

HYPERPLANE NEURAL CODES AND THE POLAR COMPLEX

VLADIMIR ITSKOV, ALEX KUNIN, AND ZVI ROSEN

ABSTRACT. Hyperplane codes are a class of convex codes that arise as the output of a one layer feed-forward neural network. Here we establish several natural properties of non-degenerate hyperplane codes, in terms of the *polar complex* of the code, a simplicial complex associated to any combinatorial code. We prove that the polar complex of a non-degenerate hyperplane code is shellable and show that all currently known properties of the hyperplane codes follow from the shellability of the appropriate polar complex.

1. INTRODUCTION

Combinatorial codes, i.e. subsets of the Boolean lattice, naturally arise as outputs of neural networks. Here, each *codeword* $\sigma \subseteq [n] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{1, \dots, n\}$ represents an allowed subset of co-active neurons; while a *code* is a collection $\mathcal{C} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ of codewords. Combinatorial codes in a number of areas of the brain are often *convex*, i.e. they arise as an intersection pattern of convex sets in a Euclidean space [18, 20, 23]. The combinatorial code of a one-layer feedforward neural network is also convex, as it arises as the intersection patterns of half-spaces [16, 24]. It is well-known that a two-layer feedforward network can approximate any measurable function [12, 19], and thus may produce any combinatorial code. In contrast, the codes of one-layer feedforward networks are not well-understood. The intersection lattices of affine hyperplane arrangements have been studied in the oriented matroid literature [1, 3, 5]. However, combinatorial codes contain less detailed information than oriented matroids, so the precise relationship is not clear. We are motivated by the following question: Can one determine if a given combinatorial code is realizable as the output of a one-layer feedforward neural network?

We study non-degenerate hyperplane codes, defined as codes that arise from the intersection patterns of half-spaces that are stable under small perturbations. We establish a number of obstructions that disqualify a combinatorial code from being a non-degenerate hyperplane code. We also prove that all the currently known obstructions to being a non-degenerate hyperplane code are subsumed by the condition that the polar complex of the code is shellable.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. Convex and hyperplane codes. For a collection $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}$ of n subsets $U_i \subseteq X$ of a set X we define a combinatorial code as follows:

Definition 2.1. For $\sigma \subseteq [n]$, let $A_\sigma^\mathcal{U}$ denote the *atom*

$$A_\sigma^\mathcal{U} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\bigcap_{i \in \sigma} U_i \right) \setminus \bigcup_{j \notin \sigma} U_j \subseteq X, \quad \text{where } A_\emptyset^\mathcal{U} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X \setminus \bigcup_{i \in [n]} U_i.$$

The *code* of \mathcal{U} relative to X is defined as

$$\text{code}(\mathcal{U}, X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\sigma \subseteq [n] \text{ such that } A_\sigma^\mathcal{U} \neq \emptyset\} \subseteq 2^{[n]}.$$

The *simplicial complex of the code*, denoted $\Delta(\mathcal{C})$, is the closure of \mathcal{C} under inclusion:

$$\Delta(\mathcal{C}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\tau \mid \tau \subseteq \sigma, \sigma \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

Note that for a code $\mathcal{C} = \text{code}(\mathcal{U}, X)$, the simplicial complex of the code is equal to the nerve of the corresponding cover:

$$\Delta(\text{code}(\mathcal{U}, X)) = \text{nerve}(\mathcal{U}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\sigma \subseteq [n] \mid \bigcap_{i \in \sigma} U_i \neq \emptyset\}.$$

A natural class of codes that arises in the context of neural networks is hyperplane codes. A hyperplane is a level set $H = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid w \cdot x - h = 0, w \in \mathbb{R}^d, h \in \mathbb{R}\}$ of a linear function. An *oriented* hyperplane partitions \mathbb{R}^d into three pieces: $\mathbb{R}^d = H^+ \sqcup H \sqcup H^-$, where H^\pm are the the open half-spaces, e.g. $H^+ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid w \cdot x - h > 0\}$.

Definition 2.2. A code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ is a *hyperplane code*, if there exists an open convex subset $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and a collection $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1^+, \dots, H_n^+\}$ of open half-spaces such that $\mathcal{C} = \text{code}(\{H_i^+ \cap X\}, X)$. We denote the code of this arrangement $\mathcal{C} = \text{code}(\mathcal{H}, X)$.

Hyperplane codes are produced by one-layer feedforward networks [16], where the convex set X is often the positive orthant $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$. A well-behaved subset of hyperplane codes are the *non-degenerate* hyperplane codes. These are codes that are preserved under small perturbations of the hyperplanes and the convex set X . Perturbations of the hyperplanes correspond to perturbations of the parameters of the neural network.

Definition 2.3. A collection of n open convex subsets $U_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is *non-degenerate*, if for every $\sigma \subseteq [n]$ of size $|\sigma| \leq d$ the following condition holds:

$$\bigcap_{i \in \sigma} \partial U_i \neq \emptyset \implies \dim\left(\bigcap_{i \in \sigma} \partial U_i\right) = d - |\sigma|.$$

Definition 2.4. Given an open convex set $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and a collection of open half-spaces $\mathcal{H} = \{H_i^+\}$, we say the pair (\mathcal{H}, X) is non-degenerate if the collection of open convex sets $U_i = H_i^+ \cap X$ is non-degenerate. A code \mathcal{C} is a non-degenerate hyperplane code if there exists a non-degenerate pair (\mathcal{H}, X) such that $\mathcal{C} = \text{code}(\mathcal{H}, X)$.

2.2. Bitflips and non-degenerate hyperplane codes. The abelian group $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^n$ acts on $2^{[n]}$ by “flipping bits” of codewords. Each generator $\mathbf{e}_i \in (\mathbb{Z}_2)^n$ acts by flipping the appropriate i -th bit, i.e.

$$\mathbf{e}_i \cdot \sigma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \sigma \cup i & \text{if } i \notin \sigma \\ \sigma \setminus i & \text{if } i \in \sigma. \end{cases}$$

This action extends to the action of $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^n$ on codes, with $g \cdot \mathcal{C} = \{g \cdot \sigma \mid \sigma \in \mathcal{C}\}$.

The group $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^n$ also acts on oriented hyperplane arrangements. Here each generator \mathbf{e}_i acts by reversing the orientation of the i -th hyperplane:

$$\mathbf{e}_i \cdot H_j^+ = \begin{cases} H_j^+ & \text{if } i \neq j \\ H_j^- & \text{if } i = j. \end{cases}$$

One might hope that applying bitflips commutes with taking the code of a hyperplane arrangement, but this is not true for arbitrary hyperplane codes. For example, consider $H_1^+, H_2^+, H_3^+ \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$, with $H_1^+ = \{x + y > 0\}$, $H_2^+ = \{x - y > 0\}$, and $H_3^+ = \{x > 0\}$. It is easy to see that the code($\mathcal{H}, \mathbb{R}^2$) has codewords $\{\emptyset, 1, 13, 123, 23, 2\}$. Meanwhile,

$$\text{code}(\mathbf{e}_3 \cdot \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{R}^2) = \{3, 13, 1, 12, 2, 23, \emptyset\} = \mathbf{e}_3 \cdot \text{code}(\mathcal{H}, \mathbb{R}^2) \cup \{\emptyset\}.$$

The extra codeword appears because after flipping plane H_3 , the origin no longer belongs to any full-dimensional atom; therefore, it produces a new codeword. Nevertheless, the non-degenerate hyperplane codes are $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^n$ -invariant.

Lemma 2.5. *If (\mathcal{H}, X) is a non-degenerate pair, then every nonempty atom $A_\sigma^\mathcal{U}$ of the cover $\mathcal{U} = \{H_i^+ \cap X\}$ has a nonempty interior.*

Corollary 2.6. *If (\mathcal{H}, X) is a non-degenerate pair, then for every $g \in (\mathbb{Z}_2)^n$,*

$$(1) \quad \text{code}(g \cdot \mathcal{H}, X) = g \cdot \text{code}(\mathcal{H}, X).$$

The proof of these and other statements throughout the paper is given in Section 6.

