

Higher-Dimensional Subdiagram Matching

Amar Hadzihasanovic

¹ Department of Software Science
Tallinn University of Technology

² Quantinuum, 17 Beaumont Street
Oxford OX1 2NA, United Kingdom

Diana Kessler

Department of Software Science
Tallinn University of Technology

Abstract—Higher-dimensional rewriting is founded on a duality of rewrite systems and cell complexes, connecting computational mathematics to higher categories and homotopy theory: the two sides of a rewrite rule are two halves of the boundary of an $(n + 1)$ -cell, which are diagrams of n -cells. We study higher-dimensional diagram rewriting as a mechanism of computation, focussing on the matching problem for rewritable subdiagrams within the combinatorial framework of diagrammatic sets. We provide an algorithm for subdiagram matching in arbitrary dimensions, based on new results on layerings of diagrams, and derive upper bounds on its time complexity. We show that these superpolynomial bounds can be improved to polynomial bounds under certain acyclicity conditions, and that these conditions hold in general for diagrams up to dimension 3. We discuss the challenges that arise in dimension 4.

INTRODUCTION

Higher-dimensional rewriting [1], [2] is founded, as a field, on the observation that different varieties of rewrite systems are instances of *directed cell complexes* in different dimensions. These, in turn, can be seen as presentations of higher or monoidal categories and groupoids, situating objects traditionally associated with syntactic and quantitative aspects of computation in the same universe as objects traditionally associated with semantic and logical aspects.

Informally, a directed cell complex is an object assembled from “directed n -cells”, models of topological n -balls whose boundary, an $(n - 1)$ -sphere, is subdivided into an *input* and an *output* half, modelling the left and right-hand sides of a rewrite rule. A 1-dimensional directed cell complex is a directed graph, which is the same as an abstract rewrite system up to interpretive nuances. A 2-dimensional directed cell complex is the presentation with “oriented equations” of a category; when the category has a single object, it is the presentation of a *monoid*, also known as a string rewrite system. One dimension higher, we find presentations with oriented equations of monoidal categories, which subsume, *via* functorial semantics [3], term rewrite systems such as presentations of algebraic theories.

The duality of rewrite systems and higher structures has, so far, been leveraged mostly on the side of higher algebra, for example in the study of homotopically coherent presentations of algebras [4] or the development of proof assistants for homotopy theory and higher category theory [5]. We would

like to argue that, also *as a mechanism of computation*, higher-dimensional rewriting has some unique characteristics which may be significant in fundamental computer science, yet have remained underexplored.

One of these is a kind of *uniformity of data and computations*. In most models, computations or executions are objects of different nature from the data that they manipulate: for example, sequences of configurations as opposed to terms or strings of characters. There is no *internal* way to manipulate computations as data, that does not require encoding in some external “reference” machine, to which the same consideration applies. In higher-dimensional rewriting, on the other hand, data is given in the form of a *diagram* (sometimes called a *pasting diagram*) of n -cells, and a computation is then embodied by a *diagram of $(n + 1)$ -cells*, which is naturally the data of a computation one dimension above. This suggests that higher-dimensional rewriting may, for example, be a natural framework for the formal study of simulations of machines by other machines.

Another point of interest is that a higher-dimensional rewrite system presents not only the admissible data and computations, but also *the space in which computations happen*. The possibility of parallelism, or whether the data is accessed as a stack or in free order, become internal topological features rather than externally imposed constraints. This is particularly interesting in relation to quantum models where the topological features themselves drive the computation [6].

This article is an effort to establish some fundamental facts about higher-dimensional rewriting as a mechanism of computation. In particular, we try to answer the following question: *is a machine that operates by higher-dimensional rewriting a “reasonable” machine, according to the standards of computational complexity theory?* More precisely: is the obvious cost model that attributes constant cost to each rewrite step a “reasonable” cost model?

The basic computational step of any such machine may be described as follows. The machine has a list $(r_i)_{i=1}^m$ of rewrite rules, which are $(n + 1)$ -cells, and whose input boundaries $(\partial^- r_i)_{i=1}^m$ and output boundaries $(\partial^+ r_i)_{i=1}^m$ are n -dimensional diagrams. Given an n -dimensional diagram t as input, the machine tries to match one of the input boundaries with a rewritable *subdiagram* of t . If it finds a match with $\partial^- r_i$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, it substitutes $\partial^+ r_i$ for the match in t ; otherwise it stops.

Evidently, our question is answered in the affirmative for such a machine if and only if the *subdiagram matching problem* is feasible in dimension n , which we read as: *admits a (preferably low-degree) polynomial-time algorithm with respect to a reasonable size measure for diagrams*. Since a cognate problem such as subgraph matching is notoriously NP-complete, it is not at all obvious that this should be true.

With this in mind, in this article we study the higher-dimensional subdiagram matching problem. As a first step, we must fix a particular model of higher-dimensional diagrams. We adopt the *diagrammatic set* model defined by the first author [7] after a combinatorial approach to diagrams started by Steiner [8]. This model combines expressiveness with the property of *topological soundness*: diagrams admit a functorial interpretation as homotopies in CW complexes. Furthermore, it uses inductive data structures that are suitable for computation; we began a study of their algorithms and complexity in [9].

Our main contribution is an algorithm for subdiagram matching in arbitrary dimension, relying on new combinatorial results on *layerings* of diagrams (decompositions into layers containing each a single cell of highest dimension). Only one stage in this algorithm takes superpolynomial time in the worst case. We show that this can be avoided under certain acyclicity conditions on diagrams, which hold in general up to dimension 3. We derive that subdiagram matching is feasible up to dimension 3, which should cover most current applications of higher-dimensional rewriting. We then discuss the case of dimension 4 and higher, showing through a counterexample why there is no obvious patch to the algorithm. We leave the question of feasibility in higher dimensions open.

Related work

Complexity-theoretic aspects of higher-dimensional rewriting in the proper sense were considered by Bonfante and Guiraud in [10], but this work focussed only on a particular class of 2-dimensional rewrite systems.

Other works focus on *string diagram rewriting*, which is connected to higher-dimensional rewriting in that both of them have semantics in higher and monoidal categories, but the flavour is altogether different: models of string diagram rewrite systems are typically 2-dimensional but have extra structure which makes the diagrams “graph-like”, and it can be convenient to reflect that in the data structures. Works in this vein include the series by Bonchi, Gadducci, Kissinger, Sobocinski, and Zanasi [11], [12], [13] with a focus on rewriting-theoretic questions, and articles by Delpuch and Vicary [14], [15] with a more complexity-theoretic focus.

Structure of the article

Section I presents the combinatorial framework together with the data structures used to represent diagrams. It also provides an improved complexity upper bound for the diagram isomorphism problem. Section II defines rewritable subdiagrams and their matching problem, which can be split into subproblems. It then deals with the first subproblem, which is to match the shape of a diagram in another diagram,

irrespective of whether it is a subdiagram. Section III deals with the second subproblem, which is to recognise which matches are, in fact, rewritable subdiagrams. It presents a theory of *layerings* and *orderings* of diagrams as a way to an algorithm solving this problem in any dimension. This algorithm has only a superpolynomial upper bound, but it is shown that it can be improved to a polynomial bound under certain acyclicity conditions. Section IV shows that these acyclicity conditions hold automatically up to dimension 3, and the algorithms can be further simplified in low dimensions. It then discusses an example in dimension 4 which highlights why the strategies that work in low dimensions do not have obvious extensions to higher dimensions.

Proofs of combinatorial results are attached in the appendix. A full development will be presented in a forthcoming technical monograph [16].

I. THE DATA STRUCTURES

1. This section is for the largest part a recap of [9]. We refer the reader there for more details.

2. In the framework of diagrammatic sets, a diagram t is specified by the data of

- 1) its *shape* U ,
- 2) a labelling $t: U \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$ in a set of variables.

The shape of a diagram records its cells, together with the information of which $(n-1)$ -dimensional cells are located in the input or output half of the boundary of an n -dimensional cell. This is similar to the data of an abstract polytope or polytopal complex, but comes with additional orientation data. We present these data in the form of an *oriented graded poset*.

3 (Covering relation). Let P be a finite poset with order relation \leq . Given elements $x, y \in P$, we say that y *covers* x if $x < y$ and, for all $y' \in P$, if $x < y' \leq y$ then $y' = y$.

4 (Hasse diagram). Let P be a finite poset. The *Hasse diagram* of P is the directed acyclic graph $\mathcal{H}P$ whose

- set of vertices is the underlying set of P , and
- for all vertices x, y , there is an edge from y to x if and only if y covers x in P .

5 (Graded poset). Let P be a finite poset. We say that P is *graded* if, for all $x \in P$, all maximal paths starting from x in $\mathcal{H}P$ have the same length.

6 (Dimension of an element). Let P be a graded poset and $x \in P$. The *dimension* of x is the length $\dim x$ of a maximal path starting from x in $\mathcal{H}P$. For each $U \subseteq P$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $U_n := \{x \in U \mid \dim x = n\}$.

7 (Oriented graded poset). Let P be a finite poset. An *orientation* on P is an edge-labelling of $\mathcal{H}P$ with values in $\{+, -\}$. An *oriented graded poset* is a graded poset P together with an orientation on P .

8 (Faces and cofaces). Let P be an oriented graded poset, $x \in P$, $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$. The set of *input* ($\alpha = -$) or *output* ($\alpha = +$) *faces* of x is

$$\Delta^\alpha x := \{y \in P \mid x \text{ covers } y \text{ with orientation } \alpha\}.$$

The set of *input* ($\alpha = -$) or *output* ($\alpha = +$) *cofaces* of x is

$$\nabla^\alpha x := \{y \in P \mid y \text{ covers } x \text{ with orientation } \alpha\}.$$

We let $\Delta x := \Delta^-x \cup \Delta^+x$ and $\nabla x := \nabla^-x \cup \nabla^+x$.

9 (Oriented Hasse diagram). Let P be an oriented graded poset. The *oriented Hasse diagram* of P is the directed graph $\mathcal{H}P$ whose

- set of vertices is the underlying set of P , and
- for all vertices x, y , there is an edge from y to x if and only if $y \in \Delta^-x$ or $x \in \Delta^+y$.

10. To represent an oriented graded poset P , we linearly order P_n in each dimension n , so that each element $x \in P$ is uniquely identified by a pair of integers (n, k) , where $n := \dim x$ and k is the position of x in the linear order on P_n . Then we represent P as a pair $(\text{face_data}, \text{coface_data})$ of arrays of arrays of pairs of sets of integers, where


- 1) $j \in \text{face_data}[n][k][i]$ iff $(n-1, j) \in \Delta^{\alpha(i)}(n, k)$,
- 2) $j \in \text{coface_data}[n][k][i]$ iff $(n+1, j) \in \nabla^{\alpha(i)}(n, k)$;

here the index $i \in \{0, 1\}$ is used to encode pairs, $\alpha(0) := -$ and $\alpha(1) := +$. Sets of integers may be implemented as any data type supporting binary search in logarithmic time. Note that this representation is redundant: face_data and coface_data can be reconstructed from each other.

This is essentially an adjacency list representation of $\mathcal{H}P$, with vertices separated according to their dimension, and incoming and outgoing edges separated according to their label. It is not unique: any permutation of the dimension-wise linear orders produces an equivalent representation.

Example 11. The following are representations of the same 2-dimensional diagram shape as

- a typical drawing of a pasting diagram;
- an oriented Hasse diagram, with input edges in pink, and dimension increasing from bottom to top;
- the pair of face_data and coface_data (rows are outer array indices, increasing from top to bottom, and columns inner array indices, increasing from left to right).



face_data:				
{}, {}	{}, {}	{}, {}	{}, {}	{}, {}
{0}, {1}	{1}, {2}	{2}, {3}	{0}, {2}	
{0, 1}, {3}				
coface_data:				
{0, 3}, {}	{1}, {0}	{2}, {1, 3}	{}, {2}	
{0}, {}	{0}, {}	{}, {}	{}, {0}	
{}, {}				

12 (Closure of a subset). Let P be a poset, $U \subseteq P$. The *closure* of U is the subset $\text{cl}U := \{x \in P \mid \exists y \in U x \leq y\}$. We say that U is *closed* if $U = \text{cl}U$.

13 (Dimension of a subset). Let U be a closed subset of a graded poset. The *dimension* of U is the integer

$$\dim U := \begin{cases} \max \{\dim x \mid x \in U\} & \text{if } U \text{ is inhabited,} \\ -1 & \text{if } U \text{ is empty.} \end{cases}$$

14 (Input and output boundaries). Let U be a closed subset of an oriented graded poset. For all $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$\Delta_n^\alpha U := \{x \in U_n \mid \nabla^{-\alpha} x \cap U = \emptyset\}.$$

Note that, if $\text{Max}U$ is the set of maximal elements of U , then

$$\Delta_n^-U \cap \Delta_n^+U = (\text{Max}U)_n.$$

The *input* ($\alpha = -$) and *output* ($\alpha = +$) n -*boundary* of U is the closed subset

$$\partial_n^\alpha U := \text{cl}(\Delta_n^\alpha U) \cup \bigcup_{k < n} \text{cl}(\text{Max}U)_k.$$

We omit the subscript when $n = \dim U - 1$, and for $n \in \{-1, -2\}$, we let $\Delta_n^\alpha U = \partial_n^\alpha U := \emptyset$.

15. We use the following notations, for x an element in an oriented graded poset, U a closed subset, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$: $\partial_n^\alpha x := \partial_n^\alpha \text{cl}\{x\}$, $\partial_n U := \partial_n^-U \cup \partial_n^+U$, $\Delta_n U := \Delta_n^-U \cup \Delta_n^+U$.

Lemma 16. Let U be a closed subset of an oriented graded poset, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$. Then

- 1) $\partial_n^\alpha U \subseteq U$,
- 2) $\partial_n^\alpha U = U$ if and only if $n \geq \dim U$.

Example 17. Let U be the oriented graded poset of Example 11. Then $\partial_2^-U = \partial_2^+U = U$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_1^-U &= \{(0, 0), (0, 1), (0, 2), (0, 3), (1, 0), (1, 1), (1, 2)\}, \\ \partial_1^+U &= \{(0, 0), (0, 2), (0, 3), (1, 2), (1, 3)\}, \\ \partial_0^-U &= \{(0, 0)\}, \quad \partial_0^+U = \{(0, 3)\}. \end{aligned}$$

18 (Map of oriented graded posets). Let P, Q be oriented graded posets. A *map* $f: P \rightarrow Q$ is a function of their underlying sets that satisfies

$$f(\partial_n^\alpha x) = \partial_n^\alpha f(x)$$

for all $x \in P$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$. There is a category \mathbf{ogPos} whose objects are oriented graded posets and morphisms are maps.

19 (Inclusion of oriented graded posets). An *inclusion* is an injective map of oriented graded posets.

Lemma 20. Let $\iota: P \hookrightarrow Q$ be an inclusion of oriented graded posets. Then

- 1) ι is both order-preserving and order-reflecting, that is, $\iota(x) \leq \iota(y)$ if and only if $x \leq y$;

- 2) ι preserves dimensions, that is, $\dim \iota(x) = \dim x$ for all $x \in P$;
- 3) ι preserves the covering relation and orientations, that is, if y covers x in P with orientation α , then $\iota(y)$ covers $\iota(x)$ in Q with orientation α ;
- 4) for all closed $U \subseteq P$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$, ι maps $\partial_n^\alpha U$ isomorphically onto $\partial_n^\alpha \iota(U)$.

Remark 21. Every closed subset of an oriented graded poset inherits an orientation by restriction, and its inclusion as a subset is an inclusion of oriented graded posets. The fact that inclusions preserve all boundaries justifies us in identifying an oriented graded poset with its image through an inclusion, which we will often do implicitly.

Proposition 22. The category \mathbf{ogPos} has

- 1) a terminal object 1 ,
- 2) an initial object \emptyset ,
- 3) pushouts of inclusions.

23. Not all oriented graded posets describe well-formed diagram shapes. In our framework, the well-formed shapes form an inductive subclass, the *regular molecules*, generated by the following constructions.

24 (Pasting construction). Let U, V be oriented graded posets, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $\varphi: \partial_k^+ U \xrightarrow{\sim} \partial_k^- V$ be an isomorphism. The *pasting of U and V at the k -boundary along φ* is the oriented graded poset $U \#_k^\varphi V$ obtained in \mathbf{ogPos} as the pushout

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \partial_k^+ U & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & \partial_k^- V & \hookrightarrow & V \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\ U & \hookrightarrow & & & U \#_k^\varphi V \end{array}$$

25 (Rewrite construction). Let U, V be oriented graded posets of the same dimension n , and suppose $\varphi: \partial U \xrightarrow{\sim} \partial V$ is an isomorphism restricting to isomorphisms $\varphi^\alpha: \partial^\alpha U \xrightarrow{\sim} \partial^\alpha V$ for each $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$. Construct the pushout

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \partial U & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & \partial V & \hookrightarrow & V \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\ U & \hookrightarrow & & & \partial(U \Rightarrow^\varphi V) \end{array}$$

in \mathbf{ogPos} . The *rewrite of U into V along φ* is the oriented graded poset $U \Rightarrow^\varphi V$ obtained by adjoining a single $(n+1)$ -dimensional element \top to $\partial(U \Rightarrow^\varphi V)$ such that $\Delta^- \top := U_n$ and $\Delta^+ \top := V_n$.

Lemma 26. Let U, V be oriented graded posets and suppose $U \Rightarrow^\varphi V$ is defined. Then

- 1) $\partial^-(U \Rightarrow^\varphi V)$ is isomorphic to U ,
- 2) $\partial^+(U \Rightarrow^\varphi V)$ is isomorphic to V .


Remark 27. The notation $\partial(U \Rightarrow^\varphi V)$ for the pushout in the rewrite construction is *a posteriori* justified, that is, the pushout indeed constructs the boundary of $U \Rightarrow^\varphi V$.

