

# VERTEX-SHELLINGS OF EUCLIDEAN ORIENTED MATROIDS

WINFRIED HOCHSTÄTTLER AND MICHAEL WILHELMI

ABSTRACT. We prove that a lexicographical extension of a Euclidean oriented matroid remains Euclidean. Based on that result we show that in a Euclidean oriented matroid program there exists a topological sweep inducing a recursive atom-ordering (a shelling of the cocircuits) of the tope cell of the feasible region. We extend that sweep and obtain also a vertex-shelling of the whole oriented matroid and finally describe some connections to the notion of stackable zonotope tilings and to a counterexample of a conjecture of A. Mandel.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

*Shellability* is a concept from topological combinatorics. Most prominently it was used by Bruggesser and Mani [6] to complete a proof of Schläfli for the Euler-Poincaré relation and by McMullen [7] to prove the Upper Bound Conjecture. A *shelling* or a *recursive coatom ordering* of a graded poset is an ordering of coatoms that can be made compatible with a recursive coatom ordering of the ideal induced by each coatom. To show that the boundary complex of a convex polytope is shellable Bruggesser and Mani in [6] used the concept of a *line shelling*. This easily generalizes to oriented matroids as follows. If  $P$  is a tope and  $\ell$  is a shortest path from  $P$  to  $-P$  in the tope graph, then recording the facets of  $P$ , in the order their defining hyperplanes are met by  $\ell$ , yields a shelling order of the tope.

While the dual of a face lattice of a polyhedron is again polyhedral, this is no longer true for oriented matroids (*see also* eg. [2], 9.3.10). It is an open problem, whether duals of face lattices of oriented matroid polytopes admit a shelling, i.e. if topes admit a recursive atom ordering ([2], Exercise 4.18 (b)). The “polar procedure” of tracing a line yields a hyperplane sweep and in polytopes this yields an ordering of the vertices corresponding to a recursive atom ordering.

In non-realizable oriented matroids such a topological sweep is not always possible ([2], 10.4.6), namely, in the oriented matroid generalizations of linear programs we may have cycles where each edge “properly improves” the objective function. Any hyperplane sweep must entangle itself in such a cycle. Oriented matroid programs, where such “improving cycles” do not occur are called *Euclidean*. It is mentioned in [2], after 10.4.6, and made explicit in [1] that topological sweeping is possible in Euclidean oriented matroid programs.

It seems immediate that such a topological sweep yields a recursive atom ordering of the feasible region of the oriented matroid program, but the recursive part turns out to be surprisingly difficult. While it is clear that a minor of a Euclidean oriented matroid program still is Euclidean, see [4], 9.III.17 or [2], 10.5.6, we may lose the boundedness, which is necessary for our shelling, in some of the minors to be considered. We fix this by using lexicographic extensions to bound the minors and prove that these extensions preserve Euclideaness. More precisely we will show.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a Euclidean oriented matroid and let  $\mathcal{O} \cup p$  be a lexicographic extension of  $\mathcal{O}$ . Then  $(\mathcal{O} \cup p, p, f)$  is a Euclidean matroid program.*

In Section 2 of this paper we present some preliminaries, required definitions, the proof that a lexicographically extended oriented matroid program is bounded and that Euclideaness is preserved if we exchange the target function and the hyperplane at infinity. Section 3 is then devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1. We actually verify its contraposition. We compare the directions of edges in the extended oriented matroid program with those in some programs of the original oriented matroid and prove that, if there is a directed cycle in the extended matroid, we always obtain a directed cycle in an oriented matroid program of the original matroid. To make the proof of the ongoing much easier we prove a more general result which we think is also interesting in its own.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Any lexicographic extension of a Euclidean oriented matroid is Euclidean.*

We prove that theorem in Section 4. Again, a directed cycle in an extended matroid yields a directed cycle in the old one but here we have to find that old cycle. The difficulty that might arise is when the directed cycle uses an edge that does not correspond to an edge in the original oriented matroid. In order to replace that edge, we convert the new cycle into a simpler form, a so-called *normalized cycle* from which we can derive either a so-called *corresponding directed cycle* in the original matroid or, with the help a so-called *Projection Lemma*, we can project it to a directed cycle at the plane of infinity reducing the proof to Theorem 1.1. Section 5 reviews the topological sweep and shows the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be a Euclidean oriented matroid program. Then  $G_f$  defines a partial order (poset) of the cocircuits of  $(\mathcal{O} \setminus f)$ . Let  $f$  be in general position. Every linear extension of that poset defines a non-degenerate topological sweep and vice versa.*

The difficult part is to show that a linear extension yields a sweep. We show it by single-element extensions of the matroid maintaining the order of the linear extension. In Section 6 we show the vertex-shelling of the tope lattice and the whole oriented matroid.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a Euclidean oriented matroid with  $f \in \mathcal{O}$  lying in general position. Then  $\mathcal{O} \setminus f$  and each tope cell of  $\mathcal{O} \setminus f$  are vertex-shellable.*

We end with our conclusion relating our work to recent research e.g. the stackability of zonotope tilings, see [8] and presenting some open questions and the relation to the work of Mandel.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

For the basic concepts/notations of oriented matroid programming we refer to [2], chapter 10. Unlike in [2], we call an oriented matroid program  $(\mathcal{O}, f, g)$  *bounded* if  $X_g = +$  for every cocircuit  $X$  of the feasible region. Using “complementary slackness” and the Main Theorem of Oriented Matroid Programming [2], 10.1.12/13 it is immediate that a feasible, bounded oriented matroid program has at least one maximal and one minimal solution. We use the notion of Euclideaness of an oriented matroid program in [2], 10.5.2. An oriented matroid program  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  is Euclidean

if and only if its cocircuit graph  $G_f$  contains no directed cycles. Additionally we call an oriented matroid  $\mathcal{O}$  *Euclidean* if all programs  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  with  $f \neq g$  of the groundset ( $f$  not a coloop,  $g$  not a loop) are Euclidean and we call it *Mandel* if there exists a single element extension  $\mathcal{O}' = (\mathcal{O} \cup f)$  of  $\mathcal{O}$  in general position such that  $(\mathcal{O}', g, f)$  is Euclidean for all elements  $g$  of the groundset that are not loops. We call an oriented matroid  $\mathcal{O}$  *strongly Euclidean* if it is of rank 1 or possesses an element  $g$  (not a loop) such that  $\mathcal{O}/g$  is strongly Euclidean and the program  $(\mathcal{O}'', g, f)$  is Euclidean for all extensions  $\mathcal{O}'' = \mathcal{O} \cup f$ .

**2.1. Directing Edges in the Graph  $G_f$  and Beyond.** Recall, that if  $X$  and  $Y$  are covectors in an oriented matroid  $\mathcal{O}$  we have  $z(X \circ Y) = z(Y \circ X) = z((-X) \circ Y)$  for their zero sets. Moreover, if  $X, Y$  are cocircuits with  $X \neq \pm Y$  then  $\text{supp}(Y) \setminus \text{supp}(X) \neq \emptyset \neq \text{supp}(X) \setminus \text{supp}(Y)$ . A covector  $F$  is an *edge* in  $\mathcal{O}$  if  $z(F)$  is a coline in the underlying matroid  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O})$ . We say a cocircuit  $X$  is *lying on the line spanned by* (or *through*)  $F$  if  $z(X) \supset z(F)$ . We call two covectors a *modular pair* or *comodular* in  $\mathcal{O}$  if their zero-sets form a modular pair in  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O})$ . Hence two cocircuits  $X$  and  $Y$  are comodular if and only if  $X \circ Y$  is an edge in  $\mathcal{O}$ . Also we will call  $(X, Y)$  an *edge* in  $\mathcal{O}$  if  $X$  and  $Y$  are conformal comodular cocircuits.

The following propositions are immediate.

**Proposition 2.1.** *Let  $F$  be an edge in an oriented matroid  $\mathcal{O}$  and  $X \neq \pm Y$  cocircuits and  $z(F) \subseteq z(X)$  as well as  $z(F) \subseteq z(Y)$ . Then  $z(X \circ Y) = z(F)$ .*

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $F$  be an edge of an oriented matroid  $\mathcal{O}$  and  $e \in \text{supp}(F)$ . Then there is, up to sign reversal, a unique cocircuit  $Z$  with  $e \notin \text{supp}(Z) \subseteq \text{supp}(F)$ .*

**Proposition 2.3** (Uniqueness Of Cocircuit Elimination). *Let  $X, Y$  be comodular cocircuits of an oriented matroid and  $e \in \text{sep}(X, Y)$ . Then cocircuit elimination of  $e$  between  $X$  and  $Y$  yields a unique cocircuit  $Z$  such that  $\text{supp}(Z) \subseteq \text{supp}(X \circ Y) \setminus e$ . Furthermore, we have  $Z_f = X_f \circ Y_f$  for all  $f \notin \text{sep}(X, Y)$ .*

We introduce a direction for modular pairs of cocircuits.

**Definition 2.1.** *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be an oriented matroid program. Let*

$$\mathcal{P} = \{(X, Y) \mid X \text{ and } Y \text{ are comodular cocircuits in } \mathcal{O} \text{ with } X_g = Y_g \neq 0\}.$$

*We say  $(X, Y) \in \mathcal{P}$  is directed from  $X$  to  $Y$  and write  $X \rightarrow_{g,f} Y$  (or  $X \rightarrow_{(\mathcal{O}, g, f)} Y$ ), if cocircuit elimination of  $g$  between  $-X$  and  $Y$  yields  $Z$  satisfying  $Z_f = +$ . We write  $X \leftarrow_{g,f} Y$  if  $Z_f = -$  and  $X \leftrightarrow_{g,f} Y$  if  $Z_f = 0$  (then we say  $(X, Y)$  is undirected). We may omit the subscript, in case it is obvious.*

The following again is immediate:

**Proposition 2.4.** *Let  $(X, Y) \in \mathcal{P}$ . Then it holds*

- (i)  $X \rightarrow Y \iff -Y \rightarrow -X$ .
- (ii)  $X \rightarrow_{(\mathcal{O}, g, f)} Y \iff X \rightarrow_{(-g, \mathcal{O}, g, f)} Y$  and  $X \rightarrow_{(\mathcal{O}, g, f)} Y \iff Y \rightarrow_{(-f, \mathcal{O}, g, f)} X$  where  $-g\mathcal{O}$  resp.  $-f\mathcal{O}$  are derived from  $\mathcal{O}$  reorienting  $g$  resp.  $f$ .
- (iii) If  $X_f \prec Y_f$  then  $X \rightarrow Y$ . If  $X_f = Y_f = 0$  then  $X \leftrightarrow Y$ .
- (iv) Let  $e \in \text{sep}(X, Y)$ ,  $X \rightarrow Y$  and cocircuit elimination of  $e$  between  $X$  and  $Y$  yield  $W$ . Then  $(X, W), (W, Y) \in \mathcal{P}$  and  $X \rightarrow W$  holds as well as  $W \rightarrow Y$ .
- (v) If  $(X, Y)$  is undirected, then also  $(Y, X), (-X, -Y)$  and  $(-Y, -X)$  are undirected in every reorientation of  $\mathcal{O}$ .

We add a small Proposition.

**Proposition 2.5.** *Let  $X_g = Y_g \neq 0$  and  $X_f = Y_f \neq 0$  and  $h \in E \setminus \{f, g\}$ . If  $X \leftrightarrow_{(\mathcal{O}, g, f)} Y$  then  $X \rightarrow_{(\mathcal{O}, g, h)} Y$  implies  $X \rightarrow_{(\mathcal{O}, f, h)} Y$ .*

*Proof.* Cocircuit elimination of  $g$  between  $-X$  and  $Y$  yields  $Z$  with  $Z_f = 0$ . Hence elimination of  $f$  between  $-X$  and  $Y$  yields again  $Z$ .  $\square$

If  $X$  and  $Y$  are a conformal comodular pair the former definition is compatible with the orientation of the cocircuit graph of an oriented matroid program.

**Definition 2.2** (see [2], 10.1.16). *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be an oriented matroid program. Let  $G_f$  be the graph whose vertices are the cocircuits of  $(\mathcal{O}, g)$  and whose edges are the edges  $(Y^1, Y^2)$  between two comodular, conformal cocircuits. The edges in  $G_f$  are (un-)directed like in  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$ . We call the graph  $(G \setminus f)_f$  the directed subgraph of  $G_f$  induced by the cocircuits of  $(\mathcal{O} \setminus f, g)$ . If two comodular cocircuits  $Y^1, Y^2$  with  $Y^1 \circ Y^2$  are conformal in  $(\mathcal{O} \setminus f, g)$  but not in  $G_f$ , then we have  $Y_f^1 \succ Y_f^2$  (or  $Y_f^1 \prec Y_f^2$ ) in  $\mathcal{O}$  and we direct the edge  $Y^1 \rightarrow Y^2$  (or  $Y^1 \leftarrow Y^2$ ) in  $(G \setminus f)_f$ .*

We define paths in  $G_f$ . We give a reformulation of the definition [2], 10.5.4.

**Definition 2.3.** *A path in  $G_f$  from  $P^1$  to  $P^n$  is a sequence*

$$P = [P^1, \dots, P^n]$$

*of vertices of  $G_f$  such that  $(P^i, P^{i+1})$  is an edge in  $G_f$  for all  $1 \leq i < n$ . A path  $P$  is undirected if  $P^i \leftrightarrow P^{i+1}$  for all  $1 \leq i < n$  and directed if is not undirected and either  $P^i \rightarrow P^{i+1}$  or  $P^i \leftarrow P^{i+1}$  for all  $1 \leq i < n$ , in which case we say that the path is directed from  $P^1$  to  $P^n$ .*

*A path is closed if  $P^1 = P^n$ . A closed path is a cycle if  $P^1, \dots, P^{n-1}$  are pairwise distinct.*

We collect some more well known facts.

