

# Sparse Incidence Geometries and Pebble Game Algorithms

Signe Lundqvist, Tovohery Randrianarisoa, Klara Stokes  
and Joannes Vermant

Department of Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics  
Umeå University, Umeå, 901 87, Sweden

8 June 2023

## Abstract

In this paper we define sparsity and tightness of rank 2 incidence geometries, and we develop an algorithm which recognises these properties. We give examples from rigidity theory where such sparsity conditions are of interest. Under certain conditions, this algorithm also allows us to find a maximum size subgeometry which is tight. This work builds on so-called pebble game algorithms for graphs and hypergraphs. The main difference compared to the previously studied hypergraph case is that in this paper, the sparsity and tightness are defined in terms of incidences, and not in terms of edges. This difference makes our algorithm work not only for uniform hypergraphs, but for all hypergraphs.

Keywords: incidence geometry, pebble game algorithm, sparse, tight  
2000 MSC: 52C25, 52-08

## 1 Introduction

Generic rigidity of graphs in the plane is a well-studied topic in rigidity theory. A graph  $G = (V, E)$  is  $(k, l)$ -sparse if  $|E'| \leq k|V(E')| - l$  for all subsets  $E' \subseteq E$ . The graph  $G$  is  $(k, l)$ -tight if it is  $(k, l)$ -sparse and  $|E| = k|V| - l$ . These notions are of high interest as they are related to the rigidity of graphs. In

fact, it is a well-known result in rigidity theory that a graph is generically rigid in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  if and only if  $G$  has a  $(2, 3)$ -tight spanning subgraph [3, 5]. There are several algorithms for finding  $(2, 3)$ -tight spanning subgraphs, one of which is the pebble game algorithm, which was introduced by Jacobs and Hendrickson [2].

In this paper, we introduce pebble game algorithms for sparse incidence geometries of rank 2. Suppose that  $\Gamma = (P, L, I)$  is an incidence geometry of rank 2, and let  $(\lambda, k_1, k_2, l) \in \mathbb{N}^4$ . We define the incidence geometry  $\Gamma$  to be  $(\lambda, k_1, k_2, l)$ -sparse if for every nonempty subset of  $I' \subseteq I$  it holds that

$$\lambda|I'| \leq k_1|P(I')| + k_2|L(I')| - l,$$

where  $P(I') \times L(I')$  is the support of  $I'$ . We say that  $\Gamma$  is  $(\lambda, k_1, k_2, l)$ -tight if  $\Gamma$  is sparse and

$$\lambda|I| = k_1|P| + k_2|L| - l.$$

The algorithm that we present recognises whether an incidence geometry is sparse or tight. Furthermore, we prove that if  $\lambda = 1$ , the tight incidence geometries are the bases of a matroid, and in this case we can extend the algorithm to find a maximal tight subgeometry. For almost all of the proofs, the approach is analogous to that in [4, 7].

The paper is organised as follows. A common situation in rigidity theory is that some sparsity condition on a combinatorial structure characterises some geometric property. In Section 1.1, we give some examples where such a sparsity count on the incidences of an incidence geometry gives interesting characterisations. In Section 1.2 we give a short summary of further generalisations of the pebble game. In Section 2, we give an algorithm that can test whether an incidence geometry is sparse or tight. In Section 3, we prove that if  $\lambda=1$ , then the  $(1, k_1, k_2, l)$ -sparse graphs are the independent sets of a matroid, and give an algorithm for finding a maximum size  $(1, k_1, k_2, l)$ -sparse subgeometry. Finally, in Section 4, we briefly compare our notion of sparsity to the existing notion of sparsity for hypergraphs. We also compare our pebble game algorithm to existing pebble game algorithms.

## 1.1 Motivation

A rank 2 incidence geometry is a triple, consisting of a set of points  $P$ , a set of lines  $L$ , and a set of incidences  $I \subseteq P \times L$ . In various contexts related

to rigidity theory there are matroids on the incidences of a rank 2 incidence geometry.

The  $k$ -plane matroid, introduced by Whiteley [8], is a matroid with ground set  $A \times B$ , for some sets  $A$  and  $B$ . A set  $I \subseteq A \times B$  is independent if for any subset  $I' \subseteq I$  it holds that:

$$|I'| \leq |A(I')| + k|B(I')| - k$$

where  $A(I') \times B(I') \subseteq A \times B$  is the support of  $I$ , i.e.

$$A(I') = \{a \in A \mid \exists i \in I', i = (a, b)\}$$

and

$$B(I') = \{b \in B \mid \exists i \in I', i = (a, b)\}.$$

The bases of this matroid have exactly

$$|I| = |A| + k|B| - k$$

incidences.

Let  $\Gamma = (P, L, I)$  be an incidence geometry. The  $k$ -plane matroid defined on the set  $P \times L$ , where  $A = P$  and  $B = L$ , has applications in scene analysis. More specifically, the lifting matrix, which has as its kernel the  $k$ -dimensional scenes over a given  $(k-1)$ -picture of an incidence geometry  $\Gamma$ , has independent rows if and only if  $I$  is independent in the  $k$ -plane matroid with  $P = A$  and  $L = B$  [8].

We can also consider the dual situation, where  $P = B$  and  $L = A$ . The matrix that has as its kernel the  $d$ -dimensional parallel redrawings of an incidence geometry  $\Gamma$  has independent rows if and only if  $\Gamma$  is independent in the dual  $k$ -plane matroid with  $P = B$  and  $L = A$ .

Another case which has been studied is that of rod configurations. A rod configuration is a realisation of an incidence geometry  $\Gamma$  as points and lines in the plane such that any motion of the points and lines preserves the distance between any two collinear points. A rod configuration is rigid if the only motions of the points and lines are rotations and translations. A rod configuration is minimally rigid if no incidence can be removed without the rod configuration becoming flexible - i.e. a rod configuration is minimally rigid if all distance constraints between the points are necessary for the rod configuration to be rigid. Whiteley proved that an incidence geometry  $\Gamma =$

$(P, L, I)$  has a realisation as a minimally rigid rod configuration if and only if

$$2|I| = 2|P| + 3|L| - 3$$

and

$$2|I'| \leq 2|P(I')| + 3|L(I')| - 3$$

for all subsets  $I' \subseteq I$ , where  $P(I') \times L(I')$  is the support of  $I'$  [8].