2.3. The polar complex. The invariance (1) of non-degenerate hyperplane codes makes it natural to consider a simplicial complex whose structure is preserved by bitflips. Given a code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$, we denote by $[n]$ and $\overline{[n]}$ two separate copies of the vertex set and define a *polar complex*, $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$, as a pure $(n - 1)$ -dimensional simplicial complex on vertex set $[n] \sqcup \overline{[n]}$ whose facets are in bijection with the codewords of \mathcal{C} .

Definition 2.7. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ be a combinatorial code. For every codeword $\sigma \in \mathcal{C}$ denote

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma(\sigma) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{i \mid i \in \sigma\} \sqcup \{\bar{i} \mid i \notin \sigma\} \text{ and} \\ \Gamma(\mathcal{C}) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Delta(\{\Sigma(\sigma) \mid \sigma \in \mathcal{C}\}). \end{aligned}$$

Example 2.8. The code for $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1^+, H_2^+, H_3^+\}$ and X depicted in Figure 1(a) has codewords $\{1, 12, 123, 2, 23\}$. The corresponding polar complex is given by

$$\Gamma(\mathcal{C}) = \Delta(\{1\bar{2}\bar{3}, 12\bar{3}, 123, \bar{1}2\bar{3}, \bar{1}23\});$$

it is depicted in Figure 1(b) as a subcomplex of the octahedron.




FIGURE 1. (a) Non-degenerate arrangement (\mathcal{H}, X) . (b) The polar complex $\Gamma(\text{code}(\mathcal{H}, X))$.

The action of the bitflips $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^n$ on the boolean lattice induces an action on the facets of the polar complex, so that $\Sigma(g \cdot \sigma) = g \cdot \Sigma(\sigma)$. In particular, $\Gamma(g \cdot \mathcal{C}) = g \cdot \Gamma(\mathcal{C})$, and the complex $\Gamma(g \cdot \mathcal{C})$ is combinatorially isomorphic to $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$.

It is easy to see that in the case of the non-degenerate hyperplane codes, $\Gamma(\text{code}(\mathcal{H}, X)) = \Delta(\text{code}(\{H_i^+, H_i^-\}, X))$. The Stanley-Reisner ideal of $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ is closely related to the *canonical form* of the neural ideal, defined in [10]. This will be elaborated in Section 5.

3. OBSTRUCTIONS FOR HYPERPLANE CODES

This section is devoted to enumerating *hyperplane obstructions*, or features of \mathcal{C} that prove it may not be realized by a non-degenerate hyperplane arrangement.

3.1. Local obstructions and bitflips. A larger class of codes that arises in the neuroscience context is the class of open convex codes [8–10, 16]. A code $\mathcal{C} \subset 2^{[n]}$ is called *open convex* if there exists a collection \mathcal{U} of n open and convex sets $U_i \subseteq X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, such that $\mathcal{C} = \text{code}(\mathcal{U}, X)$. Not every combinatorial code is convex. One obstruction to being an open convex code stems from the following variant of the nerve lemma (see e.g. [4]):

Lemma 3.1. *For any collection $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}$ of open convex sets $U_i \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, the nerve of the cover \mathcal{U} , $\text{nerve}(\mathcal{U})$ is homotopy equivalent to $\bigcup_i U_i$.*

This has the following consequence for open convex codes ([16, Theorem 3], see also [8, 9]):

Corollary 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{C} = \text{code}(\mathcal{U}, X)$ with each $U_i \subseteq X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ open and convex. Then $\text{link}_\sigma \Delta(\mathcal{C})$ is contractible for every nonempty $\sigma \in \Delta(\mathcal{C}) \setminus \mathcal{C}$.*

This observation provides a “local obstruction” for a code \mathcal{C} to being an open convex code: if $\sigma \in \Delta(\mathcal{C}) \setminus \mathcal{C}$ has a non-contractible link, then \mathcal{C} is nonconvex. Half-spaces are convex, thus local obstructions to convexity are also hyperplane obstructions. For a non-degenerate hyperplane code one can go much further since any bitflip yields a non-degenerate hyperplane code (Corollary 2.6). Therefore, not only are local obstructions in \mathcal{C} forbidden, we must also exclude local obstructions in $g \cdot \mathcal{C}$ for all bitflips $g \in (\mathbb{Z}_2)^n$.

Definition 3.3. Let $g \in (\mathbb{Z}_2)^n$ and $\tau \subseteq [n]$ be a pair such that $\text{link}_\tau(\Delta(g \cdot \mathcal{C}))$ is not contractible and $\tau \notin g \cdot \mathcal{C}$. Then (g, τ) is called a *bitflip local obstruction*.




FIGURE 2. An open convex realization of $\mathcal{C} = \{\emptyset, 2, 3, 4, 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 123, 124\}$.

Example 3.4. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\emptyset, 2, 3, 4, 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 123, 124\}$. This code is realizable as a convex code in \mathbb{R}^2 (Figure 2), this means it cannot have local obstructions to convexity. The bitflip code $\mathbf{e}_2 \cdot \mathcal{C}$ is given by $\{2, \emptyset, 23, 24, 1, 123, 124, 3, 4, 13, 14\}$. The new simplicial complex $\Delta(\mathbf{e}_2 \cdot \mathcal{C})$ has facets 123 and 124. The edge 12 is *not* in the code and $\text{link}_{12}(\Delta(\mathbf{e}_2 \cdot \mathcal{C}))$ is two vertices; therefore, $(\mathbf{e}_2, 12)$ is a bitflip local obstruction.

To search for bitflip local obstructions, the naive approach would check all $2^n \times 2^n$ possible pairs of subsets; this can be cut down in various ways for large examples. We conclude this section with a translation of this property for the polar complex of the code.

Proposition 3.5. *Suppose (g, τ) is a bitflip local obstruction for a code \mathcal{C} , and let σ denote the set of nonzero indices of g . Let $\nu = (\sigma \cup \tau) \setminus (\sigma \cap \tau)$ be the symmetric difference. Then $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ satisfies the following property:*

$$\nu \sqcup (\overline{[n] \setminus \nu}) \notin \Gamma(\mathcal{C}) \implies \text{link}_\tau(\Gamma(\mathcal{C})|_{([n] \setminus \sigma) \sqcup \bar{\sigma}}) \text{ is not contractible,}$$

where $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})|_{([n] \setminus \sigma) \sqcup \bar{\sigma}}$ is the induced subcomplex on the vertices $([n] \setminus \sigma) \sqcup \bar{\sigma}$.

3.2. Spherical Link Obstructions. Here we introduce another obstruction that can be detected via the polar complex of non-degenerate hyperplane codes. We use the following notation to aid our discussion. For a face $F \in \Gamma(\mathcal{C})$, we write $F = F^+ \sqcup \overline{F^-}$ to denote the restrictions of F to $[n]$ and $\overline{[n]}$. The *support* of F is $\underline{F} = F^+ \cup F^-$, the set of (barred or unbarred) vertices appearing in it.

Lemma 2.5 allows us to translate between faces of $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ and convex subsets of X as follows: The face $F = F^+ \sqcup \overline{F^-} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ corresponds to the open convex set

$$R_F = X \cap \bigcap_{i \in F^+} H_i^+ \cap \bigcap_{j \in \overline{F^-}} H_j^-.$$

In addition, it is easy to see that $\text{link}_F \Gamma(\mathcal{C}) = \Gamma(\mathcal{C}')$ for some $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq 2^{[n] \setminus \underline{F}}$. Therefore, we consider the topology of the covered subset of R_F ; the halfspaces indexed by the complement of F will cover either (1) nothing, (2) everything, or (3) all but a linear subspace.

Proposition 3.6. *Suppose $\mathcal{C} = \text{code}(\mathcal{H}, X)$ is a hyperplane code, and $F = F^+ \sqcup \overline{F^-} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ is a non-maximal face. Then either $\text{link}_F \Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ is contractible or it is homotopy-equivalent to a sphere, $\text{link}_F \Gamma(\mathcal{C}) \simeq S^r$, and $F^+ \in \mathcal{C}$.*

Corollary 3.7. *If \mathcal{C} is a non-degenerate hyperplane code, and $\text{link}_F \Gamma(\mathcal{C}) \simeq S^r$, then $\text{link}_F \Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ is the polar complex $\Gamma(2^{[n] \setminus \underline{F}})$ and $r = n - |F| - 1$.*

A version of Proposition 3.6 was proved in [2] using Quillen's Theorem. We prove it in more elementary terms in Section 6.2.