**Proposition 2.6.** (i) *Let  $P = [P^1, \dots, P^n]$  be a closed path in a graph and and let  $X, Y$  be subsequent vertices of  $P$ . Then there exists always a subpath  $Q$  of  $P$  containing  $X$  and  $Y$  that is a cycle.*

(ii) *If  $X, Y$  are comodular cocircuits in  $G_f$  then there is a path  $X^0, \dots, X^n$ ,  $X = X_0, Y = X_n$  in  $G_f$  with distinct cocircuits such that  $\text{supp}(X_i \circ X_j) = \text{supp}(X \circ Y)$  and all pairs  $(X_i, X_j)$  are directed as  $(X, Y)$  for all  $i < j$ .*

(iii) *Let  $P$  be a directed path  $P = (X, X^1, \dots, X^n, Y)$  between two cocircuits  $X$  and  $Y$  in  $G_f$ . If  $X_f \prec Y_f$  the path is directed from  $X$  to  $Y$ .*

(iv) *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be an oriented matroid program that contains a directed cycle in the graph  $G_f$ . Then all cocircuits in the cycle have the same  $f$ -value, in particular  $X_f \neq 0$  holds everywhere.*

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be an oriented matroid program and  $X, Y$  be comodular cocircuits in  $\mathcal{O}$  with  $X_f = Y_f = X_g = Y_g \neq 0$ . Then*

$$X \rightarrow_{g, f} Y \Leftrightarrow X \leftarrow_{f, g} Y,$$

*i.e. the orientation switches if we interchange the roles of the objective function and infinity.*

*Proof.* Possibly using Proposition 2.4 (i) we may assume  $X_f = +$ . Cocircuit elimination of  $g$  between  $-X$  and  $Y$  yields  $Z$  with  $Z_g = 0$ . Cocircuit elimination of  $f$  between  $-X$  and  $Y$  yields  $W$  with  $W_f = 0$ . We have three cases.

- (i) If  $Z_f = 0$  then  $Z = W$  hence  $X \leftrightarrow Y$  in both programs.
- (ii) If  $Z_f = +$  let  $h$  with  $Y_h = 0$  and  $X_h \neq 0$  we may assume  $X_h = +$  hence  $W_h = Z_h = -$ . Cocircuit elimination of  $f$  between  $-X$  and  $Z$  yields  $W^1$  with  $W_g^1 = -$  and  $W_h^1 = -$ . Since  $X$  and  $Y$  are comodular we must have  $W = W^1$  hence  $W_g = -$  and that is  $X \leftarrow Y$  in  $G_g$ .
- (iii) If  $Z_f = -$ , we interchange the roles of  $X$  and  $Y$  and (ii) yields  $Y \leftarrow X$  in  $G_g$ .

□

Reorienting  $g$  we derive a corollary:

**Corollary 2.1.** *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be an oriented matroid program and  $X, Y$  be comodular cocircuits in  $\mathcal{O}$  with  $X_f = Y_f = -X_g = -Y_g \neq 0$ . Then*

$$X \rightarrow_{g,f} Y \Leftrightarrow X \rightarrow_{f,g} Y.$$

**Remark 2.2.** *The last lemma and its corollary immediately imply  $X \leftrightarrow_{g,f} Y \Leftrightarrow X \leftrightarrow_{f,g} Y$ .*

**Proposition 2.7.** *If  $\mathcal{G}$  is a directed cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  then either  $\mathcal{G}$  or  $-\mathcal{G}$  is a directed cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}, f, g)$*

*Proof.* All cocircuits  $X$  of  $\mathcal{G}$  satisfy  $X_g = +$ . By Proposition 2.6 (iv) all  $X_f$  have the same value which is different from 0. Hence all edges in the circuit satisfy either the prerequisites of the Lemma 2.1 or of its corollary. In the former case  $\mathcal{G}$  is a directed cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}, f, g)$  as well, in the latter case  $-\mathcal{G}$  is (see also Proposition 2.4). □

We obtain immediately.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be a Euclidean oriented matroid program. Then  $(\mathcal{O}, f, g)$  is Euclidean, too.*

Clearly, reorienting elements from  $E \setminus \{g, f\}$  does not change the direction of any edge and hence:

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be a Euclidean oriented matroid program with groundset  $E$  and let  $S \subseteq E \setminus \{f, g\}$  and let  $_{-S}\mathcal{O}$  be derived from  $\mathcal{O}$  by reorientation of the elements of  $S$ . Then  $(_{-S}\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  is a Euclidean oriented matroid program, too.*

**2.2. Old and new cocircuits in single-element extensions.** For the notion of single-element extensions of oriented matroids and its corresponding localizations we refer to [2], chapter 7.1. We call an extension non-trivial if it is not an extension with a coloop. We mention one fact explicitly.

**Theorem 2.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be an oriented matroid of rank  $r$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  the set of its cocircuits, let  $\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O} \cup p$  be a non-trivial single-element extension of  $\mathcal{O}$  and let  $\sigma$  be the corresponding localization. Let*

$$S = \{Z = (Y, \sigma(Y)) : Y \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

*Then the cocircuits  $\mathcal{C}'$  of  $\mathcal{O}'$  are given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}' = S \cup \{Z' = (Y^1 \circ Y^2, 0) : Y^1, Y^2 \in \mathcal{C}, \sigma(Y^1) = -\sigma(Y^2) \neq 0, \\ \text{sep}(Y^1, Y^2) = \emptyset, r(z(Y^1 \circ Y^2)) = r - 2\} \end{aligned}$$

We say that the cocircuit  $Z \in S$  is derived from the cocircuit  $Y$  or old and the cocircuit  $Z' \in \mathcal{C}' \setminus S$  is derived from the edge  $Y^1 \circ Y^2$  or from the cocircuits  $Y^1, Y^2$  or new. We call an edge of two old cocircuits old as well. We call an edge new, if at least one of its cocircuits is new.

Let us mention some well-known relations between edges and vertices in the oriented matroid and its extension.

**Proposition 2.8.** *Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be an oriented matroid and let  $\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O} \cup p$  be a non-trivial single-element extension of  $\mathcal{O}$ .*

- (i) *If  $Z = (X \circ Y, 0)$  is a cocircuit in  $\mathcal{O}'$  derived from the edge  $X \circ Y$  where  $X, Y$  are conformal comodular cocircuits in  $\mathcal{O}$ , then the pair  $\{X, Y\}$  is unique.*
- (ii) *If  $Y$  is a cocircuit of  $\mathcal{O}'$  with  $Y_p \neq 0$ , then  $Y \setminus p$  is a cocircuit in  $\mathcal{O}$ ,  $Y$  is old.*
- (iii) *If  $p$  is in general position, then every cocircuit  $X$  of  $\mathcal{O}'$  with  $X_p = 0$  is new.*

**2.3. Lexicographic extensions.** We start with a technical definition.

**Definition 2.4.** *Let  $I = [e_1, \dots, e_k]$  be an ordered subset of the groundset of an oriented matroid  $\mathcal{O}$  and let  $Y$  be a cocircuit in  $\mathcal{O}$ . We call the index  $i$  such that  $Y_{e_i} \neq 0$  and  $Y_{e_j} = 0$  for all  $j < i$  the index of the cocircuit  $Y$  wrt.  $I$ . If  $Y_{e_i} = 0$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq k$  let the index of the cocircuit wrt.  $I$  be  $k + 1$ .*

We define a lexicographic extension as follows.

**Definition 2.5** (see [2], 7.2.4). *Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be an oriented matroid with  $\mathcal{C}$  being its set of cocircuits,  $I = [e_1, \dots, e_k]$  an ordered subset of the groundset, and  $\alpha = [\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k] \in \{+, -\}^k$ . Then the lexicographic extension  $\mathcal{O}[I^\alpha] = \mathcal{O}[e_1^{\alpha_1}, \dots, e_k^{\alpha_k}]$  of  $\mathcal{O}$  is given by the localization  $\sigma: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \{+, -, 0\}$  with*

$$\sigma(Y) = \begin{cases} \alpha_i Y_{e_i} & \text{if for the index } i \text{ of } Y \text{ wrt. } I \text{ holds } i \leq k, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We call the lexicographic extension positive and write  $\mathcal{O}[I^+]$  iff  $\alpha_i = +$  for all  $i \leq k$ .

It is immediate that a lexicographic extension can always be written as a reorientation of the original, a positive lexicographic extension and then reversing the reorientation in the extension. Until the end of this chapter let  $\mathcal{O}$  always be an oriented matroid of rank  $r \geq k$ , let  $I = [e_1, \dots, e_k]$  be an ordered subset of  $\mathcal{O}$ , let  $\alpha = [\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k] \in \{+, -\}^k$  and let  $\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O}[I^\alpha] = (\mathcal{O} \cup p)$  be the lexicographic extension of  $\mathcal{O}$ .

**Proposition 2.9.** *The index  $\text{ind}_Y$  wrt.  $I$  for a cocircuit  $Y$  in  $\mathcal{O}[I^\alpha]$  with  $Y_p \neq 0$  is always at most  $k$  and  $Y_{\text{ind}_Y} = Y_p$ .*

*Proof.* Because  $Y_p \neq 0$  and Proposition 2 we obtain that  $Y \setminus p$  is a cocircuit in  $\mathcal{O}$ . The rest follows from the definition of the lexicographic extension.  $\square$

Recall that we call an extension *principal* if we add a point to a flat in general position in the matroid.

**Proposition 2.10.** *The lexicographic extension  $\mathcal{O}[I^\alpha]$  is a principal extension of  $\mathcal{O}$  adding a point to the flat  $\text{cl}(e_1, \dots, e_k)$ .*

*Proof.* For each covector  $X$  in  $\mathcal{O}$  and its extension  $X'$  in  $\mathcal{O}[I^\alpha]$  holds

$$p \in z(X') \text{ iff } \{e_1, \dots, e_k\} \subseteq z(X) \text{ hence } \text{cl}(e_1, \dots, e_k) \subseteq z(X).$$

Assume  $p$  were not in general position in  $\text{cl}(e_1, \dots, e_k)$ . Then  $p$  is contained in a non-spanning cycle in that flat. Hence, there exists a cocircuit avoiding that cycle, which is non-zero on  $p$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.11.** *Let  $Y$  be a cocircuit in  $\mathcal{O}[I^\alpha]$  with  $Y_p = 0$ . If the index  $\text{ind}_Y$  wrt.  $I$  of  $Y$  is  $k+1$  then  $Y$  is an old cocircuit otherwise it is a new cocircuit.*

*Proof.* It is clear that if  $\text{ind}_Y < k+1$  and if  $Y$  would be an old cocircuit then  $Y_p = 0$  would not hold. If  $\text{ind}_Y = k+1$  and  $Y$  would be a new cocircuit it would have been derived from an edge  $X \circ Z$ . But then  $I \subseteq z(X \circ Z)$  implying  $r(z(Y)) = r(z(Y \setminus p))$  because  $p \in \text{cl}(I)$ , hence  $Y \setminus p$  was a cocircuit already in  $\mathcal{O}$ .  $\square$

We come to a technical lemma.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $Y$  be a new cocircuit in  $\mathcal{O}[I^\alpha]$ . Then we have  $Y = ((X \setminus p) \circ (Z \setminus p), 0)$  for two unique old cocircuits  $X$  and  $Z$  in  $\mathcal{O}[I^\alpha]$  such that  $(X \setminus p) \circ (Z \setminus p)$  is an edge in  $\mathcal{O}$  and  $\text{sep}(X, Z) = \{p\}$ . The indices of  $X$  and  $Z$  differ and are smaller than  $k+1$ . Let  $i = \text{ind}_X < j = \text{ind}_Z$ . We have*

$$0 \neq X_{e_i} = Y_{e_i} = -Z_{e_j} = -Y_{e_j} \text{ and } \text{ind}_Y = \text{ind}_X < k.$$

*Proof.* From Proposition 2.11 follows that  $\text{ind}_Y < k+1$ . The first statement is Theorem 2.2. Because  $X \setminus p$  and  $Y \setminus p$  are conformal and  $X_p = -Z_p$  they must have different indices. The rest is immediate.  $\square$

**Remark 2.5.** *We call the cocircuit  $Z$  in Lemma 2.4 with higher index the cocircuit corresponding to  $Y$ .*

We can always extend an oriented matroid program to a bounded one.

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be an oriented matroid program. Let  $\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O} \cup p = \mathcal{O}[I]^+$  be a positive lexicographic extension of  $\mathcal{O}$  in general position where  $I$  is a base of  $\mathcal{O} \setminus f$ . Then  $(\mathcal{O}', p, f)$  is bounded. It is feasible if and only if  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  is.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be of rank  $r$ . Then  $I = [e_1, \dots, e_r]$  is an ordered set of independent elements in  $\mathcal{O} \setminus f$ . If  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  is feasible we have a cocircuit  $X \neq 0$  with  $X_e \in \{0, +\}$  for all  $e \in E$  and also  $X_p \in \{0, +\}$  since the lexicographic extension is positive. The program remains feasible. Because  $I$  is a base in  $\mathcal{O}$  Proposition 2.11 yields that any cocircuit  $X$  with  $X_p = 0$  must be new. Lemma 2.4 yields two indices  $i \neq j \leq r$  with  $X_{e_i} = -X_{e_j} \neq 0$  hence  $X_e = -$  for an  $e \in E$  and  $X$  is not in the feasible region. The program is bounded.  $\square$

### 3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a Euclidean oriented matroid and let  $\mathcal{O} \cup p$  be a lexicographic extension of  $\mathcal{O}$ . Then  $(\mathcal{O} \cup p, p, f)$  is a Euclidean matroid program.*

Before we go into the details we give a brief sketch of the proof.