In a recent work, two of the authors of the current article introduced an approach to rigidity based on group theory and graphs of groups, which generalises both of the above cases [6].

Suppose that we are given a geometric realisation of an incidence geometry, and we want to study the ways in which this realisation can move while respecting various constraints. If these constraints are invariant under the action of a group  $G$ , then we can define motions of the structure solely in terms of the group. When  $G$  is a Lie group, the corresponding Lie algebra allows to generalise the notion of Euclidean infinitesimal motions. Within this context, in [6] we defined an analogue to the so-called Maxwell count. Denoting the space of all infinitesimal motions by  $M$ , we proved the following lower bound on the dimension of the infinitesimal motions:

$$\dim(M) \geq \sum_{x \in X} \dim(G/\rho(x)) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \dim(G/\rho(i)) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \sum_{x \in i} \dim(G/\rho(x)),$$

where  $\rho(p)$ ,  $\rho(l)$  and  $\rho(p * l)$  are stabilisers of realisations of points, lines and incidences respectively under a smooth group action. If  $\rho(p)$  has the same dimension for all points,  $\rho(l)$  has the same dimension for all lines, and  $\rho(p * l)$  has the same dimension for all incidences, such counts simplify to a count of the form:

$$\dim(M) \geq k_1|V| + k_2|L| - \lambda|I|.$$

The intuition behind this formula is that adding incidences generally removes  $\lambda$  degrees of freedom from the structure. In some cases, there will be dependencies, which will remove fewer degrees of freedom.

We may also define a notion of sparsity of an incidence geometry, related to the Maxwell type bound on the dimension of the infinitesimal motions.

Suppose all motions of  $\Gamma$  were to be trivial, in the sense that they come from the group  $G$ , so that  $\dim(M) = \dim(G)$ . In this case, we see that

$$\lambda|I| \geq k_1|V| + k_2|L| - \dim(G).$$

Suppose that we are given an incidence geometry which only has trivial motions with a minimum amount of incidences, in the sense that

$$\lambda|I| = k_1|V| + k_2|L| - \dim(G),$$

then, for every subset  $I' \subseteq I$  with

$$\bigcap_{x \in I'} \mathfrak{h}_x = \{0\},$$

where  $\mathfrak{h}_x$  is the Lie algebra of the group at  $x$ , one has:

$$\lambda|I'| \leq k_1|V(I')| + k_2|L(I')| - \dim(G).$$

In this last equation  $P(I') \times L(I')$  is the support of  $I'$ . If

$$\bigcap_{x \in I'} \mathfrak{h}_x = \{0\},$$

for every nonempty subset  $I' \subseteq I$ , this condition is precisely the sparsity condition. In this way, we see that the 'minimally rigid' incidence geometries are tight incidence geometries under a condition on the intersection of the Lie algebras.

## 1.2 Sparse Graphs and Pebble Game Algorithms

The pebble game algorithm, introduced by Jacobs and Hendrickson, is an algorithm for determining whether a graph has a  $(2, 3)$ -tight spanning subgraph [2]. The pebble game algorithm takes as its input a graph  $G$ , and outputs a maximum size  $(2, 3)$ -sparse subgraph. In particular, the algorithm can decide whether the input graph has a  $(2, 3)$ -tight spanning subgraph. The  $(2, 3)$ -tight graphs on  $n$  vertices are the bases of a matroid on the edges of the complete graph on  $n$  vertices. Another algorithm that can extract a  $(2, 3)$ -tight subgraph was introduced by Gabow and Westerman [1].

For  $l \geq 2k$ , only the empty graph is  $(k, l)$ -sparse. For  $l < 0$ ,  $(k, l)$ -sparsity does not behave well with respect to unions, in the sense that the union of two vertex disjoint sparse graphs is not necessarily sparse. Therefore,  $(k, l)$ -sparse graphs are primarily interesting to consider when  $l \in [0, 2k)$ .

Lee and Streinu introduced a family of  $(k, l)$ -pebble game algorithms that recognise exactly the  $(k, l)$ -sparse multigraphs, for  $l \in [0, 2k)$  [4]. Lee and Streinu show that the  $(k, l)$ -sparse multigraphs on  $n$  vertices are the independent sets of a matroid on the edges of the complete multigraph on  $n$  vertices. The set of bases of this matroid is the set of  $(k, l)$ -tight multigraphs on  $n$  vertices.

Later, Streinu and Theran generalised the  $(k, l)$ -pebble game algorithms to  $r$ -uniform hypergraphs, defining a hypergraph to be  $(k, l)$ -sparse if all subsets  $V'$  of vertices span at most  $k|V'| - l$  edges [7]. They consider parameters  $k$  and  $l$  such that  $0 \leq l \leq kr - 1$ , where  $r$  is the number of vertices in each edge. The  $(k, l)$ -sparse hypergraphs with  $n$  vertices also form the independent sets of a matroid, whenever  $(k, l)$ -sparse  $r$ -uniform hypergraphs with  $n$  vertices exist [4, 9]. The  $(k, l)$ -tight hypergraphs on  $n$  vertices are the bases of this matroid.

The fact that the  $(k, l)$ -sparse multigraphs and hypergraphs form the independent sets of matroids is crucial to the pebble game algorithm, where an independent set of edges is found by considering the edges in any order, and an edge is added to the independent set if it is independent of the previously considered edges. Building an independent set in this way (that is, greedily) is only guaranteed to give a maximum size independent set if the independent sets form a matroid.

Given the notions of sparsity and tightness of incidence geometries introduced in Section 1.1, it is natural to consider an analogous pebble game algorithm for incidence geometries. The pebble game algorithm introduced in this paper generalises previously introduced pebble games for determining sparsity of graphs and hypergraphs to rank two incidence geometries.

## 2 Algorithm for rank 2 Geometries

The notions of sparsity and tightness are generalised to incidence geometries as follows.