28 (Roundness). Let U be an oriented graded poset. We say that U is *round* if, for all $n < \dim U$, $\partial_n^- U \cap \partial_n^+ U = \partial_{n-1} U$.

Example 29. The shape of a pasting diagram is round when, intuitively, the diagram is shaped as a topological ball of the appropriate dimension. For example, the oriented graded poset of Example 11 is not round, since

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_0 U &= \{(0, 0), (0, 3)\} \\ \subsetneq \partial_1^+ U \cap \partial_1^- U &= \{(0, 0), (0, 2), (1, 2), (0, 3)\}, \end{aligned}$$

and, indeed, the pasting diagram is shaped as the wedge of a 2-ball (disc) with a 1-ball (interval). However, the following pasting diagram is round:



30 (Pure subset). Let U be a closed subset of a graded poset, $n := \dim U$. We say that U is *pure* if all the maximal elements of U have dimension n , that is, $\text{Max } U = U_n$.

Lemma 31. If U is round, then it is pure.

32 (Regular molecule). The class of *regular molecules* is the inductive subclass of oriented graded posets closed under isomorphisms and generated by the following clauses.

- 1) (*Point*). The terminal oriented graded poset 1 is a regular molecule.
- 2) (*Paste*). If U, V are regular molecules, $\varphi: \partial_k^+ U \xrightarrow{\sim} \partial_k^- V$ is an isomorphism with $k < \min \{\dim U, \dim V\}$, then $U \#_k^\varphi V$ is a regular molecule.
- 3) (*Atom*). If U, V are *round* regular molecules of the same dimension and $\varphi: \partial U \xrightarrow{\sim} \partial V$ is an isomorphism restricting to $\varphi^\alpha: \partial^\alpha U \xrightarrow{\sim} \partial^\alpha V$ for each $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$, then $U \Rightarrow^\varphi V$ is a regular molecule.

33. We summarise the essential properties of regular molecules. The second point of Proposition 34 allows us to write $U \#_k V$ and $U \Rightarrow V$ instead of $U \#_k^\varphi V$ and $U \Rightarrow^\varphi V$ when the latter are defined and U, V are regular molecules.

Proposition 34. Let U, V be regular molecules, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

- 1) if U and V are isomorphic, they are isomorphic in a unique way;
- 2) if $U \#_k^\varphi V$ or $U \Rightarrow^\varphi V$ is defined, it is defined for a unique φ ;
- 3) for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$, $\partial_n^\alpha U$ is a regular molecule;
- 4) U is globular, that is, for all $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \{+, -\}$, if $k < n$ then $\partial_k^\alpha (\partial_n^\beta U) = \partial_k^\alpha U$;
- 5) if U is round, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$, $\partial_n^\alpha U$ is round.

Example 35. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \text{arrow} &:= 1 \Rightarrow 1, \\ \text{binary} &:= (\text{arrow} \#_0 \text{arrow}) \Rightarrow \text{arrow}, \\ \text{cobinary} &:= \text{arrow} \Rightarrow (\text{arrow} \#_0 \text{arrow}). \end{aligned}$$

Then the shape of Example 11 is a regular molecule constructed as $\text{binary} \#_0 \text{arrow}$, while the shape of Example 29 is a regular molecule constructed as

$$(\text{cobinary} \#_0 \text{arrow}) \#_1 (\text{arrow} \#_0 \text{binary}).$$

36. The following results imply, together, that pasting of regular molecules satisfies the equations of strict ω -categories up to unique isomorphism. In particular, the associativity result allows us to write multiple pastings in the same dimension without bracketing.

Proposition 37. *Let U, V, W be regular molecules and let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $U \#_k V$ and $V \#_k W$ are both defined. Then $(U \#_k V) \#_k W$ and $U \#_k (V \#_k W)$ are both defined and uniquely isomorphic.*


Proposition 38. *Let U be a regular molecule and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $U \#_k \partial_k^+ U$ and $\partial_k^- U \#_k U$ are both defined and uniquely isomorphic to U .*

Proposition 39. *Let U, U', V, V' be regular molecules and $k < n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(U \#_n U') \#_k (V \#_n V')$ is defined. Then $(U \#_k V) \#_n (U' \#_k V')$ is defined and uniquely isomorphic to $(U \#_n U') \#_k (V \#_n V')$.*

40 (Atom). An *atom* is a regular molecule with a greatest element.

41 (Merger of a round regular molecule). Let U be a round regular molecule of dimension > 0 . The *merger* of U is the atom $\langle U \rangle := \partial^- U \Rightarrow \partial^+ U$.

Example 42. The following pair of pasting diagrams depicts a round regular molecule U and its merger $\langle U \rangle$, an atom.



Proposition 43. *Let U be a regular molecule. Then*

- 1) U is an atom if and only if it was produced by (Point) or (Atom);
- 2) for all $x \in U$, $\text{cl}\{x\}$ is an atom;
- 3) if U is an atom, then U is round, and if $\dim U > 0$ then U is isomorphic to $\langle U \rangle$.

44. For us, a *cell* is a diagram whose shape is an atom.

45 (Diagram isomorphism problem). The *diagram isomorphism problem* is the following decision problem: given diagrams $t: U \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$ and $t': U' \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$, does there exist an isomorphism $\varphi: U \xrightarrow{\sim} U'$ of their shapes such that $t = \varphi; t'$?

By Proposition 34, if φ exists it is unique, and if φ is found the labellings t and $\varphi; t'$ can be compared in linear time, so this problem reduces to the isomorphism problem for regular molecules. One of the main results of [9] is a polynomial-time solution to this problem, relying on a deterministic *traversal algorithm* for regular molecules:

- 1) all elements of a regular molecule can be traversed in polynomial time in such a way that the traversal order is invariant under isomorphism;
- 2) consequently, U and U' are isomorphic if and only if their representations using the traversal order dimension-wise are identical.

The traversal order also gives a *canonical representation* of regular molecules. The constructors for regular molecules can be implemented in such a way that the elements are rearranged in traversal order after each step, so that regular molecules can be checked for equality rather than isomorphism.

The complexity upper bound given in [9, Theorem 2.19] is in fact the result of overcounting. We describe the traversal algorithm, whose correctness is proved in [9, Theorem 2.17], and give an improved upper bound.

46 (Traversal algorithm). The procedure takes as input a regular molecule U and returns a list of its elements in the order in which they are *marked*. It uses an auxiliary stack of regular molecules $V \subseteq U$.

At the beginning, only U is on the stack and all elements are unmarked. We iterate the *main loop* until the stack is empty, at which point the procedure terminates.

At each iteration, suppose V is on top of the stack. If all elements of V are marked, then we pop V from the stack and iterate. Else, if any elements of $\partial^- V$ are unmarked, we push $\partial^- V$ to the top of the stack and iterate. Else, if $V = \text{cl}\{x\}$ for some $x \in U$, we

- 1) mark x and pop V from the stack,
- 2) if any elements of $\partial^+ V$ are unmarked, we push $\partial^+ V$ to the top of the stack, and
- 3) we iterate.

Else, we let y be the earliest marked element such that $\dim y = \dim V - 1$ and there is an unmarked $x \in \nabla^- y \cap V$. Such a y always exists, and then $\nabla^- y \cap V = \{x\}$. We push $\text{cl}\{x\}$ to the top of the stack and iterate.

47. For a regular molecule U , and all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_k U &:= \prod_{x \in U_k} \Delta x = \prod_{y \in U_{k-1}} \nabla y, \\ |U_\vee| &:= \max \{|U_i|\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, \\ |\mathcal{E}_\vee U| &:= \max(\{|\mathcal{E}_i U|\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \cup \{1\}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathcal{E}_k U$ is the set of edges between k and $(k-1)$ -dimensional elements in $\mathcal{H}U$. We have $|U_k| \leq |\mathcal{E}_k U|$ for all $k > 0$, while $|\mathcal{E}_0 U| = 0$. Since the maximum of the $|\mathcal{E}_k U|$ is 0 only when U is 0-dimensional, in which case $|U_k| = 1$, with our definition we always have $|U_\vee| \leq |\mathcal{E}_\vee U|$.

Theorem 48. *The traversal algorithm admits an implementation running in time $O(|U| |\mathcal{E}_V U| \log |\mathcal{E}_V U|)$.*

Proof. The upper bound of $O(|\mathcal{E}_V U| \log |\mathcal{E}_V U|)$ on each loop iteration is derived as in [9, Theorem 2.19], simplified by our modified definition of $|\mathcal{E}_V U|$, so we only need to show that there are $O(|U|)$ loop iterations.

We let $k \leq \dim U$ and we count the number of loop iterations where a k -dimensional subset V is on top of the stack. This can happen in two ways:

- V is either U or $\partial^\alpha W$ for some W with $\dim W > k$, where W was earlier (and may still be) on the stack,
- V is $\text{cl}\{x\}$ for some $x \in W$, where $\dim W = k$ and W is below V on the stack.

Let $(V^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ be the sequence of all k -dimensional subsets appearing on the stack *in the first way* during the run, in the order in which they appear. For all $j < i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, by [9, Lemma 2.14] $V^{(j)}$ must be fully marked before $V^{(i)}$ can appear on the stack. Moreover, $V^{(i)}$ can be on top at most

- 1) once to push $\partial^- V^{(i)}$ to the top,
- 2) once every time we push $\text{cl}\{x\}$ to the top for an unmarked $x \in (V^{(i)})_k$,
- 3) once to pop $V^{(i)}$ from the stack.

Any k -dimensional $\text{cl}\{x\}$ appearing *in the second way* appears while a unique $V^{(i)}$ is on the stack, and at most

- 1) once to push $\partial^- x$ to the top,
- 2) once to mark x and pop $\text{cl}\{x\}$ from the stack.

Let $U_k^{(i)} := (V^{(i)})_k \setminus \bigcup_{j < i} (V^{(j)})_k$. Then $U_k^{(i)}$ is precisely the set of unmarked k -dimensional elements of $V^{(i)}$ when $V^{(i)}$ first appears on the stack. It follows that the number of loop iterations with a k -dimensional subset on top of the stack *while $V^{(i)}$ is on the stack* is at most $2 + 3 |U_k^{(i)}|$.

Since at the end of the procedure all k -dimensional elements of U are marked, the $(U_k^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ form a partition of U_k . Thus, the total number of loop iterations where a k -dimensional subset is on top of the stack is bounded above by

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \left(2 + 3 |U_k^{(i)}| \right) = 2m + 3 \sum_{i=1}^m |U_k^{(i)}| = 2m + 3 |U_k|,$$

which is bounded above by $5 |U_k|$. Summing over all dimensions, we get an upper bound of $5 |U|$ iterations. ■

II. THE SUBDIAGRAM MATCHING PROBLEM

49 (Submolecule inclusion). The class of *submolecule inclusions* is the smallest subclass of inclusions of regular molecules such that

- 1) all isomorphisms are submolecule inclusions,
- 2) for all regular molecules U, V and all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $U \#_k V$ is defined, $U \hookrightarrow (U \#_k V)$ and $V \hookrightarrow (U \#_k V)$ are submolecule inclusions,
- 3) the composite of two submolecule inclusions is a submolecule inclusion.

A closed subset $V \subseteq U$ is a *submolecule* if its inclusion in U is a submolecule inclusion. In that case we write $V \sqsubseteq U$.

50. We also let $\emptyset \sqsubseteq \emptyset$ to take care of some corner cases.

Lemma 51. *Let U be a regular molecule. Then*

- 1) for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$, $\partial_n^\alpha U \sqsubseteq U$;
- 2) for all $x \in U$, $\text{cl}\{x\} \sqsubseteq U$.

52 (Substitution). Let U, V, W be regular molecules with $\dim U = \dim V = \dim W$, $\iota: V \hookrightarrow U$ an inclusion, and suppose that $V \Rightarrow W$ is defined. Consider the pushout

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V & \hookrightarrow & V \Rightarrow W \\ \downarrow \iota & & \downarrow \\ U & \hookrightarrow & U \cup (V \Rightarrow W) \end{array} \quad (1)$$

in **ogPos**. The *substitution of W for $\iota: V \hookrightarrow U$* is the oriented graded poset $U[W/\iota(V)] := \partial^+(U \cup (V \Rightarrow W))$. When ι is the inclusion of a closed subset we write simply $U[W/V]$.

Proposition 53. *Let $\iota: V \hookrightarrow U$ be an inclusion of regular molecules such that $\dim V = \dim U$ and V is round. The following are equivalent:*

- (a) ι is a submolecule inclusion;
- (b) for all regular molecules W such that $V \Rightarrow W$ is defined, $U \cup (V \Rightarrow W)$ in (1) is a regular molecule;
- (c) for all regular molecules W such that $V \Rightarrow W$ is defined, $U[W/\iota(V)]$ is a regular molecule;
- (d) $U[\langle V \rangle/\iota(V)]$ is a regular molecule.

54 (Rewritable submolecule). A submolecule $V \sqsubseteq U$ is *rewritable* if $\dim V = \dim U$ and V is round.


55 (Rewritable subdiagram). Let $t: U \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$ be a diagram. A *rewritable subdiagram* of t is the restriction of t to a rewritable submolecule $V \sqsubseteq U$.

56. We extend boundary operations to diagrams $t: U \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$ by $\partial_n^\alpha t := t|_{\partial_n^\alpha U}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$.

57. Suppose t is an n -dimensional diagram of shape U and r a rewrite rule, in the form of an $(n+1)$ -dimensional cell of shape $V \Rightarrow W$. If there is an inclusion $\iota: V \hookrightarrow U$ such that $\partial^- r = \iota; t$, then the application of the rewrite r to t is modelled by an $(n+1)$ -dimensional diagram $t \cup r$ of shape $U \cup (V \Rightarrow W)$ as in (1).

By Proposition 53, $\partial^+(t \cup r)$, which models the substitution of $\partial^+ r$ for $\partial^- r$ in t , is guaranteed to be an n -dimensional diagram precisely when ι is a submolecule inclusion, that is, $\partial^- r$ is isomorphic to a rewritable subdiagram of t .

Example 58. The following is a depiction of diagram (1) when $V \Rightarrow W := \text{cobinary}$, $U := \text{arrow} \#_0 \text{arrow}$, and ι is the inclusion of the second arrow into the pasting.



The result of the substitution is the output boundary of the bottom right diagram, isomorphic to arrow $\#_0$ arrow $\#_0$ arrow.

59 (Subdiagram matching problem). The *subdiagram matching problem* is the following search problem: given diagrams $t: U \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$ and $s: V \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$ such that $\dim U = \dim V$ and V is round, find, if any, the submolecule inclusions $\iota: V \hookrightarrow U$ such that $s = \iota; t$. This can be split into three subproblems.

- 1) (*Molecule matching problem*). Find, if any, the inclusions $\iota: V \hookrightarrow U$.
- 2) (*Rewritable submolecule problem*). Decide if $\iota(V) \subseteq U$.
- 3) Decide if $s = \iota; t$.

In this section, we will focus on the molecule matching problem, and in the next on the rewritable submolecule problem. The third problem is trivial.

Lemma 60. Let U be a regular molecule, $n := \dim U$, $x \in U_{n-1}$, and $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$. Then

- 1) $x \in \text{Max}U$ if and only if $|\nabla x| = 0$,
- 2) $x \in \Delta^\alpha U \setminus \Delta^{-\alpha} U$ if and only if $|\nabla^\alpha x| = 1$ and $|\nabla^{-\alpha} x| = 0$,
- 3) $x \notin \Delta U$ if and only if $|\nabla^+ x| = |\nabla^- x| = 1$.

61 (Flow graph). Let U be a regular molecule, $k \geq -1$. The k -flow graph of U is the directed graph $\mathcal{F}_k U$ whose

- set of vertices is $\bigcup_{i>k} U_i$, and
- for all vertices x, y , there is an edge from x to y if and only if $\Delta_k^+ x \cap \Delta_k^- y$ is non-empty.

62 (Induced subgraph). Let \mathcal{G} be a directed graph and let W be a subset of its vertex set. The *induced subgraph* of \mathcal{G} on W is the directed graph $\mathcal{G}|_W$ whose vertex set is W , and there is an edge from x to y for every edge from x to y in \mathcal{G} .

63 (Maximal flow graph). Let U be a regular molecule, $k \geq -1$. The *maximal k -flow graph* of U is the induced subgraph $\mathcal{M}_k U$ of $\mathcal{F}_k U$ on the vertex set

$$\bigcup_{i>k} (\text{Max}U)_i \subseteq \bigcup_{i>k} U_i.$$

Note that, if $k = \dim U - 1$, then $\mathcal{F}_k U = \mathcal{M}_k U$.

Example 64. If U is the regular molecule of Example 11,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (1, 3) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & (1, 2) \\ \mathcal{F}_0 U : (2, 0) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & (1, 2) \\ (1, 0) \rightarrow (1, 1) & \nearrow & \\ \mathcal{F}_1 U = \mathcal{M}_1 U : (2, 0) & & \end{array} \quad \mathcal{M}_0 U : (2, 0) \rightarrow (1, 2)$$

If U is the round regular molecule of Example 29,

$$\mathcal{F}_1 U = \mathcal{M}_1 U : (2, 0) \rightarrow (2, 1)$$

Lemma 65. Let $\iota: V \hookrightarrow U$ be an inclusion of regular molecules, $k \geq -1$. Then $\mathcal{F}_k V$ is isomorphic to the induced subgraph of $\mathcal{F}_k U$ on the vertices in the image of ι .

Proposition 66. Let U be a regular molecule, $n := \dim U$. If U is round, then $\mathcal{F}_{n-1} U$ is connected.

67. We describe an algorithm for the molecule matching problem. The main idea is the following: if we succeed in matching only *one* top-dimensional atom in V with one top-dimensional atom in U , then there is only *one possible matching* of all other top-dimensional atoms of V to atoms in U . This is because, by Proposition 66, we can try to match top-dimensional elements of V in such an order that the next element to match is connected by an edge in $\mathcal{F}_{n-1} V$ to a previously matched element; that is, it shares a face z with a previously matched element. In particular, z has already been matched. By Lemma 60, in order for us to continue, the match of z must have exactly two cofaces in U , one of which is the previously matched top-dimensional element. Necessarily, the other coface is the next match.

