

CYCLIC CRITICAL GROUPS OF GRAPHS

Ryan Becker

Department of Mathematics, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO
becker@math.colostate.edu

Darren B Glass

Department of Mathematics, Gettysburg College, Gettysburg PA 17325
dglass@gettysburg.edu

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

This article will discuss some results related to a solitaire chip-firing game played on the vertices of a finite connected graph G . In order to describe this game, let us first define a *configuration* on the graph G to be an assignment of an integer number of chips to each vertex of G . These numbers can be positive, negative, or zero, and if we denote a configuration by δ then $\delta(v)$ will be the number of chips assigned to the vertex v . Given a configuration, we define its *degree* to be the total number of chips assigned.

We next define the legal transitions between configurations, by letting a *move* consist of choosing a vertex and either borrowing one chip from each adjacent vertex or firing one chip to each adjacent vertex. See Figure 1 for one example. We note that borrowing at a vertex is equivalent to firing at all other vertices simultaneously and vice versa; we allow both as a matter of convenience. We will say that two configurations are *equivalent* if one can get from one to the other through a sequence of these moves. It is clear that a necessary but not sufficient condition for two configurations to be equivalent is that they have the same degree.




FIGURE 1. Configurations on a graph before and after firing the center vertex

This setup may appear to be purely combinatorial in nature but it has a number of interesting applications in areas such as statistical physics, cryptography, algebraic geometry, and economics. We define the *critical group* of G to be the set of equivalence classes of configurations with degree zero. This set is naturally endowed with an abelian group structure where the group operation is addition of chips at corresponding vertices. We will denote this group by $K(G)$. Due to analogies with the set of divisors on an algebraic curve up to linear equivalence, this group is also known as the Jacobian of the graph G . For more details on these connections to algebraic geometry, we refer the reader to [2].

It is well-known that for a given graph on n vertices, one can compute its critical group by noting that the set of configurations of degree zero is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}^{n-1} . The critical group of G is then isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}^{n-1}/\text{Im}(\mathcal{L}^*)$, where \mathcal{L}^* is the reduced Laplacian matrix of the graph G (see [4], [14], [15] for details). As discussed in [11], one can compute the group structure of this quotient by computing the Smith Normal Form of the matrix \mathcal{L}^* . While efficient algorithms to do this are known (see, for example, [7]) they often do not take into account the combinatorial structure of the graph. Several recent papers including [3], [5], [8], and [16] attempt to use this structure in order to gain some insight into critical groups. Some of these results use the fact that the order of the critical group of a graph is equal to the number of spanning trees of that graph, which is a corollary of Kirchhoff's Matrix Tree Theorem. One result that is well known (see, for example, [5, Prop 1.2]) and which we will use repeatedly is the following:

Lemma 1.1. *Let G_1 and G_2 be two graphs and let H be the graph obtained by identifying a single vertex of G_1 with a single vertex of G_2 . Then the critical group of H is isomorphic to the direct sum of the critical groups of G_1 and G_2 .*

Given a graph G , it is natural to ask what the minimal number of elements needed to generate the critical group of G is. The extreme cases are handled by letting G be a tree, in which case the critical group is trivial, and letting G be the complete graph K_n , in which case the critical group is $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^{n-2}$. We also note that for any finite abelian group $\Gamma \cong \mathbb{Z}/m_1\mathbb{Z} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbb{Z}/m_r\mathbb{Z}$ it is possible to construct a graph G whose critical group is Γ by starting with k cycles of length m_1, \dots, m_k and identifying a single vertex on each of the cycles by Lemma 1.1. While this construction shows that the rank of the critical group of a graph can be arbitrarily large, Wagner conjectured in [18, Conj 4.2] that the probability that a suitably defined random graph has a cyclic critical group approaches one. While this conjecture has recently been shown to be false, and Wood shows in [19, Cor 9.5] that the probability that a random graph has cyclic critical group is less than 0.8, there is still significant evidence that most random graphs have cyclic critical groups. In this note we will construct large families of graphs for which the critical group will be cyclic and in some cases we will be able to compute the order of this cyclic group.