**Definition 1.** *Let  $\Gamma = (P, L, I)$  be an incidence geometry of rank 2, and let  $\lambda, k_1, k_2$  and  $l$  be integers in  $\mathbb{N}$ . The incidence geometry  $\Gamma$  is defined to be  $(\lambda, k_1, k_2, l)$ -sparse if for every nonempty subset of  $I' \subseteq I$  it holds that*

$$\lambda|I'| \leq k_1|P(I')| + k_2|L(I')| - l,$$

where  $P' = P(I') \times L' = L(I')$  is the support  $I'$ .

We say that  $\Gamma$  is  $(\lambda, k_1, k_2, l)$ -tight if  $\Gamma$  is sparse and

$$\lambda|I| = k_1|P| + k_2|L| - l.$$

We simply say that  $\Gamma$  is sparse (or tight) if the parameters are understood.

As a remark, we notice  $\Gamma$  is sparse if and only if for every subset  $I' = I \cap (P' \times L')$ , for some  $P' \subseteq P$  and  $L' \subseteq L$ , one has:

$$\lambda|I'| \leq k_1|P(I')| + k_2|L(I')| - l.$$

Indeed, for every subset  $I^* \subseteq I'$ , which is incident to the same points and lines as  $I'$ , one only decreases the left hand side of the inequality, so if the inequality is valid for  $I'$ , it will also be valid for  $I^*$ .

As in [4] and [7], we develop a pebble game for such incidence geometries.

In our setting, we assume that

$$k_1 + k_2 - \lambda \geq l. \tag{1}$$

Under this condition, we can check whether a incidence geometry is  $(\lambda, k_1, k_2, l)$ -sparse or tight. Since we can always reduce to the case where  $\gcd(\lambda, k_1, k_2, l) = 1$ , we can assume this without loss of generality.

For an incidence geometry  $\Gamma = (P, L, I)$ , define  $I_\lambda(\Gamma)$  to be the multigraph constructed by taking the incidence graph of  $\Gamma$ , and copying each edge  $\lambda$  times. If  $\Gamma$  is understood, we simply write  $I_\lambda$ . In other words,  $V(I_\lambda(\Gamma)) = P \cup L$ , and the edge set is given by;

$$E(I_\lambda(\Gamma)) = \{(p, l, i) \in P \times L \times \{1, \dots, \lambda\} \mid (p, l) \in I\},$$

where the endpoints of an edge  $(p, l, i)$  are  $p$  and  $l$ . For  $v \in V(I_\lambda(\Gamma))$ , set  $\tau(v) = 1$  if  $v$  is a ‘‘point’’, and set  $\tau(v) = 2$  if  $v$  is a ‘‘line’’.

We now describe the pebble game. The input of the algorithm is a rank 2 incidence geometry  $\Gamma$ .

During the pebble game, we maintain the following data:

- The multigraph  $I_\lambda(\Gamma)$ .
- A directed multigraph  $D$ , with  $V(D) = V(I_\lambda(\Gamma))$ , and with edge set being a subset of  $E(I_\lambda(\Gamma))$ . We call the edges of  $D$  as *accepted* edges.
- For each vertex  $v \in V(D)$ , we store a natural number  $\text{peb}(v)$ , representing a number of ‘pebbles’.

The algorithm is initialised as follows:

- Let  $E(D) = \emptyset$ .
- For each vertex  $v \in V(D)$ , set  $\text{peb}(v) = k_{\tau(v)}$ . In other words, set  $\text{peb}(v) = k_1$  if  $v$  is a “point”, and  $\text{peb}(v) = k_2$  if  $v$  is a “line”.

At any point in time we can make one of the following moves.:

- **Accept-Edge**( $e$ ): If  $e = (v, w, i)$  is an edge in  $I_\lambda(\Gamma)$  which is not in  $D$ , and  $\text{peb}(v) + \text{peb}(w) > l$ , either remove a pebble from  $v$ , add  $(v, w, i)$  to  $D$  and orient the edge from  $v$  to  $w$ , or remove a pebble from  $w$ , add  $(v, w, i)$  to  $D$  and orient the edge from  $w$  to  $v$ .
- **Move-Pebble**( $v \leftarrow w$ ): A depth-first search algorithm is done to search for a directed path whose source is  $v$  and whose end point  $w$  contain a pebble. If there exists an oriented path  $(v \dots w) = (v, v_1, \dots, v_n, w)$  of edges in  $D$  from  $v$  to  $w$ , and if  $\text{peb}(w) > 0$ , add a pebble to  $v$ , remove a pebble from  $w$  and change the orientation for every edge in  $(v \dots w)$ .

We can then describe the pebble game algorithm in pseudocode in Algorithm 1.

The following example explains how the algorithm works.

**Example 1** We consider the incidence geometry  $\Gamma = (P, L, I)$  described in Figure 1, consisting of  $|I| = 3$  incidences from  $|P| = 2$  points and  $L = 2$  lines. Let  $\lambda = k_1 = 2$  and  $k_2 = l = 3$ . We have:

$$6 = \lambda|I| \leq k_1|P| + k_2|L| - l = 7$$

which means that the incidence geometry is sparse but not tight. The initial state of  $D$  is given by Figure 2a, each vertex is labelled with the number of pebbles at the vertex. At each step, for the edge being processed, we always have at least 5 pebbles in total. This allows us to accept two edges while removing two pebbles from the source. At the end, in Figure 2d, all edges are accepted and we have 4 pebbles left. Therefore, as expected, the algorithm concludes that the incidence geometry is sparse but not tight, as there are more than  $l$  remaining pebbles.