68 (Molecule matching algorithm). The procedure takes as input two regular molecules U, V such that $\dim U = \dim V$ and V is round, and it returns all inclusions $V \hookrightarrow U$.

Let $n := \dim U$. To begin, we pick an arbitrary ordering $(x^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$, for example the traversal order, of the elements of U_n . Moreover, we pick an ordering $(y^{(j)})_{j=1}^p$ of the elements of V_n with the property that, for all $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, the induced subgraph of $\mathcal{F}_{n-1} V$ on $(y^{(j)})_{j=1}^k$ is connected. This is possible because $\mathcal{F}_{n-1} V$ is connected by Proposition 66. For each $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, we let $V^{(k)} := \bigcup_{j \leq k} \text{cl}\{y^{(j)}\}$. We have $V^{(i)} \subseteq V^{(j)}$ whenever $i \leq j$, and $V^{(p)} = V$ since V is pure by Lemma 31.

For each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, we attempt to construct a sequence of inclusions $(\iota^{(i,j)}: V^{(j)} \hookrightarrow U)_{j=1}^p$ such that the restriction of $\iota^{(i,j')}$ to $V^{(j)}$ is equal to $\iota^{(i,j)}$ when $j \leq j'$, iterating on $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. When $k = 1$, if $V^{(1)} = \text{cl}\{y^{(1)}\}$ is isomorphic to $\text{cl}\{x^{(i)}\}$, we let $\iota^{(i,1)}$ be the unique isomorphism $V^{(1)} \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{cl}\{x^{(i)}\}$ followed by the inclusion $\text{cl}\{x^{(i)}\} \subseteq U$, and iterate on k . Else, we iterate on i .

When $k > 1$, we let j be the least value such that there exists an edge between $y^{(j)}$ and $y^{(k)}$ in $\mathcal{F}_{n-1} V$. Then $j < k$ because of our connectedness assumption, and there exists $z \in \Delta^\alpha y^{(j)} \cap \Delta^{-\alpha} y^{(k)}$ for some $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$. We pick the least such z with respect to some ordering of V_{n-1} , for example the traversal order. By Lemma 20, $\iota^{(i,k-1)}(y^{(j)})$ is one coface of $\iota^{(i,k-1)}(z)$ in U . If $\iota^{(i,k-1)}(z)$ has no other cofaces, then we iterate on i . Else, by Lemma 60, $\iota^{(i,k-1)}(z)$ has exactly one other coface, call it x ; note that x cannot be in the image of $\iota^{(i,k-1)}$, since $y^{(j)}$ and $y^{(k)}$ are the only cofaces of z in V . If $\text{cl}\{y^{(k)}\}$ is isomorphic to $\text{cl}\{x\}$, and the unique isomorphism $\text{cl}\{y^{(k)}\} \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{cl}\{x\}$ followed by the inclusion $\text{cl}\{x\} \subseteq U$ matches $\iota^{(i,k-1)}$ on $\text{cl}\{y^{(k)}\} \cap V^{(k-1)}$, then we let $\iota^{(i,k)}$ be the unique extension of $\iota^{(i,k-1)}$ that restricts to $\text{cl}\{y^{(k)}\} \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{cl}\{x\} \subseteq U$. Else, we iterate on i .

If we succeed to construct $\iota^{(i,p)}$, we add it to the list of inclusions $V \hookrightarrow U$, then iterate on i .

Theorem 69. The molecule matching problem in dimension n

can be solved in time

$$O(|U_n| |V_n| |V| |\mathcal{E}_V V| \log |\mathcal{E}_V V|).$$

Proof. We suppose $n > 0$ since the case $n = 0$ is trivial. First of all, with our choice of data structures both U_n and V_{n-1} already come with a linear order when one is needed. Moreover, we can both construct $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}V$ and order its vertices in the desired way by traversing the “slice” of $\mathcal{H}V$ on the elements of dimension n and $(n-1)$. Since $\max\{|V_n|, |V_{n-1}|\} \leq |\mathcal{E}_n V|$, this can be done in time $O(|\mathcal{E}_n V|)$ with a standard traversal algorithm.

In the main part of the algorithm, we have exactly $|U_n|$ iterations. At each iteration, we need to solve at most $|V_n|$ isomorphism problems for submolecules of V . The time complexity of each can be bounded above by the time complexity of the isomorphism problem for V , which is $O(|V| |\mathcal{E}_V V| \log |\mathcal{E}_V V|)$ by Theorem 48. It is straightforward to verify that all other operations, such as checking that the isomorphisms match on intersections or finding the next match, have lower complexity. Since $|\mathcal{E}_n V| \leq |\mathcal{E}_V V|$, we can ignore the $O(|\mathcal{E}_n V|)$ summand, and conclude. ■

III. THE REWRITABLE SUBMOLECULE PROBLEM

70. Our solution to the rewritable submolecule problem requires us to develop new results about *layerings* of diagrams, and their associated *orderings*.


71 (Layering of a regular molecule). Let U be a regular molecule, $-1 \leq k < \dim U$, and

$$m := \left| \bigcup_{i>k} (\text{Max}U)_i \right|.$$


A k -layering of U is a sequence $(U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ of regular molecules such that U is isomorphic to $U^{(1)} \#_k \dots \#_k U^{(m)}$ and $\dim U^{(i)} > k$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$.

For $k = -1$, it is implied that $m = 1$, and U is an atom. We will regularly identify the regular molecules in a layering of U with their isomorphic images in U , which are submolecules.


Example 72. The shape of the pasting diagram



admits no (-1) -layerings, a single 0-layering



and two 1-layerings:



Lemma 73. Let U be a regular molecule, $k < \dim U$, and suppose U admits a k -layering $(U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$. Then

- 1) for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $U^{(i)}$ contains a single maximal element of dimension $> k$,
- 2) for all $k \leq \ell < \dim U$, U admits an ℓ -layering.

74. A regular molecule does not, in general, admit a k -layering for each $k < \dim U$; however, by Lemma 73, when it does admit a k -layering, it also admits a layering in dimensions higher than k . The next result shows that every regular molecule does admit a k -layering for some k , and that the smallest such k falls into a particular range.

75 (Layering dimension). Let U be a regular molecule. The *layering dimension* of U is the integer

$$\text{lydim} U := \min \left\{ k \geq -1 \mid \left| \bigcup_{i>k+1} (\text{Max}U)_i \right| \leq 1 \right\}.$$

76 (Frame dimension). Let U be a regular molecule. The *frame dimension* of U is the integer

$$\text{frdim} U := \dim \bigcup \{ \text{cl}\{x\} \cap \text{cl}\{y\} \mid x, y \in \text{Max}U, x \neq y \}.$$

Theorem 77. Let U be a regular molecule. Then there exists $k < \dim U$ such that U admits a k -layering. Moreover,

$$\text{frdim} U \leq \min \{ k \mid U \text{ admits a } k\text{-layering} \} \leq \text{lydim} U.$$

Corollary 78. Let U be a regular molecule, $n := \dim U$. Then U admits an $(n-1)$ -layering.

79 (Ordering of a regular molecule). Let U be a regular molecule, $k \geq -1$, and suppose $\mathcal{M}_k U$ is acyclic. A k -ordering of U is a topological sort of $\mathcal{M}_k U$.

Proposition 80. Let U be a regular molecule, $k \geq -1$. If U admits a k -layering, then $\mathcal{M}_k U$ is acyclic, hence U admits a k -ordering.

Corollary 81. Let U be a regular molecule, $n := \dim U$. Then $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U$ is acyclic.

Proof. Follows from Corollary 78 and Proposition 80 combined with the fact that $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U = \mathcal{M}_{n-1}U$. ■

82. Let U be a regular molecule, $k \geq -1$. We let

$$\text{Lay}_k U := \left\{ k\text{-layerings } (U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m \text{ of } U \right\},$$

$$\text{Ord}_k U := \left\{ k\text{-orderings } (x^{(i)})_{i=1}^m \text{ of } U \right\},$$

where layerings are considered up to layer-wise isomorphism.

Proposition 83. Let U be a regular molecule, $k \geq -1$. For each k -layering $(U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ of U and each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, let $x^{(i)}$ be the only element of $\bigcup_{j>k} (\text{Max}U)_j$ in the image of $U^{(i)}$. Then the assignment

$$m_{k,U}: (U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m \mapsto (x^{(i)})_{i=1}^m \quad (2)$$

determines an injective function $\text{Lay}_k U \hookrightarrow \text{Ord}_k U$.

84. In general, the function $m_{k,U}$ is not surjective, that is, not every k -ordering is induced by a k -layering. The following

is a criterion for deciding when a k -ordering comes from a k -layering.

Proposition 85. *Let U be a regular molecule, $k \geq -1$, and let $(x^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ be a k -ordering of U . Let*

$$U^{(0)} := \partial_k^- U,$$

$$U^{(i)} := \partial_k^+ U^{(i-1)} \cup \text{cl} \left\{ x^{(i)} \right\} \quad \text{for } i \in \{1, \dots, m\}.$$

The following are equivalent:

- (a) $(U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ is a k -layering of U ;
- (b) for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $\partial_k^- x^{(i)} \sqsubseteq \partial_k^- U^{(i)}$.

Moreover, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$, if $\partial_k^- x^{(i)} \sqsubseteq \partial_k^- U^{(i)}$, then $U^{(i)}$ and $\partial_k^+ U^{(i)} = \partial_k^- U^{(i+1)}$ are regular molecules.

86 (Path-induced subgraph). Let \mathcal{G} be a directed graph and W a subset of its vertex set. We say that $\mathcal{G}|_W$ is *path-induced* if, for all $x, y \in W$, every path from x to y in \mathcal{G} is included in $\mathcal{G}|_W$.

87. Path-induced subgraphs are also called *convex subgraphs*, for example in [12].

88 (Contraction of a connected subgraph). Let \mathcal{G} be a directed graph and W a subset of its vertex set such that $\mathcal{G}|_W$ is connected. The *contraction* of $\mathcal{G}|_W$ in \mathcal{G} is the graph minor $\mathcal{G}/(\mathcal{G}|_W)$ obtained by contracting every edge in $\mathcal{G}|_W$.

Lemma 89. *Let \mathcal{G} be a directed acyclic graph and W a subset of its vertex set such that $\mathcal{G}|_W$ is connected. The following are equivalent:*

- (a) $\mathcal{G}|_W$ is path-induced;
- (b) $\mathcal{G}/(\mathcal{G}|_W)$ is acyclic;
- (c) there is a topological sort of \mathcal{G} in which vertices of W are consecutive.

Moreover, under any of the equivalent conditions, there is a bijection between

- topological sorts of \mathcal{G} in which vertices of W are consecutive,
- pairs of a topological sort of $\mathcal{G}|_W$ and a topological sort of $\mathcal{G}/(\mathcal{G}|_W)$.

Lemma 90. *Let $\iota: V \hookrightarrow U$ be an inclusion of regular molecules such that $n := \dim U = \dim V$ and V is round. Then $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U[\langle V \rangle / \iota(V)]$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U / \mathcal{F}_{n-1}V$.*

Proposition 91. *Let $\iota: V \hookrightarrow U$ be an inclusion of regular molecules such that $n := \dim U = \dim V$ and V is round. If ι is a submolecule inclusion, then $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}V$ is a path-induced subgraph of $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U$.*

Proof. By Proposition 53, if ι is a submolecule inclusion then $U[\langle V \rangle / \iota(V)]$ is a regular molecule. By Corollary 81 $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U[\langle V \rangle / \iota(V)]$ is acyclic, and by Lemma 90 it is isomorphic to $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U / \mathcal{F}_{n-1}V$. It follows from Lemma 89 that $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}V$ is a path-induced subgraph of $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U$. ■

92. Given an inclusion $\iota: V \hookrightarrow U$ of regular molecules such that $n := \dim U = \dim V$ and V is round, the vertices of $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U / \mathcal{F}_{n-1}V$ are either

- $x \in U_n \setminus \iota(V_n)$, or
- x_V , obtained from contracting all vertices in $\iota(V_n)$.

The following results will justify our algorithm for the rewritable submolecule problem.

Lemma 93. *Let $\iota: V \hookrightarrow U$ be an inclusion of regular molecules such that $n := \dim U = \dim V$ and V is round, and let $(y^{(i)})_{i=1}^p$ be an $(n-1)$ -ordering induced by an $(n-1)$ -layering of V . The following are equivalent:*

- (a) ι is a submolecule inclusion;
- (b) there exist an $(n-1)$ -ordering $(x^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ induced by an $(n-1)$ -layering $(U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ of U , and $q \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ such that
 1. $(x^{(i)})_{i=q}^{p+q-1} = (\iota(y^{(i)}))_{i=1}^p$,
 2. $\iota(\partial^- V) \sqsubseteq \partial^- U^{(q)}$.

Theorem 94. *Let $\iota: V \hookrightarrow U$ be an inclusion of regular molecules such that $n := \dim U = \dim V$ and V is round, $m := |U_n|$, $p := |V_n|$. The following are equivalent:*

- (a) ι is a submolecule inclusion;
- (b) there is a topological sort $((x^{(i)})_{i=1}^{q-1}, x_V, (x^{(i)})_{i=q+1}^{m-p+1})$ of $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U / \mathcal{F}_{n-1}V$ such that, letting

$$U^{(0)} := \partial^- U,$$

$$U^{(q)} := \partial_{n-1}^+ U^{(q-1)} \cup \iota(V),$$

$$U^{(i)} := \partial_{n-1}^+ U^{(i-1)} \cup \text{cl} \left\{ x^{(i)} \right\} \quad \text{for } i \neq q,$$

we have $\iota(\partial^- V) \sqsubseteq \partial^- U^{(q)}$ and $\partial^- x^{(i)} \sqsubseteq \partial^- U^{(i)}$ for all $i \neq q$.

Sketch of proof. By Proposition 53, if ι is a submolecule inclusion then $U[\langle V \rangle / \iota(V)]$ is a regular molecule, so by Corollary 78 it admits an $(n-1)$ -layering inducing an $(n-1)$ -ordering. By Lemma 90 this can be identified with a topological sort of $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U / \mathcal{F}_{n-1}V$. The properties of the $U^{(i)}$ follow from the properties of the layering of $U[\langle V \rangle / \iota(V)]$, as established by Proposition 85, after we “reverse” the substitution of $\langle V \rangle$ for $\iota(V)$, producing a regular molecule isomorphic to U .

Conversely, if $(y^{(i)})_{i=1}^p$ is an $(n-1)$ -ordering induced by an $(n-1)$ -layering of V , then $((x^{(i)})_{i=1}^{q-1}, (y^{(i)})_{i=1}^p, (x^{(i)})_{i=q+1}^{m-p+1})$ is an $(n-1)$ -ordering of U , which by the criterion of Proposition 85 is induced by an $(n-1)$ -layering. We conclude by Lemma 93. ■

95 (Rewritable submolecule decision algorithm). The procedure takes as input an inclusion $V \subseteq U$ of regular molecules such that $n := \dim U = \dim V$ and V is round, and it returns whether $V \sqsubseteq U$. We let $m := |U_n|$ and $p := |V_n|$.

We construct the graph $\mathcal{G} := \mathcal{F}_{n-1}U / \mathcal{F}_{n-1}V$. Then we start a loop. At each iteration, we search for a new topological sort of \mathcal{G} . If we cannot find one, we return *false*. Else, let $((x^{(i)})_{i=1}^{q-1}, x_V, (x^{(i)})_{i=q+1}^{m-p+1})$ be the new topological sort, and let $(U^{(i)})_{i=1}^{m-p+1}$ be as in Theorem 94.

For each $i \in \{1, \dots, m-p+1\}$, we start a recursive call to the algorithm to decide whether $\partial^- x^{(i)} \sqsubseteq \partial^- U^{(i)}$ if $i \neq q$, and $\partial^- V \sqsubseteq \partial^- U^{(q)}$ if $i = q$. If this returns *false*, we break

the iteration on i and iterate the main loop. If this returns *true*, we iterate on i . At the end of the iteration on i , we return *true*.

Theorem 96. *The rewritable submolecule decision algorithm is correct: it always terminates, and returns true if and only if $V \sqsubseteq U$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on the dimension n of U and V . If $n = 0$, this is straightforward, so let $n > 0$.

The number of iterations of the main loop is bounded by the number of topological sorts of $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U/\mathcal{F}_{n-1}V$, which is finite. Consider one such iteration, producing a topological sort $((x^{(i)})_{i=1}^{q-1}, x_V, (x^{(i)})_{i=q+1}^{m-p+1})$. Let us write $V^{(q)} := V$ and $V^{(i)} := \text{cl}\{x^{(i)}\}$ for $i \neq q$. For all $i \in \{1, \dots, m-p+1\}$, we have a call to the decision algorithm with input $\partial^-V^{(i)} \subseteq \partial^-U^{(i)}$, assuming that the calls for $j < i$ all returned *true*.

Now, $\partial^-V^{(i)}$ is round by Proposition 34 and Proposition 43. Moreover, $\partial^-U^{(1)} = \partial^-U$, which is a regular molecule. For $i > 1$, assuming that $\partial^-V^{(i-1)} \subseteq \partial^-U^{(i-1)}$, we may apply Proposition 53 to derive that $U^{(i-1)}$ and $\partial^+U^{(i-1)} = \partial^-U^{(i)}$ are regular molecules. Thus

- 1) the input of the first call is well-formed,
- 2) for $i > 1$, assuming that the $(i-1)$ -th call correctly returned *true*, the input of the i -th call is well-formed.