**3.1. Sketch of proof.** We assume that there is a directed cycle  $\mathcal{C}$  in  $(\mathcal{O} \cup p, p, f)$  and show that there is already a directed cycle in an oriented matroid program in  $\mathcal{O}$ . First all cocircuits in  $\mathcal{C}$  are old because  $p = +$  holds for them, see Proposition 2.8, and have the same  $f$ -value, see Proposition 2.6. We show in Subsection 3.2 that the edges between these old cocircuits are already edges in  $\mathcal{O}$  and in Subsection 3.3 that the directions of these edges are always preserved in some oriented matroid programs of  $\mathcal{O}$ . Hence we always obtain a directed cycle in a matroid program of  $\mathcal{O}$ .

**3.2. Directions of edges of old cocircuits in single-element extensions.** We start examining the directions of old edges.

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be an oriented matroid program and let  $\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O} \cup p$  be a non-trivial single-element extension of  $\mathcal{O}$ . Let  $X, Y$  be two old conformal, comodular cocircuits in  $(\mathcal{O}', g)$ . Then  $X \setminus p, Y \setminus p$  are conformal cocircuits in  $(\mathcal{O}, g)$ . They are also comodular in  $(\mathcal{O}, g)$  if  $(X \circ Y)_p \neq 0$  or if  $\mathcal{O} \cup p$  is a principal extension (or if both cases hold).*

*Proof.* Clearly,  $X \setminus p, Y \setminus p$  are conformal cocircuits in  $(\mathcal{O}, g)$ . If  $(X \circ Y)_p \neq 0$  then  $z(X \circ Y) = z(X \circ Y) \setminus p$  hence  $((X \circ Y) \setminus p)$  is an edge in  $\mathcal{O}$ . If  $\mathcal{O} \cup p$  is a principal extension we have  $p \in \text{cl}_{\mathcal{M}'}(F \setminus p)$  for a flat  $F \setminus p$  and all of its supersets in  $\mathcal{M}$ . Hence if  $p \in \text{cl}_{\mathcal{M}'}(z(X \setminus p))$  and  $p \in \text{cl}_{\mathcal{M}'}(z(Y \setminus p))$  we have  $F \setminus p \subseteq z(X \setminus p)$  and  $F \setminus p \subseteq z(Y \setminus p)$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ . We obtain  $F \setminus p \subseteq z(X \setminus p) \cap z(Y \setminus p) = z((X \circ Y) \setminus p)$  hence  $p \in \text{cl}_{\mathcal{M}'}(z((X \circ Y) \setminus p))$  and  $((X \circ Y) \setminus p)$  is an edge in  $\mathcal{O}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.1.** *If  $(X \circ Y)_p = 0$  and  $\mathcal{O} \cup p$  is not a principal extension it is possible that  $X \setminus p$  and  $Y \setminus p$  are not comodular in  $\mathcal{O}$  e.g. if  $\mathcal{O}$  has rank 3 and  $z(X \setminus p)$  and  $z(Y \setminus p)$  are disjoint lines in the underlying matroid intersecting at the point  $p$  in the extension. Because the lexicographic extension is principal (see Proposition 2.10) the two cocircuits are always comodular in  $\mathcal{O}$  in that case.*

We introduce a new function to abbreviate our notions.

**Definition 3.1** (Dir-function). *Let  $X, Y$  be a comodular pair of cocircuits in  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  with  $X_g = Y_g \neq 0$ . Then we define*

$$\text{Dir}_{(\mathcal{O}, g, f)}(X, Y) = \left\{ \begin{array}{lll} + & \text{iff} & X \rightarrow Y, \\ - & \text{iff} & X \leftarrow Y, \\ 0 & \text{iff} & X \leftrightarrow Y. \end{array} \right\} \text{ in } (\mathcal{O}, g, f).$$

*If  $X, Y$  are comodular cocircuits with  $X_g \neq 0$  and  $Y_g = 0$  (or vice versa) then we define  $\text{Dir}(X, Y) = Y_f$  (or  $\text{Dir}(X, Y) = -X_f$  resp.).*

Finally we show that the directions of old edges are preserved in extensions.

**Lemma 3.2** (direction preservation of old edges). *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be an oriented matroid program and let  $\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O} \cup p$  be a non-trivial single-element extension of  $\mathcal{O}$ . Let  $X, Y$  be two old cocircuits in  $(\mathcal{O}', g)$  with  $X \circ Y$  being an edge in  $\mathcal{O}'$ . If  $((X \circ Y) \setminus p)$  is also an edge in  $\mathcal{O}$  then cocircuit elimination of  $g$  between  $-X$  and  $Y$  yields an old cocircuit and it holds*

$$\text{Dir}_{(\mathcal{O}', g, f)}(X, Y) = \text{Dir}_{(\mathcal{O}, g, f)}(X \setminus p, Y \setminus p).$$

*Proof.* Since  $F = z((X \setminus p) \circ (Y \setminus p))$  is a coline in  $\mathcal{M}$ ,  $\text{cl}_{\mathcal{M}}(F \cup g)$  is a hyperplane in  $\mathcal{M}$ . Then cocircuit elimination of  $g$  between  $-X \setminus p$  and  $Y \setminus p$  in  $\mathcal{O}$  yields a



unique cocircuit  $Z$  which can be extended to an old cocircuit  $Z'$  in  $\mathcal{O}'$ . We have  $z(Z') = cl_{\mathcal{M}'}(F \cup g)$ . Cocircuit elimination of  $g$  between  $-X$  and  $Y$  in  $\mathcal{O}'$  yields a unique cocircuit  $Z^1$  with  $z(Z^1) \supseteq cl_{\mathcal{M}'}(z(X \circ Y) \cup g) \supseteq z(Z')$ . Because of rank reasons equality holds, hence  $Z^1 = \pm Z'$ . Let  $e \neq p$  with  $e \in z(X \setminus p)$  and  $e \notin z(Y \setminus p)$  then we obtain  $Z'_e = Z_e^1$  hence  $Z' = Z^1$  which proves the lemma.  $\square$

**3.3. The directions of the cocircuit graph of the lexicographic extension**  $(\mathcal{O} \cup p, p, f)$ . We can describe completely the directions of the graph  $G_f$  of  $(\mathcal{O} \cup p, p, f)$  if we know the directions of some edges in the graphs  $G_f$  of  $\mathcal{O}$ . Until the end of this chapter let  $\mathcal{O}$  be an oriented matroid of rank  $r$  with groundset  $E$  and let  $f \in E$ . Let  $I = [e_1, \dots, e_k]$  with  $k \leq r$  be an ordered set of independent elements of  $E$ , where possibly  $f \in I$ . Let  $\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O} \cup p$  be the lexicographic extension  $\mathcal{O}[e_1^+, \dots, e_k^+]$ .

For the next technical lemmas we fix some assumptions.

**Definition 3.2** (Assumptions A). *Let  $X, Y$  be two conformal cocircuits with  $X_p = Y_p \neq 0$  and  $X \circ Y$  being an edge in  $\mathcal{O}'$ . Let  $P$  be the cocircuit yielded by elimination of  $p$  between  $-X$  and  $Y$ . Let  $\text{ind}_X, \text{ind}_Y$  be the indices of  $X, Y$  wrt.  $I$ . We assume  $\text{ind}_X \leq \text{ind}_Y$ . If  $i = \text{ind}_X = \text{ind}_Y$  and thus  $X_{e_i} = Y_{e_i} \neq 0$ , let  $Z$  denote the cocircuit yielded by elimination of  $e_i$  between  $-X$  and  $Y$ . If  $\text{ind}_X < \text{ind}_Y$  let  $Z = Y$ .*

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let assumptions A hold. Then  $P$  is old if and only if  $P = Z$ . If  $P$  is new then  $Z$  and  $P$  are compatible.*

*Proof.* We have  $z(Z) \supseteq z(X \circ Y) \cup e_i$  and  $z(P) \supseteq z(X \circ Y) \cup p$ . Regarding the indices we obtain  $\text{ind}_Z > \text{ind}_X$  and  $\text{ind}_P \geq \text{ind}_X$ . Let  $e \in z(X) \cap \text{supp}(Y)$ . Then we must have  $Y_e = P_e = Z_e \neq 0$  in all cases.

If  $P_{e_i} = 0$  Proposition 2.2 yields  $P = \pm Z$  hence  $P = Z$ . Also  $Z_p = 0$  implies  $P = Z$  and  $P$  is old. On the other hand, if  $P$  is old, we must have  $P_{e_i} = 0$  hence  $P = Z$ . As by assumption  $Y_p \neq 0$  we have that  $\text{ind}_X < \text{ind}_Y$  implies  $P \neq Y = Z$  hence  $P$  must be new.

Now let  $P$  be new and thus derived from two compatible comodular cocircuits  $P^1, P^2$ . We have  $z(P^1 \circ P^2) = z(X \circ Y)$  thus by Proposition 2.8 (i) and Lemma 2.4 we may assume that  $\text{ind}_X \leq \text{ind}_{P^2} < \text{ind}_{P^1}$ . We conclude  $P_{e_i}^1 = 0$  and Proposition 2.2 again yields  $P^1 = \pm Z$ . But because  $P^1 \neq \pm X$  we have  $P_e^1 \neq 0$  and thus  $P_e^1 = P_e$ . Hence  $P_e = Z_e$  implies  $P^1 = Z$ , and hence  $P$  and  $Z$  are compatible.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let assumptions A hold. Let  $1 \leq i = \text{ind}_X = \text{ind}_Y \leq k$  and  $f \neq e_i$  and thus  $X_{e_i} = Y_{e_i} \neq 0$ . If  $X_f \neq Y_f$  or  $X_f = Y_f = 0$  or  $\text{Dir}_{e_i, f}(X, Y) \neq 0$  then*

$$\text{Dir}_{e_i, f}(X, Y) = \text{Dir}_{p, f}(X, Y) \text{ and } \text{Dir}_{f, e_i}(X, Y) = \text{Dir}_{f, p}(X, Y).$$

*Proof.* If  $X_f \neq Y_f$  or  $X_f = Y_f = 0$  Proposition 2.4 (iii) yields  $\text{Dir}_{e_i, f}(X, Y) = \text{Dir}_{p, f}(X, Y)$ . If  $\text{Dir}_{e_i, f}(X, Y) \neq 0$  we may assume that  $X_f = Y_f \neq 0$ . Hence if  $f \in I$  then  $f = e_j$  with  $j > i$ . In any case Proposition 3.2 yields either  $Z = P$  or  $P$  is compatible to  $Z$ . We have  $Z_f \neq 0$  hence  $P_f = Z_f$  implying the assertion. The second equation (if defined) follows from Lemma 2.1 or Corollary 2.1 and  $X_{e_i} = Y_{e_i} = X_p = Y_p$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let assumptions A hold. Let  $1 \leq i = \text{ind}_X = \text{ind}_Y \leq k$ . Hence  $X_{e_i} = Y_{e_i} = X_p = Y_p \neq 0$ . Let  $X_f = Y_f \neq 0$  and  $\text{Dir}_{e_i, f}(X, Y) = 0$  or  $f = e_i$ . Then*

$$(i) \text{Dir}_{e_i, e_j}(X, Y) = 0 \text{ for all } j \text{ with } i < j < k + 1 \Rightarrow \text{Dir}_{p, f}(X, Y) = 0.$$

- (ii) Otherwise  $Dir_{f,p}(X, Y) = Dir_{e_i, e_j}(X, Y)$ , where  $j > i$  is the first index with  $Dir_{e_i, e_j}(X, Y) \neq 0$ .
- (iii) It holds  $Dir_{f, e_j}(X, Y) = Dir_{e_i, e_j}(X, Y)$ .

*Proof.*  $Dir_{e_i, f}(X, Y) = 0$  and  $f = e_i$  both imply  $Z_f = 0$  and  $\text{ind}_Z = j > i$ . Because  $X_f = Y_f \neq 0$  we have  $f \notin \{e_1, \dots, e_{i-1}\}$ .

ad (i): We obtain  $Z_{e_j} = 0$  for all  $i < j < k + 1$  hence Proposition 2.5 yields  $Z_p = 0$  and Proposition 3.2 yields  $Z = P$  hence  $Z_f = P_f = 0$ .

ad (ii): We have  $Z_{e_j} \neq 0$ . Lemma 3.2 yields that  $Z$  is an old cocircuit. We obtain  $Z_p = Z_{e_j}$  because  $j > i$  is the first index where  $Dir_{e_i, e_j}(X, Y) \neq 0$ . Cocircuit elimination of  $f$  between  $-X$  and  $Y$  yields also the cocircuit  $Z$  which proves (ii).

ad (iii): This is Proposition 2.5.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let assumptions A hold and let  $Y_f \neq 0$ . Let  $1 \leq i = \text{ind}_X < \text{ind}_Y = j \leq k$ . Then*

$$Dir_{p, f}(X, Y) = Dir_{e_i, f}(X, Y) = Y_f.$$

*Proof.* Proposition 3.2 yields that  $Y$  and  $P$  are compatible hence  $P_f = Y_f$ .  $\square$

We denote some small facts concerning cycles in  $(\mathcal{O}', p, f)$  where  $\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O} \cup p$  is a non-trivial single-element extension of  $\mathcal{O}$ .

**Proposition 3.3.** *All cocircuits in a cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}', p, f)$  are also cocircuits in  $\mathcal{O}$  and all edges remain edges.*

*Proof.* This follows immediately from Proposition 2.8 and Proposition 3.1.  $\square$

For the last three lemmas let  $\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O} \cup p = \mathcal{O}[e_1^+, \dots, e_k^+]$  be a positive lexicographic extension of  $\mathcal{O}$ .