---

**Algorithm 1** Pebble game on Incidence graph

---

**Input:** An incidence geometry  $\Gamma$ **Output:** sparsity and/or tightness of  $\Gamma$ 

---

```
for all incidences  $(v, w)$  do
  for  $e = (v, w, i) \in E(I_\lambda)$  associated to the incidence  $(v, w)$  do
    while  $(v, w, i)$  not processed do
      if  $p(v) + p(w) > l$  then
        Accept-Edge $(e)$ .
         $e$  has been processed.
      else
        search for a directed path  $(v' \dots u)$ ,  $v' \in \{v, w\}$ ,  $\{v', u\} \neq \{v, w\}$ , such that  $\text{peb}(u) > 0$ 
        if  $(v' \dots u)$  with  $\text{peb}(u) > 0$  has been found then
          Move-Pebble $(v' \leftarrow u)$ .
        else
          return :  $\Gamma$  is not sparse.
        end if
      end if
    end while
  end for
end for
if  $\sum_{v \in V} \text{peb}(v) = l$  then
  return  $\Gamma$  is tight.
else
  return  $\Gamma$  is sparse, but not tight.
end if
```

---




Figure 1: Incidence graph of the incidence geometry

**Complexity** Suppose that the algorithm terminates after accepting  $\lambda\epsilon + \lambda'$  edges, where  $\epsilon$  is the number of fully “accepted” incidences and  $\lambda'$  is the




Figure 2: Multigraph  $D$  at each step of the algorithm applied to the incidence geometry of Figure 1

number of edges from the last partially accepted edge. For each edge, at most  $l + 1$  depth-first searches are done through an oriented graph  $D$  to collect enough pebbles. The size of  $D$  increases for each additional step but if we use the whole incidence graph as an upper bound, in total the time complexity is given by

$$\mathcal{O}((\lambda\epsilon + \lambda')(l + 1)(|P| + |L| + \lambda\epsilon + \lambda')).$$

In the worst case, this time complexity is approximately

$$\mathcal{O}(\lambda|I|(|P| + |L| + \lambda|I|)).$$

On the storage side, only a directed graph is stored with  $|P| + |L| + |I|$  data from the incidence geometry and an additional  $\lambda\epsilon + \lambda'$  for the orientations of accepted edges. This gives a complexity

$$\mathcal{O}(\lambda|I| + |P| + |L|).$$

## 2.1 Invariants of the algorithm

For every subset  $V \subseteq P \cup L$ , define the following quantities.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{peb}(V) &:= \sum_{v \in V} \text{peb}(v), \\ \text{span}(V) &:= \#\{e \in D \mid o(e) \in v \text{ and } t(e) \in V\}, \\ \text{out}(V) &:= \#\{e \in D \mid o(e) \in v \text{ and } t(e) \notin V\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $o(e)$  is source of an oriented edge  $e$ , and  $t(e)$  is the target. If  $V = \{v\}$ , we write  $\text{out}(v)$  instead of  $\text{out}(\{v\})$ .

**Lemma 2.** *The following are invariants of the algorithm:*

1. For all  $v \in V$ , one has  $\text{peb}(v) + \text{out}(v) = k_{\tau(v)}$ .
2. Suppose that  $V = A \cup B$ , for some subsets  $A \subseteq P$  and  $B \subseteq L$ . Then  $\text{peb}(V) + \text{span}(V) + \text{out}(V) = k_1|A| + k_2|B|$ .
3. Suppose that  $V = A \cup B$ , for some nonempty subsets  $A \subseteq P$  and  $B \subseteq L$ . Then  $\text{peb}(V) + \text{out}(V) \geq l$ .
4. Suppose that  $V = A \cup B$ , for some nonempty subsets  $A \subseteq P$  and  $B \subseteq L$ . Then  $\text{span}(V) \leq k_1|A| + k_2|B| - l$ .

*Proof.* To prove the first point, let  $v \in V$ . At the start of the algorithm,  $\text{peb}(v) = k_{\tau(v)}$ , and  $\text{out}(v) = 0$ , since  $E(D) = \emptyset$ . Suppose that after  $m$  steps, we have  $\text{peb}(v) + \text{out}(v) = k_{\tau(v)}$ . At the  $m$ -th step, we can either accept an edge, move pebbles, or end the algorithm. Let us verify all cases where we accept an edge or move a pebble. If  $P$  is a path which starts at  $v$  and ends at some  $w$  with  $\text{peb}(w) > 0$ , then after moving the pebble,  $\text{peb}(v)$  has increased by 1 and  $\text{out}(v)$  has decreased by 1, since the path has changed direction. If  $P$  is a path which starts at some  $w \in P \cup L$  and ends at  $v$  with  $\text{peb}(w) > 0$ , then after moving a pebble,  $\text{peb}(v)$  has decreased by 1 and  $\text{out}(v)$  has increased by 1. For any other path, if we move a pebble,  $\text{peb}(v)$  and  $\text{out}(v)$  remain the same. If we have added an edge, with source  $v$ , then  $\text{peb}(v)$  has decreased by 1 and  $\text{out}(v)$  has increased by 1. If an edge is added with sources different from  $v$ , both  $\text{out}(v)$  and  $\text{peb}(v)$  remain unchanged.

Let us now turn to the second point. Thus let  $V = A \cup B$ , for some subsets  $A \subseteq P$  and  $B \subseteq L$ . We remark that

$$\sum_{v \in V} \text{out}(v) = \text{span}(V) + \text{out}(V).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{peb}(v) + \text{span}(V) + \text{out}(V) &= \sum_{v \in V} (\text{out}(v) + \text{peb}(v)) \\ &= \sum_{v \in A} (\text{out}(v) + \text{peb}(v)) + \sum_{v \in B} (\text{out}(v) + \text{peb}(v)) \\ &= k_1|A| + k_2|B|. \end{aligned}$$

Now for the third point. Let  $A, B$  be nonempty subsets of  $P$  and  $L$  respectively. If we are at the first step of the algorithm, then we have at least  $k_1$  pebbles in  $A$  and  $k_2$  pebbles in  $B$ . Then, since

$$k_1 + k_2 > l,$$

there are more than  $l$  pebbles in  $V = A \cup B$ ,

$$\text{peb}(V) + \text{out}(V) = \text{peb}(V) \geq l.$$

Now, suppose the algorithm has run for  $m$  steps. We analyse the various cases. If in the last step, an edge was accepted with endpoints in  $V$ , there must have been at least  $l + 1$  pebbles in  $V$  before the edge was accepted, and thus  $\text{peb}(V) + \text{out}(V) \geq l$ . If in the last step, an edge was accepted, with endpoint not in  $V$ , then  $\text{peb}(V) + \text{out}(V)$  remains invariant. By checking all cases, we also see that if a pebble is moved,  $\text{peb}(V) + \text{out}(V)$  remains invariant. Hence, whatever happens in the algorithm, we see that  $\text{peb}(V) + \text{out}(V) \geq l$ .