Since all of these are in dimension $(n-1)$, by the inductive hypothesis, each call terminates returning the correct answer. By Theorem 94, this proves both correctness and termination in dimension n . ■

Theorem 97. *The rewritable submolecule problem in dimension n can be solved in time*

$$O\left(\prod_{k \leq n} |U_k|! |U_k|\right).$$

Proof. For $n = 0$, this is obvious, so let $n > 0$. The number of iterations of the main loop is bounded above by the number of topological sorts of $\mathcal{G} := \mathcal{F}_{n-1}U/\mathcal{F}_{n-1}V$. This reaches its maximum when \mathcal{G} is a discrete graph, in which case the number is $(|U_n| - |V_n| + 1)!$, tightly bounded above by $|U_n|!$.

At each iteration of the main loop, we have at most $|U_n| - |V_n| + 1$ calls to the algorithm on regular molecules of dimension $n-1$ contained in U . By the inductive hypothesis, these take time $O(\prod_{k \leq n-1} |U_k|! |U_k|)$.

All other operations have lower complexity: both finding topological sorts and computing the boundaries of the $U^{(i)}$ take linear time in $|\mathcal{E}_n U|$, but this can be bounded above by $|U_n| |U_{n-1}|$, and we conclude. ■

98. The superpolynomial upper bound on the rewritable submolecule problem leaves it inconclusive whether subdiagram matching admits a polynomial-time algorithm in arbitrary dimension. Nevertheless, we are at least able to prove that the problem is in NP.

Proposition 99. *For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the n -dimensional subdiagram matching problem is in NP.*

Proof. It suffices to prove by induction on n that the rewritable submolecule problem in dimension n is in NP. When $n = 0$, the problem is trivial. In dimension $n > 0$, a polynomial-size certificate that $V \sqsubseteq U$ is given by

- 1) a topological sort $((x^{(i)})_{i=1}^{q-1}, x_V, (x^{(i)})_{i=q+1}^{m-p+1})$ of the graph $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U/\mathcal{F}_{n-1}V$, and
- 2) polynomial-size certificates that $\partial^-V \subseteq \partial^-U^{(q)}$ and $\partial^-x^{(i)} \subseteq \partial^-U^{(i)}$ for all $i \neq q$,

with the notations of Theorem 94. By the inductive hypothesis this exists and is verifiable in polynomial time. ■

100. We conclude this section by considering some improvements on the subdiagram matching algorithm conditional on *acyclicity* properties.

101 (Frame-acyclic molecule). Let U be a regular molecule. We say that U is *frame-acyclic* if for all submolecules $V \sqsubseteq U$, if $r := \text{frdim } V$, then $\mathcal{M}_r V$ is acyclic.

Theorem 102. *Let U be a regular molecule. The following are equivalent:*

- (a) U is frame-acyclic;
- (b) for all $V \sqsubseteq U$ and all $\text{frdim } V \leq k < \dim V$, V admits a k -layering;
- (c) for all $V \sqsubseteq U$ and all $\text{frdim } V \leq k < \dim V$, the sets $\text{Lay}_k V$ and $\text{Ord}_k V$ are non-empty and equinumerous.

103 (Stably frame-acyclic molecule). Let U be a regular molecule. We say that U is *stably frame-acyclic* if for all submolecules $V \sqsubseteq U$ and all rewritable submolecules $W \sqsubseteq V$, the regular molecule $V[\langle W \rangle/W]$ is frame-acyclic.

104. Every stably frame-acyclic regular molecule is frame-acyclic: if we take $V \sqsubseteq U$ to be an atom, the substitution $U[\langle V \rangle/V]$ is trivial. Moreover, every submolecule of a (stably) frame-acyclic regular molecule is (stably) frame-acyclic.

We are not aware of examples of regular molecules that are stably frame-acyclic but not frame-acyclic (as we will see in the next section, any such example is at least 4-dimensional), so we cannot exclude that the two classes coincide, but neither it seems clear that they do.

105. In general, frame-acyclicity seems difficult to check. However, it is implied by stronger acyclicity conditions that are easier to check. We do not know any easily verifiable sufficient conditions for stable frame-acyclicity.


106 (Acyclic molecule). Let U be a regular molecule. We say that U is *acyclic* if $\mathcal{H}U$ is acyclic.

107 (Dimension-wise acyclic molecule). Let U be a regular molecule. We say that U is *dimension-wise acyclic* if, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{F}_k U$ is acyclic.

Lemma 108. *Let U be a regular molecule. Then*

- 1) if U is acyclic, it is dimension-wise acyclic;
- 2) if U is dimension-wise acyclic, it is frame-acyclic.


Example 109. Both implications are strict. The 3-dimensional atom



(based on [8, Fig. 2]) is not acyclic, since its oriented Hasse diagram contains the cycle

$$(0, 1) \rightarrow (1, 1) \rightarrow (2, 1) \rightarrow (3, 0) \rightarrow (2, 2) \rightarrow (1, 4) \rightarrow (0, 1),$$

but it is dimension-wise acyclic. The 3-dimensional atom



(based on [8, Fig. 4]) is not dimension-wise acyclic, since its 0-flow graph contains the cycle $(1, 2) \rightarrow (1, 5) \rightarrow (1, 2)$, but it is frame-acyclic by Theorem 121.

Proposition 110. *If U is guaranteed to be frame-acyclic, the rewritable submolecule problem in dimension n can be solved in time*

$$O\left(\prod_{k \leq n} |U_k|!\right).$$

Proof. Given a topological sort $((x^{(i)})_{i=1}^{q-1}, x_V, (x^{(i)})_{i=q+1}^{m-p+1})$ of $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U/\mathcal{F}_{n-1}V$, by Lemma 89, substituting any $(n-1)$ -ordering of V for x_V produces an $(n-1)$ -ordering of U in which the elements of V are consecutive. By Theorem 102, this is induced by an $(n-1)$ -layering of U . By Lemma 93, it suffices to check that $\partial^-V \sqsubseteq \partial^-U^{(q)}$ to conclude that $V \sqsubseteq U$, so we have a single recursive call instead of $O(|U_n|)$ many. Since $\partial^-U^{(q)} \sqsubseteq U^{(q)} \sqsubseteq U$, it is frame-acyclic, and we can proceed inductively. ■

Proposition 111. *If U is guaranteed to be stably frame-acyclic, the rewritable submolecule problem can be solved in linear time in the size of $\mathcal{H}U$.*

Proof. If $V \sqsubseteq U$, by assumption $U[\langle V \rangle/V]$ is frame-acyclic. By Theorem 102, all its $(n-1)$ -orderings are induced by $(n-1)$ -layerings, and by Lemma 90 they are in bijection with topological sorts of $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U/\mathcal{F}_{n-1}V$. It follows that, if any topological sort of $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U/\mathcal{F}_{n-1}V$ fails to satisfy the conditions of Theorem 94, then V is not a submolecule of U , so in the decision algorithm we can stop after the first iteration of the main loop.

This involves finding a single topological sort and computing $\partial^-U^{(q)}$, both of which take time $O(|\mathcal{E}_n U|)$; then, as in Proposition 110, we make a single call to the decision algorithm for $\partial^-V \sqsubseteq \partial^-U^{(q)}$. Since $\partial^-U^{(q)} \sqsubseteq U^{(q)} \sqsubseteq U$, it is stably frame-acyclic, and we can proceed inductively. ■

Corollary 112. *The subdiagram matching problem restricted to diagrams with stably frame-acyclic shape is in P.*

113. Proposition 111 begs the question: why not just develop a higher-dimensional rewriting theory around stably frame-acyclic shapes of diagrams? The reason is that, in general, acyclicity properties are *global* properties of diagrams, that are not stable under local substitutions, essential to rewriting theory. Indeed, the inductive definition of regular molecules makes them “minimal” for a class of shapes closed under pasting and rewrites of round diagrams, with roundness seemingly the natural condition ensuring both topological soundness and a good combinatorial account of substitution. Any further restriction would almost certainly be impractical from a rewriting-theoretic perspective.

Nevertheless, the following section will show that *up to dimension 3* there is no restriction at all: all regular molecules are stably frame-acyclic, and in fact we can further simplify our algorithms.

IV. IN LOW DIMENSIONS

114. Some results in this section come from [17, Section 3].

Lemma 115. *Let U be a 1-dimensional regular molecule, $m := |U_1|$. Then $\mathcal{H}U$ is a linear graph with $(2m+1)$ vertices, and \mathcal{F}_0U is a linear graph with m vertices.*

Proposition 116. *Let $\iota: V \hookrightarrow U$ be an inclusion of regular molecules, $\dim V = \dim U = 1$. Then ι is a submolecule inclusion.*

Proof. By Lemma 65 \mathcal{F}_0V is an induced subgraph of \mathcal{F}_0U . By Lemma 115 both of them are linear graphs, and an induced subgraph of a linear graph is a linear graph if and only if its vertices are consecutive in the ambient graph. All other conditions of Lemma 93 are trivially satisfied. ■

Proposition 117. *Let U be a regular molecule, $\dim U \leq 2$. Then U is acyclic.*

Lemma 118. *Let $\iota: V \hookrightarrow U$ be an inclusion of regular molecules, $\dim U \leq 2$. Then \mathcal{F}_1V is a path-induced subgraph of \mathcal{F}_1U .*

Theorem 119. *Let $\iota: V \hookrightarrow U$ be an inclusion of regular molecules such that $\dim U = \dim V = 2$ and V is round. Then ι is a submolecule inclusion.*

Proof. By Lemma 118 combined with Lemma 89, there exists a 1-ordering $(x^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ of U in which the elements of $\iota(V)$ are consecutive, that is, $x^{(i)} \in \iota(V)$ if and only if $p \leq i \leq q$ for some $p, q \in \{1, \dots, m\}$.

By Proposition 117 U is acyclic, so by Lemma 108 it is frame-acyclic, and by Theorem 102 the 1-ordering comes from a 1-layering $(U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ such that $\iota(\partial^-V) \subseteq \partial^-U^{(p)}$. Since both are 1-dimensional regular molecules, by Proposition 116 $\iota(\partial^-V) \sqsubseteq \partial^-U^{(p)}$, and Lemma 93 allows us to conclude. ■

Corollary 120. *The rewritable submolecule problem in dimension ≤ 2 has a trivial constant-time solution.*

Theorem 121. *Let U be a regular molecule, $\dim U \leq 3$. Then U is stably frame-acyclic.*

Theorem 122. Let $\iota: V \hookrightarrow U$ be an inclusion of regular molecules such that $\dim U = \dim V = 3$ and V is round. The following are equivalent:

- (a) ι is a submolecule inclusion;
- (b) \mathcal{F}_2V is a path-induced subgraph of \mathcal{F}_2U .

Proof. One implication is Proposition 91, so we only need to prove the converse. By Lemma 89, if \mathcal{F}_2V is path-induced, then there exists a 2-ordering $(x^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ of U in which the elements of $\iota(V)$ are consecutive, that is, $x^{(i)} \in \iota(V)$ if and only if $p \leq i \leq q$ for some $p, q \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. By Theorem 121, U is frame-acyclic, so by Theorem 102 the 2-ordering comes from a 2-layering $(U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ such that $\iota(\partial^-V) \subseteq \partial^-U^{(p)}$. Since both are 2-dimensional regular molecules and ∂^-V is round, by Theorem 119 $\iota(\partial^-V) \sqsubseteq \partial^-U^{(p)}$, and we conclude by Lemma 93. ■

Theorem 123. The rewritable submolecule problem in dimension 3 can be solved in time $O(|\mathcal{E}_3U|)$.

Proof. By Theorem 122 combined with Lemma 89, it suffices to construct $\mathcal{F}_2U/\mathcal{F}_2V$ and check if it is acyclic. The first can be done while traversing the induced subgraph of $\mathcal{H}U$ on $U_3 \cup U_2$, which takes time $O(|\mathcal{E}_3U|)$. Both the number of vertices and the number of edges of $\mathcal{F}_2U/\mathcal{F}_2V$ is also $O(|\mathcal{E}_3U|)$, and we conclude. ■

124. To match a diagram $s: V \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$ in $t: U \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$ in dimension 3, according to our results we need

- $O(|U_3| |V_3| |V| |\mathcal{E}_V V| \log |\mathcal{E}_V V|)$ time to find all inclusions $V \hookrightarrow U$, of which there are $O(|U_3|)$,
- $O(|\mathcal{E}_3U|)$ time to check whether each of them is a submolecule inclusion,
- $O(|V|)$ time to compare labellings on each, assuming labels can be compared in constant time,

leading to an overall

$$O(|U_3| (|\mathcal{E}_3U| + |V_3| |V| |\mathcal{E}_V V| \log |\mathcal{E}_V V|))$$

upper bound. Here we used the bound on molecule matching in generic dimension; it is possible that this can be improved by using strategies tailored to dimension 3, as it is certainly the case in dimension ≤ 2 .

If we consider a machine operating by rewriting 3-dimensional diagrams, which has a fixed finite list of rewrite rules, the variables linked to V can be considered as constant parameters of the machine. Our results then imply that such a machine can be simulated with $O(|U_3| |\mathcal{E}_3U|)$ overhead in a standard model of computation.

125. We leave the existence of a polynomial algorithm for subdiagram matching in dimension 4 or higher as an open problem. The main obstacle to overcome is the expensive iteration on topological sorts, motivated by the fact that, from dimension 4 onwards, not all of them arise from layerings. One may hope, perhaps, that this is due to flow graphs “missing” some relations, and that it should be possible to supplement them with extra information, in such a way as to restore the bijective correspondence between layerings and topological




Figure 1. Oriented Hasse diagram of Example 126.


sorts. Unfortunately, this cannot be the case in general, as the following counterexample shows.

Example 126. This example is a 4-dimensional regular molecule U which is not frame-acyclic. Its Hasse diagram is given in Figure 1, with dimensions increasing from left to right.

To understand this example, we can picture the 4-dimensional elements of U as rewrites of planar projections of U , portrayed as string diagrams. Then U has one 3-layering inducing the 3-ordering

$$((4, 1), (4, 3), (4, 0), (4, 2))$$

corresponding to the sequence of rewrite steps



where nodes represent 3-dimensional elements and incoming and outgoing wires represent their input and output faces. It has one other 3-layering inducing the 3-ordering

$$((4, 0), (4, 2), (4, 1), (4, 3)).$$

These are the only two 3-layerings of U . Indeed, the application of the rewrite $(4, 1)$ creates a “non-convexity” in the input boundary of $(4, 0)$, in the form of a path $(3, 1) \rightarrow (3, 5) \rightarrow (3, 0)$ in \mathcal{F}_2U , which can also be spotted as the upward path $1 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 0$ in the second string diagram. Before $(4, 0)$ can be applied, this needs to be resolved by the application of $(4, 3)$, which removes the non-convexity. Similarly, if $(4, 0)$ is applied first, it creates a non-convexity in the input boundary of $(4, 1)$, a path $(3, 2) \rightarrow (3, 4) \rightarrow (3, 3)$ in \mathcal{F}_2U , which needs to be resolved by the application of $(4, 2)$.

Now we have examples of all the following.

- 1) *A 3-ordering that is not induced by a 3-layering.*

The graph \mathcal{F}_3U is simply

$$(4, 0) \rightarrow (4, 2)$$

$$(4, 1) \rightarrow (4, 3)$$

so U admits four other 3-orderings which do not determine 3-layerings; for example, $((4, 0), (4, 1), (4, 2), (4, 3))$. What is more, there is no extension of \mathcal{F}_3U , and more in general no graph whose vertex set is U_4 , whose topological sorts correspond to the 3-layerings of U .

- 2) *A regular molecule that is not frame-acyclic.*

We can deduce that U is not frame-acyclic using Theorem 102. More directly, $V := \text{cl}\{(4, 0), (4, 3)\}$ is a submolecule of U such that $\text{frdim } V = 2$, but \mathcal{M}_2V contains a cycle $(4, 3) \rightarrow (4, 0) \rightarrow (4, 3)$, since

$$(2, 5) \in \Delta_2^+(4, 3) \cap \Delta_2^-(4, 0),$$

$$(2, 7) \in \Delta_2^+(4, 0) \cap \Delta_2^-(4, 3).$$

- 3) *An inclusion of a round regular molecule that is not a submolecule inclusion.*

We have that $\partial^-(4, 0) = \text{cl}\{(3, 0), (3, 1)\}$ is a round 3-dimensional regular molecule, included in the 3-dimensional regular molecule $W := \text{cl}\{(3, 0), (3, 1), (3, 5)\}$. However, it is *not* a submolecule of W , due to the presence of the path $(3, 1) \rightarrow (3, 5) \rightarrow (3, 0)$ in \mathcal{M}_2W .

CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK

We have taken the first steps into the study of machines based on higher-dimensional rewriting in all dimensions. We have presented algorithms by which they could be simulated in standard models of computation, and shown that this requires only low-degree polynomial time overhead in dimension ≤ 3 .

Feasibility in dimension > 3 is the most obvious open question. We hope that a deeper understanding of cases like Example 126 will lead either to an improved algorithm, or to a proof of NP-completeness. The way in which 4-dimensional rewrites can introduce obstructions to “disjoint” rewrites, in a

non-local way, may be a hint that the latter is more likely. In either case, we are actively working on the problem.