2. ADDING CHAINS TO GRAPHS

Given a graph G and two vertices $x, y \in V(G)$ we define $\delta_{x,y}$ to be the configuration on G so that $\delta_{x,y}(x) = 1, \delta_{x,y}(y) = -1$ and $\delta_{x,y}(v) = 0$ for $v \neq x, y$. We note that $\delta_{x,y} = -\delta_{y,x}$, and in particular the two divisors will generate the same subgroup of $K(G)$.

Definition 2.1. *A generating pair of vertices for a graph G is a pair $\{x, y\} \subset V(G)$ so that the configuration $\delta_{x,y}$ is a generator of the critical group of G . Equivalently, $\{x, y\}$ will be a generating pair if any configuration of degree zero is equivalent to a configuration which has value zero except possibly at x and y .*

Example 2.2. *Let G be an n -cycle. More explicitly, let G be a graph with $V(G) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and an edge between x_i and x_j if and only if $i \equiv j \pm 1 \pmod n$. Let δ be any configuration of total degree 0 on G . We claim that δ is equivalent to a multiple of δ_{x_{n-1}, x_n} .*

To see this, we let δ_1 be the configuration obtained from δ by borrowing $\delta(x_1)$ times at the vertex x_2 . In particular, δ_1 will be the configuration defined by setting $\delta_1(x_1) = 0$, $\delta_1(x_2) = \delta(x_2) + 2\delta(x_1)$, $\delta_1(x_3) = \delta(x_3) - \delta(x_1)$, and $\delta_1(x_i) = \delta(x_i)$ for all $i \geq 4$. For each $2 \leq k \leq n-2$ we define δ_k inductively as the configuration obtained from δ_{k-1} by borrowing $\delta_{k-1}(x_k)$ times at x_{k+1} .

We note that the configuration δ_{n-2} is equivalent to δ and $\delta_{n-2}(x_i) = 0$ except possibly at $i = n-1, n$. This verifies our claim and in particular proves that $\{x_{n-1}, x_n\}$ is a generating pair for G . More generally, one can show that the pair $\{x_i, x_j\}$ is a generating pair if and only if $\gcd(i-j, n) = 1$.

It is not always the case that a generating pair consists of two adjacent vertices. For example, if G is the graph in Figure 2a it follows from Lemma 1.1 $K(G) \cong \mathbb{Z}/15\mathbb{Z}$ but that $\delta_{x,y}$ will either have order three or five for any pair of adjacent vertices. However, for the vertices labelled a and b one can see that $\delta_{a,b}$ will generate the full group.




FIGURE 2. Examples

We note that even in a situation where a graph has a cyclic critical group then there does not need to be a generating pair. The following example describes such a situation, answering a question posed by Lorenzini in [12, Remark 2.11].

Example 2.3. Let G be the graph in Figure 2b. By Lemma 1.1, $K(G) \cong \mathbb{Z}/105\mathbb{Z}$. Moreover, if z is the labelled vertex and $x \neq z$ is a different vertex on a cycle of size $d_x \in \{3, 5, 7\}$ then we note that the divisor $\delta_{x,z}$ has order d_x . For any two vertices x, y both of which are distinct from z , the divisor $\delta_{x,y}$ can be written as $\delta_{x,z} - \delta_{y,z}$, and therefore has order equal to $\text{lcm}(d_x, d_y) \in \{3, 5, 7, 15, 21, 35\}$ and in particular not equal to $|K(G)|$.

In the situation where our graph has a known generating pair, then we are able to construct a family of graphs which also have cyclic critical groups and known generating pairs due to the following theorem, which is the main result of this section.

Theorem 2.4. Let x and y be a generating pair for G . Let \tilde{G} be the graph G with an additional path of $\ell \geq 1$ edges (and $\ell - 1$ new vertices) between the vertices x

and y . Then any pair of consecutive vertices along this path are a generating pair for \tilde{G} . In particular, $K(\tilde{G})$ is cyclic.

Proof. Let G be a graph and $\{x, y\}$ be a generating pair for G . In particular, this means that for any configuration δ on G we can do a series of moves so that the resulting configuration has chips only on x and y .

Let \tilde{G} be the graph with an additional path of length ℓ between vertices x and y . To be precise, $V(\tilde{G}) = V(G) \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_{\ell-1}\}$ and the edges of \tilde{G} will be the edges of G along with edges connecting x_i and x_{i+1} for $1 \leq i \leq \ell - 2$ as well as edges connecting x to x_1 and $x_{\ell-1}$ to y . By convention, we set $x_0 = x$ and $x_\ell = y$.