3.3. Chamber Obstructions. The motivation behind the final obstruction in this section concerns maximal hyperplane intersections. If a collection $\{H_i\}_{i \in \sigma}$ of hyperplanes intersects in a point ($H_\sigma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcap_{i \in \sigma} H_i = \text{pt}$) then that point has fixed position relative to other hyperplanes. In particular, there can not be two distinct regions defined by the other planes that contain that point. This is the basis for the chamber obstruction.

Definition 3.8. The *geometric chamber complex* of a hyperplane arrangement \mathcal{H} relative to an open convex set X , $\text{cham}(\mathcal{H}, X)$, is the set of $\sigma \subseteq [n]$ such that $H_\sigma \cap X \neq \emptyset$. By convention, $H_\emptyset = \mathbb{R}^d$ so $\emptyset \in \text{cham}(\mathcal{H}, X)$ for all (\mathcal{H}, X) .

The *combinatorial chamber complex* of a code \mathcal{C} , denoted $\text{cham}(\mathcal{C})$, is given by the set of $\sigma \subseteq [n]$ such that there exists $T \in \Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ with $\underline{T} = [n] \setminus \sigma$ and $\text{link}_T \Gamma(\mathcal{C}) = \Gamma(2^\sigma)$. We call such a T a *chamber* of σ .

Example 3.9. Consider the code from Example 2.8, $\mathcal{C} = \{1, 12, 123, 2, 23\}$. The corresponding polar complex $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ has facets $\{\overline{123}, \overline{12\bar{3}}, \overline{123}, \overline{1\bar{2}3}, \overline{123}\}$. The set of maximal faces σ in the combinatorial chamber complex are $\{2, 13\}$. This is because:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{link}_{\overline{13}}(\Gamma(\mathcal{C})) &= \Gamma(2^{\{2\}}) \\ \text{link}_2(\Gamma(\mathcal{C})) &= \Gamma(2^{\{1,3\}}) \end{aligned}$$

By inspection, these are also maximal faces of the geometric chamber complex.

We state here some properties of the chamber complexes. Most arguments are straightforward; details can be found in Section 6.3.

Proposition 3.10. 1. *Both chamber complexes are simplicial.*

2. *For a non-degenerate pair (\mathcal{H}, X) , the associated chamber complexes coincide, i.e. $\text{cham}(\mathcal{H}, X) = \text{cham}(\text{code}(\mathcal{H}, X))$.*

3. *Let \mathcal{C} be a non-degenerate hyperplane code. Then, each facet σ of $\text{cham}(\mathcal{C})$ has a unique chamber $T \in \Gamma(\mathcal{C})$.*

Based on this proposition, we obtain another hyperplane obstruction:

Definition 3.11. Let \mathcal{C} be a neural code. We say that \mathcal{C} has a *chamber obstruction* to hyperplane realization if there exists a face σ maximal in $\text{cham}(\mathcal{C})$ with at least two chambers, i.e. faces $T_1 \neq T_2$ in $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ with $\underline{T}_1 = \underline{T}_2 = [n] \setminus \sigma$ and

$$\text{link}_{T_1} \Gamma(\mathcal{C}) = \text{link}_{T_2} \Gamma(\mathcal{C}) = \Gamma(2^\sigma).$$

Example 3.12. Continuing Example 3.4, take $\mathcal{C} = \{\emptyset, 2, 3, 4, 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 123, 124\}$ as before. Let $\sigma = \{1, 2\}$. There are two faces $\{\bar{3}, 4\}$ and $\{3, \bar{4}\}$ with link in $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ equal to the full polar complex on $\{1, 2\}$. You can check that this is maximal in $\text{cham}(\mathcal{C})$, creating a chamber obstruction.

4. THE MAIN RESULTS

Our main results consist of showing that (i) the polar complex of a non-degenerate hyperplane code is shellable and (ii) that shellability of $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ implies \mathcal{C} has none of the obstructions thus far considered. The proofs of the theorems in this section are given in Sections 6.4 (proving shellability of the polar complex) and 6.5 (proving shellability subsumes other conditions).

Definition 4.1. Let Δ be a simplicial complex and F_1, \dots, F_t an ordering of its facets. The ordering is a *shelling order* if the sequence of complexes $\Delta_i = \Delta(\{F_1, \dots, F_i\})$, $i = 1, \dots, t$, satisfies the property that $\Delta_i \setminus \Delta_{i-1}$ has a unique minimal element, denoted $r(F_i)$ and called the *associated minimal face of F_i* . We say Δ is *shellable* if its facets permit a shelling order.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\mathcal{C} = \text{code}(\mathcal{H}, X)$ be a non-degenerate hyperplane code. Then $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ is shellable.*

The properties of links (Propositions 3.5 and 3.6) and the single chamber condition (Proposition 3.10.3.) are then seen to be consequences of shellability (respectively, Theorem 4.3, Corollary 4.4, and Theorem 4.5 below).

Theorem 4.3. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ be a combinatorial code such that $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ is shellable. Then for any $F \in \Gamma(\mathcal{C})$, $\text{link}_F \Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ is either $\Gamma(2^{[n] \setminus E})$ or contractible.*

Corollary 4.4. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ be a combinatorial code such that $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ is shellable. Then \mathcal{C} has no bitflip local obstructions.*

Theorem 4.5. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ be a combinatorial code such that $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ is shellable. Then \mathcal{C} has no chamber obstructions.*

5. ALGEBRAIC SIGNATURES OF A HYPERPLANE CODE

The connections between neural codes and Stanley-Reisner theory were first developed in [10], and later expanded upon in [11], [15], and [17]. The key observation is that a code can be considered as a set of points in $(\mathbb{F}_2)^n$, and the vanishing ideal of that variety is a “pseudomonomial ideal” with many similarities to a monomial ideal. In this section, we show that this connection can be made even more explicit via the polar complex.

5.1. Stanley-Reisner Ideal. The construction of the polar complex is seen to be particularly natural when considering the associated Stanley-Reisner ideal. For the unbarred vertices, we set the corresponding variables via $i \mapsto x_i$; for the barred vertices, we associate $\bar{i} \mapsto y_i$. The monomial ideal $I_{\Gamma(\mathcal{C})} \subseteq S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} k[x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n]$ is generated by the squarefree monomials indexed by **nonfaces** of $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$.

Example 5.1. Taking the example from Figure 1, $\mathcal{C} = \{1, 2, 12, 23, 123\}$, gives:

$$\Gamma(\mathcal{C}) = \Delta(\{1\bar{2}\bar{3}, \bar{1}2\bar{3}, \bar{1}\bar{2}3, \bar{1}\bar{2}\bar{3}\}).$$

The minimal nonfaces of $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ are $\{1\bar{1}, \bar{2}\bar{2}, \bar{3}\bar{3}, \bar{1}\bar{2}, \bar{2}\bar{3}\}$. This gives the Stanley-Reisner ideal

$$I_{\Gamma(\mathcal{C})} = \langle x_1 y_1, x_2 y_2, x_3 y_3, y_1 y_2, y_2 y_3 \rangle.$$

The first three faces in this list correspond to the Boolean relations from [10], while the last two relations can be compared to the elements of the canonical form: $(1 - x_1)(1 - x_2)$ and $x_3(1 - x_2)$.

The intuition mapped out in Example 5.1 can be proven to be true in general.

Proposition 5.2. *Suppose that neither $\text{link}_i(\Gamma(\mathcal{C}))$ nor $\text{link}_{\bar{i}}(\Gamma(\mathcal{C}))$ is empty, for any $i \in [n]$. Then, the generators of the Stanley-Reisner ideal $I_{\Gamma(\mathcal{C})}$ can be partitioned into two lists:*

- (1) one in bijection with the Boolean relations $\mathcal{B} = \{x_i(1 - x_i) : i \in [n]\}$,
- (2) one in bijection with the canonical form $CF(I_{\mathcal{C}})$.