Beyond the more immediate questions, we hope to have laid the groundwork for an approach to complexity theory based on higher-dimensional rewriting, that leverages its unique characteristics as described in the introduction. For instance, we believe that the coexistence of higher algebraic structures and rewrite systems within the same category, as made possible by the theory of diagrammatic sets or their variants, may lead to a unified and compositional understanding of interpretations of rewrite systems, such as polynomial and matrix interpretations, which are one of the key techniques in implicit computational complexity. We plan to develop various aspects of this programme in future work.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the ESF funded Estonian IT Academy research measure (project 2014-2020.4.05.19-0001) and by the Estonian Research Council grant PSG764. We thank the anonymous referees for their helpful comments on an earlier draft.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Burroni, “Higher-dimensional word problems with applications to equational logic,” *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 115, no. 1, pp. 43–62, 1993.
- [2] Y. Guiraud, “*Rewriting methods in higher algebra*,” Thèse d’habilitation à diriger des recherches, Université Paris 7, 2019.
- [3] F. Lawvere, “Functorial semantics of algebraic theories,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, vol. 50, no. 5, p. 869, 1963.
- [4] S. Gaussent, Y. Guiraud, and P. Malbos, “Coherent presentations of Artin monoids,” *Compositio Mathematica*, vol. 151, no. 5, pp. 957–998, 2015.
- [5] D. Reutter and J. Vicary, “High-level methods for homotopy construction in associative n -categories,” in *2019 34th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–13.
- [6] M. Freedman, A. Kitaev, M. Larsen, and Z. Wang, “Topological quantum computation,” *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 31–38, 2003.
- [7] A. Hadzihanovic, “Diagrammatic sets and rewriting in weak higher categories,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.14505*, 2020.
- [8] R. Steiner, “The algebra of directed complexes,” *Applied Categorical Structures*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 247–284, 1993.
- [9] A. Hadzihanovic and D. Kessler, “Data structures for topologically sound higher-dimensional diagram rewriting,” in *Proceedings Fifth International Conference on Applied Category Theory (ACT2022)*, 2022.
- [10] G. Bonfante and Y. Guiraud, “Polygraphic programs and polynomial-time functions,” *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, vol. 5, no. 2: 14, pp. 1–37, 2009.
- [11] F. Bonchi, F. Gadducci, A. Kissinger, P. Sobocinski, and F. Zanasi, “String diagram rewrite theory I: Rewriting with Frobenius structure,” *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, vol. 69, no. 2, pp. 1–58, 2022.
- [12] —, “String diagram rewrite theory II: Rewriting with symmetric monoidal structure,” *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 511–541, 2022.
- [13] —, “String diagram rewrite theory III: Confluence with and without Frobenius,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.06049*, 2021.
- [14] A. Delpeuch and J. Vicary, “The word problem for braided monoidal categories is unknot-hard,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.04237*, 2021.
- [15] J. Vicary and A. Delpeuch, “Normalization for planar string diagrams and a quadratic equivalence algorithm,” *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, vol. 18, 2022.
- [16] A. Hadzihanovic, “Higher-categorical pasting diagrams,” to appear.
- [17] —, “The smash product of monoidal theories,” in *2021 36th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*. IEEE, 2021.

APPENDIX
ADDITIONAL PROOFS

A. Proofs for Section I

I27. Most of the proofs are taken from a forthcoming monograph on the combinatorics of pasting diagrams [16]. To avoid making this appendix longer than it already is, we cite results of [8], [7], [17] whenever possible, even though they use slightly different definitions; all the results used have been independently proved.

Proof of Lemma 20. This is a combination of [7, Lemma 1.9 and Lemma 1.11]. ■

Proof of Proposition 22. By [7, Lemma 1.9], there is a forgetful functor U from \mathbf{ogPos} to the category \mathbf{Pos} of posets and order-preserving maps. All these limits and colimits exist in \mathbf{Pos} , so it suffices to prove that they can be lifted to \mathbf{ogPos} .

The terminal poset is the poset with a single element, and the initial poset is the empty poset. Both of them admit a unique orientation. Let P be an oriented graded poset. Both the unique map from UP to the terminal poset and the unique map from the initial poset trivially preserve boundaries, so they lift to maps of oriented graded posets.

Let $\iota_1: Q \hookrightarrow P_1$ and $\iota_2: Q \hookrightarrow P_2$ be inclusions of oriented graded posets. Computing their pushout in \mathbf{Pos} determines two order-preserving maps

$$j_1: UP_1 \rightarrow UP_1 \cup UP_2, \quad j_2: UP_2 \rightarrow UP_1 \cup UP_2.$$

Since $U\iota_1$ and $U\iota_2$ are closed embeddings, it is an exercise to show that j_1 and j_2 are also closed embeddings, and deduce that $UP_1 \cup UP_2$ is a graded poset. Since j_1 and j_2 preserve the covering relation and are jointly surjective, we can put a unique orientation on $UP_1 \cup UP_2$ in such a way that j_1 and j_2 both preserve orientations; overlaps are resolved by the fact that $(U\iota_1); j_1 = (U\iota_2); j_2$ and ι_1 and ι_2 preserve orientations. This choice of orientation determines a unique lift of the pushout to \mathbf{ogPos} . ■

Lemma 128. *Let U be a closed subset of an oriented graded poset, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$. Then*

- 1) $(\partial_n^\alpha U)_n = \Delta_n^\alpha U$,
- 2) $(\text{Max}(\partial_n^\alpha U))_k = (\text{Max}U)_k$ for all $k < n$.

Proof. Let $x \in \partial_n^\alpha U$. Then by definition there exists y such that $x \leq y$ and either $y \in \Delta_n^+ U$ or $y \in (\text{Max}U)_k$ for some $k < n$. If x is maximal, necessarily $x = y$, and we obtain one inclusion. The converse inclusions are evident. ■

Lemma 129. *Let U be a closed subset in an oriented graded poset, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$. Then*

- 1) $(\text{Max}U)_n = \Delta_n^+ U \cap \Delta_n^- U$,
- 2) if $n = \dim U$ then $(\text{Max}U)_n = \Delta_n^\alpha U = U_n$.

Proof. Let $x \in U$, $\dim x = n$. Then x is maximal if and only if it has no cofaces in U , if and only if $\nabla^{-\alpha} x \cap U = \nabla^\alpha x \cap U = \emptyset$, if and only if $x \in \Delta_n^+ U \cap \Delta_n^- U$. If $n = \dim U$, then every element of U_n is maximal in U , so

$$U_n = (\text{Max}U)_n \subseteq \Delta_n^\alpha U \subseteq U_n$$

using the first part of the proof, and we conclude that they are all equal. ■

Lemma 130. *Let U, V be closed subsets of an oriented graded poset, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$. Then*

- 1) $\text{Max}(U \cup V) = (\text{Max}U \cap \text{Max}V) + (\text{Max}U \setminus V) + (\text{Max}V \setminus U)$,
- 2) $\Delta_n^\alpha(U \cup V) = (\Delta_n^\alpha U \cap \Delta_n^\alpha V) + (\Delta_n^\alpha U \setminus V) + (\Delta_n^\alpha V \setminus U)$.

Proof. Follows straightforwardly from the definitions using the decomposition $U \cup V = (U \cap V) + (U \setminus V) + (V \setminus U)$. ■

Proof of Lemma 26. Identifying U and V with their isomorphic images, we will prove that $\partial^-(U \Rightarrow^\varphi V) = U$ and $\partial^+(U \Rightarrow^\varphi V) = V$. Let $n := \dim U = \dim V$. By construction, we have $\Delta_n^-(U \Rightarrow^\varphi V) = U_n$ and $\Delta_n^+(U \Rightarrow^\varphi V) = V_n$.

For all $k < n$, the set $(\text{Max}(U \Rightarrow^\varphi V))_k$ is equal to $(\text{Max}(U \cup V))_k$. We claim that this is equal to both $(\text{Max}U)_k$ and $(\text{Max}V)_k$. For $k < n - 1$,

$$(\text{Max}U)_k = (\text{Max} \partial^\alpha U)_k = (\text{Max} \partial^\alpha V)_k = (\text{Max}V)_k$$

by Lemma 128. For $k = n - 1$, by Lemma 129

$$(\text{Max}U)_{n-1} = \Delta^- U \cap \Delta^+ U = \Delta^- V \cap \Delta^+ V = (\text{Max}V)_{n-1}.$$

We then conclude by Lemma 130. ■

Proof of Lemma 31. We will prove the contrapositive. Suppose that U is not pure. Then there exists a maximal element x in U with $k := \dim x < \dim U$.

Since $(\text{Max}U)_k = \Delta_k^- U \cap \Delta_k^+ U$, we have $x \in \partial_k^- U \cap \partial_k^+ U$. Then $\partial_k^- U \cap \partial_k^+ U$ is k -dimensional and cannot be equal to $\partial_{k-1} U$, which is $(k-1)$ -dimensional. It follows that U is not round. ■

Proof of Proposition 34. The first point follows from [7, Proposition 1.38], the third and fourth point from [7, Proposition 1.23]. The second point follows from the first and the third for the pasting construction, and [7, Lemma 2.2] for the rewrite construction. The fifth point is an immediate consequence of the definition of roundness combined with globularity. ■

Proof of Propositions 37, 38, 39. These all follow from [7, Proposition 1.23] in conjunction with uniqueness of isomorphisms of regular molecules. ■

Proof of Proposition 43. We prove the first point by induction. If U was produced by *(Point)*, then U is the terminal oriented graded poset, which trivially has a greatest element. If U was produced by *(Paste)*, then U splits into a union $V \cup W$, where $V \cap W = \partial_k^+ V = \partial_k^- W$ and $k < \max\{\dim V, \dim W\}$. Then there exist elements $x_1 \in V$ and $x_2 \in W$ such that

- 1) x_1 is maximal in V and x_2 is maximal in W ,
- 2) $\dim x_1 > k$ and $\dim x_2 > k$.

We have $\dim(V \cap W) \leq k$, so neither x_1 nor x_2 are contained in $V \cap W$. It follows that x_1 and x_2 are distinct maximal elements of U , so U does not have a greatest element. If U was produced by *(Atom)*, then U splits into $(U_- \cup U_+) + \{\top\}$, where U_- and U_+ are round regular molecules of dimension n , and $\Delta^\alpha \top = (U_\alpha)_n$ for each $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$. By Lemma 31,

we have $U_\alpha = \text{cl}(U_\alpha)_n$, so $U_\alpha = \partial^\alpha \top \subseteq \text{cl}\{\top\}$. It follows that all elements of U are in the closure of x , that is, x is the greatest element of U .

We prove the second point also by induction. If U was produced by *(Point)*, then x must be the unique element of U whose closure is U itself. If U was produced by *(Paste)*, it splits into $V \cup W$, and $x \in V$ or $x \in W$; the inductive hypothesis applies. If U was produced by *(Atom)*, it is equal to $(V \cup W) + \{\top\}$, and either $x \in V$ or $x \in W$, in which case the inductive hypothesis applies, or $x = \top$, and $\text{cl}\{x\} = U$ is an atom by definition.

For the third point, if U was produced by *(Point)*, it is trivially round. If it was produced by *(Atom)*, it is of the form $V \Rightarrow W$ where ∂^-U is isomorphic to V and ∂^+U to W , and by definition of the rewrite construction their intersection is uniquely isomorphic to ∂V and ∂W ; we conclude by globularity. If $\dim U > 0$, then U was produced by *(Atom)*, so it is of the form $V \Rightarrow W$, with ∂^-U isomorphic to V and ∂^+U to W . By uniqueness of these isomorphisms, U is isomorphic to $\partial^-U \Rightarrow \partial^+U$. ■

B. Proofs for Section II

Proof of Lemma 51. For the first point, $\partial_n^\alpha U$ is a regular molecule by Proposition 34. By Proposition 38, the pastings $U \#_n \partial_n^+ U$ and $\partial_n^- U \#_n U$ are both defined and uniquely isomorphic to U . The inclusion of $\partial_n^- U$ into U factors as the inclusion $\partial_n^- U \hookrightarrow (\partial_n^- U \#_n U)$ followed by an isomorphism, and the inclusion of $\partial_n^+ U$ factors as the inclusion $\partial_n^+ U \hookrightarrow (U \#_n \partial_n^+ U)$ followed by an isomorphism.

For the second point, $\text{cl}\{x\}$ is an atom by Proposition 43. We proceed by induction on the construction of U . If U was produced by *(Point)*, then x must be the unique element of U , so $\text{cl}\{x\} = U$. If U was produced by *(Paste)*, it splits into $V \cup W$ with $V, W \subseteq U$, and $x \in V$ or $x \in W$. By the inductive hypothesis, $\text{cl}\{x\} \subseteq V$ or $\text{cl}\{x\} \subseteq W$. If U was produced by *(Atom)*, it splits into $(V \cup W) + \{\top\}$ with $V, W \subseteq U$, and either $x \in V$ or $x \in W$, in which case the inductive hypothesis applies since $V, W \subseteq U$ by Lemma 51, or $x = \top$, and $\text{cl}\{x\} = U$. ■

Lemma 131. *Let V be a regular molecule, $n < \dim V$, $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$. Consider a pushout diagram of the form*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \partial_n^\alpha V & \longrightarrow & V \\ \downarrow \iota & & \downarrow j_V \\ U & \xrightarrow{j_U} & V \cup U \end{array}$$

in **ogPos**. If $\dim U = n$ and ι is a submolecule inclusion, then

- 1) $V \cup U$ is a regular molecule,
- 2) j_U maps U onto $\partial_n^\alpha(V \cup U)$,
- 3) $j_V(V) \subseteq V \cup U$ and $j_V(\partial_n^\alpha V) \subseteq \partial_n^\alpha(V \cup U)$.

Proof. By induction on the construction of ι . If ι is an isomorphism, then j_V is also an isomorphism, and all the statements are trivially satisfied.

Suppose U is of the form $\partial_n^\alpha V \#_k W$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and ι is the inclusion of $\partial_n^\alpha V$ into the pasting. Since $\dim U = n$, necessarily $\dim W \leq n$, so $\partial_n^\alpha W = W$. If $k \geq n$, then also $k \geq \dim W$, and in this case ι and j_V are again isomorphisms. Suppose that $k < n$. Identifying V with its image through j_V , $V \cup U$ splits into $V \cup W$ with

$$V \cap W = \partial_n^\alpha V \cap W = \partial_k^- W = \partial_k^+(\partial_n^\alpha V) = \partial_k^+ V$$

where the final equation uses globularity of V . This exhibits $V \cup U$ as $V \#_k W$, with j_V the inclusion of V into the pasting, and j_U maps $\partial_n^\alpha V \#_k W$ onto $\partial_n^\alpha(V \#_k W)$ by [7, Proposition 1.23] and the axioms of strict ω -categories. Similarly, $\partial_n^{-\alpha} V \subseteq \partial_n^{-\alpha}(V \#_k W)$. The case where U is of the form $W \#_k \partial_n^\alpha V$ is dual.

By the pasting law for pushout squares, if the statement is true of two submolecule inclusions, it is also true of their composite. ■

Lemma 132. *Let U be an oriented graded poset, V, W round regular molecules, and $\iota: V \hookrightarrow U$ an inclusion such that $U[W/\iota(V)]$ is defined. Let $\varphi: \partial V \xrightarrow{\sim} \partial W$ be the isomorphism used in the construction of $V \Rightarrow W$. Then $U[W/\iota(V)]$ can be constructed as the pushout*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \partial V & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & \partial W & \longrightarrow & W \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \iota & & \downarrow j \\ U \setminus (\iota(V) \setminus \iota(\partial V)) & \longrightarrow & U[W/\iota(V)] & & \end{array} \quad (3)$$

Proof. We can safely identify V with its image through ι , and treat it as a closed subset of U . First of all, observe that $U \setminus (V \setminus \partial V)$ is the complement of the complement of a closed subset in a closed subset, so it is closed in U , and well-defined as an oriented graded poset.

Let $n := \dim U$, so $\dim(U \cup (V \Rightarrow W))$ and $\dim(V \Rightarrow W)$ are both equal to $n + 1$. Then

$$\Delta_n^+(V \Rightarrow W) = W_n, \quad \Delta_n^+ U = U_n$$

and since $U \cap (V \Rightarrow W) = V$, by Lemma 130

$$\Delta_n^+(U \cup (V \Rightarrow W)) = W_n + (U_n \setminus V_n) = W_n + (U \setminus (V \setminus \partial V))_n,$$

while for all $k < n$

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{Max}(U \cup (V \Rightarrow W)))_k &= (\text{Max} U)_k = \\ &= (\text{Max}(U \setminus (V \setminus \partial V)))_k \end{aligned}$$

because both V and $V \Rightarrow W$ are round, hence pure, and do not contain any maximal elements of dimension k .

It follows that $\partial^+(U \cup (V \Rightarrow W))$ is the union of W and $(U \setminus (V \setminus \partial V))$, with intersection $\partial W = \partial V$. ■

Lemma 133. *Let U be an oriented graded poset, V, W round regular molecules, and $\iota: V \hookrightarrow U$ an inclusion such that $U[W/\iota(V)]$ is defined. Let $j: W \hookrightarrow U[W/\iota(V)]$ be the right side of (3). Then $(U[W/\iota(V)])[V/j(W)]$ is defined and isomorphic to U .*

Proof. Since $W \Rightarrow V$ is defined whenever $V \Rightarrow W$ is defined, it follows that $(U[W/\iota(V)])[V/j(W)]$ is defined.

The isomorphism with U is straightforward algebra of closed subsets using Lemma 132 twice. ■

Proof of Proposition 53. If ι is a submolecule inclusion, by Lemma 131 $U \cup (V \Rightarrow W)$ and its output boundary $U[W/\iota(V)]$ are regular molecules, and the inclusion of W into $U[W/\iota(V)]$ is a submolecule inclusion.

If V is a round regular molecule, then $\langle V \rangle$ is an atom, which is round by Proposition 43, and has boundaries isomorphic to those of V by Lemma 26. Then $V \Rightarrow \langle V \rangle$ is defined, so the fourth condition is a special case of the third one.

Finally, suppose $U[\langle V \rangle/\iota(V)]$ is a regular molecule. By Lemma 51, since $\langle V \rangle$ is an atom, its inclusion j into $U[\langle V \rangle/\iota(V)]$ is a submolecule inclusion.

Using Lemma 131 as in the first part, we deduce that $(U[\langle V \rangle/\iota(V)]][V/j(\langle V \rangle)]$ is a regular molecule, and the inclusion of V into it is a submolecule inclusion. By Lemma 133, $(U[\langle V \rangle/\iota(V)])[V/j(\langle V \rangle)]$ is isomorphic to U , and ι factors as this submolecule inclusion followed by an isomorphism. ■

Proof of Lemma 60. This is [7, Lemma 1.16]. ■

Proof of Lemma 65. It follows from Lemma 20 that, for all $x \in V$ and $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$, the set $\Delta_k^\alpha x$ is isomorphic to $\Delta_k^\alpha \iota(x)$. It follows that, for all $x, y \in \bigcup_{i>k} V_i$, there is an edge between x and y in $\mathcal{F}_k V$ if and only if there is an edge between $\iota(x)$ and $\iota(y)$ in $\mathcal{F}_k U$. ■

134. The following proof uses results proved in the following sections; none of their proofs use it, so there is no circularity.