Given a configuration $\tilde{\delta}$ on \tilde{G} we can consider its restriction $\tilde{\delta}|_G$ as a configuration (not necessarily of degree zero) on G . We know there exists a sequence of legal moves that will make this configuration have chips only on the two vertices x and y . We perform this sequence of moves on $\tilde{\delta}$ and denote the resulting configuration on \tilde{G} by δ_0 .

We have now moved all of the chips in the configuration onto the chain connecting x and y , and we can therefore consolidate these on any two adjacent vertices. To be explicit, choose two adjacent vertices x_i and x_{i+1} . If $i \geq 1$ then for each $1 \leq j \leq i$ we let δ_j be the configuration obtained by borrowing $\delta_{j-1}(x_{j-1})$ times at the vertex x_j . In particular, the configuration δ_i will only have a nonzero value for vertices in $\{x_i, \dots, x_\ell\}$.

We continue by defining δ_j for $j > i$. In particular, for each $i < j \leq \ell - 1$ we let δ_j be the configuration obtained by borrowing $\delta_{j-1}(x_{\ell-j})$ times at the vertex $x_{\ell-j-1}$. At the end of this process, the resulting configuration $\delta_{\ell-1}$ will only have a nonzero number of chips on the vertices x_i and x_{i+1} . In particular, we have shown that every configuration on \tilde{G} of degree zero is equivalent to a multiple of the divisor $\delta_{x_i, x_{i+1}}$ and therefore $\{x_i, x_{i+1}\}$ is a generating pair for \tilde{G} . \square

We note that Theorem 2.4 is also a consequence of results in [9, Sect.2]. However, our proof is more elementary.

Example 2.5. Let G be the ‘house’ graph as pictured in Figure 3 with vertices as labelled. Assume that δ is a configuration of total degree zero on G . The fact that a 3-cycle has cyclic critical group and that any pair of adjacent vertices is a generating pair for the graph tells us that there is a sequence of moves that will lead to an equivalent divisor δ_1 with $\delta_1(z) = 0$. In particular, we can let δ_1 be the divisor obtained by borrowing $\delta(z)$ times at the vertex x .




FIGURE 3. The one-story house is one simple example of a stack of polygons.

If we now let γ be the divisor obtained by borrowing $\delta_1(x)$ times at the vertex x_1 and $\delta_1(y)$ times at the vertex x_2 , we can check that $\gamma(v)$ is only nonzero at x_1, x_2 . In particular, (x_1, x_2) is a generating pair for G . In a similar manner, we could show that (x, x_1) and (x_2, y) are also generating pairs for G .

One can generalize the construction in Example 2.5 to more general stacks of polygons. In particular, let (k_1, \dots, k_n) be a sequence of integers with each $k_i \geq 2$. Define the graph G_1 to be a k_1 -cycle and, for each $1 < i \leq n$ define the graph G_i by starting with graph G_{i-1} and adding a path of $k_i - 1$ edges between any two consecutive vertices of the path added at the previous step. The resulting graph G_n will consist of a stack of polygons with k_1, \dots, k_n sides. One example is that the stack corresponding to $(3, 4)$ or $(4, 3)$ are isomorphic to the house graph in Example 2.5. See Figure 4 for additional examples. It follows from inductive applications of Theorem 2.4 that $K(G_n)$ is cyclic; we note that similar results are discussed in [13].




FIGURE 4. Polygonal stacks corresponding to (k_1, \dots, k_n)

We conclude this section by discussing some similarities between our result and results of Dino Lorenzini. In particular, [10, Thm 5.1] gives the following result:

Theorem 2.6. *Let G be a connected graph with vertices x, y so that there are $c > 0$ edges between x and y . Moreover, let G_1 be the graph obtained by deleting all edges between the two vertices x and y . If $|K(G)|$ and $|K(G_1)|$ are relatively prime then $K(G)$ is cyclic.*

In [13], he gives an alternate proof of this theorem and strengthens the result somewhat. In particular, he is able to prove:

Theorem 2.7. *Let G be a connected graph with vertices x, y connected by at least one edge so that $|K(G)|$ and $|K(G_1)|$ are relatively prime, where G_1 is as defined in the previous theorem. Let G' be the graph obtained from G by adding a path of ℓ edges between x and y , and let G'_1 be the graph obtained from G' by deleting the single edge between any two adjacent vertices in the chain. Then $|K(G_1)|$ and $|K(G'_1)|$ are relatively prime. In particular, it follows from Theorem 2.6 that $K(G')$ is cyclic.*

We note the similarities between Theorem 2.7 and Theorem 2.4. This leads us to pose the following question.