The fourth point follows immediately from the third and second invariant:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{span}(V) &= k_1|A| + k_2|B| - \text{out}(V) - \text{peb}(V) \\ &\leq k_1|A| + k_2|B| - l. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Corollary 3.** *Let  $\Gamma = (P, L, I)$  be a rank 2 incidence geometry. If all edges associated to an incidence in  $\Gamma$  are accepted in the pebble game, then  $\Gamma$  is sparse.*

*If there are exactly  $l$  pebbles left in the graph, then  $\Gamma$  is tight.*

*Proof.* Let  $I'$  be a set of incidences. Let

$$A = \{x \in P \mid x \in i \text{ for some incidence } i \in I'\},$$

and

$$B = \{x \in L \mid x \in i \text{ for some incidence } i \in I'\}.$$

By assumption, all edges in  $I_\lambda(\Gamma)$  are accepted, and there are  $\lambda$  edges for each incidence. Thus, by invariant 4 in the lemma above we see that:

$$\lambda|I'| = \text{span}(A \cup B) \leq k_1|A| + k_2|B| - l.$$

This precisely means that  $\Gamma$  is sparse. If there are exactly  $l$  pebbles left at the end of the algorithm we see by the second invariant applied to  $V = P \cup L$ , that

$$\text{span}(V) + l = k_1|P| + k_2|L|,$$

since  $\text{out}(V) = 0$  and  $\text{peb}(V) = l$ . This implies that  $\Gamma$  is sparse.  $\square$

We have now shown that if every incidence in  $\Gamma$  is accepted in the pebble game, then  $\Gamma$  is sparse. Now we show the converse, namely that if  $\Gamma$  is sparse, then every edge of  $I_\lambda(\Gamma)$  will be accepted.

In the following proof, we need to define the notion of the *Reach* of a vertex in an oriented graph  $D$ . Let

$$\text{Reach}(v) := \{w \in V(D) \mid \text{there exists an oriented path from } v \text{ to } w\}.$$

Note that in particular  $v \in \text{Reach}(v)$ , by taking the empty path.

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $D$  be the set of edges we accepted so far and let  $I_D$  be set of all incidences having at least one edge in  $D$ . Suppose that  $i_0 \in I_D$  such that*

- *for all  $i \neq i_0$ , all edges associated to  $i$  are in  $D$ ,*
- *some edge associated to  $i_0$  is not in  $D$ .*

*If  $I_D$  is sparse, then we can accept all edges associated to  $i_0$ .*

*Proof.* We show that if we are in this situation, we can always accept an edge, and thus all edges can be accepted by induction.

Let  $i_0 = (uv)$ , where  $u$  is a point and  $v$  is a line. If there are more than  $l$  pebbles at  $u$  and  $v$  together, we can add a new edge and remove a pebble. So,

we may assume that  $\text{peb}(u) + \text{peb}(v) < l + 1$ . Let  $V = \text{Reach}(u) \cup \text{Reach}(v)$ . Since  $I_D$  is sparse,  $\text{span}(V) < k_1|V \cap P| + k_2|V \cap L| - l$ . Note that  $V \cap P$  and  $V \cap L$  are nonempty since  $u \in V \cap P$  and  $v \in V \cap L$ . By the definition of  $\text{Reach}$ ,  $\text{out}(V) = 0$  and by invariant 2 in Lemma 2,

$$\text{span}(V) + \text{peb}(V) = k_1|V \cap P| + k_2|V \cap L|$$

and thus

$$\text{peb}(V) > l.$$

Hence, there is a point/line  $w$  in  $V$  such that  $w \notin \{v, u\}$  with at least one pebble left. Since it is reachable by either  $v$  or  $u$ , we can move that pebble while changing the direction of the path. Repeat this process until we get enough pebbles together at  $u$  and  $v$  so that we can accept a new edge and add it to  $D$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 5.** *Let  $\Gamma = (P, L, I)$  be an incidence geometry. Given parameters  $\lambda, k_1, k_2, l$  such that  $k_1 + k_2 - \lambda \geq l$ . If  $\Gamma$  is sparse, then the pebble game accepts all edges of  $I_\lambda(\Gamma)$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 4, every incidence will be accepted by the pebble game.  $\square$

### 3 Matroidal properties of $(\lambda, k_1, k_2, l)$ -sparsity.

Although we now have an algorithm which recognises whether an incidence geometry is sparse or not, we are not necessarily able to use this algorithm to greedily build a maximum size sparse subgeometry of a given incidence geometry, which is possible for the classical pebble games. The property which makes this possible is the fact that sparse graphs form the independent sets of a matroid. Therefore, in this section, we consider whether or not we get a matroid, depending on the values of  $(\lambda, k_1, k_2, l)$ . We will need the following lemma, for which we need the following terminology. A subgeometry of an incidence geometry  $\Gamma = (P, L, I)$ , is an incidence geometry  $\Lambda = (P', L', I')$  such that  $P' \subseteq P, L' \subseteq L$  and  $I \subseteq I'$ . A block of an incidence geometry  $\Gamma = (P, L, I)$ , is a tight subgeometry  $B = (P', L', I)$ .