Proof of Proposition 66. First of all, if U is round, then it is pure, so the vertices of $\mathcal{F}_{n-1} U$ are the elements of U_n . If U is an atom, then $\mathcal{F}_{n-1} U$ consists of a single vertex and no edges, so it is trivially connected. In particular this is true when $n = 0$ since U is then the point, so we can proceed by induction on n .

Suppose $n > 0$ and $|U_n| > 1$, which by Lemma 136 implies $\text{lydim } U = n - 1$. Assume by way of contradiction that $\mathcal{F}_{n-1} U$ is not connected. Then there is a bipartition $U_n = A + B$ such that there are no edges in $\mathcal{F}_{n-1} U$ between vertices in A and vertices in B . By Lemma 60, no element of U_{n-1} can be covered by two elements with the same orientation, so this implies that $\dim(\text{cl } A \cap \text{cl } B) < n - 1$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} A' &:= \{x \in \Delta^- U \mid \nabla^- x \subseteq A\}, \\ B' &:= \{x \in \Delta^- U \mid \nabla^- x \subseteq B\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $A' + B'$ is a bipartition of $\Delta^- U$. By Proposition 34, $\partial^- U$ is round, so by the inductive hypothesis $\mathcal{F}_{n-2}(\partial^- U)$ is connected. It follows that there exist $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$, $x \in A'$, $y \in B'$, and $z \in U_{n-2}$ such that $z \in \Delta^\alpha x \cap \Delta^{-\alpha} y$. Then z has two distinct cofaces in $\partial^- U$, so by Lemma 60 $z \notin \partial(\partial^- U) = \partial_{n-2} U$. We claim that $z \in \partial^+ U$, contradicting the roundness of U .

By Theorem 77, there exists an $(n - 1)$ -layering $(U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ of U ; we will identify the $U^{(i)}$ with their isomorphic images in

U . Let $V_0 := \partial^- U$ and $V_i := \partial^+ U^{(i)}$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. We will prove that, for all $i \in \{0, \dots, m\}$,

- 1) $z \in V_i$,
- 2) there exist elements $x_i \in \text{cl } A$ and $y_i \in \text{cl } B$ such that $\nabla^\alpha z \cap V_i = \{x_i\}$ and $\nabla^{-\alpha} z \cap V_i = \{y_i\}$.

For $i = 0$, we have already established this with $x_0 := x$, $y_0 := y$. Let $i \geq 0$, and assume this holds for $i - 1$. By Lemma 73, there is a single n -dimensional element $x^{(i)}$ in $U^{(i)}$, and by Lemma 144

$$V_i = \partial^- U^{(i)}[\partial^+ x^{(i)}/\partial^- x^{(i)}] = V_{i-1}[\partial^+ x^{(i)}/\partial^- x^{(i)}].$$

Suppose $x^{(i)} \in A$. Then $y_{i-1} \notin \text{cl } \{x^{(i)}\}$, so $y_{i-1} \in V_i$, and we let $y_i := y_{i-1}$. If $x_{i-1} \notin \text{cl } \{x^{(i)}\}$ then also $x_{i-1} \in V_i$, and we let $x_i := x_{i-1}$. Otherwise, x_{i-1} is the only coface of z in $\partial^- x^{(i)}$, so by Lemma 60 we have $z \in \partial^\alpha(\partial^- x^{(i)}) = \partial^\alpha(\partial^+ x^{(i)})$. It follows that $z \in V_i$ and there exists a unique x_i such that $\nabla^\alpha z \cap \partial^+ x^{(i)} = \{x_i\}$. The case $x^{(i)} \in B$ is analogous.

Since $V_m = \partial^+ U$, we have proved that $z \in \partial^+ U$, a contradiction. ■

C. Proofs for Section III

Lemma 135. Let U be a regular molecule, $-1 \leq k < \dim U$, and $(U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ a k -layering of U . For all $i < j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$,

$$U^{(i)} \cap U^{(j)} = \partial_k^+ U^{(i)} \cap \partial_k^- U^{(j)}.$$

Proof. Let $i < j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} V &:= U^{(1)} \#_k \dots \#_k U^{(i)}, \\ W &:= \partial_k^+ U^{(i)} \#_k U^{(i+1)} \#_k \dots \#_k U^{(j-1)}, \\ Z &:= U^{(j)} \#_k \dots \#_k U^{(m)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then U splits into $V \cup (W \#_k Z)$ along the k -boundary, so

$$\partial_k^+ U^{(i)} = \partial_k^+ V = \partial_k^- (W \#_k Z) = V \cap (W \#_k Z).$$

Since $U^{(i)} \subseteq V$ and $U^{(j)} \subseteq (W \#_k Z)$, it follows that $U^{(i)} \cap U^{(j)} \subseteq \partial_k^+ U^{(i)}$. Dually, from the fact that U splits into $(V \#_k W) \cup Z$ along the k -boundary, we derive $U^{(i)} \cap U^{(j)} \subseteq \partial_k^- U^{(j)}$. ■

Proof of Lemma 73. For the first point, since $\dim U^{(i)} > k$ each $U^{(i)}$ contains at least one maximal element of dimension $> k$, and because

$$\dim(U^{(i)} \cap U^{(j)}) = \dim(\partial_k^+ U^{(i)} \cap \partial_k^- U^{(j)}) \leq k$$

by Lemma 135, no such maximal element is contained in two of them. Since there are exactly m maximal elements of dimension $> k$, it follows that each $U^{(i)}$ contains exactly one of them.

For the second point, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, let

$$\begin{aligned} V^{(i)} &:= \partial_\ell^+ U^{(1)} \#_k \dots \#_k \partial_\ell^+ U^{(i-1)} \#_k \\ &\quad \#_k U^{(i)} \#_k \partial_\ell^- U^{(i+1)} \#_k \dots \#_k \partial_\ell^- U^{(m)}. \end{aligned}$$

By repeated applications of Proposition 39 followed by Proposition 38, U is isomorphic to

$$V^{(1)} \#_\ell \dots \#_\ell V^{(m)}.$$

Restricting to the subsequence of $(V^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ on those i such that $\dim V^{(i)} > \ell$, which does not change the result by Proposition 38, we obtain an ℓ -layering of U . ■

Lemma 136. *Let U be a regular molecule, $n := \dim U$. Then*

- 1) $\text{lydim } U \leq n - 1$,
- 2) $\text{lydim } U = n - 1$ if and only if $|U_n| > 1$.

Proof. We have

$$\left| \bigcup_{i>n} (\text{Max } U)_i \right| = |\emptyset| = 0,$$

so $\text{lydim } U \leq n - 1$, with equality if and only if

$$\left| \bigcup_{i>n-1} (\text{Max } U)_i \right| = |(\text{Max } U)_n| = |U_n| > 1,$$

where we used Lemma 129. ■

Lemma 137. *Let U be a regular molecule. Then $\text{lydim } U$ is -1 if and only if U is an atom.*

Proof. Suppose $\text{lydim } U = -1$. If $|\bigcup_{i>0} (\text{Max } U)_i| = 0$, then $\dim U = 0$ and U is the point.

Otherwise, $1 = |\bigcup_{i>0} (\text{Max } U)_i| = |\text{Max } U|$ because a regular molecule which is not 0-dimensional cannot have a 0-dimensional maximal element. In either case, U has a greatest element. Conversely, if U has a greatest element, $|\bigcup_{i>0} (\text{Max } U)_i| \leq |\text{Max } U| = 1$. ■

Lemma 138. *Let U, V be regular molecules, and suppose $U \#_k V$ is defined for some $k < \min \{\dim U, \dim V\}$. Then*

$$\text{lydim } (U \#_k V) \geq \max \{\text{lydim } U, \text{lydim } V, k\}.$$

Proof. Identifying U and V with their isomorphic images, $U \#_k V$ splits into $U \cup V$ with $\dim(U \cap V) = \dim \partial_k^+ U = k$. By Lemma 130, for all $i > k$,

$$(\text{Max } (U \#_k V))_i = (\text{Max } U)_i + (\text{Max } V)_i,$$

and since $k < \min \{\dim U, \dim V\}$, both U and V have at least one maximal element of dimension strictly larger than k . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \bigcup_{i>k} (\text{Max } (U \#_k V))_i \right| &= \\ &= \left| \bigcup_{i>k} (\text{Max } U)_i \right| + \left| \bigcup_{i>k} (\text{Max } V)_i \right| \geq 2, \end{aligned}$$

so $k - 1 < \text{lydim } (U \#_k V)$, that is, $k \leq \text{lydim } (U \#_k V)$. Furthermore, letting $n := \text{lydim } (U \#_k V)$, since $n + 1 > k$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \bigcup_{i>n+1} (\text{Max } U)_i \right| + \left| \bigcup_{i>n+1} (\text{Max } V)_i \right| &= \\ &= \left| \bigcup_{i>n+1} (\text{Max } (U \#_k V))_i \right| \leq 1, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\left| \bigcup_{i>n+1} (\text{Max } U)_i \right| \leq 1, \left| \bigcup_{i>n+1} (\text{Max } V)_i \right| \leq 1.$$

Then $\max \{\text{lydim } U, \text{lydim } V\} \leq \text{lydim } (U \#_k V)$. ■

Lemma 139. *Let U be a regular molecule, $k := \text{lydim } U$. Suppose $k \geq 0$, and let $(U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ be a k -layering of U . Then*

- 1) $m > 1$,
- 2) for each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $\text{lydim } U^{(i)} < k$,
- 3) at most one of the $U^{(i)}$ contains an element of dimension $> k + 1$.

Proof. By definition of $\text{lydim } U$, if $k \geq 0$ and a k -layering exists, then $m > 1$, for otherwise $k - 1 \leq \text{lydim } U$, a contradiction. Moreover, U contains at most one element of dimension $> k + 1$, which can be contained at most in one of the $U^{(i)}$. Finally, by Lemma 73, we have $|\bigcup_{j>k} (\text{Max } U^{(i)})_j| = 1$, so $\text{lydim } U^{(i)} \leq k - 1 < k$. ■

Proof of Theorem 77. Let $k := \text{lydim } U$. If $k = -1$, then U is an atom and admits the trivial layering $U = U^{(1)}$. If $k \geq 0$, by Lemma 137 U is not an atom, so we can assume that U was produced by (Paste). Then U is equal to $V \#_\ell W$ for some regular molecules V, W and $\ell < \min \{\dim V, \dim W\}$. By the inductive hypothesis, we have layerings

$$V^{(1)} \#_{k_V} \dots \#_{k_V} V^{(m_V)}, \quad W^{(1)} \#_{k_W} \dots \#_{k_W} W^{(m_W)}$$

of V and W , where $k_V := \text{lydim } V$ and $k_W := \text{lydim } W$. Furthermore, by Lemma 138, $k \geq \max \{k_V, k_W, \ell\}$. Let

$$n_V := \begin{cases} m_V & \text{if } k_V = k, \\ 1 & \text{if } k_V < k \text{ and } \dim V > k, \\ 0 & \text{if } k_V < \dim V < k, \end{cases}$$

$$n_W := \begin{cases} m_W & \text{if } k_W = k, \\ 1 & \text{if } k_W < k \text{ and } \dim W > k, \\ 0 & \text{if } k_W < \dim W < k. \end{cases}$$

Notice that it can never be the case that $n_V = n_W = 0$. We claim that we can decompose V as

$$\tilde{V}^{(1)} \#_k \dots \#_k \tilde{V}^{(n_V)} \#_k \underbrace{\partial_k^+ V \#_k \dots \#_k \partial_k^+ V}_{n_W \text{ times}}, \quad (4)$$

where each $\tilde{V}^{(i)}$ is a regular molecule containing exactly one maximal element of dimension $> k$. If $k_V = k$, we let $\tilde{V}^{(i)} := V^{(i)}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m_V\}$. If $k_V < k$, then V contains at most one maximal element of dimension $> k_V + 1$, hence at most one maximal element of dimension $> k$. If $\dim V > k$, it contains exactly one, and we let $\tilde{V}^{(1)} := V$. If $\dim V < k$, then $V = \partial_k^+ V$. By Proposition 38, pasting copies of $\partial_k^+ V$ does not change the result up to unique isomorphism. Similarly, we can decompose W as

$$\underbrace{\partial_k^- W \#_k \dots \#_k \partial_k^- W}_{n_V \text{ times}} \#_k \tilde{W}^{(1)} \#_k \dots \#_k \tilde{W}^{(n_W)} \quad (5)$$

where each $\tilde{W}^{(i)}$ contains exactly one maximal element of dimension $> k$.

If $\ell = k$, since $\ell < \min\{\dim V, \dim W\}$, we have $0 < \min\{n_V, n_W\}$. Then

$$\tilde{V}^{(1)} \#_k \dots \#_k \tilde{V}^{(n_V)} \#_k \tilde{W}^{(1)} \#_k \dots \#_k \tilde{W}^{(n_W)}$$

is a k -layering of U . If $\ell < k$, let

$$U^{(i)} := \begin{cases} \tilde{V}^{(i)} \#_\ell \partial_k^- W & \text{if } i \leq n_V, \\ \partial_k^+ V \#_\ell \tilde{W}^{(i-n_V)} & \text{if } n_V < i \leq n_V + n_W. \end{cases}$$

Since $\dim \partial_k^- V = \dim \partial_k^+ W = k$, each $U^{(i)}$ still contains exactly one maximal element of dimension $> k$. Plugging (4) and (5) in $V \#_\ell W$ and using Proposition 39 repeatedly, we deduce that $V \#_\ell W$ is isomorphic to

$$U^{(1)} \#_k \dots \#_k U^{(n_V+n_W)},$$

which has the desired properties. Necessarily, $n_V + n_W = m$.

This proves that U has a k -layering. It remains to show that $\text{fdim } U \leq k$. Let x, y be distinct maximal elements of U . If $\min\{\dim x, \dim y\} \leq k$, then $\dim(\text{cl}\{x\} \cap \text{cl}\{y\}) < k$.

Suppose that $k < \min\{\dim x, \dim y\}$, and let $(U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ be a k -layering of U . By Lemma 73 there exist $i \neq j$ such that $x \in U^{(i)}$ and $y \in U^{(j)}$. By Lemma 135, there exists $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$ such that $U^{(i)} \cap U^{(j)} = \partial_k^\alpha U^{(i)} \cap \partial_k^{-\alpha} U^{(j)}$. Then $\text{cl}\{x\} \cap \text{cl}\{y\} \subseteq \partial_k^\alpha U^{(i)} \cap \partial_k^{-\alpha} U^{(j)}$, which is at most k -dimensional. ■

Proof of Corollary 78. Follows from Theorem 77 together with Lemma 136. ■

Lemma 140. *Let U, V be regular molecules and suppose $U \#_k V$ is defined for some $k < \min\{\dim U, \dim V\}$. If $\mathcal{M}_k U$ and $\mathcal{M}_k V$ are acyclic, then $\mathcal{M}_k(U \#_k V)$ is acyclic.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathcal{M}_k U$ and $\mathcal{M}_k V$ are acyclic. We may identify U and V with their images in $U \#_k V$. By Lemma 130, since $\dim(U \cap V) = k$,

$$\bigcup_{i>k} (\text{Max}(U \#_k V))_i = \bigcup_{i>k} (\text{Max } U)_i + \bigcup_{i>k} (\text{Max } V)_i,$$

so $\mathcal{M}_k U$ and $\mathcal{M}_k V$ are isomorphic to the induced subgraphs of $\mathcal{M}_k(U \#_k V)$ on the vertices in U and V , respectively. It follows that a cycle in $\mathcal{M}_k(U \#_k V)$ cannot remain in U or V , but has to visit vertices in both. In particular, such a cycle has to go through an edge from $x \in V$ to $y \in U$, induced by the existence of $z \in \Delta_k^+ x \cap \Delta_k^- y$. But then $z \notin \partial_k^- V$ and $z \notin \partial_k^+ U$, yet $z \in U \cap V$, a contradiction. ■

Proof of Proposition 80. Let $(U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ be a k -layering of U . For each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, the graph $\mathcal{M}_k U^{(i)}$ is trivially acyclic by Lemma 73. We conclude by applying Lemma 140 repeatedly. ■

Proof of Proposition 83. The function $(U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m \mapsto (x^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ is well-defined by Lemma 73. Let $i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, and suppose that there is an edge from $x^{(i)}$ to $x^{(j)}$ in $\mathcal{M}_k U$, that is, there exists $z \in \Delta_k^+ x^{(i)} \cap \Delta_k^- x^{(j)}$. By Proposition 80, $\mathcal{M}_k U$ is acyclic, so necessarily $i \neq j$. If $j < i$, then

$U^{(j)} \cap U^{(i)} \subseteq \partial_k^+ U^{(j)} \cap \partial_k^- U^{(i)}$ by Lemma 135, contradicting the existence of z . It follows that $i < j$, so $(x^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ is a k -ordering of U .