**Lemma 3.6.** *All cocircuits in a directed cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}', p, f)$  have the same index.*

*Proof.* Because of Proposition 2.6 (iv) all cocircuits in the cycle must have the same  $f$ -value  $\neq 0$ . Assume there were a directed cycle  $X_0, \dots, X_n = X_0$  where not all vertices had the same index. Then there exist  $X_i, X_j$  such that  $\text{ind}_{X_i} < \text{ind}_{X_{i+1}}$  and  $\text{ind}_{X_j} > \text{ind}_{X_{j+1}}$ . But then Lemma 3.5 implies  $Dir_{p, f}(X_i, X_{i+1}) = -Dir_{p, f}(X_j, X_{j+1})$  contradicting the cycle being directed.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a directed cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}', p, f)$  where all cocircuits of  $\mathcal{G}$  have the same index  $i$ . If one edge of the cycle is directed in  $(\mathcal{O}', e_i, f)$  we have a directed cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}', e_i, f)$ .*

*Proof.* Lemma 3.3 yields that the edge is directed as in  $(\mathcal{O}', p, f)$ . All other edges are either undirected or directed as in  $(\mathcal{O}', p, f)$ . We obtain a directed cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}', e_i, f)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.8.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a directed cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}', p, f)$  where all cocircuits of  $\mathcal{G}$  have the same index  $i$ . If all edges of the cycle are undirected in  $(\mathcal{O}', e_i, f)$  we have a directed cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}', e_i, e_j)$  (and in  $(\mathcal{O}', f, e_j)$ ) for a  $j > i$ . This case can not occur if  $f$  is in general position and if  $f \neq e_i$ .*

*Proof.* Proposition 2.7 yields a directed cycle  $\mathcal{G}' = \pm\mathcal{G}$  in  $(\mathcal{O}', f, p)$ . If all edges of  $\mathcal{G}'$  would be undirected in  $(\mathcal{O}', e_i, e_j)$  Lemma 3.4 would yield that the edges are also undirected in  $(\mathcal{O}', f, p)$  contradicting the assumptions. Hence we obtain at least one directed edge in  $(\mathcal{O}', e_i, e_j)$  for some  $j > i$ . We take the smallest index  $j > i$  where

such an edge exist. Lemma 3.4 yields that the edge is directed as in  $(\mathcal{O}', f, p)$ . If we have another directed edge in  $(\mathcal{O}', e_i, e_j)$  Lemma 3.4 yields again (because the edge is undirected in all  $(\mathcal{O}', e_i, e_k)$  with  $k < j$ ) that it must be directed like in  $(\mathcal{O}', f, p)$ . That means in  $(\mathcal{O}', e_i, e_j)$  all edges of the cycle are undirected or directed like in  $(\mathcal{O}', f, p)$ . We obtain a directed cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}', e_i, e_j)$ . Because of Lemma 3.4 (iii) the proof works also if we substitute  $e_i$  by  $f$  everywhere. The second statement is immediate.  $\square$

**3.4. First Main Theorems.** We formulate the main theorem with the least possible assumptions.  $\mathcal{O}$  does not need to be fully Euclidean only a few programs of  $\mathcal{O}$  and here even only the contractions of these programs. (Recall that a contraction of a Euclidean oriented matroid program remains Euclidean, see [2],10.5.6.)

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be an oriented matroid of rank  $r$  with groundset  $E$  and let  $f \in E$ . Let  $I = [e_1, \dots, e_k]$  with  $k \leq r$  be an ordered set of independent elements of  $E$ . Let  $l \leq k$  be the smallest index such that  $f \in \text{cl}(\{e_1, \dots, e_l\})$ . If there is no such  $l$  let  $l = k + 1$  (in that case  $k + 1 \leq r$ ).*

- (i) *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, e_1, f), (\mathcal{O}/\{e_1\}, e_2, f), \dots, (\mathcal{O}/\{e_1, \dots, e_{l-2}\}, e_{l-1}, f)$  be Euclidean oriented matroid programs and*
- (ii) *If  $f$  is not in general position or if  $f \in I$  let  $(\mathcal{O}/\{e_1, \dots, e_{i-1}\}, e_i, e_j)$  be Euclidean oriented matroid programs for all  $1 \leq i \leq \min(l, k - 1)$  and  $i < j \leq k$ .*

*Let  $\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O} \cup p$  be the lexicographic extension  $\mathcal{O}[e_1^+, \dots, e_k^+]$ . Then  $(\mathcal{O}', p, f)$  is a Euclidean oriented matroid program.*

*Proof.* We show that the graph  $G_f$  of  $(\mathcal{O}', p, f)$  has no directed cycles. Proposition 2.6 (iv) shows that the cocircuits of a directed cycle must all have the same  $f$ -value  $v_f \neq 0$ . Lemma 3.6 shows that the cocircuits of the cycle have all the same index  $i$ . We obtain that  $f \notin \text{cl}\{e_1, \dots, e_{i-1}\}$  hence  $i \leq l$ . If one of the edges of the cycle is directed in  $(\mathcal{O}', e_i, f)$  Lemma 3.7 yields a directed cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}', e_i, f)$ . Otherwise (and that case can only happen if  $f$  is not in general position or if  $f = e_i$ ) Lemma 3.8 yields a directed cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}', e_i, e_j)$  for some  $j > i$ . Lemma 3.2 yields that we obtain directed cycles in either  $(\mathcal{O}, e_i, f)$  or  $(\mathcal{O}, e_i, e_j)$ . Since all indices of the cocircuits of these cycles are  $i$ , in the contractions  $(\mathcal{O}/\{e_1, \dots, e_{i-1}\}, e_i, f)$  and  $(\mathcal{O}/\{e_1, \dots, e_{i-1}\}, e_i, e_j)$  the cocircuits stay cocircuits and we obtain a directed cycle in at least one of them, contradicting the assumptions.  $\square$

**Remark 3.9.** *In the assumption (ii) of the Theorem we can substitute  $e_i$  by  $f$ , the proof works analogously.*

We get immediately:

**Corollary 3.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be an oriented matroid of rank  $r$  with groundset  $E$  and let  $f \in E$  being in general position. Let  $I = [e_1, \dots, e_k]$  with  $k \leq r$  be an ordered set of independent elements of  $E \setminus f$  such that  $(\mathcal{O}, e_1, f), (\mathcal{O}/\{e_1\}, e_2, f), \dots, (\mathcal{O}/\{e_1, \dots, e_{k-1}\}, e_k, f)$  are Euclidean oriented matroid programs. Let  $\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O} \cup p$  be the lexicographic extension  $\mathcal{O}[e_1^+, \dots, e_k^+]$ . Then  $(\mathcal{O}', p, f)$  is a Euclidean oriented matroid program.*

#### 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

**Theorem 1.2.** *A lexicographic extension of a Euclidean oriented matroid is Euclidean.*

**4.1. Sketch of Proof.** To show that the program  $(\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O} \cup p, g, f)$  of a lexicographic extended oriented matroid remains Euclidean if  $\mathcal{O}$  is Euclidean is slightly more complicated than the proof of our first theorem, where  $p$  was a new hyperplane at infinity. Like before we show that a directed cycle  $P$  in the program  $(\mathcal{O}', g, f)$  yields a directed cycle in a program of  $\mathcal{O}$ . We know already from Lemma 3.2 that the directions of edges between old cocircuits in  $(\mathcal{O}', g, f)$  are preserved in  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  hence we may assume that  $P$  contains new edges. These new edges do not exist in  $\mathcal{O}$  we have to substitute them with old edges preserving their directions. We apply two approaches to achieve that. On the one hand we prove a Lemma in Subsection 4.2, the *Projection Lemma* 4.1. so that we can project new edges (and their directions) to edges in the program  $(\mathcal{O} \cup p, p, f)$  obtaining a projected directed cycle there. On the other hand we examine all constellations of new edges together with their corresponding cocircuits. In some constellations corresponding edges appear and we obtain a corresponding cycle. We examine the directions of these edges in Subsection 4.5 again frequently using the Projection Lemma. The directions of the edges that give rise to the new cocircuits of  $P$  (analyzed in Subsection 4.3) do matter as well. It is important that they do not suddenly change since otherwise we loose information about the direction of the corresponding edges. We call cycles / paths with that property *normalized* and prove in Subsection 4.4 that we can always get a normalized version of a directed cycle. We use the *Triangle Lemma* 4.2 and the *Zero Line Lemma* 4.3 proven in Subsection 4.2 here. Hence we may assume that our directed cycle  $P$  is normalized. In Subsection 4.5 we show that if  $P$  has old cocircuits or cocircuits with different indices we obtain a corresponding cycle  $Q$  that is directed in  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$ . Finally assuming  $P$  having only new cocircuits with index  $i$  the corresponding cycle (if existing) is either directed like  $P$  in  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  or in  $(\mathcal{O}, g, e_j)$  for a  $j > i$ , or is undirected. But if the corresponding cycle is undirected or even not existing we use our first approach and project  $P$  to a directed cycle in  $(\mathcal{O} \cup p, p, f)$  and are done. We show the final result in Subsection 4.7 and a Corollary with less assumptions for the case that  $g$  and  $f$  are in general position.

**4.2. The Projection Lemma and the Triangle Lemma.** The lemmas in this preparatory section are results concerning edges in oriented matroids whose zero sets intersect in a coplane (a flat of corank 3) in the underlying matroid. We call  $(F, G, H)$  a *modular triple* of covectors in an oriented matroid if  $(F, G)$ ,  $(G, H)$  and  $(F, H)$  are modular pairs in the underlying matroid.

The following is immediate.

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $(F, G)$  be a pair of edges in an affine oriented matroid  $(\mathcal{O}, g)$  with  $z(F \cap G)$  being a coplane in the underlying matroid  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O})$ . Then there is up to sign reversal a unique cocircuit  $C$  lying on the line through  $F$  and on the line through  $G$ .*

**Definition 4.1.** *Let the assumptions of Proposition 4.1 hold. If  $C_g \neq 0$  we call the cocircuit  $C$  with  $C_g = +$  the crossing point of  $F$  and  $G$ . If  $C_g = 0$  the crossing point is chosen arbitrarily among  $C$  and  $-C$ .*

We use the assumptions of the next proposition in the whole Section.

**Proposition 4.2.** *Let  $(C, X, Y)$  be a modular triple of cocircuits in an oriented matroid of rank  $\geq 3$  with  $z(C \circ X \circ Y)$  being a coplane in the underlying matroid. Then  $(C \circ X, C \circ Y, X \circ Y)$  is a modular triple of edges with different zero sets which means that  $C, X, Y$  are not lying on one line.*




FIGURE 1. Projection Lemma

*Proof.* Because  $(C, X, Y)$  is a modular triple,  $C \circ X, C \circ Y, X \circ Y$  are edges. Because  $z(C \circ X \circ Y)$  is a coplane, it is clear that they form a modular triple, too. All these edges have different zero sets, otherwise if we would have e.g.  $z(C \circ X) = z(C \circ Y)$  we would obtain  $z(C \circ X) = z(C \circ X \circ Y)$  and  $z(C \circ X)$  would not be a coline.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.3.** *Let  $F$  and  $G$  be two edges of an affine oriented matroid  $(\mathcal{O}, g)$  with  $z(F \cap G)$  being a coplane in  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O})$ . Let  $C$  be the crossing point of  $F$  and  $G$ . Let  $X$  resp.  $Y$  be cocircuits in  $(\mathcal{O}, g)$  lying on the line through  $F$  resp. through  $G$  and  $C \neq X \neq Y \neq C$ . If  $z(X) \cap z(Y) \cap \text{supp}(C) \neq \emptyset$ , then  $X \circ Y$  is an edge,  $(C, X, Y)$  a modular triple with  $z(C \circ X \circ Y)$  being a coplane in  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O})$ .*

*Proof.* We have  $z(F) = z(X \circ C) = z(C \circ X)$  and  $z(G) = z(Y \circ C) = z(C \circ Y)$ . With  $H = F \circ G$  we obtain  $z(F \cap G) = z(H) = z(C \circ X \circ Y)$  being a coplane. Since  $z(H) \subsetneq z(X \circ Y)$  we obtain  $X \circ Y$  being an edge hence  $(C, X, Y)$  being a modular triple.  $\square$

The proofs of the next lemmata are all reduced to the case of pseudoline arrangements (oriented matroids of rank 3). First recall that oriented matroid programs of rank 3 are always Euclidean, see [2], Proposition 10.5.7. The next Lemma called 'Projection Lemma' yields a connection between oriented matroid programs with exchanged target functions.

**Lemma 4.1** (Projection Lemma). *Let  $(C, X, Y)$  be a modular triple of cocircuits in an oriented matroid program  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  of rank  $\geq 3$  with  $z(C \circ X \circ Y)$  being a coplane in  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O})$ . Let  $C_g = X_g = Y_g = +$ . Let  $e \in \text{supp}(C)$  and  $(X \circ Y)_e = 0$ . Let cocircuit elimination of  $g$  between  $-X$  and  $C$  yield  $X^1$  and between  $-Y$  and  $C$  yield  $Y^1$ . Then  $X^1 \circ Y^1$  is an edge and*

$$X \rightarrow_{g,f} Y \iff Y^1 \rightarrow_{e,f} X^1 \iff -X^1 \rightarrow_{e,f} -Y^1.$$

*Proof.* Since  $z(X), z(Y), z(C), z(X^1), z(Y^1) \supset z(X \circ Y \circ C) = S$  we can continue with the contraction  $P' = (\mathcal{O}/S, g, f)$  which is a rank 3 oriented matroid program.