**Lemma 6.** *Given two blocks  $B_1 = (P_1, L_1, I_1), B_2 = (P_2, L_2, I_2)$  of a sparse incidence geometry  $\Gamma = (P, L, I)$ . If  $P_1 \cap P_2$  and  $L_1 \cap L_2$  are nonempty, then*

$B_1 \cap B_2$  and  $B_1 \cup B_2$  are also blocks, where these subgeometries are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} I_\cup &:= \{i \in I \mid i \in (P_1 \cup P_2) \times (L_1 \cup L_2)\} \\ I_\cap &:= \{i \in I \mid i \in (P_1 \cap P_2) \times (L_1 \cap L_2)\} \\ B_1 \cup B_2 &:= (P_1 \cup P_2, L_1 \cup L_2, I_\cup) \\ B_1 \cap B_2 &:= (P_1 \cap P_2, L_1 \cap L_2, I_\cap). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* For any subset of  $I' \subseteq I_\cup$  or any subset of  $I_\cap$ , sparsity holds by sparsity of  $\Gamma$ , thus we only need to show that  $I_\cap$  and  $I_\cup$  have the desired cardinality. We compute

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda|I_\cup| &\geq \lambda(|I_1| + |I_2| - |I_\cap|) \\ &= k_1(|P_1| + |P_2|) + k_2(|L_1| + |L_2|) - 2l - \lambda|I_\cap| \\ &\geq k_1(|P_1| + |P_2| - |P_1 \cap P_2|) + k_2(|L_1| + |L_2| - |L_1 \cap L_2|) - l \\ &= k_1(|P_1 \cup P_2|) + k_2(|L_1 \cup L_2|) - l, \end{aligned}$$

where we apply sparsity of  $\Gamma$  to  $I_\cap$  to get the third line from the second. By sparsity of  $\Gamma$ , it also holds that

$$\lambda|I_\cup| \leq k_1(|P_1 \cup P_2|) + k_2(|L_1 \cup L_2|) - l,$$

and thus we have

$$\lambda|I_\cup| = k_1(|P_1 \cup P_2|) + k_2(|L_1 \cup L_2|) - l.$$

Thus  $B_1 \cup B_2$  is tight, and every inequality in the computation above is necessarily an equality. Thus, for  $B_1 \cap B_2$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda|I_\cap| &= \lambda(|I_1| + |I_2| - |I_\cup|) \\ &= k_1(|P_1| + |P_2| - |P_1 \cup P_2|) + k_2(|L_1| + |L_2| - |L_1 \cup L_2|) - l \\ &= k_1(|P_1 \cap P_2|) + k_2(|L_1 \cap L_2|) - l. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the claim.  $\square$

**Lemma 7.** *Suppose that*

$$l \leq k_2 + k_1 - 1.$$

*Suppose that  $n \geq k_2, m \geq k_1$  are integers such that*

$$nm \geq k_1n + k_2m - l. \tag{2}$$

*Then, there exists a  $(1, k_1, k_2, l)$ -tight incidence geometry with  $a_0$  points and  $b_0$  lines, where  $k_2 \leq a_0 \leq n$  and  $k_1 \leq b_0 \leq m$ .*

*Proof.* Note that in any incidence geometry, there are at most  $|P||L|$  incidences. Hence, to get a tight incidence geometry, we need the following bound on the points and lines:

$$|P||L| \geq k_1|P| + k_2|L| - l.$$

Note that the function

$$f(x, y) = xy - k_1x - k_2y + l$$

is increasing as a function of  $x$  for all  $y > k_1$  and similarly, for all  $x > k_2$  it is increasing as a function of  $y$ . Moreover, if  $1 \leq c$ , and  $y \leq k_1$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} f(c, y) &= cy - k_1c - k_2y + l \\ &= (y - k_1 - k_2y + l) + (c - 1)y - (c - 1)k_1 \\ &= f(1, y) + (c - 1)(y - k_1). \end{aligned}$$

which is non-increasing as a function of  $x$ . Similarly, if  $1 \leq x \leq k_2$ , then

$$f(x, c) = f(x, 1) + (c - 1)(x - k_2),$$

is non-increasing as a function of  $y$ . Furthermore, note that

$$f(1, 1) \leq 1 - k_2 - k_1 + l \leq 0,$$

since  $k_1 + k_2 - 1 \geq l$ . Hence, we see that for all  $x, y$  with  $x \leq k_2$ , or  $y \leq k_1$ , we have

$$f(x, y) \leq 0.$$

By these properties, there must exist some integers  $a_0$  and  $b_0$ , with  $k_2 \leq a_0 \leq n$  and  $k_1 \leq b_0 \leq m$  such that:

$$a_0b_0 - k_1a_0 - k_2b_0 + l \geq 0$$

and such that for any integers  $a, b$  with  $0 < a \leq a_0$  and  $0 < b \leq b_0$  with  $a + b < a_0 + b_0$  one has:

$$ab - k_1a - k_2b + l \leq 0. \tag{3}$$

Now, consider the incidence geometry with  $a_0$  points  $P$  and  $b_0$  lines  $L$ , and all incidences  $P \times L$ . Then remove any set of

$$a_0b_0 - k_1a_0 - k_2b_0 + l$$



incidences. We claim the resulting incidence geometry is tight. Clearly, we have:

$$|I| = k_1|P| + k_2|L| - l.$$

On the other hand, for any subset  $I' \subseteq I$ , we have by the property 3:

$$|I'| \leq |P(I')||L(I')| < k_1|P(I')| + k_2|L(I')| - l,$$

Hence the incidence geometry is sparse.  $\square$

**Theorem 8.** *Suppose we are given a set of points  $P$  and a set of lines  $L$ . Let  $(\lambda, k_1, k_2, l)$  be such that  $\lambda = 1$  and  $k_1 + k_2 - 1 \geq l$ . Then letting  $E = P \times L$ , the collection*

$$\mathcal{I} = \{I \subseteq E \mid (P, L, I) \text{ is sparse}\}$$

*are the independent sets of a matroid provided that  $|P|, |L|$  are sufficiently large.*

*Proof.* We prove that the tight incidence geometries on  $|P|$  points and  $|L|$  lines are the bases of a matroid. Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be the collection of all sets  $B_i \subseteq E$  such that  $(P, L, B_i)$  is a tight geometry. We need to check the following 2 properties

1.  $\mathcal{B} \neq \emptyset$

Let  $P$  and  $L$  be such that  $|P| \geq k_2$ ,  $|L| \geq k_1$  and  $|P||L| \geq k_1|P| + k_2|L| - l$ . By Lemma 7, there are numbers  $a_0$  and  $b_0$  such that  $k_2 \leq a_0 \leq |P|$  and  $k_1 \leq b_0 \leq |L|$  and there is a tight incidence geometry with  $a_0$  points and  $b_0$  lines. Let  $\Gamma$  be this incidence geometry. If  $|P| > a_0$ , we can add a point to  $\Gamma$  which is incident to  $k_1$  lines. The incidence geometry obtained in this way will still be tight. We can do this inductively until the incidence geometry has  $|P|$  points. Similarly, if  $|L| > b_0$ , we can add a line to  $\Gamma$  which is incident to  $k_2$  points. Again, the resulting incidence geometry will be tight. We can do this inductively until  $\Gamma$  has  $|L|$  lines.