Let $(V^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ be another k -layering, and suppose it determines the same k -ordering as $(U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$. Then the image of both $U^{(1)}$ and $V^{(1)}$ in U is

$$\text{cl}\{x^{(1)}\} \cup \partial^- U,$$

so $U^{(1)}$ is isomorphic to $V^{(1)}$. If $m = 1$ we are done. Otherwise, $(U^{(i)})_{i=2}^m$ and $(V^{(i)})_{i=2}^m$ are k -layerings inducing the same k -ordering on their image. By recursion, we conclude that they are layer-wise isomorphic. ■

Lemma 141. *Let U, V, W be regular molecules, $k < \dim U$, $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$, and let $\iota: V \hookrightarrow U$ be a submolecule inclusion such that $U[W/\iota(V)]$ is defined. Then $\partial_k^\alpha U$ is isomorphic to $\partial_k^\alpha(U[W/\iota(V)])$.*

Proof. By Lemma 131, $U \cup (V \Rightarrow W)$ is a regular molecule and U is isomorphic to its input boundary. By globularity, $\partial_k^\alpha U$ is isomorphic to

$$\partial_k^\alpha(\partial^+(U \cup (V \Rightarrow W))) = \partial_k^\alpha(U[W/\iota(V)]). \quad \blacksquare$$

Lemma 142. *Let U, V, W, U', U'' be regular molecules, let $k < \dim U$, and let $\iota: V \hookrightarrow U$ be a submolecule inclusion such that*

$$U \#_k U', U'' \#_k U, U[W/\iota(V)]$$

are defined. Then

- 1) $U[W/\iota(V)] \#_k U'$ and $U'' \#_k U[W/\iota(V)]$ are defined,
- 2) if $\dim U' \leq \dim U$, then $(U \#_k U')[W/\iota_U(\iota(V))]$ is defined and isomorphic to $U[W/\iota(V)] \#_k U'$,
- 3) if $\dim U'' \leq \dim U$, then $(U'' \#_k U)[W/\iota_U(\iota(V))]$ is defined and isomorphic to $U'' \#_k U[W/\iota(V)]$.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 141 that $U[W/\iota(V)] \#_k U'$ and $U'' \#_k U[W/\iota(V)]$ are defined.

The substitution $(U \#_k U')[W/\iota_U(\iota(V))]$ is then defined if and only if $\dim(U \#_k U') = \dim U$, equivalently, if and only if $\dim U' \leq \dim U$. Similarly, $(U'' \#_k U)[W/\iota_U(\iota(V))]$ is defined if and only if $\dim U'' \leq \dim U$. The isomorphisms follow straightforwardly from the definitions using the pasting law for pushout squares. ■

143. Theorem 77 in conjunction with Lemma 139 and Lemma 137 allows us to prove properties of regular molecules by induction on their layering dimension. That is, to prove that a property holds of all regular molecules U , it suffices to

- prove that it holds when $\text{lydim } U = -1$, that is, when U is an atom,
- prove that it holds when $k := \text{lydim } U \geq 0$, assuming that it holds of all the $(U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ in a k -layering of U .

Lemma 144. *Let U be a regular molecule, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and suppose*

$$\bigcup_{i>k} (\text{Max } U)_i = \{x\}.$$

Then, for all $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$,

- 1) $\partial_k^\alpha x \sqsubseteq \partial_k^\alpha U$,
- 2) $\partial_k^\alpha U$ is isomorphic to $\partial_k^{-\alpha} U[\partial_k^\alpha x / \partial_k^{-\alpha} x]$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on $\text{lydim } U$.

If $\text{lydim } U = -1$, then U is an atom and equal to $\text{cl}\{x\}$. It follows that $\partial_k^\alpha x = \partial_k^\alpha U$, which is trivially a submolecule, and is isomorphic to $\partial_k^{-\alpha} U[\partial_k^\alpha x / \partial_k^{-\alpha} x]$.

Suppose $\ell := \text{lydim } U \geq 0$, and let $(U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ be an ℓ -layering of U . Then $\ell \leq k-1 < k$ because $|\bigcup_{i>k} (\text{Max } U)_i| = 1$. By [7, Proposition 1.23] and the axioms of strict ω -categories, $\partial_k^\alpha U$ is isomorphic to

$$\partial_k^\alpha U^{(1)} \#_\ell \dots \#_\ell \partial_k^\alpha U^{(m)}.$$

Now x is contained in a single $U^{(i)}$. By the inductive hypothesis, $\partial_k^\alpha x \sqsubseteq \partial_k^\alpha U^{(i)}$, and the latter is isomorphic to $\partial_k^{-\alpha} U^{(i)}[\partial_k^\alpha x / \partial_k^{-\alpha} x]$. We conclude by Lemma 142. ■

Proof of Proposition 85. Suppose $(U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ is a k -layering. Then, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $U^{(i)}$ is a regular molecule, and by Proposition 73 $x^{(i)}$ is the only element of dimension $> k$ in $U^{(i)}$. By Lemma 144, $\partial_k^- x^{(i)} \sqsubseteq \partial_k^- U^{(i)}$.

Conversely, it follows from Lemma 131 that for all i , if $\partial_k^- U^{(i)}$ is a regular molecule and $\partial_k^- x^{(i)}$ is its submolecule, then $U^{(i)}$ is a regular molecule, hence $\partial_k^+ U^{(i)}$ is a regular molecule. Moreover, since $(x^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ is a k -ordering, it is straightforward to prove that $U^{(i)} \cap U^{(i+1)} = \partial_k^+ U^{(i)} = \partial_k^- U^{(i+1)}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$. Since $\partial^- U^{(1)} = \partial^- U$ is a regular molecule, it follows by induction, assuming condition (b), that $U^{(i)}$ is a regular molecule for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. This proves that $(U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ is a k -layering of U . ■

145. In the following, we use the following explicit construction of $\mathcal{G}/(\mathcal{G}|_W)$. Its set of vertices is $(V_{\mathcal{G}} \setminus W) + \{x_W\}$, and for all pair of vertices x, y ,

- if $x, y \neq x_W$, there is an edge between x and y for each edge between x and y in \mathcal{G} ,
- if $x = x_W$ and $y \neq x_W$, there is an edge from x to y for each pair of a vertex $z \in W$ and an edge from x to y in \mathcal{G} ,
- if $x \neq x_W$ and $y = x_W$, there is an edge from x to y for each pair of a vertex $z \in W$ and an edge from x to z in \mathcal{G} ,
- there are no edges from x_W to x_W .

Proof of Lemma 89. We prove the contrapositive of the implication from (a) to (b). Suppose $\mathcal{G}/(\mathcal{G}|_W)$ has a cycle. If the cycle does not pass through x_W , then it lifts to a cycle in \mathcal{G} , contradicting the assumption that \mathcal{G} is acyclic. It follows that the cycle contains a segment of the form $x_W \rightarrow x_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow x_m \rightarrow x_W$, where $m > 0$ and $x_i \neq x_W$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Then there exist $y, z \in W$ and a path $y \rightarrow x_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow x_m \rightarrow z$ in \mathcal{G} , so $\mathcal{G}|_W$ is not path-induced.

Next, suppose that $\mathcal{G}/(\mathcal{G}|_W)$ is acyclic. Then both the graphs $\mathcal{G}/(\mathcal{G}|_W)$ and $\mathcal{G}|_W$ are acyclic, so they admit topological sorts $(x^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ and $(y^{(j)})_{j=1}^p$, respectively. For exactly one $q \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $x^{(q)} = x_W$. We claim that

$$((x^{(i)})_{i=1}^{q-1}, (y^{(j)})_{j=1}^p, (x^{(i)})_{i=q+1}^m)$$

is a topological sort of \mathcal{G} . Indeed, for all edges from x to x' in \mathcal{G} ,

- if $x, x' \notin W$, then $x = x^{(i)}$, $x' = x^{(i')}$ for some $i, i' \in \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus \{q\}$, and there is an edge from x to x' in $\mathcal{G}/(\mathcal{G}|_W)$, so $i < i'$;
- if $x, x' \in W$, then $x = y^{(j)}$, $x' = y^{(j')}$ for some $j, j' \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, and there is an edge from x to x' in $\mathcal{G}|_W$, so $j < j'$;
- if $x \in W$, $x' \notin W$, then $x = y^{(j)}$, $x' = x^{(i)}$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus \{q\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, and there is an edge from x_W to x' in $\mathcal{G}/(\mathcal{G}|_W)$, so $q < i$;
- if $x \notin W$, $x' \in W$, then $x = x^{(i)}$, $x' = y^{(j)}$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus \{q\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, and there is an edge from x to x_W in $\mathcal{G}/(\mathcal{G}|_W)$, so $i < q$.

This proves the implication from (b) to (c). Moreover, it defines an injection from pairs of a topological sort of $\mathcal{G}|_W$ and a topological sort of $\mathcal{G}/(\mathcal{G}|_W)$ to topological sorts of \mathcal{G} in which the vertices of W are consecutive. This will prove to be a bijection as soon as we have proven the converse implication.

Finally, we prove the contrapositive of the implication from (c) to (a). Suppose $\mathcal{G}|_W$ is not path-induced, that is, there is a path $x \rightarrow x_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow x_m \rightarrow y$ in \mathcal{G} such that $m > 0$, $x, y \in W$, and $x_i \notin W$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. It follows that the x_i must come between x and y in every topological sort of \mathcal{G} , so the vertices of W can never be consecutive. ■

Proof of Lemma 90. By Lemma 65 combined with Proposition 66, $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}V$ is a connected induced subgraph of $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U$, so its contraction is well-defined. Now, the vertices of the graph $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U[\langle V \rangle / \iota(V)]$ are either

- $x \in U_n \setminus V_n$, or
- x_V such that the image of $\langle V \rangle$ in $U[\langle V \rangle / \iota(V)]$ is $\text{cl}\{x_V\}$.

Let x, y be two vertices of $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U[\langle V \rangle / \iota(V)]$.

- If $x, y \in U_n \setminus V_n$, then $\Delta^+ x \cap \Delta^- y$ is the same in $U[\langle V \rangle / \iota(V)]$ as in U , so there is an edge from x to y in $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U$ if and only if there is an edge in $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U[\langle V \rangle / \iota(V)]$.
- If $x = x_V$ then $\Delta^+ x_V \cap \Delta^- y$ is in bijection with $\Delta^+ V \cap \Delta^- y$ in U . For all $z \in \Delta^+ V$, since V is pure and n -dimensional, there exists $w \in \nabla^+ z$. If $\Delta^+ x_V \cap \Delta^- y$ is non-empty, it follows that $\Delta^+ z \cap \Delta^- y$ is non-empty in U for some $z \in \iota(V)_n$. Thus there exist $z \in \iota(V)_n$ and an edge from z to y in $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U$.
- Dually, if $y = x_V$, there is an edge from x to y in $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U[\langle V \rangle / \iota(V)]$ if and only if there exist $z \in \iota(V)_n$ and an edge from x to z in $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U$.
- Finally, $\Delta^+ V \cap \Delta^- V = \emptyset$ because V is pure, so $\Delta^+ x_V \cap \Delta^- x_V$ and there is no edge from x_V to x_V .

It is then straightforward to establish an isomorphism with the explicit description of $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U/\mathcal{F}_{n-1}V$. ■

Proof of Lemma 93. Identify V with its isomorphic image through ι , and suppose that ι is a submolecule inclusion. Then $\tilde{U} := U[\langle V \rangle / V]$ is a regular molecule by Proposition 53, and admits an $(n-1)$ -layering $(\tilde{U}^{(i)})_{i=1}^{m-p+1}$ by Theorem 77. Let $\text{cl}\{x\}$ be the image of $\langle V \rangle$ in \tilde{U} ; then $x \in \tilde{U}^{(q)}$ for exactly

one $q \in \{1, \dots, m - p + 1\}$. Then $W := \tilde{U}^{(q)}[V/\text{cl}\{x\}]$ is defined, and by Lemma 142 combined with Lemma 133, U is isomorphic to

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{U}^{(1)} \#_{n-1} \dots \#_{n-1} \tilde{U}^{(q-1)} \#_{n-1} \\ & \#_{n-1} W \#_{n-1} \tilde{U}^{(q+1)} \#_{n-1} \dots \#_{n-1} \tilde{U}^{(m-p+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 144, $\partial^-x \subseteq \partial^- \tilde{U}^{(q)}$, so by Lemma 141 $\partial^-V \subseteq \partial^-W$. We can apply the criterion of Proposition 85 to deduce that $(y^{(i)})_{i=1}^p$ is an $(n-1)$ -ordering of W induced by an $(n-1)$ -layering $(W^{(i)})_{i=1}^p$. Letting

$$(U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m := ((\tilde{U}^{(i)})_{i=1}^{q-1}, (W^{(i)})_{i=1}^p, (\tilde{U}^{(i)})_{i=q+1}^{m-p+1}),$$

produces an $(n-1)$ -layering, hence an $(n-1)$ -ordering $(x^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ of U , with the property that $(x^{(i)})_{i=q}^{p+q-1} = (y^{(i)})_{i=1}^p$.

Conversely, let $(U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ be an $(n-1)$ -layering of U satisfying the properties in the statement, and let $W \subseteq U$ be the image of $U^{(q)} \#_{n-1} \dots \#_{n-1} U^{(p+q-1)}$ in U . Then $W_n = V_n$, so

$$W = V \cup \partial^-W.$$

Because $\partial^-V \subseteq \partial^-U^{(q)}$ which is equal to ∂^-W , by Lemma 131 $V \subseteq W \subseteq U$. ■

Full proof of Theorem 94. Identify V with its isomorphic image through ι , and suppose that ι is a submolecule inclusion. Then $\tilde{U} := U[(V)/V]$ is a regular molecule by Proposition 53, so it admits an $(n-1)$ -layering $(\tilde{U}^{(i)})_{i=1}^{m-p+1}$, which induces an $(n-1)$ -ordering. By Lemma 90, this $(n-1)$ -ordering can be identified with a topological sort $((x^{(i)})_{i=1}^{q-1}, x_V, (x^{(i)})_{i=q+1}^{m-p+1})$ of $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}U/\mathcal{F}_{n-1}V$. By Lemma 144, we have $\partial^-x_V \subseteq \partial^- \tilde{U}^{(q)}$ and $\partial^-x^{(i)} \subseteq \partial^- \tilde{U}^{(i)}$ for $i \neq q$. By Lemma 142 combined with Lemma 133, letting $W := \tilde{U}^{(q)}[V/\text{cl}\{x_V\}]$, U is isomorphic to

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{U}^{(1)} \#_{n-1} \dots \#_{n-1} \tilde{U}^{(q-1)} \#_{n-1} \\ & \#_{n-1} W \#_{n-1} \tilde{U}^{(q+1)} \#_{n-1} \dots \#_{n-1} \tilde{U}^{(m-p+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

and W is isomorphic to $U^{(q)}$, while $\tilde{U}^{(i)}$ is isomorphic to $U^{(i)}$ for all $i \neq q$. We conclude by Lemma 141.

The converse implication has already been fully proved. ■

Lemma 146. *Let U be a regular molecule, $\ell \geq -1$. If U has an ℓ -layering, then for all $k > \ell$ the function $m_{k,U}: \mathcal{Lay}_k U \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Ord}_k U$ is a bijection.*

Proof. Let $(U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ be an ℓ -layering of U , and let $(x^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ be its image through $m_{\ell,U}$. For $k > \ell$, let $(y^{(i)})_{i=1}^p$ be a k -ordering of U . Then there exists a unique injection $j: \{1, \dots, p\} \hookrightarrow \{1, \dots, m\}$ such that $y^{(i)} = x^{(j(i))}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} V^{(i)} &:= \partial_k^{\alpha(i,1)} U^{(1)} \#_{\ell} \dots \#_{\ell} U^{(j(i))} \#_{\ell} \dots \#_{\ell} \partial_k^{\alpha(i,m)} U^{(m)}, \\ \alpha(i, j) &:= \begin{cases} + & \text{if } j = j(i') \text{ for some } i' < i, \\ - & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Applying Proposition 38 and Proposition 39 repeatedly, we find that $(V^{(i)})_{i=1}^p$ is a k -layering of U and $(y^{(i)})_{i=1}^p$ is its

image through $m_{k,U}$. This proves that $m_{k,U}$ is surjective, and we conclude by Proposition 83. ■

Lemma 147. *Let U be a regular molecule. Suppose that for all submolecules $V \subseteq U$, if $r := \text{frdim } V$, then V admits an r -layering. Then for all $k \geq \text{frdim } U$ the function $m_{k,U}: \mathcal{Lay}_k U \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Ord}_k U$ is a bijection.*

Proof. Let $r := \text{frdim } U$. By assumption, there exists an r -layering of U , so by Lemma 146 it suffices to show that $m_{r,U}$ is a bijection.

Given two r -orderings $(x^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ and $(y^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$, there exists a unique permutation σ such that $x^{(i)} = y^{(\sigma(i))}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Let $d((x^{(i)})_{i=1}^m, (y^{(i)})_{i=1}^m)$ be the number of pairs (j, j') such that $j < j'$ but $\sigma(j') < \sigma(j)$. Under the assumption that $(x^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ is in the image of $m_{r,U}$, we will prove that $(y^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ is also in the image of $m_{r,U}$ by induction on $d((x^{(i)})_{i=1}^m, (y^{(i)})_{i=1}^m)$. Since the image of $m_{r,U}$ is not empty, this will suffice to prove that $m_{r,U}$ is surjective, hence bijective by Proposition 83.

If $d((x^{(i)})_{i=1}^m, (y^{(i)})_{i=1}^m) = 0$, then $x^{(i)} = y^{(i)}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, and there is nothing left to prove.

Suppose $d((x^{(i)})_{i=1}^m, (y^{(i)})_{i=1}^m) > 0$. Then there exists $j < m$ such that $\sigma(j+1) < \sigma(j)$. Suppose $(x^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ is the image of the r -layering $(U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$. Let $V \subseteq U$ be the image of $U^{(j)} \#_r U^{(j+1)}$ in U , and let

$$z_1 := x^{(j)} = y^{(\sigma(j))}, \quad z_2 := x^{(j+1)} = y^{(\sigma(j+1))}.$$

Because z_1 comes before z_2 in one r -ordering, but after in another, there can be no edge between them in $\mathcal{M}_r U$, so

$$\dim(\text{cl}\{z_1\} \cap \text{cl}\{z_2\}) < r.$$

Since z_1, z_2 are the only maximal elements of dimension $> r$ in V , we deduce that $\ell := \text{frdim } V < r$. By assumption, there exists an ℓ -layering of V . In particular, there exist regular molecules $V^{(1)}, V^{(2)}$ such that

- 1) z_i is in the image of $V^{(i)}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and
- 2) V is isomorphic to $V^{(1)} \#_{\ell} V^{(2)}$ or to $V^{(2)} \#_{\ell} V^{(1)}$.