Necessarily we must have  $X^1 \neq Y^1$  for otherwise  $z(C \circ X) = z(C \circ X^1) = z(C \circ Y^1) = z(C \circ Y)$  contradicting the assumptions.  $(X^1 \circ Y^1)_g = 0$  then implies that  $X \circ Y$  is an edge. Cocircuit elimination of  $g$  between  $-X$  and  $Y$  yields  $Z$  with  $Z_e = Z_g = 0$ . Cocircuit elimination of  $e$  between  $-Y^1$  and  $X^1$  yields  $Z^1$  with  $Z_e^1 = Z_g^1 = 0$ . This implies  $Z = \pm Z^1$ . Let  $e_1 \in z(Y \circ C) \setminus z(X \circ C)$ , then  $X_{e_1} \neq 0$  but  $C_{e_1} = 0$  and  $X_{e_1}^1 = -X_{e_1}$ . Now  $Z_{e_1} = -X_{e_1}$  and  $Z_{e_1}^1 = X_{e_1}^1$  implies  $Z^1 = Z$  implying the first equivalence. The second equivalence follows from Proposition 2.4.  $\square$

We formulate the so called 'Triangle Lemma'.

**Lemma 4.2** (Triangle Lemma). *Let  $(C, X, Y)$  be a modular triple of cocircuits in an oriented matroid program  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  of rank  $\geq 3$  with  $z(C \circ X \circ Y)$  being a coplane in  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O})$ . Let  $X_g = Y_g = +$  and  $C_g = +$  or  $C_g = 0 \neq C_f$ . Then the triangle  $(X, Y, C)$  connected via the lines through  $(X \circ Y, X \circ C, Y \circ C)$  is not a directed cycle.*

*Proof.* We omit the obvious case  $C_g = 0 \neq C_f$  hence let  $C_g = +$ . First we assume  $f \in z(C \circ X \circ Y) = S$ . Then we have  $X_f = Y_f = C_f = 0$  and (using Proposition 2.6(ii)) all the edges of the triangle are undirected. Otherwise and if the triangle would be a directed cycle we would obtain a directed cycle in the contraction  $P' = (\mathcal{O}/S, g, f)$ . But that is impossible because  $P'$  is of rank 3 hence Euclidean.  $\square$

If we have  $C_g = C_f = 0$  for the crossing point  $C$  of two edges neither the triangle nor the projection lemma yield any information here. We show another lemma regarding that case.

**Lemma 4.3** (Zero-Line Lemma). *Let  $(C, X, Y)$  be a modular triple of cocircuits in an oriented matroid program  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  of rank  $\geq 3$  with  $z(C \circ X \circ Y)$  being a coplane in  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O})$ . Let  $X_g = Y_g = +$  and let  $C_g = C_f = 0$ . Let  $X^1, Y^1$  be different cocircuits in  $(\mathcal{O}, g)$  lying on the line through  $F = X \circ C$  resp.  $G = Y \circ C$  with  $X \neq X^1 \neq C$  and  $Y \neq Y^1 \neq C$  with  $X^1 \circ Y^1$  being an edge. Then  $X^1 \leftrightarrow X$  and  $Y^1 \leftrightarrow Y$  and furthermore*

$$X^1 \rightarrow Y^1 \Leftrightarrow X \rightarrow Y.$$

*Proof.*  $C_f = 0$  implies that all edges along the line through  $F$  and along the line through  $G$  are undirected. If  $X^1 \rightarrow Y^1$  and not  $X \rightarrow Y$  would hold, then Proposition 2.6(ii) would yield a directed cycle  $(X^1, \dots, Y^1, \dots, Y, \dots, X, \dots, X^1)$  in  $P$  and also in the contraction  $P' = (\mathcal{O}/(z(F) \cap z(G)), g, f)$  contradicting the Euclideaness of  $P'$ .  $\square$

**4.3. Directions of Edges with New Cocircuits in Single-element Extensions.** In this section let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be an oriented matroid program of rank  $r$  and let  $\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O} \cup p$  be a non-trivial single-element extension of  $\mathcal{O}$ . Even for the case of an arbitrary single element extension we can show that edges between old and new cocircuits behave in an obvious way.

**Proposition 4.4.** *Let  $X$  be a new cocircuit in  $\mathcal{O}'$  with  $X_g = +$  derived from the two cocircuits  $X^1, X^2$  with  $X_g^1 = X_g^2 = +$ . Then we have*

$$Dir_{(\mathcal{O}', g, f)}(X^1, X) = Dir_{(\mathcal{O}', g, f)}(X, X^2) = Dir_{(\mathcal{O}', g, f)}(X^1, X^2).$$

*Proof.* Proposition 3.2 yields  $Dir_{(\mathcal{O}, g, f)}(X^1, X^2) = Dir_{(\mathcal{O}', g, f)}(X^1, X^2)$  for the old cocircuits  $X^1, X^2$  and the rest follows from Proposition 2.4 (iv).  $\square$

**Proposition 4.5.** *Let  $X$  be an new cocircuit in  $\mathcal{O}'$  with  $X_g = +$  derived from the two cocircuits  $X^1, X^2$  with  $X_g^1 = +$  and  $X_g^2 = 0$ . Then it holds*

$$\text{Dir}_{(\mathcal{O}', g, f)}(X^1, X) = X_f^2 = \text{Dir}_{(\mathcal{O}, g, f)}(X^1, X^2).$$

*Proof.* Cocircuit elimination of  $g$  between  $-X^1$  and  $X$  yields a cocircuit  $W$  with  $W_g = 0, W_p = X_p^2$ . It is clear that  $W = X^2$ .  $\square$

Now we examine the directions of new edges. Because we still work with arbitrary extensions we can not say very much in that case, but at least we can show two helpful propositions.

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let  $X, Y$  be conformal new cocircuits in  $(\mathcal{O}', g)$  derived from the cocircuits  $X^1, X^2$  and  $Y^1, Y^2$  with  $X \circ Y$  being an edge. Let  $F = X^1 \circ X^2$  and  $G = Y^1 \circ Y^2$ . Then there is a crossing point  $C$  different from  $X$  or  $Y$  between the lines through  $F$  and  $G$  with  $C_p \neq 0$  and  $(C, X, Y)$  is a modular triple with  $z(C \circ X \circ Y)$  being a coplane in  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O})$ .*

*Proof.* We have  $z(X) = z(F) \cup p$  and  $z(Y) = z(G) \cup p$  hence  $z(X \circ Y) = (z(F) \cap z(G)) \cup p$  and  $z(X) \neq z(Y)$  yields  $z(F) \neq z(G)$ . Because of  $r(z(X \circ Y)) = r - 2$  we have  $r(z(F) \cap z(G)) \geq r - 3$  and equality follows from  $z(F) \neq z(G)$ . Proposition 4.1 yields the existence of a crossing point  $C$ . We have  $X \neq C \neq Y$  otherwise e.g.  $C = X$  would yield  $z(X) = z(C) \supseteq z(G) \cup p = z(Y)$  hence  $X = \pm Y$  which is impossible. It follows  $C_p \neq 0$  and Proposition 4.3 yields the rest.  $\square$

That means that the Triangle Lemma, the Projection Lemma and the Zero-line Lemma can be applied in that case. Applying the Projection Lemma 4.1 yields immediately a projection of undirected edges in another oriented matroid program.

**Proposition 4.7.** *Let  $X, Y$  be conformal new cocircuits in  $(\mathcal{O}', g)$  derived from the cocircuits  $X^1, X^2$  and  $Y^1, Y^2$  with  $X \circ Y$  being an edge. Let  $C$  be the crossing point of  $X^1 \circ X^2$  and  $Y^1 \circ Y^2$  and let  $C_g = +$ . Let cocircuit elimination of  $g$  between  $-C$  and  $X$  yield  $X^3$  and between  $-C$  and  $Y$  yield  $Y^3$ . Then  $X^3 \circ Y^3$  is an edge and it holds*

$$X \leftrightarrow_{g, f} Y \iff X^3 \leftrightarrow_{p, f} Y^3$$

**4.4. Paths and Cycles in Single Element Extensions.** In this chapter we define the notion of a *normalized cycle* and prove that from each directed cycle we can derive a normalized version. In the following if we have two comodular cocircuits  $X, Y$  we say that  $X$  and  $Y$  *span a line* and with *the path from  $X$  to  $Y$*  we mean always the shorter path from  $X$  to  $Y$  along the line through  $X \circ Y$ . We start with a technical proposition.  $\mathcal{O}$  and  $\mathcal{O}'$  are defined like in the previous subsection.

**Proposition 4.8.** *Let  $X, Y$  be conformal new cocircuits in  $\mathcal{O}'$  derived from the cocircuits  $X^1, X^2$  and  $Y^1, Y^2$  with  $X \circ Y$  being an edge. Let  $F = X^1 \circ X^2$  and  $G = Y^1 \circ Y^2$  and let  $F \neq G$ . Let  $C$  be the crossing point of  $F$  and  $G$ . Let  $C \neq X \neq Y \neq C$  and let  $X_p^1 = Y_p^1 \neq 0$ . Then  $C = \pm X^1$  if and only if  $Y^1 = X^1$ .*

*Proof.* It is clear that if  $X^1 = Y^1$  implies  $X^1 = Y^1 = \pm C$ . For the other implication it suffices to show that  $C$  and  $Y$  are conformal. Assume there is  $q \in \text{sep}(C, Y)$ . Since  $X$  is conformal with  $C$  as well as with  $Y$ , we must have  $q \notin \text{supp}(X)$ . Clearly,  $q \neq p$ , implying  $q \in z(F) \subseteq z(C)$ , contradicting  $q \in \text{sep}(C, Y)$ .  $\square$

The next lemma says that in some constellations we can substitute an edge between two new conformal cocircuits with a path of old cocircuits having the same direction.

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $X, Y$  be conformal cocircuits in  $(\mathcal{O}', g)$  with  $X_p = Y_p = 0$  and  $X \circ Y$  being an edge. Let  $Y$  be new, derived from  $Y^1 \circ Y^2$ . If  $X$  is new let it be derived from  $X^1 \circ X^2$  and let  $X_p^1 = Y_p^1$ . Then if either*

- (i)  $Dir(Y^1, Y^2) = 0$  or
- (ii) both cocircuits are new and  $Dir(X^1, X^2) = -Dir(Y^1, Y^2) \neq 0$

there is a path

$$P = \begin{cases} (X, \dots, Y^i, Y) & \text{if } X \text{ is old,} \\ (X, X^i, \dots, Y^i, Y) & \text{if } X \text{ is new (with } i \in \{1, 2\}) \end{cases}$$

in  $(\mathcal{O}', g)$  directed like the edge  $X \circ Y$ . All cocircuits of  $P \setminus \{X, Y\}$  are old.

*Proof.* If  $X$  is new let  $C$  be the crossing point between the edges  $X^1 \circ X$  and  $Y^1 \circ Y$ . Proposition 4.6 yields  $(C, X, Y)$  being a modular triple with  $z(C \circ X \circ Y)$  being a coplane in  $\mathcal{M}$ . If  $X$  is old let  $e \in \text{supp}(Y) \setminus \text{supp}(X)$  and let  $C$  be a cocircuit on the line through  $Y^1 \circ Y$  with  $C_e = 0$  and  $C_g \neq -$ . We have  $z(C \circ Y \circ X) = z(Y^1 \circ Y \circ X) = z(Y \circ X) \setminus p$  hence  $r(z(C \circ Y \circ X)) \geq r - 3$ . Equality holds because  $p \notin z(C \circ Y)$  and  $p \in z(X \circ Y)$ . Hence  $z(C \circ X \circ Y)$  is a coplane in  $\mathcal{M}$ . Applying Proposition 4.3 with  $Y$  being the crossing point yields that  $X$  and  $C$  span a line and  $(C, X, Y)$  is a modular triple.

First we assume  $C_g = +$ . Let  $Q^1$  be the path on the line from  $X$  to  $C$ , let  $Q^2$  be the path on the line from  $C$  to  $Y$  and let  $P = Q^1 \cup (Q^2 \setminus C)$ . Since  $Y_g = X_g = C_g = +$  and because  $C_p \neq 0$  all cocircuits of  $P$  except  $X$  and  $Y$  are old and lie in  $(\mathcal{O}', g)$ . In case (ii)  $Dir(Y_1, Y_2) = -Dir(X_1, X_2) \neq 0$  implies  $Dir(X, C) = -Dir(Y, C) = Dir(C, Y)$ . Hence  $Q^1$  is directed like  $Q^2$  and  $P$  is a directed path. It must be directed like the edge  $X \circ Y$  otherwise we would obtain a directed cycle contradicting the Triangle Lemma 4.2. In case (i) the path  $Q^2$  is undirected but then  $Q^1$  must be directed like the edge  $X \circ Y$  otherwise we obtain a directed cycle again. In all cases  $P$  is directed like the edge  $X \circ Y$  and ends with  $(\dots, Y^i, Y)$  and starts with  $(X, X^i, \dots)$  if  $X$  is new with  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  hence is as required.

Now we assume  $C_g = 0$ . If  $X$  is new this implies  $Dir(X^1, X^2) = Dir(Y^1, Y^2)$ , hence case (ii) can not appear. We consider only case (i),  $Dir(Y^1, Y^2) = 0$ , implying  $C_f = 0$  hence  $X \leftrightarrow C$ . We may assume  $Y_g^1 = +$  (possibly interchanging superscripts) and  $C_p = Y_p^1$  (possibly using  $-C$ ) hence  $Y^1$  is on the path from  $C$  to  $Y$ . If  $X$  is new  $X_g^1 = 0$  would imply  $X^1 = C$  and Proposition 4.8 would yield  $X^1 = Y^1$  contradicting  $Y^1 \neq C$ . We obtain  $X^1 \neq Y^1$ ,  $X_g^1 = +$  and  $X^1$  being on the path from  $X$  to  $C$ . Let  $h \in \text{supp}(Y) \setminus \text{supp}(Y^1)$ .