2.  $\forall B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B} \forall b \in B_2 \setminus B_1, \exists c \in B_1 \setminus B_2 : ((B_1 \setminus \{c\}) \cup \{b\}) \in \mathcal{B}$

*proof:* Suppose that the incidence  $b = (p, \ell)$ . Consider:

$$M = \bigcap_{\substack{B \subseteq B_1 \\ B \text{ is a block} \\ p \in B, \ell \in B}} B$$

We note that  $M$  is nonempty since  $B_1$  is in the collection we are intersecting over, and  $M$  is a block of  $B_1$  by Lemma 6. Suppose that the incidences in  $M$  are incident to the points  $P_M$  and  $L_M$ . Now, there must exist some  $c \in M \setminus B_2$ , since otherwise  $B_2$  would violate sparsity on the set of incidences  $I'$  between  $P_M$ , and  $L_M$ , since we would have:

$$|I'| \geq (|M| + 1) = k_1|P_M| + k_2|L_M| - l + 1.$$

Now, consider  $(B_1 \setminus \{c\}) \cup \{b\}$ . Let us show that it is tight. Suppose for a contradiction that there is some set  $I_* \subseteq (B_1 \setminus \{c\}) \cup \{b\}$  incident to point set  $P_*$  and line set  $L_*$ , which violates sparsity. So we assume,

$$|I_*| > k_1|P_*| + k_2|L_*| - l.$$

For this to be possible,  $I_*$  must contain  $b$ . Now, note that

$$|I_* \setminus \{b\}| > k_1|P_*| + k_2|L_*| - l - 1$$

and on the other hand

$$|I_* \setminus \{b\}| \leq k_1|P(I_* \setminus \{b\})| + k_2|L(I_* \setminus \{b\})| - l \leq k_1|P_*| + k_2|L_*| - l.$$

We see that:

$$|I_* \setminus \{b\}| = k_1|P_*| + k_2|L_*| - l.$$

This implies that  $I_* \setminus \{b\}$  is a block of  $B_1$ . We also see that  $P(I_* \setminus \{b\}) = P(I_*)$ , and  $L(I_* \setminus \{b\}) = L(I_*)$ . Since  $p \in P(I_*)$ , and  $\ell \in L(I_*)$ , this means that  $M \subseteq I_*$ , but then we must have  $c \in I_*$ , as  $c \in M$ , which is a contradiction with the fact that  $I_* \subset (B_1 \cup \{B\}) \setminus \{c\}$ .

□




Figure 3: Two  $(2, 2, 3, 3)$ -tight incidence geometries with 4 points and 5 lines

**Example 2** Consider the two graphs in Figure 3. As incidence geometries, both graphs are  $(2, 2, 3, 3)$ -tight, and they have the same number of points and lines. Note that, to go from one of the graphs in Figure 3 to the other, two incidences need to be changed.

Hence, the  $(2, 2, 3, 3)$ -tight incidence geometries do not form the bases of a matroid on the set  $V \times E$ , where  $V$  is the set of four vertices, and  $E$  is the set of edges of  $K_4$ .

### 3.1 Algorithm for finding a tight subgeometry

By what we have shown, it is easy to see that Algorithm 2 returns a maximum size  $(1, k_1, k_2, l)$ -sparse subgeometry, whenever  $\lambda = 1$ ,  $k_1 + k_2 - 1 \geq l$  and  $P$  and  $L$  are sufficiently large. Moreover, the pebble game recognises whenever this subgeometry is sparse but not tight. The difference to the pebble game described in section 2 is that instead of stopping when we have found an edge which cannot be accepted, we continue to see if we can add subsequent incidences, and we stop when we cannot add any more incidences, or if all incidences are added to  $D$ . The description is somewhat simplified because  $\lambda = 1$ , so we can play the pebble game directly on the incidence graph.

The complexity of this algorithm in the worst case is the same as Algorithm 1. With  $\lambda = 1$ , we have a time complexity of

$$\mathcal{O}(lI(|P| + |L| + |I|)),$$

and a storage complexity of

$$\mathcal{O}(|I| + |P| + |L|).$$

Probably, further extensions are possible to improve the complexity by considering a pebble game with components, as is done in [4, 7].

## 4 Comparison to previously known pebble game algorithms

Any hypergraph  $H = (V, E)$  can be considered as a rank 2 incidence geometry  $\Gamma(H)$  with point set  $V$  and line set  $E$ , where a point  $v$  and a line  $e$  are incident if and only if  $v$  is contained in the edge  $e$ . We remark that if  $H$  is  $r$ -uniform, then for each edge we get  $r$  incidences. In the counts above, it is thus easy

---

**Algorithm 2** Pebble game for recognising a subgeometry

---

**Input:** An incidence geometry  $\Gamma$

---

```
for all incidences  $i$ , with corresponding edge  $e$  in the incidence graph do
  while The edge  $e$  has not been processed do
    if  $\text{peb}(v) + \text{peb}(w) > l$  then
      Accept-Edge( $e$ ).
       $e$  has been processed.
    else
      search for a directed path  $(v' \dots u)$ ,  $v' \in \{v, w\}$ ,  $\{v', u\} \neq \{v, w\}$ ,
such that  $\text{peb}(u) > 0$ 
      if  $(v' \dots u)$  with  $\text{peb}(u) > 0$  has been found then
        Move-Pebble( $v' \leftarrow u$ ).
      else
         $e$  has been processed.
      end if
    end if
  end while
end for
if  $\sum_{v \in V} \text{peb}(v) = l$  then
  return the set of accepted edges  $D$ , which is tight.
else
  return the set of accepted edges  $D$ , which is sparse but not tight.
end if
```