The bijection in both cases is the map

$$\left(\prod_i x_i\right) \left(\prod_j y_j\right) \longleftrightarrow \left(\prod_i x_i\right) \left(\prod_j (1 - x_j)\right).$$

Remark 5.3. We pause to make reference to two very similar constructions. The recent work of Jeffries et al [17] explains how one may construct the ideal $I_{\Gamma(\mathcal{C})}$ via polarization of the pseudomonomial ideal described in [10]. Our construction, on the other hand, arrives at the ideal through the Stanley-Reisner ideal of the polar complex. The ideal described in this section also resembles the construction of the *oriented matroid ideal* described in [22].

5.2. Spherical link obstructions and multigraded free resolutions. Earlier, in Corollary 3.7, we specified that $\text{link}_{\Sigma}(\Gamma(\mathcal{C}))$ is either empty, contractible, or has dimension $n - |\Sigma| - 1$. One consequence of this fact is that if a hyperplane realization of \mathcal{C} exists, then a lower bound on the dimension of the realizing space is

$$d \geq \max_{\Sigma \in \Gamma(\mathcal{C})} \left\{ (n - |\Sigma|) \mid \text{link}_{\Sigma}(\Gamma(\mathcal{C})) = S^{n-|\Sigma|-1} \right\}.$$

However, this may not be the true lower bound.




FIGURE 3. Realization of $\mathcal{C} = \{\emptyset, 1, 2, 3\}$ in \mathbb{R}^2 . Though sphere link dimension is 1, minimal realization dimension is 2.

Example 5.4. Consider the code $\mathcal{C} = \{\emptyset, 1, 2, 3\}$ consisting of four words; this can be realized by hyperplanes as in Figure 3. Still, the polar complex $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ has facets $\overline{123}, \overline{12\bar{3}}, \overline{1\bar{2}3}, \overline{1\bar{2}\bar{3}}$, which has spherical links only at $\Sigma = \{\bar{i}, \bar{j}\}$ for $i \neq j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. This might lead us to infer that the minimal realizing dimension is $n - |\Sigma| = 3 - 2 = 1$; however, it is not difficult to prove that it is impossible to realize by hyperplanes in \mathbb{R}^1 .

Another consequence of the spherical link theorem relates to algebraic properties of the Stanley-Reisner ring. An early draft of [9], which can be found online, used multigraded free resolutions of the Stanley-Reisner ideal to extract information about links of the simplicial complex. We can use a similar strategy here to find spherical link obstructions to a code being non-degenerate hyperplane.

Proposition 5.5. *Let \mathcal{C} be a non-degenerate hyperplane code with polar complex $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$. Then, $\beta_{i,\sigma}(S/I_{\Gamma(\mathcal{C})^*}) = 0$ for all $i \geq 1$ except:*

$$\begin{cases} \beta_{1,\Sigma^c}(S/I_{\Gamma(\mathcal{C})^*}) = 1 & \text{if } \Sigma \text{ is a facet.} \\ \beta_{n-|\Sigma|+1,\Sigma^c}(S/I_{\Gamma(\mathcal{C})^*}) = 1 & \text{if } \text{link}_{\Sigma} \Gamma(\mathcal{C}) \sim S^{n-|\Sigma|-1}. \end{cases}$$

This proposition provides an algebraic signature of non-degenerate hyperplane codes.

Example 5.6. The following Macaulay2 code translates the code $\mathcal{C} = \{1, 3, 12, 23, 13\}$ into its polar complex and computes the Betti numbers for the Stanley-Reisner ideal of its Alexander dual:

```
loadPackage("SimplicialComplexes")
n = 3; R = QQ[x_0..x_(n-1),y_0..y_(n-1),
  Degrees => {{1,0,0,0,0,0},{0,1,0,0,0,0},{0,0,1,0,0,0},
             {0,0,0,1,0,0},{0,0,0,0,1,0},{0,0,0,0,0,1}}]
C = {(1,0,0),(1,1,0),(0,1,1),(0,0,1),(1,0,1)};
F = for c in C list product(for a to n-1 list
  if c#a == 1 then x_(a) else y_(a));
S = dual simplicialComplex(F);
I = ideal(S);
peek betti res I
```

The resulting nonzero Betti numbers are as below:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{0,\emptyset} = 1, \quad \beta_{1,\bar{123}} = 1, \quad \beta_{1,\bar{12}\bar{3}} = 1, \quad \beta_{1,\bar{1}23} = 1, \quad \beta_{1,1\bar{2}\bar{3}} = 1, \quad \beta_{1,12\bar{3}} = 1, \\ \beta_{2,23\bar{13}} = 1, \quad \beta_{2,23\bar{1}\bar{2}} = 1, \quad \beta_{2,13\bar{1}\bar{2}\bar{3}} = 1, \quad \beta_{2,12\bar{2}\bar{3}} = 1, \quad \beta_{2,12\bar{1}\bar{3}} = 1, \quad \beta_{2,123\bar{1}\bar{2}\bar{3}} = 1, \end{aligned}$$

We first point out that the grading of each Betti number corresponds to the face of its complement (e.g, $(0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1) \rightarrow x_1x_3y_2 \leftrightarrow (1, 0, 1)$). The first entry has to do with conventions regarding the empty set. The next five are the facets of the complex and $\beta_{1,\Sigma} = 1$ again due to the empty set. Our main interest is in faces where the first index corresponding to $i + 1$ is at least 2, namely the last six numbers corresponding to faces: $\bar{1}\bar{2}, \bar{1}\bar{3}, 2, \bar{1}\bar{3}, \bar{2}\bar{3}, \emptyset$.

The dual Hochster's formula, described in Section 6.6, tells us that $\tilde{H}^0(\text{link}_{\sigma^c} B\Delta(\mathcal{C}))$ is 1 for each of $\bar{1}\bar{2}, \bar{1}\bar{3}, \bar{1}\bar{3}, \bar{2}\bar{3}$, and 2. For the first four, the indices agree with the second exception in Proposition 5.5; however, for the face 2, the sphere has the wrong dimension. This indicates the presence of a spherical link obstruction.

6. PROOFS

6.1. Non-degeneracy and bit flips. The geometry of non-degenerate hyperplane arrangements is well-behaved under the $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^n$ action.

Proof of Lemma 2.5. We set $\mathcal{H} = \{H_i^+\}_{i \in [n]}$ with $H_i = \{w_i \cdot x - h_i = 0\}$, where $w_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for each i . Let A_σ be a nonempty atom of the arrangement,

$$\begin{aligned} A_\sigma &= X \cap \bigcap_{i \in \sigma} H_i^+ \setminus \bigcup_{j \notin \sigma} H_j^+ \\ &= X \cap \bigcap_{i \in \sigma} H_i^+ \cap \bigcap_{j \notin \sigma} (H_j \cup H_j^-) \neq \emptyset. \end{aligned}$$

For any $x \in A_\sigma$, we have

$$\begin{cases} w_i \cdot x - h_i > 0 & i \in \sigma \\ w_i \cdot x - h_i \leq 0 & i \notin \sigma. \end{cases}$$

Let $x \in A_\sigma$ be a point which satisfies $w_j \cdot x - h_j = 0$ for $j \in \alpha = \{j_1, \dots, j_k\} \subseteq [n] \setminus \sigma$, i.e. $x \in H_\alpha$. We have $x \in R \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X \cap \bigcap_{i \in \sigma} H_i^+ \cap \bigcap_{j \notin \sigma \cup \alpha} H_j^-$ which is open, hence for sufficiently small coefficients,

$$x + \sum_{\ell=1}^k a_{j_\ell} w_{j_\ell} \in R.$$

By non-degeneracy, we have $\dim H_\alpha = d - |\alpha|$, meaning the vectors $\{w_{j_1}, \dots, w_{j_k}\}$ are linearly independent. Let w'_{j_1} be the projection of w_{j_1} onto $H_{\alpha \setminus \{j_1\}}$. For small positive a'_{j_1} , we have

$$\begin{cases} w_{j_\ell} \cdot (x - a'_{j_1} w'_{j_1}) - h_{j_\ell} < 0 & \ell = 1 \\ w_{j_\ell} \cdot (x - a'_{j_1} w'_{j_1}) - h_{j_\ell} = 0 & \ell \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