We assume  $X_h = 0$ . Then  $X \circ Y^1$  is an edge by Proposition 4.3 and directed like  $X \circ Y$  by the Triangle Lemma 4.2. If  $X$  is new Proposition 2.8 (i) yields  $Y^1 = X^1$  which is impossible. Hence  $X$  is old in that case and the path  $(X, Y^1, Y)$  is as required. Finally, we consider the case  $X_h = Y_h \neq 0$ , recall that  $X$  and  $Y$  are conformal. Cocircuit elimination of  $p$  between  $-C$  and  $Y^1$  yields  $Y$  hence  $-C_h = Y_h = X_h$ . Cocircuit elimination of  $h$  between  $C$  and  $X$  yields a cocircuit  $Z$  with  $Z_g = +$  and  $Z_p = C_p = Y_p^1$ . The path  $Q_1$  from  $X$  to  $Z$  is undirected and starts with  $(X, X^1)$  if  $X$  is new. Proposition 4.3 yields that  $Z$  and  $Y^1$  span a



line and the Zero-line Lemma 4.3 yields that the path  $Q_2$  from  $Z$  to  $Y^1$  is directed like the edge  $X \circ Y$ . All cocircuits of  $Q_1 \setminus X$  and  $Q_2$  lie in  $(\mathcal{O}', g)$ , have the same  $p$ -value  $\neq 0$  hence are old. It holds  $Y^1 \leftrightarrow Y$  and the path  $Q_1 \cup (Q_2 \setminus Z) \cup Y$  is as required.  $\square$

We define normalized paths.

**Definition 4.2.** A path / cycle  $P$  of cocircuits in  $(\mathcal{O}', g)$  is called prenormalized iff for each pair  $(X, Y)$  or  $(Y, X)$  of subsequent cocircuits in  $P$  with  $X$  being new, derived from  $X^1 \circ X^2$  holds:

- (i) If  $X^1 \leftrightarrow X^2$  then  $Y$  is old and  $Y \in \{X^1, X^2\}$ .
- (ii) If  $Y$  is new, derived from  $Y^1 \circ Y^2$  and  $Y_p^1 = X_p^1$  then  $Dir(X^1, X^2) = Dir(Y^1, Y^2) \neq 0$ .

We call  $P$  normalized if additionally  $X$  new, derived from  $X^1 \circ X^2$  and  $X^1 \leftrightarrow X^2$  implies that  $X$  appears only in triples  $(X^i, X, X^{3-i})$  for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  in  $P$ . We call a maximal sequence of new cocircuits in  $P$  a new piece of  $P$ .

We can always derive a directed normalized cycle from a directed cycle.

**Lemma 4.5.** Let  $P = (P^1, \dots, P^n)$  be a directed path in  $(\mathcal{O}', g, f)$ . Then there is a prenormalized path  $Q = (P^1, \dots, P^n)$  in  $(\mathcal{O}', g, f)$  directed like  $P$  containing all cocircuits of  $P$  and additionally only old cocircuits. If  $P$  is a cycle then  $Q$  contains a normalized directed cycle.

*Proof.* Let the path  $P$  have  $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$  violations which are pairs of subsequent cocircuits violating the conditions of the definition of a prenormalized path. Let  $(X, Y)$  be a violation in  $P$ . We have two cases.

- (i) Let  $X$  be an old cocircuit and  $Y$  be new derived from  $Y^1 \circ Y^2$  with  $Y^1 \leftrightarrow Y^2$  and  $X \notin \{Y^1, Y^2\}$  (or vice versa). Then Proposition 2.8 (i) yields  $X_p = 0$  (or  $Y_p = 0$ ) and Lemma 4.4 yields a path  $P' = X, \dots, Y^i, Y$  (or  $P' = (X, X^i, \dots, Y)$ ) with  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  directed like  $X \circ Y$  containing only old cocircuits except  $Y$  (or  $X$ ).
- (ii) Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be new cocircuits derived from  $X^1 \circ X^2$  and  $Y^1 \circ Y^2$ . In a violation we have  $Dir(X^1, X^2) = 0, Dir(Y^1, Y^2) = 0$  or  $Dir(X^1, X^2) = -Dir(Y^1, Y^2) \neq 0$ . In all cases Lemma 4.4 yields a path  $P' = (X, X^i, \dots, C, \dots, Y^i, Y)$  with  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  directed like  $X \circ Y$  containing only old cocircuits except  $X$  and  $Y$ .

If we substitute the subsequent cocircuits  $X, Y$  in the path  $P$  with the path  $P'$  we get a path with  $k - 1$  violations. Using induction yields finally the required path  $Q$  with no violations. If  $P$  is a cycle then  $Q$  is a closed path. For each new cocircuit  $X$  in  $Q$ , derived from  $X^1 \circ X^2$  with  $X^1 \leftrightarrow X^2$  we substitute every triple  $(X^i, X, X^i)$  with  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  in  $Q$  with  $X^i$  and obtain a directed normalized closed path  $Q'$ . It is easy to see that  $Q'$  contains a directed normalized cycle.  $\square$

In new pieces of normalized paths there are constraints concerning the  $f$ - and  $g$ -values.

**Proposition 4.9.** Let  $P$  be a normalized path / cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}', g, f)$  where all cocircuits have the same  $f$ -value  $v_f \neq 0$  and let  $X, Y$  be two new cocircuits of  $P$  such that all cocircuits on the path from  $X$  to  $Y$  are new. Let  $X$  resp.  $Y$  be derived from  $X^1 \circ X^2$  and  $Y^1 \circ Y^2$  with  $X_p^1 = Y_p^1$ . Then  $X_f^1 \neq 0$  or  $Y_g^1 \neq 0$ . In particular we never have  $Y_g^1 = Y_f^1 = 0$ .

*Proof.* The last statement  $Y_g^1 = Y_f^1 = 0$  implies  $Y^1 \leftrightarrow Y$  hence  $Y^1$  would be in  $P$  because  $P$  is normalized contradicting  $P$  being in  $(\mathcal{O}', g)$ . If we assume  $Y_g^1 = 0$  (hence  $Y_f^1 = v_f$ ) and  $X_f^1 = 0$  (hence  $X_g^1 = +$ ) we obtain  $Dir(X, X^1) = -v_f = -Y_f^1 = -Dir(Y, Y^1)$  as  $Y_g^1 = 0$  contradicting the fact that  $P$  is normalized.  $\square$

The next proposition follows from the definition of a normalized path / cycle applying Lemma 2.1 and Corollary 2.1 and from Proposition 2.7.

**Proposition 4.10.** *Let  $P$  be a normalized path / cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}', g, f)$  where all cocircuits and have the same  $f$ -value  $v_f \neq 0$ . If  $v_f = +$  then  $P$  is also a normalized path / cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}', f, g)$  otherwise  $-P = (-P^1, \dots, -P^n)$ .*

We can reconstruct some directed normalized cycles in other oriented matroid programs. This is an application of the Projection Lemma and of Proposition 4.7.

**Lemma 4.6.** *Let  $P = P^1, \dots, P^n$  be a directed normalized cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}', g, f)$  with only new cocircuits. Then we have two disjoint sequences  $\{U^1, \dots, U^n\}$  and  $\{V^1, \dots, V^n\}$  of cocircuits such that  $P^i$  is derived from  $U^i, V^i$  and  $U_p^i = U_p^j = -V_p^i = -V_p^j$  for all  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ . If an edge  $P^i \circ P^{i+1}$  in  $P$  is directed then let  $V^i = V^{i+1}$  hold. Then there is directed cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}', p, f)$  or in  $(\mathcal{O}', p, g)$ .*

*Proof.* By Proposition 4.9 in  $V^1, \dots, V^n$  we have either  $g \neq 0$  or  $f \neq 0$  for all cocircuits. In the first case cocircuit elimination of  $g$  between  $-P^i$  and  $V^i$  if  $V_p^i = +$  or between  $-V^i$  and  $P^i$  if  $V_p^i = -$  yields  $W^i$  with  $W_p^i = W_p^j = +$ . Then  $W = W^1, \dots, W^n$  is a closed path and is directed in  $(\mathcal{O}', p, f)$  because of the Projection Lemma 4.1 and Proposition 4.7.  $W$  contains a directed cycle. In the second case we know from Proposition 2.6 (iv) that all cocircuits in  $P$  have the same  $f$ -value  $v_f \neq 0$ . If  $v_f = +$  let  $P' = P$  if  $v_f = -$  let  $P' = -P$ . Then  $P'$  is a normalized directed cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}', f, g)$  because of the Proposition before. We eliminate  $f$  like in the case before and get a directed closed path hence a directed cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}', p, g)$ .  $\square$

**4.5. The Orientation of the Cocircuit Graph of  $(\mathcal{O} \cup p, g, f)$ .** We give a complete description of the orientation of the edges of that graph where  $\mathcal{O} \cup p$  is a lexicographic extension. Lemma 3.2 and Proposition 4.4 already handle the case of edges that are not new. We look here at the case of new edges. First we formulate new assumptions.

**Definition 4.3.** *By assumptions B we fix the following situation: Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be an oriented matroid of rank  $r$  with groundset  $E$  and let  $f \in E$ . Let  $I = [e_1, \dots, e_k]$  with  $k \leq r$  be an ordered set of independent elements of  $E$ , possibly with  $f \in I$ . Let  $\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O} \cup p$  be the lexicographic extension  $\mathcal{O}[e_1^+, \dots, e_k^+]$ .*

*Let  $X$  be a cocircuit with  $X_p = 0$  derived from the two cocircuits  $X^1$  and  $X^2$ .*

*Let  $Y$  be a cocircuit with  $Y_p = 0$  derived from the two cocircuits  $Y^1$  and  $Y^2$ .*

*Let  $X_g = Y_g = +$ . Let  $X \circ Y$  be an edge and  $X, Y$  conformal cocircuits. We assume  $X_p^1 = Y_p^1 = -X_p^2 = -Y_p^2 \neq 0$ . Let  $\text{ind}_X$  and  $\text{ind}_Y$  be the indices of  $X$  and  $Y$  wrt.  $I$ .*

**Remark 4.7.** *In this subsection we omit the case that one (or more) of the cocircuits are zero on  $f$  and on  $g$ .*

**Proposition 4.11.** *Let assumptions B hold. If the four cocircuits  $X^1, X^2, Y^1, Y^2$  are distinct then none of the cocircuits is the crossing point of the edges  $X^1 \circ X^2$  and  $Y^1 \circ Y^2$ .*

*Proof.* That is a direct consequence of Proposition 4.8.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.12.** *Let assumptions B hold. Let  $X$  and  $Y$  have the same index  $\text{ind}_X = \text{ind}_Y = i$ . Then we have either  $X_{e_i}^1 = Y_{e_i}^1 = 0$  or  $X_{e_i}^2 = Y_{e_i}^2 = 0$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from Lemma 2.4 that for one and only one of the cocircuits  $X^1, X^2$  resp.  $Y^1, Y^2$  that give rise to  $X$  resp.  $Y$  we have  $e_i = 0$ . We assume  $X_{e_i}^1 = Y_{e_i}^2 = 0$ . Then we have  $X_p^2 = X_{e_i}^2 \neq 0$  and  $Y_p^1 = Y_{e_i}^1 \neq 0$ . Because  $X_p^2 = -Y_p^1$  we obtain  $X_{e_i}^2 = -Y_{e_i}^1$  hence  $X_{e_i} = -Y_{e_i} \neq 0$  and  $X, Y$  are not conformal, contradicting assumptions B.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.13.** *Let assumptions B hold. Let  $i = \text{ind}_X$  and  $j = \text{ind}_Y$  with  $i < j$ . Then we have  $Y_{e_i}^1 = Y_{e_i}^2 = 0$  and either  $X^1 = Y^1$  and  $X_{e_i}^2 \neq 0$  or  $X^2 = Y^2$  and  $X_{e_i}^1 \neq 0$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $C$  be the crossing point between the two edges  $X^1 \circ X^2$  and  $Y^1 \circ Y^2$ . It holds  $C_{e_i} = 0$ . On the other hand we have either  $X_{e_i}^1 = 0$  or  $X_{e_i}^2 = 0$ . We may assume  $X_{e_i}^1 = 0$ . Then we have  $X_{e_i}^2 \neq 0$  and  $C = X^1$  because of Proposition 2.2 and  $X_g^1 \in \{0, +\}$ . But then Proposition 4.8 yields  $Y^1 = X^1$  which shows everything.  $\square$

We define all constellations that can appear between two new comodular, conformal cocircuits.

**Definition 4.4.** *Let assumptions B hold.*

*Let  $X$  and  $Y$  have the same index  $\text{ind}_X = \text{ind}_Y = i$ . We assume  $X_{e_i}^2 = Y_{e_i}^2 = 0$ . We have the following constellations.*

- *If  $X^1 \neq Y^1$  and  $X^2 = Y^2$  we call it constellation A,*
- *if  $X^1 \neq Y^1$  and  $X^2 \neq Y^2$  we call it constellation B.*
- *if  $X^1 = Y^1$  and  $X^2 \neq Y^2$  we call it constellation AB.*

*Let  $X$  and  $Y$  have different indices. We may assume that  $i = \text{ind}_X < \text{ind}_Y = j$  and  $X_{e_i}^2 = 0$  hence  $X_{e_i}^1 \neq 0$ . Then we have  $Y_{e_i}^1 = Y_{e_i}^2 = 0$  and  $X^2 = Y^2$ . We call that constellation an index change constellation. If additionally we have  $Y_{e_j}^1 = 0$ , hence  $Y_{e_j}^2 \neq 0$  (or vice versa) we call it an index change constellation with (or without) side change.*

**Proposition 4.14.** *Let constellation B or AB hold. Then  $X^2 \circ Y^2$  is an edge and  $X^2, Y^2$  are conformal.*

*Proof.* Proposition 4.6 and Proposition 4.3 yield that  $X^2 \circ Y^2$  is an edge. If  $X^2$  and  $Y^2$  were not conformal and we would have  $X_e^2 = +$ , and  $Y_e^2 = -$ , then we would also have  $X_e = +, Y_e = -$  hence  $X, Y$  would be not conformal.  $\square$

**Definition 4.5.** *Let assumptions B hold and let  $i$  be the lower index of the two cocircuits  $X$  and  $Y$ . We call  $X, Y$  the original cocircuits and  $X \circ Y$  the original edge. All old cocircuits with  $e_i = 0$  in the constellations are corresponding cocircuits (see Remark 2.5). If we have two different corresponding cocircuits in a constellation they form an edge with  $e_i = 0$  which we call the corresponding edge of the constellation.*

We start with a small and clear proposition concerning  $g$ .

