notes*, 5 (1969), 138–140.
- [2] F. AURENHAMMER, *A criterion for the affine equivalence of cell complexes in \mathbb{R}^d and convex polyhedra in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}* , *Discrete Comput. Geometry*, 2 (1987), 49–64.

- [3] F. AURENHAMMER, F. HOFFMANN, AND B. ARONOV, *Minkowski-type theorems and least-squares partitioning*, in 8th Annual Symp. Comput. Geometry (SoCG), Berlin, June 1992, ACM, 1992, 350–357.
- [4] ———, *Minkowski-type theorems and least-squares clustering*, *Algorithmica*, 20 (1998), 61–76.
- [5] F. AURENHAMMER AND R. KLEIN, *Voronoi diagrams*, in Handbook of Computational Geometry, J. Sack and G. Urrutia, eds., Elsevier, 2000, ch. V, 201–290.
- [6] D. AYALA AND R. HEPWORTH, *Configuration spaces and θ_n* . Preprint, February 2012, 12 pages, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1202.2806>.
- [7] I. BÁRÁNY, P. V. M. BLAGOJEVIĆ, AND A. SZÚCS, *Equipartitioning by a convex 3-fan*, *Advances in Math.*, 223 (2010), 579–593.
- [8] I. BASABE, J. GONZÁLEZ, YU. B. RUDYAK, AND D. TAMAKI, *Higher topological complexity and homotopy dimension of configuration spaces of spheres*. Preprint, 36 pages, Sept. 2010; version 5, 48 pages, June 2012; <http://arxiv.org/abs/1009.1851>.
- [9] A. BJÖRNER, *Subspace arrangements*, in Proc. of the First European Congress of Mathematics (Paris 1992), vol. I, Birkhäuser, 1994, 321–370.
- [10] A. BJÖRNER, M. LAS VERGNAS, B. STURMFELS, N. WHITE, AND G. M. ZIEGLER, *Oriented Matroids*, *Encyclopedia of Math.* vol. 46, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993; second (paperback) ed., 1999.
- [11] A. BJÖRNER AND G. M. ZIEGLER, *Combinatorial stratification of complex arrangements*, *Journal Amer. Math. Soc.*, 5 (1992), 105–149.
- [12] P. V. M. BLAGOJEVIĆ AND A. S. DIMITRIJEVIĆ BLAGOJEVIĆ, *Using equivariant obstruction theory in combinatorial geometry*, *Topology and its Applications*, 154 (2007), 2635–2655.
- [13] P. V. M. BLAGOJEVIĆ, W. LÜCK, AND G. M. ZIEGLER, *Equivariant topology of configuration spaces*. Preprint, 40 pages, September 2012; <http://arxiv.org/abs/1207.2852>.
- [14] A. BOREL AND J. MOORE, *Homology theory for locally compact spaces*, *Michigan Math. J.*, 7 (1960), 137–159.
- [15] M. E. CHISHOLM, *k -regular mappings of 2^n -dimensional euclidean space*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 74 (1979), 187–190.
- [16] F. R. COHEN, J. E. CONNETT, *A coincidence theorem related to the Borsuk-Ulam theorem*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 44 (1974), 218–220.
- [17] F. R. COHEN AND D. HANDEL, *k -regular embeddings of the plane*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 72 (1978), 201–204.
- [18] G. E. COOKE AND R. L. FINNEY, *Homology of Cell Complexes*, *Mathematical Notes*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1967.
- [19] C. DE CONCINI AND M. SALVETTI, *Cohomology of Coxeter groups and Artin groups*, *Math. Research Letters*, 7 (2000), 213–232.
- [20] P. DELIGNE, *Les immeubles des groupes de tresses généralisés*, *Inventiones Math.*, 17 (1972), 273–302.
- [21] T. TOM DIECK, *Transformation Groups*, *Studies in Mathematics* vol. 8, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1987.
- [22] A. DOLD, *Simple proofs of some Borsuk-Ulam results*, *Contemp. Math.*, 19 (1983), 65–69.
- [23] L. C. EVANS, *Partial differential equations and Monge-Kantorovich mass transfer*, in *Current Developments in Mathematics*, Boston, MA, 1999, Int. Press, 65–126. Updated and corrected version, Sept. 2001, http://math.berkeley.edu/~evans/Monge-Kantorovich_survey.pdf.
- [24] R. FOX AND L. NEUWIRTH, *The braid groups*, *Math. Scandinavica*, 10 (1962), 119–126.
- [25] D. B. FUKS, *Cohomologies of the braid groups mod 2*, *Functional Anal. Appl.*, 4 (1970), 143–151.
- [26] D. GEISS, R. KLEIN, R. PENNINGER, AND G. ROTE, *Optimally solving a transportation problem using Voronoi diagrams*, Preprint, June 2012, 15 pages, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1206.3057>; *Computational Geometry – Theory and Applications* (special issue for EuroCG’12), to appear.