Repeating this process for $\ell = 2, \dots, k$, we construct a point

$$x' \in X \cap \bigcap_{i \in \sigma} H_i^+ \cap \bigcap_{j \notin \sigma} H_j^- = \text{int } A_\sigma.$$

Thus, A_σ has nonempty interior. \square

Proof of Corollary 2.6. Non-degeneracy of a collection of convex sets is a property of their boundaries, i.e. the hyperplanes H_i together with the boundary of X in this setting. Since the action of $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^n$ does not change the planes H_i (only their orientation), non-degeneracy is preserved. Flipping planes on the boundary of an atom does not affect the interior. By Lemma 2.5, each atom has a nonempty interior which, as a subset of \mathbb{R}^d , is unchanged by reorientation of the hyperplanes. Atoms are neither created nor destroyed by reorienting planes in a non-degenerate arrangement; only their labels change, giving $g \cdot \text{code}(\mathcal{H}, X) = \text{code}(g \cdot \mathcal{H}, X)$. \square

6.2. Spherical Link Obstructions. We make use of the following simple lemma, stated without proof, to prove Proposition 3.6.

Lemma 6.1. *Let X be an open convex set in Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d , and L an affine subspace of \mathbb{R}^d , such that $X \cap L \neq \emptyset$. Then $X \setminus L$ is homotopy equivalent to S^r , with $r = d - \dim L - 1$.*

Proof of Proposition 3.6. Consider F properly contained in a maximal face. We confine our attention to the region R_F , defined as before,

$$R_F = X \cap \bigcap_{i \in F^+} H_i^+ \cap \bigcap_{\bar{j} \in \overline{F^-}} H_{\bar{j}}^-.$$

Let $\nu := [n] \setminus \underline{F}$. In place of the ambient convex set X , we set R_F as the convex set. The open half-spaces $\{H_\ell^+, H_\ell^-\}_{\ell \in \nu}$ form a cover of $R_F \setminus \bigcap_{\ell \in \nu} H_\ell$, since each pair covers the whole space outside of its boundary hyperplane. If $H_\nu = \emptyset$, this indicates that the hyperplane arrangement is not central, and that the sets $\{H_\ell^+, H_\ell^-\}$ properly cover the convex set R_F . Any convex set is contractible; the nerve lemma implies that the nerve of the cover $\{H_\ell^+, H_\ell^-\}$ is contractible as well.

If $H_\nu \cap X \neq \emptyset$, then the link now describes a cover of $X \setminus H_\nu$. By Lemma 6.1, this is homotopic to a sphere. \square

6.3. Chamber complexes.

Proof of Proposition 3.10.1. The geometric chamber complex is simplicial because if $H_\sigma \neq \emptyset$ then $H_{\sigma \setminus i} \neq \emptyset$.

For the combinatorial chamber complex, let σ be a face of $\text{cham}(\mathcal{C})$ with chamber T . We have $\text{link}_T \Gamma(\mathcal{C}) = \Gamma(2^\sigma)$, so in particular, for a fixed index $i \in \sigma$, all possible facets appear in $\Gamma(2^\sigma)$ with both i and \bar{i} . This implies that:

$$\text{link}_{T \cup i} \Gamma(\mathcal{C}) = \text{link}_{T \cup \bar{i}} \Gamma(\mathcal{C}) = \Gamma(2^{\sigma \setminus i})$$

This means that $\sigma \setminus i$ is also a face of $\text{cham}(\mathcal{C})$ and so $\text{cham}(\mathcal{C})$ is simplicial. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.10.2. Let (\mathcal{H}, X) be a non-degenerate pair and set $\mathcal{C} = \text{code}(\mathcal{H}, X)$. Suppose $\sigma \in \text{cham}(\mathcal{C})$ has chamber T . Then

$$\Gamma(2^\sigma) = \text{link}_T \Gamma(\mathcal{C}) = \Gamma(\text{code}(\{H_i\}_{i \notin \sigma}, R_T)),$$

meaning the planes $\{H_i\}_{i \in \sigma}$ partition R_T into the maximal number of regions. Since the arrangement is non-degenerate, we must have $H_\sigma \cap R_T \neq \emptyset$ and so $H_\sigma \cap X \neq \emptyset$. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.10.3. Consider a realization of \mathcal{C} by the arrangement (\mathcal{H}, X) , and let σ be a maximal face in the chamber complex. By the geometric interpretation, this means that, in the interior of X , the intersection of hyperplanes H_σ does not meet any other planes. Therefore, it is interior to only one atom of the arrangement $(\{H_j^+\}_{j \notin \sigma}, X)$; the face in $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ corresponding to this atom is the unique T . \square

6.4. Shellability. The proof of Theorem 4.2 consists of three parts. First, we show non-degenerate hyperplane codes can be realized by a pair $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{P})$ with \mathcal{P} the interior of a polyhedron, i.e. an intersection of halfspaces, such that the arrangement of those halfspaces together with \mathcal{H} is non-degenerate. Next, we show $\Gamma(\text{code}(\mathcal{H}, X))$ is shellable for non-degenerate arrangements \mathcal{H} in the special case $X = \mathbb{R}^d$. Finally, we use links to consider \mathcal{P} as a region in \mathbb{R}^d , reducing to the special case.

Lemma 6.2. *If \mathcal{C} is a non-degenerate hyperplane code, then \mathcal{C} can be realized by a non-degenerate pair $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{P})$ such that $\mathcal{P} = \bigcap_{j \in [m]} B_j^+$ is an open polyhedron with bounding planes \mathcal{B} such that $\mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{B}$ is non-degenerate in \mathbb{R}^d .*

Proof of Lemma 6.2. Let (\mathcal{H}, X) be a non-degenerate pair realizing \mathcal{C} . Because every atom of $\text{code}(\mathcal{H}, X)$ has non-empty interior, a small enough perturbation of the oriented hyperplanes in \mathcal{H} will preserve the atoms of $\text{code}(\mathcal{H}, X)$. Thus we can choose the oriented half-spaces $\mathcal{H} = \{H_i^+\}$ to be non-degenerate¹. Since there are finitely many elements in the code, one can always intersect X with an open convex set of a large-enough diameter while preserving the code and the non-degeneracy of the pair (\mathcal{H}, X) . Thus we can assume that the open convex set X is bounded.

Because every compact convex set can be approximated with arbitrary precision², and there are no zero measure atoms, one can replace the bounded open convex set X with an

¹Note that the non-degenerate condition on the half-spaces H_i^+ can be violated outside of the set X , thus the non-degeneracy of the pair (\mathcal{H}, X) alone does not ensure that the original $\mathcal{H} = \{H_i^+\}$ are non-degenerate.

²With respect to the Hausdorff distance, see e.g. [7].

open polytope $\mathcal{P} = \bigcap_{j \in [m]} B_j^+$. Finally, one can infinitesimally perturb the hyperplanes in $\mathcal{B} = \{B_j^+\}$ to ensure that $\mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{B}$ is a non-degenerate arrangement in \mathbb{R}^d . \square

Lemma 6.3. *If $(\mathcal{H}, \mathbb{R}^d)$ is a non-degenerate half-space arrangement, then $\Gamma(\text{code}(\mathcal{H}, \mathbb{R}^d))$ is shellable.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C} = \text{code}(\mathcal{H}, X)$ with $k = |\mathcal{C}|$ the number of codewords. Without loss of generality, the w_i defining the planes H_i span \mathbb{R}^d . Our proof proceeds by induction on d , the ambient dimension. We recall the notation $R_F = \bigcap_{i \in F} H_i^+ \cap \bigcap_{\bar{i} \in F} H_{\bar{i}}^-$ for $F \in \Gamma(\mathcal{C})$. By Lemma 2.5, for a facet $\Sigma \in \Gamma(\mathcal{C})$, R_Σ is the interior of the atom $A_{\Sigma^+}^{\mathcal{H}}$. For ease of narration and notation, we will refer interchangeably to ordering facets Σ of $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ and the corresponding interiors of atoms R_Σ of the arrangement (\mathcal{H}, X) . Further, we abuse terminology and refer interchangeably to atoms and their interiors.