**Proposition 4.15.** *Let assumptions B hold and let  $i$  be the index of a cocircuit with  $g = +$ . Then  $g \notin \{e_1, \dots, e_{i-1}\}$ .*




FIGURE 2. Constellation A




FIGURE 3. Constellation AB




FIGURE 4. Constellation B




FIGURE 5. Index Change Constellation Without Side Change




FIGURE 6. Index Change Constellation With Side Change

Now we give a description of the directions of  $(X, Y)$  in nearly all constellations. We start with the index change constellation.

**Proposition 4.16.** *Let the index change constellation hold. We may assume  $i = \text{ind}_X < \text{ind}_Y = j$  and  $X^2 = Y^2 = C$  and let  $X_g = Y_g = +$ . If  $\text{Dir}(C, Y) = 0$  then  $\text{Dir}(X, Y) = \text{Dir}(X, C)$  holds. Otherwise we obtain  $\text{Dir}(X, Y) = \text{Dir}(C, Y)$ .*

*Proof.* First we may assume that  $C_g = +$ . The first statement follows directly from the Triangle Lemma 4.2. Hence let  $\text{Dir}(C, Y) \neq 0$ . If we have  $\text{Dir}(C, X) = 0$  or  $\text{Dir}(C, X) = -\text{Dir}(C, Y)$  the Triangle Lemma 4.2 yields  $\text{Dir}(X, Y) = \text{Dir}(C, Y)$ . Hence we may assume  $0 \neq \text{Dir}(C, X) = \text{Dir}(C, Y)$ . We have  $C_{e_i} = Y_{e_i} = 0$  and  $X_{e_i} \neq 0$ . Cocircuit elimination of  $g$  between  $-X$  and  $C$  yields the cocircuit  $X^3$  and between  $-Y$  and  $C$  yields the cocircuit  $Y^3$ . We have  $Y_f^3 \neq 0$ . We have also  $i = \text{ind}_{X^3} < j \leq \text{ind}_{Y^3}$ . The Projection Lemma 4.1 yields  $\text{Dir}_{g,f}(X, Y) = -\text{Dir}_{p,f}(X^3, Y^3)$ . Lemma 3.5 yields  $\text{Dir}_{p,f}(X^3, Y^3) = Y_f^3 \neq 0$ . But it holds also  $Y_f^3 = \text{Dir}_{g,f}(Y, C)$ . We obtain  $\text{Dir}_{g,f}(X, Y) = -\text{Dir}_{g,f}(Y, C)$ . Now we assume that  $C_g = 0$  hence  $C_f = v_f \neq 0$ . We obtain directly  $X_f = Y_f = v_f$  and get the statement of the Proposition by exchanging  $g$  and  $f$  and using Lemma 2.1 or Corollary 2.1.  $\square$

The next lemma handles constellation B and AB. We use the Projection Lemma 4.1 quite often in the proof.

**Lemma 4.8.** *Let constellation B or AB hold. Let  $X_g = Y_g = +$  and let  $i$  be the index of the cocircuits  $X$  and  $Y$ . Let  $f, g \notin \{e_1, \dots, e_{i-1}\}$ . Let  $X_p^2 = Y_p^2 = v_p \neq 0$  and let  $\text{Dir}(X, X^2) = \text{Dir}(Y, Y^2) \neq 0$ . Let  $X_g^2 \neq 0$  or  $Y_g^2 \neq 0$  or both and let  $j$  be the index of the cocircuit  $Z$  yielded by cocircuit elimination of  $g$  between  $-X^2$  and  $Y^2$ . Then the following holds:*

- (i) *If  $\text{Dir}(X^2, Y^2) \neq 0$  then  $\text{Dir}(X, Y) = \text{Dir}(X^2, Y^2)$ .*
- (ii) *If  $\text{Dir}(X^2, Y^2) = 0$  and  $j \leq k$  then*

$$\text{Dir}(X, Y) = -v_p * \text{Dir}(X, X^2) * \text{Dir}_{g,e_j}(X^2, Y^2).$$

- (iii) *If  $\text{Dir}(X^2, Y^2) = 0$  and  $j = k + 1$  then  $\text{Dir}(X, Y) = 0$ .*

Now let  $X_g^2 = Y_g^2 = 0$  and let  $j$  be the index of the cocircuit  $Z$  yielded by cocircuit elimination of  $f$  between  $-X^2$  and  $Y^2$ . Then the following holds:

- (iv) *If  $j \leq k$  then*

$$\text{Dir}(X, Y) = -v_p * \text{Dir}(X, X^2) * \text{Dir}_{f,e_j}(X^2, Y^2).$$

(v) If  $j = k + 1$  then  $Dir(X, Y) = 0$ .

If  $f$  and  $g$  are in general position and not in I only case (i) can appear.

*Proof.* Let  $Dir(X, X^2) = v_f$ . We have  $X_f = Y_f \neq 0$  because  $v_f \neq 0$  and  $j > i$  because  $X^2$  and  $Y^2$  have index  $> i$ . We assume  $X_g^2 = Y_g^2 = +$ . Cocircuit elimination of  $g$  between  $-X$  and  $X^2$  yields  $X^3$ . Cocircuit elimination of  $g$  between  $-Y$  and  $Y^2$  yields  $Y^3$ . We have  $X_f^3 = Y_f^3 = v_f \neq 0$ . Let  $C$  be the crossing point between the two edges  $X \circ X^2$  and  $Y \circ Y^2$ . We assume  $C_g = +$  hence  $C \neq X^3 \neq Y^3 \neq C$  and postpone the other case at the end. We have  $v_p = X_p^3 = Y_p^3 = X_{e_i}^3 = Y_{e_i}^3 \neq 0$  because  $X^3$  and  $Y^3$  have index  $i$ . Let  $\epsilon = -$  if  $C_p = X_p^2$  and  $\epsilon = +$  otherwise. The Projection Lemma 4.1 yields

$$(4.1) \quad Dir_{g,f}(X, Y) = \epsilon * Dir_{p,f}(X^3, Y^3)$$

$$(4.2) \quad Dir_{g,f}(X^2, Y^2) = \epsilon * Dir_{e_i,f}(X^3, Y^3) \text{ if } f \neq e_i$$

$$(4.3) \quad Dir_{g,e_j}(X^2, Y^2) = \epsilon * Dir_{e_i,e_j}(X^3, Y^3)$$

If  $f \neq e_i$  and  $Dir_{g,f}(X^2, Y^2) \neq 0$  equation 4.2 yields  $Dir_{e_i,f}(X^3, Y^3) \neq 0$ . Using equation 4.1, Lemma 3.3 and equation 4.2 we have

$$Dir_{g,f}(X, Y) = \epsilon * Dir_{p,f}(X^3, Y^3) = \epsilon * Dir_{e_i,f}(X^3, Y^3) = Dir_{g,f}(X^2, Y^2)$$

Otherwise the assumptions of Lemma 3.4 hold for  $X^3$  and  $Y^3$ . We assume  $i < j \leq k$ . Then  $j$  is also the smallest index with  $Dir_{e_i,e_j}(X^3, Y^3) \neq 0$  because equation 4.3 holds for all  $j > i$ . We obtain (using equation 4.1, Lemma 2.1 or Corollary 2.1, Lemma 3.4 and equation 4.3):

$$\begin{aligned} Dir_{g,f}(X, Y) &= \epsilon * Dir_{p,f}(X^3, Y^3) = -\epsilon * v_p * X_f^3 * Dir_{f,p}(X^3, Y^3) \\ &= -\epsilon * v_p * X_f^3 * Dir_{e_i,e_j}(X^3, Y^3) = -v_p * X_f^3 * Dir_{g,e_j}(X^2, Y^2) \end{aligned}$$

If  $j = k + 1$  we have

$$Dir_{g,f}(X, Y) = \epsilon * Dir_{p,f}(X^3, Y^3) = 0.$$

Now let  $X_g^2 = +$  and  $Y_g^2 = 0$ . The Projection Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 3.5 yield

$$Dir_{g,f}(X, Y) = Dir_{p,f}(X^3, Y^2) = Y_f^2 = Dir_{g,f}(X^2, Y^2).$$

The case  $X_g^2 = 0$  and  $Y_g^2 = +$  works analogously. If  $X_g^2 = Y_g^2 = 0$  we have  $X_f^2 = Y_f^2 = Dir(X, X^2) = v_f$ . The Projection Lemma 4.1, Lemma 2.1 and the fact that  $Z$  is old (Lemma 3.2) having index  $j$  yield

$$Dir_{g,f}(X, Y) = Dir_{p,f}(X^2, Y^2) = -v_p * v_f * Dir_{f,p}(X^2, Y^2) = -v_p * v_f * Z_p$$

This equals 0 if  $j = k + 1$  otherwise we obtain

$$Dir_{g,f}(X, Y) = -v_p * v_f * Z_{e_j} = -v_p * v_f * Dir_{f,e_j}(X^2, Y^2).$$

Finally if  $X^3 = Y^3 = C$  it must be  $X_f^3 \neq 0$ . Because we have  $X_f = Y_f \neq 0$  we can exchange  $f$  and  $g$  using Lemma 2.1 or Corollary 2.1 and work like before. In case (ii) we need Proposition 2.5 yielding  $Dir_{g,e_j}(X^2, Y^2) = Dir_{f,e_j}(X^2, Y^2)$  if  $Dir(X^2, Y^2) = 0$ . The last statement is obvious.  $\square$

To be complete we add a short proposition concerning constellation A which follows directly from the Projection Lemma 4.1 and from Proposition 2.1.

**Proposition 4.17.** *Let constellation  $A$  hold. Let  $X_f = Y_f \neq 0$  and  $X_g = Y_g = +$ . Let  $X_g^2 = +$  then cocircuit elimination of  $g$  between  $-X$  ( $-Y$ ) and  $C$  yields  $X^3$  ( $Y^3$ ). We obtain  $Dir_{g,f}(X, Y) = -Dir_{p,f}(X^3, Y^3)$ . If  $X_g^2 = 0$  and  $X_f^2 = X_f$  we eliminate  $f$  between  $-X$  ( $-Y$ ) and  $C$  obtaining  $X^3$  ( $Y^3$ ). We have  $Dir_{g,f}(X, Y) = -v_f * Dir_{f,g}(X, Y) = v_f * Dir_{p,g}(X^3, Y^3)$ .*

**4.6. The Corresponding Cycle.** Now we construct a normalized cycle  $P$  its corresponding cycle  $Q$  containing only old, corresponding cocircuits (recall Remark 2.5). We show that in most cases  $Q$  is directed in a program of  $\mathcal{O}$  iff  $P$  is. In this chapter let  $\mathcal{O}$  be an oriented matroid of rank  $r$  with groundset  $E$  and  $f \in E$ . Let  $I = [e_1, \dots, e_k]$  with  $k \leq r$  be an ordered set of independent elements of  $E$ . Let  $\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O} \cup p$  be the lexicographic extension  $\mathcal{O}[e_1^+, \dots, e_k^+]$ . We construct the corresponding path.

**Definition 4.6.** *Let  $P = (P^1, \dots, P^n)$  be a path / cycle in  $\mathcal{O}'$ . Let  $Q^i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  such that  $Q^i = P^i$  if  $P^i$  is an old cocircuit and  $Q^i = X$  if  $P^i$  is a new cocircuit and  $X$  its corresponding cocircuit. We call  $Q' = (Q^1, \dots, Q^n)$  the corresponding sequence to  $P$ . In  $Q'$  we may have subsequent repeating cocircuits. Identifying subsequent equal cocircuits we call  $Q$  the corresponding path to  $P$ .*

We collect some facts about the corresponding sequence / path. In the following if we say an edge is directed, we mean directed in  $(\mathcal{O}', g, f)$  or  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$ .

**Proposition 4.18.** *Let  $P$  be a path in  $(\mathcal{O}', g)$  and let  $Q'$  be the corresponding sequence to  $P$ . Let  $P^i, P^{i+1}$  be two subsequent cocircuits in  $P$ . Then we have  $Q^i \neq Q^{i+1}$  in  $Q'$  in four cases.*

- (i)  $P^i, P^{i+1}$  are both old.
- (ii) One of both cocircuits is new the other one old but not corresponding.
- (iii)  $P^i, P^{i+1}$  are in constellation  $AB$  or  $B$ .
- (iv)  $P^i, P^{i+1}$  are in an index change constellation with side change.

We omit the case that  $Q_g^i = Q_f^i = 0$  or  $Q_g^{i+1} = Q_f^{i+1} = 0$  or both.  $F = Q^i \circ Q^{i+1}$  and  $E = P^i \circ P^{i+1}$  are edges. In the four cases, we obtain

- (i)  $F$  is directed like  $E$ .
- (ii)  $F$  is directed like  $E$ .
- (iii)  $F$  is undirected or directed like  $E$ .
- (iv)  $F$  is undirected or directed like  $E$ . If  $P$  is normalized  $F$  is directed like  $E$ .

*Proof.* If  $P^i, P^{i+1}$  are old we have  $E = F$ , if only one cocircuit  $X \in \{P^i, P^{i+1}\}$  is new then  $F$  is the edge where  $X$  is derived from and Proposition 4.4 yields (ii). Lemma 4.8 yields (iii) and Proposition 4.16 (iv). In all cases  $F$  is an edge, this is Proposition 4.14 and Theorem 2.2.  $\square$

Inversely we have.