Open Question 2.8. *Given a graph G and a pair of vertices x, y so that $|K(G)|$ and $|K(G_1)|$ are relatively prime, must it be the case that the configuration $\delta_{x,y}$ is a generator of $K(G)$?*

3. RECURRENCE RELATIONS AND ORDERS OF CRITICAL GROUPS

Given a string of integers k_1, \dots, k_n with all $k_i > 1$, we define G_n to be a stack of polygons given by the construction in the previous section. Such a graph is not uniquely defined by the n -tuple, as we could stack the polygons along different edges and get different graphs. However, we will see in this section that all such graphs will have the same critical group. In particular, it follows from Theorem 2.4 that $K(G_n)$ is a cyclic group. Moreover, it is a consequence of the Matrix Tree Theorem (see [1]) that the order of the critical group of any graph is equal to the number of spanning trees of the graph. Therefore if we can count the number of spanning trees of G_n then we will know the critical group up to isomorphism.

In order to count spanning trees on our polygonal graphs, we use the notion of a spanning forest, introduced in [6]. A *spanning forest* is a pair of disjoint trees on a graph with specified roots that together span all vertices in the graph. For example, if we fix two adjacent vertices of a 4-cycle then there are three spanning forests of this graph, as seen in Figure 5.




FIGURE 5. The 3 spanning forests on C_4 rooted at x and y .

Definition 3.1. *Let G_n be the graph as described above, and for each $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ let e_i be the edge shared by the k_i -gon and the k_{i+1} -gon in the stack. We define $T(k_1, \dots, k_n)$ to be the number of spanning trees on the graph G_n defined by the n -tuple (k_1, \dots, k_n) as above. Additionally, it is easy to see that for any pair of consecutive vertices x and y on the k_n -gon ending the stack of polynomials other than the two vertices connected by e_{n-1} , the number of spanning forests on G_n which are rooted at x and y will be the same as they must contain all edges of this polygon other than e_{n-1} and the edge between x and y ; we denote the number of such forests by $F(k_1, \dots, k_n)$.*

For example, if one considers the ‘house’ graph from Figure 3, one can compute that there are eleven spanning trees so that $T(3, 4) = 11$. Moreover, there are eight spanning forests rooted at the vertices x_1 and x_2 , so $F(3, 4) = 8$.

Lemma 3.2. *The functions F and T are related by the following recurrence relations.*

$$\begin{aligned} T(k_1, \dots, k_n) &= (k_n - 1)T(k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}) + F(k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}) \\ F(k_1, \dots, k_n) &= (k_n - 2)T(k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}) + F(k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let G_{n-1} be a graph defined by the $(n-1)$ -tuple (k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}) , and let x and y be two vertices on the $(n-1)^{\text{st}}$ level of the graph connected by an edge. Let \mathcal{P} be a path of $k_n - 1$ additional edges joining x and y . We label the new vertices x_2, \dots, x_{k_n-1} , letting $x_1 = x$ and $x_{k_n} = y$ by convention. Define the graph G_n be the union $G_{n-1} \cup \mathcal{P}$.

Let \mathcal{T} be a spanning tree on G_n . If \mathcal{T} contains all of the edges in \mathcal{P} then the restriction $\mathcal{T}|_{G_{n-1}}$ is a spanning forest on the graph G_{n-1} rooted at the two vertices x and y . Similarly, given a spanning forest \mathcal{F}_{n-1} on G_{n-1} , we can see that $\mathcal{F}_{n-1} \cup \mathcal{P}$ will be a spanning tree on G_n . On the other hand, let \mathcal{T}_{n-1} be a spanning tree on G_{n-1} . Then \mathcal{T}_{n-1} can be extended to be a spanning tree on G_n in $k_n - 1$ ways, as we must leave off one of the $k_n - 1$ edges on the path between x and y while including all of the other new edges. This proves the first identity.