The base case $d = 1$ is straightforward: The atoms are intervals (a_σ, b_σ) for $\sigma \in \mathcal{C}$. Ordering the atoms by their lower bounds induces a shelling order on $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$, with

$$r(\Sigma_j) = \begin{cases} i_j & u_j > 0 \\ \bar{i}_j & u_j < 0. \end{cases}$$

Now consider $d > 1$. Let $w_{sw} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a vector chosen to satisfy the following two properties:

- (1) w_{sw} is not in the span of any $(d - 1)$ -element subset of $\{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$.
- (2) For every pair $\alpha \neq \beta \subseteq [n]$ of d -element sets with $x = H_\alpha \neq \emptyset, y = H_\beta \neq \emptyset$, w_{sw} is not in $(x - y)^\perp$.

Such a w_{sw} exists since we exclude finitely many sets of measure zero from \mathbb{R}^d . We use w_{sw} to define a ‘‘sweep plane’’ $H_{sw}(t)$ and a monotone function $m_{sw} : \Gamma(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{sw}(t) &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid w_{sw} \cdot x = t\} \\ m_{sw}(F) &= \inf\{w_{sw} \cdot x \mid x \in R_F\}. \end{aligned}$$

Monotonicity of m_{sw} is meant in the following sense:

$$F \subseteq G \implies R_F \supseteq R_G \implies m_{sw}(F) \leq m_{sw}(G).$$

We call $m_{sw}(F)$ the *time of discovery* of region R_F . We claim the inductive hypothesis will provide a shelling order for facets Σ with $m_{sw}(\Sigma) = -\infty$, and the remaining facets are totally ordered in a shelling order by m_{sw} .

By construction, $\mathcal{H} \cup \{H_{sw}(t)^+\}$ is a non-degenerate arrangement for all but finitely many t ; specifically, the values of t where $H_{sw}(t)$ contains the point of intersection of exactly d planes from \mathcal{H} . Let t_0 be a constant less than the minimum of these values. Property (1) ensures we have $H_i \cap H_{sw}(t_0) \neq \emptyset$ for all i . Let $\mathcal{L} = \{H_i^+ \cap H_{sw}(t_0)\}_{i \in [n]}$. Then $\mathcal{C}' = \text{code}(\mathcal{L}, H_{sw}(t_0))$ is a non-degenerate hyperplane code in $H_{sw}(t_0) \cong \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$, so $\Gamma(\mathcal{C}')$ is shellable by inductive hypothesis. By construction, each atom of $(\mathcal{L}, H_{sw}(t_0))$ is the intersection of an atom of (\mathcal{H}, X) with $H_{sw}(t_0)$, meaning $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ and thus facets of $\Gamma(\mathcal{C}')$ are facets of $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$. These facets are precisely those with $m_{sw}(\Sigma) = -\infty$; let $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_q$ be the shelling order.

We order the remaining atoms by their time of discovery to complete the shelling order. By the fundamental theorem of linear programming [13], $w_{sw} \cdot x$ is minimized at a face or

vertex of each closed polyhedral region $\text{cl } R_\Sigma$. Our choice of w_{sw} ensures this minimizing set will be a vertex: Vertices of $\text{cl } R_\Sigma$ are points where d planes intersect, and properties (1) and (2) ensures $H_{sw}(t)$ does not contain two such vertices at a time. This further ensures two atoms cannot be discovered simultaneously at different points. Non-degeneracy of the arrangement ensures we do not discover two cells simultaneously at the same point: If two regions share a point of discovery we violate non-degeneracy by having more than d planes meet at that point. So, m_{sw} is injective on the facets of $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ with finite time of discovery. Let $\Sigma_{q+1}, \dots, \Sigma_k$ be the order with discovery times t_{q+1}, \dots, t_k .

We adopt the shorthand $\Gamma_i = \Delta(\{\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_i\})$ for $i = q + 1, \dots, k$. Note

$$F \in \Gamma_i \implies m_{sw}(F) \leq t_i$$

by monotonicity of m_{sw} . We have just shown

$$m_{sw}(F) \leq t_i \implies F \in \Gamma_i$$

by injectivity of m_{sw} on $\Sigma_{q+1}, \dots, \Sigma_k$. Therefore, $\Gamma_i = \{F \in \Gamma(\mathcal{C}) \mid m_{sw}(F) \leq t_i\}$.

We show Σ_i has an associated minimal face for $i = q + 1, \dots, k$ to complete the proof. We claim $r(\Sigma_i) = \Sigma_i|_{\alpha_i} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Sigma_i \cap (\alpha_i \sqcup \bar{\alpha}_i)$, where α_i indexes the set of planes intersecting at the point of discovery of R_{Σ_i} . By monotonicity, $m_{sw}(\Sigma_i|_{\alpha_i}) \leq m_{sw}(\Sigma_i) = t_i$; by construction $R_{\Sigma_i|_{\alpha_i}} \subseteq H_{sw}(t_i)^+$ so $m_{sw}(\Sigma_i|_{\alpha_i}) \geq t_i$. Thus $m_{sw}(\Sigma_i|_{\alpha_i}) = t_i$ and $\Sigma_i|_{\alpha_i} \in \Gamma_i \setminus \Gamma_{i-1}$.

We now show minimality and uniqueness. Consider $F = \Sigma_i|_{\beta} \in \Gamma_i \setminus \Gamma_{i-1}$. Suppose for the sake of contradiction $\alpha_i \not\subseteq \beta$, i.e. there is some $\ell \in \alpha_i \setminus \beta$. Set $\Sigma' = \mathbf{e}_\ell \cdot \Sigma_i$. Then we have $R_{\Sigma'} \subseteq R_F$ which implies $m_{sw}(F) \leq m_{sw}(\Sigma')$. However, $R_{\Sigma'} \cap H_{sw}(t_i) \neq \emptyset$, meaning $t_i > m_{sw}(\Sigma') \geq m_{sw}(F)$, contradicting our assumption that $F \notin \Gamma_{i-1}$. Therefore, we must have $\alpha_i \subseteq \beta$, and $r(\Sigma_i) = \Sigma_i|_{\alpha_i}$ is the unique minimal face in $\Gamma_i \setminus \Gamma_{i-1}$. This completes the proof. \square

We extend Lemma 6.3 to the general case with the following lemma, stated without proof:

Lemma 6.4. [6, Proposition 10.14] *Let Δ be a shellable simplicial complex. Then $\text{link}_\sigma \Delta$ is shellable for any $\sigma \in \Delta$ with shelling order induced from the shelling order of Δ .*

Proof of Theorem 4.2. By Lemma 6.2, \mathcal{C} can be realized as $\mathcal{C} = \text{code}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{P})$ with

$$\mathcal{P} = \bigcap_{j=n+1}^{n+m} B_j^+$$

an open polyhedron such that $\mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{B}$ is non-degenerate in \mathbb{R}^d . Let $\mathcal{C}' = \text{code}(\mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{B}, \mathbb{R}^d)$ be a code on vertex set $[n + m]$. By Lemma 6.3, $\Gamma(\mathcal{C}')$ is shellable. Set $F = \{n + 1, \dots, n + m\} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{C}')$. Then we have

$$\text{link}_F \Gamma(\mathcal{C}') = \Gamma \left(\text{code} \left(\mathcal{H}, \bigcap_{j=n+1}^{n+m} B_j^+ \right) \right) = \Gamma(\mathcal{C}).$$

As the link of a shellable complex, by Lemma 6.4, $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ is shellable. \square

6.5. Obstructions following from shellability. The proofs of Theorem 4.3 and Corollary 4.4 actually follow from the *collapsibility* of $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$, defined below. Moreover, we use collapses in the proof of Theorem 4.5.