- [27] I. M. GELFAND, M. M. KAPRANOV, AND A. V. ZELEVINSKY, *Discriminants, Resultants, and Multidimensional Determinants*, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1994.

- [28] C. GIUSTI AND D. SINHA, *Fox–Newwirth cell structures and the cohomology of the symmetric group*. Preprint, October 2011, 18 pages, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1110.4137>.
- [29] M. GORESKEY AND R. D. MACPHERSON, *Stratified Morse Theory*, Ergebnisse Series vol. 14, Springer Verlag, 1988.
- [30] A. HUBARD AND B. ARONOV, *Convex equipartitions of volume and surface area*. Preprint, October 2010, 9 pages; version 3, September 2011, 17 pages; <http://arxiv.org/abs/1010.4611>.
- [31] H. JORIS, C. OESTREICHER, AND J. STEINIG, *The greatest common divisor of certain sets of binomial coefficients*, J. Number Theory, 21 (1985), 101–119.
- [32] L. V. KANTOROVICH, *A new method of solving some classes of extremal problems*, Doklady Akad. Sci. USSR, 28 (1940), 211–214.
- [33] G. KAPLAN AND D. LEVY, *GCD of truncated rows in Pascal’s triangle*, INTEGERS: Electronic J. Comb. Number Theory, 4 (2004), p. #A14. <http://www.emis.de/journals/INTEGERS/papers/e14/e14.pdf>.
- [34] R. N. KARASEV, *Equipartition of several measures*. Preprint, November 2010, 6 pages; version 6, August 2011, 10 pages; <http://arxiv.org/abs/1011.4762>.
- [35] M. LAZARD, *Sur les groupes de Lie formels à un paramètre*, Bull. Soc. Math. France, 83 (1955), p. 251–274.
- [36] J. MATOUŠEK, *Using the Borsuk–Ulam Theorem. Lectures on Topological Methods in Combinatorics and Geometry*, Universitext, Springer, Heidelberg 2003; second printing, 2008.
- [37] J. MILNOR, *Collected Papers, Vol. III: Differential Topology*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.
- [38] J. MILNOR AND J. D. STASHEFF, *Characteristic Classes*, Annals of Mathematics Studies vol. 76, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1974.
- [39] H. MINKOWSKI, *Allgemeine Lehrsätze über konvexe Polyeder*, Nachr. Ges. Wiss. Göttingen, (1897), p. 198–219. Reprinted in *Gesammelte Abhandlungen II* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1911) 103–121.
- [40] ———, *Volumen und Oberfläche*, Math. Annalen, 57 (1903), p. 447–495. Reprinted in *Gesammelte Abhandlungen II* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1911) 230–276.
- [41] J. R. MUNKRES, *Elements of Algebraic Topology*, Addison-Wesley, Menlo Park, CA, 1984.
- [42] R. NANDAKUMAR, *“Fair” partitions*. Blog entry, <http://nandacumar.blogspot.de/2006/09/cutting-shapes.html>, September 28, 2006.
- [43] R. NANDAKUMAR AND N. RAMANA RAO, *Fair partitions of polygons: An elementary introduction*, Proc. Indian Academy of Sciences (Mathematical Sciences), 122 (2012), 459–467.
- [44] S. P. NOVIKOV, *Homotopy properties of Thom complexes*, Mat. Sbornik, (4) 57(99) (1962), 407–442.
- [45] V. V. PRASOLOV, *Elements of Homology Theory*, Graduate Studies in Math. vol. 81, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.
- [46] B. RAM, *Common factors of $\frac{n!}{m!(n-m)!}$, ($m = 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$)*, J. Indian Math. Club (Madras), 1 (1909), 39–43.
- [47] M. SALVETTI, *Topology of the complement of real hyperplanes in \mathbb{C}^N* , Inventiones Math., 88 (1987), 603–618.
- [48] D. SIERSMA AND M. VAN MANEN, *Power diagrams and applications*. Preprint, 23 pages, August 2005; <http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0508037>.
- [49] C. SOULÉ, *Secant varieties and successive minima*, J. Algebraic Geometry, 13 (2004), 323–341.
- [50] V. A. VASSILIEV, *Braid group cohomologies and algorithm complexity*, Functional Analysis Appl., 22 (1988), 182–190.
- [51] ———, *Complements of Discriminants of Smooth Maps: Topology and Applications*, Translations of Math. Monographs vol. 98, American Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1992.
- [52] C. VILLANI, *Topics in Optimal Transportation*, Graduate Studies in Math. vol. 58, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2003.
- [53] G. M. ZIEGLER, *Lectures on Polytopes*, vol. 152 of Graduate Texts in Math. vol. 152, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995; seventh updated printing 2007.