Similar reasoning allows us to arrive at the second recurrence. Fixing a vertex $x_i \in \mathcal{P}$, any forest on G_{n-1} rooted at x and y can be extended to a forest on G_n rooted at x_i and x_{i+1} by adding the path between x and x_i and the path between y and x_{i+1} . Meanwhile, a tree on G_{n-1} can be extended to a spanning forest on G_n rooted at x_i and x_{i+1} by adding all elements of \mathcal{P} except for the edge connecting x_i and x_{i+1} and one other edge. In particular, there will be $k_n - 2$ ways to extend it. This implies the theorem. \square

Theorem 3.3. *With notation as above, we have:*

$$T(k_1, \dots, k_n) = k_n T(k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}) - T(k_1, \dots, k_{n-2}).$$

Proof. If we subtract the second recurrence relation in Lemma 3.2 from the first, we see that $T(k_1, \dots, k_n) - F(k_1, \dots, k_n) = T(k_1, \dots, k_{n-1})$ and in particular that $F(k_1, \dots, k_n) = T(k_1, \dots, k_n) - T(k_1, \dots, k_{n-1})$ for all n . This implies that $F(k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}) = T(k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}) - T(k_1, \dots, k_{n-2})$. Plugging this into the first recurrence relation gives the desired result. \square

Remark 3.4. *The readers may find it strange, as the authors did at first, that the sequence T_n is given by a recurrence relation that depends on the previous two terms and the length of the most recently added chain, but not on the length of the chain before it. We note that this follows more directly from an alternative purely combinatorial proof of Theorem 3.3 that we will now sketch.*

In particular, for any spanning tree \mathcal{T}_{n-1} on G_{n-1} one can see that there are k_{n-1} ways to extend it to a spanning tree on G_n merely by including all but one of the new edges. Moreover, there is a unique way to restrict it to a tree on G_{n-2} , by removing any portion of the tree that is contained in the $(n-1)^{\text{st}}$ polygon and adding an additional edge if the resulting set is not connected. One can show that this gives a k_n -to-1 map from the set of trees on G_{n-1} to the union of the sets of trees on G_n and G_{n-2} , implying the theorem.

Example 3.5. *Let us consider the case where we have a stack of k -gons with $k \geq 3$, and let T_n be the number of spanning trees of such a graph so that the critical group of this graph is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}/T_n\mathbb{Z}$. In particular, this will be the case where k_n is the constant value k for all n , so Theorem 3.3 implies that the sequence $\{T_n\}$ satisfies the second order linear recurrence $T_n = kT_{n-1} - T_{n-2}$. One can easily compute the initial conditions $T_0 = 1$ and $T_1 = k$. If one prefers an explicit formula to a recursive one, it is then possible to use well-known results on*

recurrence relations (see, for example, [17, Ch. 6]) to compute that

$$T_n = \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(1 + \frac{k}{\sqrt{k^2 - 4}} \right) \left(\frac{k + \sqrt{k^2 - 4}}{2} \right)^n + \left(1 - \frac{k}{\sqrt{k^2 - 4}} \right) \left(\frac{k - \sqrt{k^2 - 4}}{2} \right)^n \right]$$

It is worth noting that when $k = 4$, the graph G_n is the 2-by- n grid and the number of spanning trees is computed in [6] using similar techniques to ours.

Example 3.6. Next, consider the example of an n -story ‘house’, corresponding to the $(n + 1)$ -tuple $(3, 4, \dots, 4)$. As in the previous example, the number of trees will satisfy the recurrence relation $T_n = 4T_{n-1} - T_{n-2}$. One can compute by hand in this case that $T_0 = 3$ and $T_1 = 11$. In particular, this shows that

$$T_n = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} \left[(3\sqrt{3} + 5) (2 + \sqrt{3})^n + (3\sqrt{3} - 5) (2 - \sqrt{3})^n \right]$$

Example 3.7. For our final example, we consider the case of a stack of alternating k_1 -gons and k_2 -gons, where a and b are both at least 2. Again, it follows from Theorem 2.4 that the critical group is cyclic and therefore we only need to count the number of spanning trees to determine the group. Let us assume that A_n is the number of spanning trees of the graph formed by adding n of each type of shape in an alternating fashion. (We leave as an exercise to the reader the interesting fact that you get a different answer if you put a stack of n k_1 -gons on top of a stack of n k_2 -gons). Moreover, let B_n be the number of spanning trees of a graph composed with n k_1 -gons and $n - 1$ k_2 -gons arranged alternately.