Definition 6.5. A pair of faces (σ, τ) of a simplicial complex Δ is a *free pair* if (1) τ is a facet of Δ , (2) $\sigma \subsetneq \tau$, and (3) $\sigma \not\subseteq \tau'$ for any facet $\tau' \neq \tau$. The simplicial complex

$$\text{del}_\sigma \Delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\tau \in \Delta \mid \tau \not\supseteq \sigma\}$$

is the *collapse of Δ along σ* , denoted $\Delta \searrow_\sigma \text{del}_\sigma \Delta$. If a finite sequence of such collapses of Δ results in a new complex Δ' , we write $\Delta \searrow \Delta'$.

It is well known that simplicial collapses preserve homotopy type (see, e.g. [14]).

Lemma 6.6. *If $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ is shellable, then either $\mathcal{C} = 2^{[n]}$ (and hence $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ is homotopy-equivalent to S^{n-1}) or $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ is collapsible (and hence contractible).*

Proof. We induct on the number of codewords of \mathcal{C} . Suppose $\mathcal{C} \neq 2^{[n]}$. Let F_1, \dots, F_t be a shelling of $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$. Since $\mathcal{C} \neq 2^{[n]}$, $(r(F_t), F_t)$ must be a free pair. Collapsing $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ along this face yields $\Gamma(\mathcal{C} \setminus \{F_t^+\})$ which is shellable and hence, by inductive hypothesis, collapsible. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.3. Links of $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ are polar complexes of a code on a smaller set of neurons, and links of shellable complexes are shellable (Lemma 6.6). Therefore, we can apply Lemma 6.6 to conclude $\text{link}_F \Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ is either collapsible or $\Gamma(2^{[n] \setminus E})$. \square

Proof of Corollary 4.4. Since $\Gamma(g \cdot \mathcal{C})$ is isomorphic to $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ for any $g \in (\mathbb{Z}_2)^n$, it is also shellable. Therefore, we only need to make the argument for $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$.

Suppose $\alpha \in \Delta(\mathcal{C}) \setminus \mathcal{C}$ and $\text{link}_\alpha \Delta(\mathcal{C})$ is not contractible. We apply one of the link lemmas from [9]: α and $[n] \setminus \alpha$ are disjoint, $[n] = \alpha \cup ([n] \setminus \alpha)$, and $\Delta(\mathcal{C}) = \Gamma(\mathcal{C})|_{[n]}$, the induced subcomplex on the unbarred vertices. We have

$$\text{link}_\alpha \Delta(\mathcal{C}) = \text{link}_\alpha (\Gamma(\mathcal{C})|_{\alpha \cup ([n] \setminus \alpha)})$$

and therefore there exists $F \subseteq [n] \sqcup \overline{[n]}$ such that $\alpha \subseteq F$, $F \cap ([n] \setminus \alpha) = \emptyset$, and $\text{link}_F \Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ is not contractible. This, in turn, means $\text{link}_F \Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ must be the sphere $\Gamma(2^{[n] \setminus E})$. This means that $\alpha \sqcup \overline{[n] \setminus \alpha} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ and therefore $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$. \square

To prove the single chamber condition (Proposition 3.10) follows from shellability, we will need one more lemma, which lets us delete faces whose links are collapsible without changing the homotopy type.

Definition 6.7. Let Δ be a simplicial complex with $\sigma \in \Delta$. The *star* of σ is

$$\text{star}_\sigma \Delta = \{\tau \in \Delta : \tau \cup \sigma \in \Delta\}.$$

Lemma 6.8. *Let Δ be a simplicial complex with $\alpha \in \Delta$ such that $\text{link}_\alpha \Delta$ is collapsible. Then $\Delta \searrow \text{del}_\alpha \Delta$.*

Proof. Let $(\sigma_1, \tau_1), \dots, (\sigma_k, \tau_k)$ be the sequence of free pairs along which $\Delta_1 = \text{link}_\alpha \Delta$ is collapsed (in particular, $\sigma_k = \emptyset$), resulting in the sequence of simplicial complexes

$$\text{link}_\alpha \Delta = \Delta_1 \searrow_{\sigma_1} \Delta_2 \searrow_{\sigma_2} \cdots \searrow_{\sigma_k} \Delta_{k+1} = \{\}.$$

It is a straight forward check that $(\sigma_1 \cup \alpha, \tau_1 \cup \alpha), \dots, (\sigma_k \cup \alpha, \tau_k \cup \alpha)$ is a sequence of free pairs in $\text{star}_\alpha \Delta$.

Consider this sequence of pairs in Δ . They must still be free pairs: the only facets of Δ containing α are facets of $\text{star}_\alpha \Delta$, so the collapsing order is unaffected by faces of Δ outside $\text{star}_\alpha \Delta$. Therefore, $\Delta \searrow \text{del}_\alpha \Delta$. \square

We now proceed to the proof that shellability of $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ implies the single-chamber condition.

Proof of Theorem 4.5. We demonstrate that if $\sigma \in \text{cham}(\mathcal{C})$ has more than one chamber, then σ is not maximal.

Suppose $T_1 \neq T_2$ are chambers of σ , i.e.

$$\text{link}_{T_1} \Gamma(\mathcal{C}) = \text{link}_{T_2} \Gamma(\mathcal{C}) = \Gamma(2^\sigma).$$

We will proceed by induction on $k = |T_1 \setminus T_2| > 0$, the Hamming distance between the two. For the base case $k = 1$, suppose $T_1 \setminus T_2 = i$. Then

$$\text{link}_{T_1 \cap T_2} \Gamma(\mathcal{C}) = \Gamma(2^{\sigma \cup \{i\}})$$

so $\sigma \cup i \in \text{cham}(\mathcal{C})$ and σ is not maximal.

Now suppose $|T_1 \setminus T_2| = k > 1$. We produce a face F such that $\text{link}_F \Gamma(\mathcal{C}) = \Gamma(2^\sigma)$ and $|T_1 \setminus F| < k$, giving the induction step. Let $T = T_1 \cap T_2$, and consider $\text{link}_T \Gamma(\mathcal{C})$. This is a shellable subcomplex of $\Gamma(2^{[n] \setminus T})$; denote its corresponding code by \mathcal{C}' . Let $T'_1 = T_1 \setminus T$ and $T'_2 = T_2 \setminus T$; by design these are disjoint with $|T'_1 \setminus T'_2| = |T'_1| = |T'_2| = k$ and $\text{link}_{T'_i} \Gamma(\mathcal{C}') = \Gamma(2^\sigma)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Because they are disjoint, $\text{star}_{T'_1} \Gamma(\mathcal{C}') \cup \text{star}_{T'_2} \Gamma(\mathcal{C}')$ is a suspension of $\Gamma(2^\sigma)$, making it homotopy equivalent to $S^{|\sigma|}$.

Consider a face $F' \in \Gamma(\mathcal{C}')$ such that $\underline{F'} = \underline{T'_1}$. By construction, $\text{link}_{F'} \Gamma(\mathcal{C}')$ is a subcomplex of $\Gamma(2^\sigma)$. If $\text{link}_{F'} \Gamma(\mathcal{C}') \neq \Gamma(2^\sigma)$, then the link is collapsible by Lemmas 6.4 and 6.6; Lemma 6.8 implies that $\Gamma(\mathcal{C}')$ collapses to $\text{del}_{F'} \Gamma(\mathcal{C}')$.

There are $2^k - 2$ faces $F' \neq T_1, T_2$ with $\underline{F'} = \underline{T'_1}$. If none of these F' had $\text{link}_{F'} \Gamma(\mathcal{C}') = \Gamma(2^\sigma)$, this would lead to a contradiction: we would have a sequence of collapses

$$\Gamma(\mathcal{C}') \searrow \text{star}_{T'_1} \Gamma(\mathcal{C}') \cup \text{star}_{T'_2} \Gamma(\mathcal{C}').$$

Since $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ is shellable, by Lemma 6.6 it has homotopy type S^{n-1} or is contractible. Collapsing preserves homotopy type, so we reach a contradiction.