Without loss of generality suppose that V is isomorphic to $V^{(1)} \#_{\ell} V^{(2)}$. By Proposition 38 and Proposition 39, letting

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{U}^{(j)} &:= \partial_r^- V^{(1)} \#_{\ell} V^{(2)}, \\ \tilde{U}^{(j+1)} &:= V^{(1)} \#_{\ell} \partial_r^+ V^{(2)}, \end{aligned}$$

we have that V is isomorphic to $\tilde{U}^{(j)} \#_r \tilde{U}^{(j+1)}$. Letting $\tilde{U}^{(i)} := U^{(i)}$ for $i \notin \{j, j+1\}$, we have that $(\tilde{U}^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ is an r -layering of U , and

$$\begin{aligned} m_{r,U}: (\tilde{U}^{(i)})_{i=1}^m &\mapsto (\tilde{x}^{(i)})_{i=1}^m = \\ &= (x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(j+1)}, x^{(j)}, \dots, x^{(m)}). \end{aligned}$$

Then $d((\tilde{x}^{(i)})_{i=1}^m, (y^{(i)})_{i=1}^m) < d((x^{(i)})_{i=1}^m, (y^{(i)})_{i=1}^m)$ and $(\tilde{x}^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ is in the image of $m_{r,U}$. We conclude by the inductive hypothesis. ■

Lemma 148. *Let U be a regular molecule, $r := \text{frdim } U$. If U is frame-acyclic, then U admits an r -layering.*

Proof. Since submolecules of frame-acyclic regular molecules are frame-acyclic, we can proceed by induction on submolecules. For all $x \in U_0$, we have $\text{frdim}\{x\} = -1$, and $\{x\}$ admits a trivial (-1) -layering, proving the base case.

We construct an ordered tree of submolecules $U^{(j_1, \dots, j_p)}$ of U , as follows:

- the root is $U^{(0)} := U$;
- if $\text{lydim} U^{(j_1, \dots, j_p)} \leq r$, then we let $U^{(j_1, \dots, j_p)}$ be a leaf;
- if $k := \text{lydim} U^{(j_1, \dots, j_p)} > r$, then we pick a k -layering $(V^{(i)})_{i=1}^q$ of $U^{(j_1, \dots, j_p)}$, which is possible by Theorem 77, and for each $i \in \{1, \dots, q\}$, we let the image of $V^{(i)}$ be a child $U^{(j_1, \dots, j_p, i)}$ of $U^{(j_1, \dots, j_p)}$.

By Lemma 139, the layering dimension of the children of a node is strictly smaller than that of the node, so the procedure terminates.

Fix an r -ordering $(x^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ of U ; this is possible because $\mathcal{M}_r U$ is acyclic. Let $V := U^{(j_1, \dots, j_p)}$ be a node of the tree. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcup_{j>r} (\text{Max } V)_j &= \sum_{i=1}^m \bigcup_{j>r} \left((\text{Max } V)_j \cap \text{cl} \{x^{(i)}\} \right) \\ &=: \sum_{i=1}^m M^{(i)}; \end{aligned}$$

the $M^{(i)}$ form a partition because $\text{frdim} U = r$, so every element of dimension $> r$ is in the closure of $x^{(i)}$ for a unique $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. We claim that V is isomorphic to

$$V^{(1)} \#_r \dots \#_r V^{(m)}$$

for some regular molecules $(V^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ with the following property: for each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, identifying $V^{(i)}$ with its image in V , we have

$$\bigcup_{j>r} (\text{Max } V^{(i)})_j = M^{(i)}.$$

We will prove this by backward induction on the tree $U^{(j_1, \dots, j_p)}$.

Suppose V is a leaf, so $\text{lydim} V \leq r$. Then V admits an r -layering. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, fix a topological sort $(y^{(i,j)})_{j=1}^{p_i}$ of the induced subgraph $\mathcal{M}_r V|_{M^{(i)}}$. We claim that $((y^{(i,j)})_{j=1}^{p_i})_{i=1}^m$ is an r -ordering of V .

Suppose there is an edge from x to x' in $\mathcal{M}_r V$. Then $x \in M^{(i)}$, $x' \in M^{(i')}$ for a unique pair $i, i' \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. If $i = i'$, then $x = y^{(i,j)}$ and $x' = y^{(i,j')}$ for some $j, j' \in \{1, \dots, p_i\}$, and $j < j'$ because $(y^{(i,j)})_{j=1}^{p_i}$ is a topological sort of $\mathcal{M}_r V|_{M^{(i)}}$. If $i \neq i'$, then there exists

$$z \in \Delta_r^+ x \cap \Delta_r^- x' \subseteq \text{cl} \{x^{(i)}\} \cap \text{cl} \{x^{(i')}\}.$$

Since $\partial_r^\alpha x^{(i)}$ and $\partial_r^\alpha x^{(i')}$ is pure and r -dimensional for all $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$, by [8, Proposition 6.4]

$$z \in (\Delta_r^+ x^{(i)} \cap \Delta_r^- x^{(i')}) \cup (\Delta_r^- x^{(i)} \cap \Delta_r^+ x^{(i')}),$$

and $\Delta_r^- x^{(i)} \cap \text{cl} \{x\} \subseteq \Delta_r^- x$ which is disjoint from $\Delta_r^+ x$, so $z \in \Delta_r^+ x^{(i)} \cap \Delta_r^- x^{(i')}$. It follows that there is an edge

from $x^{(i)}$ to $x^{(i')}$ in $\mathcal{M}_r U$, so $i < i'$ because $(x^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ is a topological sort of $\mathcal{M}_r U$. This proves that $((y^{(i,j)})_{j=1}^{p_i})_{i=1}^m$ is an r -ordering of V .

Let $W \sqsubseteq V$, $\ell := \text{frdim} W$. If $V \neq U$ or $W \neq U$, then W admits an ℓ -layering by the inductive hypothesis on proper submolecules of U . If $W = V = U$ then $\ell = r$ and W admits an ℓ -layering by Theorem 77. In either case, V satisfies the conditions of Lemma 147, and since $r \geq \text{lydim} V \geq \text{frdim} V$, every r -ordering of V comes from an r -layering of V .

It follows that $((y^{(i,j)})_{j=1}^{p_i})_{i=1}^m$ comes from an r -layering $((W^{(i,j)})_{j=1}^{p_i})_{i=1}^m$, and we can define

$$V^{(i)} := W^{(i,1)} \#_r \dots \#_r W^{(i,p_i)}$$

for each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, satisfying the desired condition.

Now, suppose that V is not a leaf, so $k := \text{lydim} V > r$, and V has children $(W^{(j)})_{j=1}^q$ forming a k -layering of V . By the inductive hypothesis, each of the $W^{(j)}$ has a decomposition

$$W^{(j,1)} \#_r \dots \#_r W^{(j,m)}$$

such that the maximal elements of dimension $> r$ in the image of $W^{(j,i)}$ are contained in $\text{cl} \{x^{(i)}\}$. Then, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and $j, j' \in \{1, \dots, q\}$,

$$W^{(j,i)} \cap W^{(j',i)} \subseteq W^{(j',i)},$$

so $V^{(i)} := W^{(1,i)} \#_k \dots \#_k W^{(q,i)}$ is defined. Using Proposition 39 repeatedly, we conclude that V is isomorphic to $V^{(1)} \#_r \dots \#_r V^{(m)}$.

This concludes the induction on $U^{(j_1, \dots, j_p)}$. In particular, for the root $U^{(0)} = U$, the decomposition $U^{(1)} \#_r \dots \#_r U^{(m)}$ satisfies

$$\bigcup_{j>r} (\text{Max } U^{(i)})_j = \{x^{(i)}\},$$

that is, $(U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ is an r -layering of U . ■

Proof of Theorem 102. The implication from (a) to (b) is a consequence of Lemma 148 together Lemma 73. The implication from (b) to (c) is Lemma 147. Finally, the implication from (c) to (a) follows from Proposition 80. ■

Proof of Lemma 108. Suppose U is acyclic. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and suppose there is a cycle $x_0 \rightarrow x_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow x_m = x_0$ in $\mathcal{F}_k U$. By definition, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ there exists $y_i \in \Delta_k^+ x_{i-1} \cap \Delta_k^- x_i$. By [7, Lemma 1.37], there exist paths from x_{i-1} to y_i and then from y_i to x_i in $\mathcal{H}U$. Concatenating all these paths, we obtain a cycle in $\mathcal{H}U$.

Suppose U is dimension-wise acyclic, and let $V \sqsubseteq U$ be a submolecule inclusion, $r := \text{frdim} V$. Then $\mathcal{F}_r U$ is acyclic, hence so are its induced subgraphs $\mathcal{F}_r V$ and $\mathcal{M}_r V$. ■

D. Proofs for Section IV

Proof of Lemma 115. We will show that U is isomorphic to

$$\underbrace{\text{arrow} \#_0 \dots \#_0 \text{arrow}}_{m \text{ times}}.$$

By Lemma 136, either $\text{lydim} U = -1$ or $\text{lydim} U = 0$. In the first case, U is an atom by Lemma 137. Because the point is

the only 0-dimensional molecule up to isomorphism, the arrow is the only 1-dimensional atom, so U is isomorphic to arrow. In the second case, U admits a 0-layering $(U^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ by Theorem 77, and by Lemma 139, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, necessarily $\text{lydim } U^{(i)} = -1$. By the first part, $U^{(i)}$ is isomorphic to arrow. ■

Proof of Proposition 117. This is [17, Proposition 5]. ■

149 (Horizontal and vertical order). Let U be a regular molecule, $\dim U \leq 2$. The *horizontal order* \preceq_0 and the *vertical order* \preceq_2 on the set U_1 of 1-dimensional elements of U are defined by

- $x \preceq_0 y$ if and only if there is a path from x to y in $\mathcal{H}U$ only passing through elements of dimension 0 and 1,
- $x \preceq_2 y$ if and only if there is a path from x to y in $\mathcal{H}U$ only passing through elements of dimension 1 and 2.

Lemma 150. Let U be a regular molecule, $\dim U \leq 2$. Then

- 1) the union of \preceq_0 and \preceq_2 is a linear order on U_1 ,
- 2) the intersection of \preceq_0 and \preceq_2 is the identity relation on U_1 .

Proof. If $\dim U < 2$, then \preceq_2 is trivially the identity relation, and \preceq_0 is a linear order by 115. If U is a 2-dimensional atom, then $U_1 = \Delta^-U + \Delta^+U$, and that \preceq_0 is a linear order on $\Delta^\alpha U$ for each $\alpha \in \{+, -\}$ separately, so we have $x \preceq_2 y$ for all $x \in \Delta^-U$ and $y \in \Delta^+U$, and no other relations exist.

Otherwise, we proceed exactly as in the proof of Proposition 117, defining a 1-ordering $(x^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ and a sequence $(V^{(i)})_{i=1}^m$ of increasing submolecules of U . We let $\preceq_0^{(i)}$ and $\preceq_2^{(i)}$ be the orders determined by paths in $\mathcal{H}V^{(i)}$, which are increasing in i , and proceed by induction. Since $\dim V^{(0)} = 1$, we have already proved the base case.

Let $i > 0$, assume that the statement holds of the orders $\preceq_0^{(i-1)}$ and $\preceq_2^{(i-1)}$ on $(V^{(i-1)})_1$. Let $x, y \in (V^{(i)})_1$; we will show that x and y are comparable via $\preceq_0^{(i)}$ or $\preceq_2^{(i)}$. If $x, y \in V^{(i-1)}$ or $x, y \in \text{cl}\{x^{(i)}\}$, we can apply the inductive hypothesis or the atom case, so it suffices to consider the case

$$x \in V^{(i-1)} \setminus \Delta^-x^{(i)}, \quad y \in \Delta^+x^{(i)}.$$

Let $(z^{(j)})_{j=1}^p$ be the unique linear 0-ordering on $\partial^-x^{(i)}$, so $z^{(j)} \preceq_0 z^{(j')}$ if $j \leq j'$. For all $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, we have $x \neq z^{(j)}$, and by the inductive hypothesis x and $z^{(j)}$ are comparable via $\preceq_0^{(i-1)}$ or they are comparable via $\preceq_2^{(i-1)}$.

- Suppose there exists j such that x and $z^{(j)}$ are comparable via $\preceq_2^{(i-1)}$. Then necessarily $x \preceq_2^{(i-1)} z^{(j)}$, because $\Delta^-x^{(i)} \subseteq \Delta^+V^{(i-1)}$. Since $z^{(j)} \preceq_2^{(i)} y$, we have $x \preceq_2^{(i)} y$.
- Otherwise, x and $z^{(j)}$ are comparable via $\preceq_0^{(i-1)}$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. Suppose that $x \preceq_0^{(i-1)} z^{(1)}$, in which case $x \preceq_0^{(i-1)} z^{(j)}$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. Then the path from x to $z^{(1)}$ through elements of dimension 0 and 1 must enter $z^{(1)}$ from $\partial^-z^{(1)} = \partial_0^-x^{(i)}$. Since there is a path in $\mathcal{H}V_i$ from $\partial_0^-x^{(i)}$ to y , we have $x \preceq_0^{(i)} y$.

- Otherwise, there is a greatest j such that $z^{(j)} \preceq_0^{(i-1)} x$. If $j < p$, then $z^{(j)} \preceq_0^{(i-1)} x \preceq_0^{(i-1)} z^{(j+1)}$. Because all three are distinct, letting $\partial^+z^{(j)} = \partial^-z^{(j+1)} = \{w\}$, there is a non-trivial cycle in $\mathcal{H}V^{(i-1)}$ from w to x and back to w , a contradiction to Proposition 117. It follows that $z^{(p)} \preceq_0^{(i-1)} x$, and the path between the two must leave $z^{(p)}$ through $\partial_0^+x^{(i)}$, so $y \preceq_0^{(i)} x$.

This proves that the union of $\preceq_0^{(i)}$ and $\preceq_2^{(i)}$ is a linear order on $(V^{(i)})_1$.

Suppose that $x \preceq_0^{(i)} y$ and $x \preceq_2^{(i)} y$; we will prove that $x = y$. If $x \in \text{cl}\{x^{(i)}\}$, then $x \preceq_2^{(i)} y$ implies that $y \in \text{cl}\{x^{(i)}\}$, and any path from x to y in $\mathcal{H}V^{(i)}$ is entirely contained in $\text{cl}\{x^{(i)}\}$, so we can apply the atom case. Suppose that $x \notin \text{cl}\{x^{(i)}\}$.

If $y \in \Delta^+x^{(i)}$, then any path from x to y through elements of dimension 1 and 2 consists of a path contained in $V^{(i-1)}$ to some $z \in \Delta^-x^{(i)}$ followed by the path $z \rightarrow x^{(i)} \rightarrow y$; while any path through elements of dimension 0 and 1 consists of a path contained in $V^{(i-1)}$ to $\partial_0^-x^{(i)}$ followed by a path contained in $\partial^+x^{(i)}$. Since there is a path from $\partial_0^-x^{(i)}$ to any $z \in \Delta^-x^{(i)}$ through elements of dimension 0 and 1 in $V^{(i-1)}$, we have that $x \preceq_0^{(i-1)} z$ and $x \preceq_2^{(i-1)} z$ for some $z \in \Delta^-x^{(i)}$. By the inductive hypothesis, $x = z$, a contradiction since $z \in \text{cl}\{x^{(i)}\}$.

It follows that $y \in V^{(i-1)}$. Then any path from x to y through elements of dimension 1 and 2 is entirely contained in $V^{(i-1)}$, so $x \preceq_2^{(i-1)} y$; while a path through elements of dimension 0 and 1 is either contained in $V^{(i-1)}$, or it enters $\partial^+x^{(i)}$ through $\partial_0^-x^{(i)}$, traverses it in its entirety, and leaves from $\partial_0^+x^{(i)}$. Such a path segment can be replaced with the one that traverses $\partial^-x^{(i)}$ in its entirety, so in either case $x \preceq_0^{(i-1)} y$, and we conclude that $x = y$ by the inductive hypothesis. This concludes the proof of the statement for $V^{(i)}$. Since $V^{(m)} = U$, we conclude. ■

Proof of Lemma 118. Both U and $\iota(V)$ are regular molecules of dimension ≤ 2 . Let \preceq_0, \preceq_2 be the horizontal and vertical order on U , and \preceq_0^V, \preceq_2^V those on $\iota(V)$, which are subsets of those on U .

Suppose by way of contradiction that \mathcal{F}_1V is not path-induced. Then there exists a path $x_0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow x_m$ in \mathcal{F}_1U such that $m > 1$, $x_0, x_m \in \iota(V)$, and $x_i \notin \iota(V)$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$. By definition, there exist 1-dimensional elements $y_i \in \Delta^+x_{i-1} \cap \Delta^-x_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Then $y_1 \preceq_2 y_m$ and $y_1 \neq y_m$. By Lemma 60, x_{i-1} and x_i are the only cofaces of y_i for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Necessarily, then, $y_1 \in \Delta^+\iota(V)$ and $y_m \in \Delta^-\iota(V)$, so it is not possible that $y_1 \preceq_2^V y_m$. Then by Lemma 150 applied to $\iota(V)$, one of $y_1 \preceq_0^V y_m, y_m \preceq_0^V y_1$, or $y_m \preceq_2^V y_1$ must hold. Combined with $y_1 \preceq_2 y_m$, each one of these implies $y_1 = y_m$ by Lemma 150 applied to U , a contradiction. ■

Proof of Theorem 121. By [17, Theorem 1] U is frame-acyclic. Since for all $V \sqsubseteq U$ and all rewritable $W \sqsubseteq V$, $V[\langle W \rangle/W]$ is still a regular molecule of dimension ≤ 3 , it is frame-acyclic. Hence U is stably frame-acyclic. ■