In particular, it follows from Theorem 3.3 that we have $A_n = k_2 B_n - A_{n-1}$ and $B_n = k_1 A_{n-1} - B_{n-1}$. From these two relations, one can deduce that $A_n = (k_1 k_2 - 2) A_{n-1} - A_{n-2}$ and $B_n = (k_1 k_2 - 2) B_{n-1} - B_{n-2}$. Combined with the additional observations that $A_0 = 1$, $A_1 = k_1 k_2 - 1$, $B_0 = 0$, and $B_1 = k_1$ one can use standard results on recurrence relations to get an explicit formula for the A_n and B_n .

REFERENCES

- [1] Roland Bacher, Pierre de la Harpe, and Tatiana Nagnibeda, *The lattice of integral flows and the lattice of integral cuts on a finite graph*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **125** (1997), no. 2, 167–198. MR 1478029 (99c:05111)
- [2] Matthew Baker and Serguei Norine, *Riemann-Roch and Abel-Jacobi theory on a finite graph*, Adv. Math. **215** (2007), no. 2, 766–788. MR 2355607 (2008m:05167)
- [3] Andrew Berget, Andrew Manion, Molly Maxwell, Aaron Potechin, and Victor Reiner, *The critical group of a line graph*, Ann. Comb. **16** (2012), no. 3, 449–488. MR 2960015
- [4] N. L. Biggs, *Chip-firing and the critical group of a graph*, J. Algebraic Combin. **9** (1999), no. 1, 25–45. MR 1676732 (2000h:05103)
- [5] Robert Cori and Dominique Rossin, *On the sandpile group of dual graphs*, European J. Combin. **21** (2000), no. 4, 447–459. MR 1756151 (2001i:05084)
- [6] Melissa Desjarlais and Robert Molina, *Counting spanning trees in grid graphs*, Proceedings of the Thirty-first Southeastern International Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Computing (Boca Raton, FL, 2000), vol. 145, 2000, pp. 177–185. MR 1817953 (2001m:05131)
- [7] Wayne Eberly, Mark Giesbrecht, and Gilles Villard, *On computing the determinant and Smith form of an integer matrix*, 41st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (Redondo Beach, CA, 2000), IEEE Comput. Soc. Press, Los Alamitos, CA, 2000, pp. 675–685. MR 1931864
- [8] Darren Glass and Criel Merino, *Critical groups of graphs with dihedral actions*, European J. Combin. **39** (2014), 95–112. MR 3168517
- [9] I.A. Krepiy, *The sandpile groups of chain-cyclic graphs*, Journal of Mathematical Sciences **200** (2014), no. 6, 698–709 (English).

- [10] Dino J. Lorenzini, *Arithmetical graphs*, Math. Ann. **285** (1989), no. 3, 481–501. MR 1019714 (91b:14026)
- [11] ———, *A finite group attached to the Laplacian of a graph*, Discrete Math. **91** (1991), no. 3, 277–282. MR 1129991 (93a:05091)
- [12] ———, *Arithmetical properties of Laplacians of graphs*, Linear and Multilinear Algebra **47** (2000), no. 4, 281–306. MR 1784872 (2001e:05082)
- [13] ———, *Smith normal form and Laplacians*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **98** (2008), no. 6, 1271–1300. MR 2462319 (2010d:05092)
- [14] Criel Merino, *The chip-firing game*, Discrete Math. **302** (2005), no. 1-3, 188–210. MR 2179643 (2007c:91036)
- [15] David Perkinson, Jacob Perlman, and John Wilmes, *Primer for the algebraic geometry of sandpiles*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1112.6163v2>, 2011.
- [16] Victor Reiner and Dennis Tseng, *Critical groups of covering, voltage and signed graphs*, Discrete Math. **318** (2014), 10–40. MR 3141623
- [17] Fred S. Roberts and Barry Tesman, *Applied combinatorics*, second ed., CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2009. MR 2530502 (2010k:05002)
- [18] David G. Wagner, *The critical group of a directed graph*, <http://arXiv:math/0010241>, 2000.
- [19] Melanie Matchett Wood, *The distribution of sandpile groups of random graphs*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1402.5149>, 2014.