Therefore, for one of these F' we must have $\text{link}_{F'} \Gamma(\mathcal{C}') = \Gamma(2^\sigma)$. Thus $\text{link}_{F' \cup T} \Gamma(\mathcal{C}) = \Gamma(2^\sigma)$ and so we have another face whose link yields $\Gamma(2^\sigma)$, namely $F = F' \cup T$. Since $|T_1 \setminus F| < k$, by induction σ is not maximal in $\text{cham} \mathcal{C}$. \square

6.6. Commutative Algebra.

Proof of Proposition 5.2. Recall the definition from [10]: the canonical form of $I_{\mathcal{C}}$ is the set of minimal pseudomonomials in $I_{\mathcal{C}}$, i.e. the set of polynomials of type $(\prod_{i \in \sigma} x_i) \left(\prod_{j \in \tau} (1 - x_j) \right)$ in $\mathbb{F}_2[x]$ with $\sigma \cap \tau = \emptyset$ that vanish on the codewords, and are minimal by divisibility. The Boolean relations are always minimal because of the condition on links; they are always nonfaces by definition.

Consider a monomial generator $x^\sigma y^\tau \in I_{\Gamma(\mathcal{C})}$. By definition, the face $\sigma \sqcup \bar{\tau}$ is a nonface of the complex $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$. This means that no codewords of \mathcal{C} have all indices in σ and exclude all indices in τ . In particular, the polynomial $\prod_\sigma x \prod_\tau (1 - x)$ vanishes everywhere (since it either has a 0 in one of the σ indices or a 1 in a τ index). Further, the fact that $x^\sigma y^\tau$ is a generator means that it has minimal degree in $I_{\Gamma(\mathcal{C})}$. Any proper subface $\sigma' \sqcup \bar{\tau}'$ has a corresponding codeword with all indices in σ' and excluding all indices in $\bar{\tau}'$ meaning that the corresponding pseudomonomial does not vanish on that codeword. Therefore, the pseudomonomial is minimal by divisibility, implying that it is in the canonical form.

The argument runs in much the same way in reverse, sending every pseudomonomial in the canonical form to a minimal nonface in $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ and a generator of the Stanley-Reisner ideal. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.5. We use the following fact, based on a formula in [21]:

Lemma 6.9 (Dual Hochster's formula). $\beta_{i+1, \Sigma^c}(S/I_{\Gamma(\mathcal{C})^\vee}) = \dim_k \tilde{H}^{i-1}(\text{link}_\Sigma \Gamma(\mathcal{C}); k)$.

where $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})^\vee$ denotes the Alexander dual and $\Sigma^c = ([n] \sqcup \bar{[n]}) \setminus \Sigma$ denotes the complement of Σ in the vertex set of $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$.

Inserting $i = 0$ and Σ a facet into the formula above yields

$$\beta_{1, \Sigma^c}(S/I_{\Gamma(\mathcal{C})^\vee}) = \dim_k \tilde{H}^{-1}(\text{link}_\Sigma \Gamma(\mathcal{C}); k).$$

The right-hand side is equal to 1, since the link of a facet is the empty set, which gives a generator of (-1) -homology. This gives the first equation from the Proposition.

Setting $i = n - |\Sigma|$ and Σ a face of $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$:

$$\beta_{n-|\Sigma|+1, \Sigma}(S/I_{\Gamma(\mathcal{C})^\vee}) = \dim_k \tilde{H}^{n-|\Sigma|-1}(\text{link}_{\Sigma^c} \Gamma(\mathcal{C}); k).$$

The right-hand side is 1 precisely when the link is a sphere of the right dimension. In all other cases, the link is contractible (Proposition 3.6) or empty (links of non-faces), so the reduced homology is zero. \square

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the joint NSF DMS/NIGMS grant R01GM117592, NSF IOS-155925, and ARO award W911NF-15-1-0084 for DARPA to VI. Research by ZR was partially supported by a Math+X Research Grant. The authors would like to thank Carina Curto, Art Duval, Jack Jeffries, Katie Morrison and Anne Shiu for helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] Hans-Jürgen Bandelt, Victor Chepoi, and Kolja Knauer, *Coms: complexes of oriented matroids*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.06111 (2015).
- [2] Marilena Barnabei and Andrea Brini, *Dissections of convex sets and homotopy types of posets*, *Advances in Mathematics* **58** (1985), no. 2, 109–118.
- [3] Andrea Baum and Yida Zhu, *The axiomatization of affine oriented matroids reassessed*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.03228 (2016).
- [4] Anders Björner, *Handbook of combinatorics*, 1995, pp. 1819–1872.
- [5] Anders Björner, Michel Las Vergnas, Bernd Sturmfels, Neil White, and Günter M Ziegler, *Oriented matroids, volume 46 of encyclopedia of mathematics and its applications*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.

- [6] Anders Björner and Michelle L. Wachs, *Shellable nonpure complexes and posets. II*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **349** (1997), no. 10, 3945–3975.
- [7] E. M. Bronstein, *Approximation of convex sets by polytopes*, Journal of Mathematical Sciences **153** (2008), no. 6, 727–762.
- [8] Josh Cruz, Chad Giusti, Vladimir Itskov, and Bill Kronholm, *On open and closed convex codes* (2017). <https://arxiv.org/abs/1609.03502>.
- [9] Carina Curto, Elizabeth Gross, Jack Jeffries, Katherine Morrison, Mohamed Omar, Zvi Rosen, Anne Shiu, and Nora Youngs, *What makes a neural code convex?*, SIAM Journal on Applied Algebra and Geometry **1** (2017), no. 1, 222–238.
- [10] Carina Curto, Vladimir Itskov, Alan Veliz-Cuba, and Nora Youngs, *The neural ring: an algebraic tool for analyzing the intrinsic structure of neural codes.*, Bulletin of mathematical biology **75** (2013), no. 9, 1571–1611.
- [11] Carina Curto and Nora Youngs, *Neural ring homomorphisms and maps between neural codes*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.00255 (2015).
- [12] G Cybenko, *Approximations by superpositions of sigmoidal functions*, Mathematics of Control, Signals, and Systems **2** (1989), no. 4, 303–314.
- [13] George Bernard Dantzig, *Linear programming and extensions*, RAND Corporation, 1963.
- [14] Robin Forman, *Morse theory for cell complexes*, Advances in Mathematics **134** (March 1998), no. 1, 90–145.
- [15] Rebecca Garcia, Luis David García Puente, Ryan Kruse, Jessica Liu, Dane Miyata, Ethan Petersen, Kaitlyn Phillipson, and Anne Shiu, *Gröbner bases of neural ideals*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.05660 (2016).
- [16] Chad Giusti and Vladimir Itskov, *A no-go theorem for one-layer feedforward networks*, Neural Comput. **26** (2014), no. 11.
- [17] Sema Gunturkun, Jack Jeffries, and Jeffrey Sun, *Polarization of neural rings*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.08559 (2017).
- [18] Torkel Hafting, Marianne Fyhn, Sturla Molden, May-Britt Moser, and Edvard I. Moser, *Microstructure of a spatial map in the entorhinal cortex.*, Nature **436** (2005), no. 7052, 801–806.
- [19] Kurt Hornik, *Approximation capabilities of multilayer feedforward networks*, Neural Networks **4** (1991), no. 2, 251–257.
- [20] David H Hubel and Torsten N Wiesel, *Receptive fields, binocular interaction and functional architecture in the cat’s visual cortex*, The Journal of physiology **160** (1962), no. 1, 106–154.
- [21] Ezra Miller and Bernd Sturmfels, *Combinatorial commutative algebra*, Vol. 227, Springer Science & Business Media, 2004.
- [22] Isabella Novik, Alexander Postnikov, Bernd Sturmfels, et al., *Syzygies of oriented matroids*, Duke Mathematical Journal **111** (2002), no. 2, 287–317.
- [23] John O’Keefe, *Place units in the hippocampus of the freely moving rat*, Experimental neurology **51** (1976), no. 1, 78–109.
- [24] Frank. Rosenblatt, *Principles of neurodynamics; perceptrons and the theory of brain mechanisms.*, Spartan Books, Washington, 1962.