---

to translate the condition for a hypergraph to be sparse, into a condition for the associated incidence geometry to sparse:

**Theorem 9.** *For all natural numbers  $\lambda \geq 1$ , one has that  $(k_1, l)$ -sparsity of a  $r$ -uniform hypergraph  $H$ , corresponds to  $(\lambda, k_1, \lambda r - 1, l)$ -sparsity of the incidence geometry  $\Gamma(H)$ . Moreover,  $H$  is tight if and only if  $\Gamma(H)$  is tight.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $H$  is  $(k_1, l)$ -sparse. Then, for any subset  $V'$  of vertices one has:

$$|E(V')| \leq k_1|V'| - l,$$

where  $E(V') = \{e \in E \mid e \subseteq V'\}$ . Hence for the set  $V' \times E(V')$ , and  $I' :=$

$I \cap V' \times E(V')$  one has:

$$\begin{aligned} (r - (r - 1))|E(V')| &\leq k_1|V'| - l \\ |I'| &\leq k_1|V'| + (r - 1)|E'(V')| - l. \end{aligned}$$

and for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ , we get:

$$\lambda|I| \leq k_1|V'| + (\lambda r - 1)|E(V')| - l.$$

Now, suppose we are given any subset of incidences  $I'$  given by  $I' = I \cap V' \times E'$ . Without loss of generality,  $V(I') = V'$ ,  $E(I') = E'$ . Let  $E'(V')$  be the set of  $e \in E'$  such that for any incidences  $v * e$  one has  $v \in V'$ . We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda|I| &\leq \lambda r|E'(V')| + \lambda(r - 1)|E' \setminus E'(V')| \\ &\leq k_1|V'| + (\lambda r - 1)|E'(V')| + \lambda(r - 1)|E' \setminus E(V')| - l \\ &\leq k_1|V'| + (\lambda r - 1)|E'| - l, \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we see that  $\Gamma(H)$  is sparse.

Conversely, if  $\Gamma(H)$  is sparse, then for any  $V'$ , and  $E' = E(V')$ , we have:

$$\lambda|I'| \leq k_1|V'| + (\lambda r - 1)|E'| - l,$$

and thus

$$|E(V')| \leq k_1|V'| - l,$$

which proves sparsity of  $H$ .

Finally, to finish the proof, we note that

$$|E| = k|V| - l$$

if and only if

$$\lambda|I| = k|V| + (\lambda r - 1)|E| - l,$$

which shows the claim about tightness.  $\square$

If we wish to apply the pebble game, do notice that the condition  $k_1 + (\lambda r - 1) - \lambda \geq l$ , forces us to increase  $\lambda$  in order to check sparsity and tightness. Furthermore, we find that if  $\lambda = 1$ , we are constrained to the case where  $k_1 + r - 2 \geq l$ , so we can only find tight substructures in this range.

We remark that our algorithm still works outside of the range  $l > 2k_1$  for graphs, which is outside of the range stated in [4]. However, in this range the graphs corresponding to sparse incidence geometries are not very interesting in the sense that they will have at most one vertex in an edge.

**Remark 10.** *The algorithm for multigraphs in [4] is a particular case of the hypergraph algorithm in [7]. We now show that there is a strong analogy between our algorithm and that of [7], and therefore also that of [4].*

*Suppose that we are given a  $r$ -uniform hypergraph  $H$ , and we look at the incidence geometry  $\Gamma(H)$  as in Theorem 9. If we want to check  $(k_1, l)$  sparsity of  $H$ , we check  $(\lambda, k_1, \lambda r - 1, l)$ -sparsity of  $\Gamma(H)$ . Let  $e = \{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$  be an edge in  $H$ , and let  $x_e$  be its associated node in the incidence graph. If every incidence to this edge is accepted, because of the invariant 1 in Lemma 2 we see that:*

$$\text{out}(x_e) + \text{peb}(x_e) = \lambda r - 1.$$

*After reorienting edges, we may assume that  $\text{peb}(x_e) = 0$ , and there are  $\lambda r - 1$  edges pointing out of  $x_e$ . Since there are  $\lambda r$  edges of  $I_\lambda$  adjacent to  $x_e$ , we see that there is one edge pointing into  $x_e$ . Such an orientation on the set of incidences to  $x_e$  is the same thing as having an orientation on the edge as in the hypergraph pebble game of [7]. For the hypergraph pebble game, whenever an edge is accepted into the pebble, a tail of the edge is chosen, and one can move a pebble from the tail to other vertices in the edge. In the incidence graph, we can move pebbles in the same way.*

**Acknowledgements** This work has been supported by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation Grant 2020.0001 and 2020.0007.

## References

- [1] Harold N. Gabow and Herbert H. Westermann. Forests, frames, and games: algorithms for matroid sums and applications. *Algorithmica*, 7(5-6):465–497, 1992.
- [2] Donald J. Jacobs and Bruce Hendrickson. An algorithm for two-dimensional rigidity percolation: the pebble game. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 137(2):346–365, 1997.
- [3] G. Laman. On graphs and rigidity of plane skeletal structures. *J. Engrg. Math.*, 4:331–340, 1970.
- [4] Audrey Lee and Ileana Streinu. Pebble game algorithms and sparse graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 308(8):1425–1437, 2008. Third European Conference on Combinatorics.

- [5] H. Pollaczek-Geiringer. Über die gliederung ebener fachwerke. *ZAMM - Journal of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics / Zeitschrift für Angewandte Mathematik und Mechanik*, 7(1):58–72, 1927.
- [6] Klara Stokes and Joannes Vermant. Structural rigidity and flexibility using graphs of groups. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.07588>, 2023.
- [7] Ileana Streinu and Louis Theran. Sparse hypergraphs and pebble game algorithms. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 30(8):1944–1964, 2009. Combinatorial Geometries and Applications: Oriented Matroids and Matroids.
- [8] Walter Whiteley. A matroid on hypergraphs, with applications in scene analysis and geometry. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 4(1):75–95, 1989.
- [9] Walter Whiteley. Some matroids from discrete applied geometry. In *Matroid theory (Seattle, WA, 1995)*, volume 197 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 171–311. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1996.