**Proposition 4.19.** *Let  $P$  be a path in  $(\mathcal{O}', g)$  and let  $Q$  be the corresponding path to  $P$ . Let  $Q^j, Q^{j+1}$  be two subsequent cocircuits in  $Q$ . Then they are corresponding to two subsequent cocircuits  $P^i$  and  $P^{i+1}$  in  $P$ . The cocircuits  $Q^j \setminus p, Q^{j+1} \setminus p$  are conformal in  $\mathcal{O}$  and  $F = Q^j \setminus p \circ Q^{j+1} \setminus p$  is an edge in  $\mathcal{O}$ . We call  $E = P^i \circ P^{i+1}$  the original edge and  $F$  the corresponding edge to  $E$ . If we assume  $Q_g^j = Q_g^{j+1} = +$  and if  $F$  is directed then it is directed like  $E$ .*

*Proof.* The existence of  $P^i$  and  $P^{i+1}$  follows from the definition. If  $Q^j \setminus p, Q^{j+1} \setminus p$  were not conformal then also not  $P^i$  and  $P^{i+1}$ . The other statements follow from the Proposition before.  $\square$

We prove some facts about the corresponding path.

**Proposition 4.20.** *Let  $P = (P^1, \dots, P^n)$  be a path in  $\mathcal{O}'$  and  $Q$  its corresponding path. The following holds:*

- (i)  $Q$  contains only old cocircuits and contains all old cocircuits of  $P$ .
- (ii) If  $P^i$  is a new cocircuit, then its corresponding cocircuit lies in  $Q$ .
- (iii)  $Q$  is a path in  $\mathcal{O}$ . If  $P$  is a cycle then  $Q$  is a closed path.
- (iv) If an edge in  $Q$  is directed, the original edge in  $P$  has the same direction.
- (v) If  $P$  is directed then  $Q$  is directed like  $P$  or undirected.

*Proof.* (i), (ii) and (iii) follow from the construction of  $Q$ , (iv) is the Proposition before and (v) follows from (iv).  $\square$

Now we consider normalized paths. Recall Proposition 4.9 that in normalized paths none of the corresponding cocircuits have  $f = g = 0$ .

**Lemma 4.9.** *Let  $P = (P^1, \dots, P^n)$  be a directed normalized closed path in  $\mathcal{O}'$  and  $Q$  its corresponding closed path. Then either all cocircuits of  $Q$  have  $f = 0$  or none of them and either all cocircuits of  $Q$  have  $g = 0$  or none of them.*

*Proof.* Because  $P$  is directed and because of Proposition 2.6 (iv) all cocircuits in  $P$  have the same  $f$ -value  $v_f$ . Hence all cocircuits in  $Q$  have  $f = 0$  or  $f = v_f$  and  $g = 0$  or  $g = +$  (but never  $f = g = 0$  because  $P$  is normalized). First we assume having cocircuits in  $Q$  with  $g = 0$  (hence  $f = v_f$ ) and other cocircuits with  $g = +$ . But then we have at least one edge going from  $g = 0$  to  $g = +$  having direction  $-v_f$  and one edge going from  $g = +$  to  $g = 0$  with direction  $v_f$  (see the definition of the Dir-function) hence also  $P$  would have edges with opposite directions because of Proposition 4.20. If we assume all cocircuits having  $g = 0$  then all cocircuits have  $f = v_f$  and we are done. Last we assume all cocircuits having  $g = +$ . If we would have a cocircuit with  $v_f$  and a cocircuit with 0 in  $Q$  we would get at least two edges with opposite direction hence also in  $P$  like before which is impossible.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.21.** *The corresponding closed path  $Q$  to a directed normalized closed path  $P$  with old cocircuits has no cocircuits with  $f = 0$  and with  $g = 0$ .*

*Proof.* All cocircuits in  $P$  have the same  $f$ -value  $v_f \neq 0$ . Because  $P$  contains old cocircuits  $Q$  contains also at least one cocircuit with  $g = +$  and  $f = v_f$  hence all cocircuits in  $Q$  must have  $g = +$  and  $f = v_f$  because of the Lemma before.  $\square$

Now we can handle the index change constellations with side change.

**Lemma 4.10.** *The corresponding cycle to a directed normalized cycle with index change constellations with side change is always directed.*

*Proof.* Let  $F$  be a corresponding edge to an index change constellation with side change. Then at least one of the two cocircuits of the edge must have  $f \neq 0$  and one  $g = +$  hence Proposition 4.21 and Lemma 4.9 yield that all  $f \neq 0$  and  $g = +$  in the corresponding cycle. Proposition 4.18 (iv) yields that  $F$  is directed like the original edge hence Proposition 4.20 yields that the corresponding cycle is directed.  $\square$

We show a main first result concerning the corresponding cycle.



**Lemma 4.11.** *The corresponding closed path  $Q$  to a directed normalized closed path  $P$  with old cocircuits is always directed.*

*Proof.* If  $P$  contains only old cocircuits then  $Q = P$ . Hence we may assume that there are also new cocircuits in  $P$ . All cocircuits in  $P$  have the same  $f$ -value  $v_f \neq 0$ . Proposition 4.21 yields that all cocircuits in  $Q$  have  $g = +$  and  $f = v_f$ . Because of Lemma 4.10 we may assume that we have no index change constellations with side change in the cycle.

We show that  $Q$  contains at least one directed edge (then it is directed because of Proposition 4.20 (vi)). We may assume that  $P$  hence  $Q$  starts with an old cocircuit. We consider the first transition in  $P$  from an outside cocircuit  $P^{i-1}$  to an inside cocircuit  $P^i$ . It comes now a pathpiece with new cocircuits derived from cocircuits of two partitions  $X = \{X^i \dots\}$  and  $Y = \{Y^i \dots\}$  with  $X_p^i = -Y_p^j$ . The corresponding path of that inside pathpiece contains only the edges of one partition. We may assume of partition  $Y$ . If  $P^{i-1} = X^i$  we have an edge from  $X^i$  to  $Y^i$  in the corresponding cycle that is directed, too. Hence we may assume that is  $P^{i-1} = Y^i$ . Because  $P$  is normalized we have  $Dir(Y^i, P^i) = v_y$  with  $v_y \in \{+, -\}$ . But then let  $P^{i+k}$  be the last new cocircuit in that pathpiece and  $P^{i+k+1}$  the next outside cocircuit. Because  $P$  is normalized we have  $Dir(P^{i+k}, Y^{i+k}) = -v_y$  hence because  $P$  is directed  $P^{i+k+1}$  must be the cocircuit  $X^{i+k}$  which means that we have the directed edge  $Y^{i+k} \circ X^{i+k}$  in the corresponding path  $Q$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.12.** *Let  $P = (P^1, \dots, P^n = P^1)$  be a normalized directed cycle of new cocircuits without index change constellations with side change. Then all cocircuits in  $P$  have the same index.*

*Proof.* Assume to the contrary that in the cycle we have at least one index-change constellation without side change from a cocircuit with lower index to a cocircuit with higher index and vice versa. Proposition 4.16 yields then two edges in  $P$  in opposite direction because  $P$  is normalized.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.13.** *Let  $P = (P^1, \dots, P^n = P^1)$  be a normalized directed cycle of new cocircuits without index change constellations with side change such that at least one edge in constellation  $B$  or  $AB$  is directed. Then there is a directed cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  or in a  $(\mathcal{O}, g, e_j)$  (or in  $(\mathcal{O}, f, g)$  or in a  $(\mathcal{O}, f, e_j)$ ) where  $j$  is higher than the index of the cocircuits of  $P$ . The second case appears only if  $f$  (or  $g$ ) is not in general position.*

*Proof.* All cocircuits of  $P$  have the same  $f$ -value  $v_f \neq 0$ . Because of Lemma 4.12 all cocircuits in  $P$  have the same index  $i$ . We assume  $g = +$  for all cocircuits in  $Q$ . Proposition 4.20 yields that if  $Q$  has at least one directed edge in  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  it is a directed cycle there. If  $Q$  is undirected then let  $j > i$  be the smallest index reached by cocircuit elimination of  $g$  between the corresponding cocircuits  $-Q^1, Q^2$  of the directed edges in constellation  $B$  or  $AB$ . Because of Lemma 4.8 (ii) it must hold  $j < r + 1$ , because  $P$  is directed and  $Q$  is directed in  $(\mathcal{O}, g, e_j)$  because  $P$  is normalized and the directions  $Dir(X, X^2)$  are all the same. If we have  $g = 0$  for all cocircuits in  $Q$  we obtain  $f = v_f$  for all of them (because  $P$  is normalized). Then  $P$  (or  $-P$  if  $v_f = -$ ) is also a directed and normalized cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}, f, g)$ , see Proposition 4.10, and we obtain a directed cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}, f, g)$  or in  $(\mathcal{O}, f, e_k)$  with  $k > i$  like before.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.14.** *Let  $(P^1, \dots, P^n = P^1)$  be a normalized directed cycle of new cocircuits without index change constellations with side change such that none of the edges in constellation AB and B are directed. Then there is a directed cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}', p, f)$  or in  $(\mathcal{O}', p, g)$ .*

*Proof.* That is Lemma 4.6. If there is  $f = 0$  for all cocircuits we project to  $g$  and if  $g = 0$  we project to  $f$ .  $\square$

**4.7. Second Main Theorem.** We put everything together for the second main Theorem.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be an oriented matroid of rank  $r$  with groundset  $E$  and  $f \neq g \in E$ . Let  $I = [e_1, \dots, e_k]$  with  $k \leq r$  be an ordered set of independent elements of  $E$ . Let  $l \leq k$  be the smallest index such that  $f \in \text{cl}(\{e_1, \dots, e_l\})$ . If there is no such an  $l$  then let  $l = k + 1$ . Let  $m \leq k$  be the smallest index such that  $g \in \text{cl}(\{e_1, \dots, e_m\})$ . If there is no such an  $m$  then let  $m = k + 1$ .*

- (i) *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be a Euclidean oriented matroid program and*
- (ii) *let  $(\mathcal{O}, e_1, f), \dots, (\mathcal{O}, e_k, f)$  be Euclidean oriented matroid programs and*
- (iii) *let  $(\mathcal{O}, e_1, g), \dots, (\mathcal{O}, e_k, g)$  be Euclidean oriented matroid programs and*
- (iv) *if  $\min(l, m) < k + 1$  or if  $f$  or  $g$  are not in general position let  $n = \min(\max(l, m), k - 1)$  and let  $(\mathcal{O}/\{e_1, \dots, e_{i-1}\}, e_i, e_j)$  be Euclidean oriented matroid programs for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $i < j \leq k$ .*

*Let  $\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O} \cup p$  be the lexicographic extension  $\mathcal{O}[e_1^+, \dots, e_k^+]$ . Then  $(\mathcal{O}', g, f)$  is a Euclidean oriented matroid program.*

*Proof.* First if we have a directed cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}', g, f)$  with old cocircuits we have also a directed normalized closed path in  $(\mathcal{O}', g, f)$  with old cocircuits because of Lemma 4.5. But because of Lemma 4.11 we obtain a directed corresponding closed path and Proposition 2.6 (i) yields a directed cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  which is impossible. Hence we assume a directed cycle  $P$  with only new cocircuits. Again Lemma 4.5 yields a normalized directed closed path. Again that closed path cannot have old cocircuits. Hence we can assume that  $P$  is a directed normalized cycle with only new cocircuits. Let  $Q$  be its corresponding closed path.

Because of Proposition 2.6 (iv) all cocircuits in  $P$  have the same  $f$ -value  $v_f$ . We know from Lemma 4.9 that for all cocircuits in  $Q$  we have  $g = 0$  or for none of them. We assume  $g = +$  for all of them otherwise we have  $f = v_f$  for all cocircuits and we look at the cycle  $P$  (or  $-P$  if  $v_f = -$ ) in  $(\mathcal{O}', f, g)$ . It stays a directed normalized cycle there because of Proposition 4.10. We know from Lemma 4.10 that we have no index change constellations with side change in  $P$ . Hence from Lemma 4.12 we know that all cocircuits in  $P$  have the same index. If in  $P$  at least one of the constellation AB or B edges are directed the closed path  $Q$  is also directed in  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  or in  $(\mathcal{O}, g, e_j)$  where  $j$  is higher than index the cocircuits in  $P$ , see Lemma 4.13. If in  $P$  the constellation AB and B edges are all undirected (or there are no such edges) and an edge of constellation A is directed the projected closed path  $Q'$  is also directed in  $(\mathcal{O}', p, f)$  (or in  $(\mathcal{O}', p, g)$  if we exchange  $g$  and  $f$ ), see Lemma 4.14, contradicting that  $(\mathcal{O}', p, f)$  and  $(\mathcal{O}', p, g)$  are Euclidean oriented matroid programs which was shown by the first main Theorem 3.1.  $\square$

**Remark 4.15.** *We use assumption (iv) of the Theorem only to recur on Theorem 3.1 hence we can always substitute  $e_i$  by  $f$  or by  $g$  there (see Remark 3.9).*

We formulate the Theorem if  $g$  and  $f$  are in general position.

**Corollary 4.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be an oriented matroid of rank  $r$  with groundset  $E$ . Let  $I = [e_1, \dots, e_k]$  with  $k \leq r$  be an ordered set of independent elements of  $E$ . Let  $f \neq g \in E \setminus I$  be in general position.*

- (i) *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be a Euclidean oriented matroid program and*
- (ii) *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, e_1, f), \dots, (\mathcal{O}/\{e_1, \dots, e_{k-1}\}, e_k, f)$  be Euclidean oriented matroid programs and*
- (iii) *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, e_1, g), \dots, (\mathcal{O}/\{e_1, \dots, e_{k-1}\}, e_k, g)$  be Euclidean oriented matroid programs.*

*Let  $\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O} \cup p$  be the lexicographic extension  $\mathcal{O}[e_1^+, \dots, e_k^+]$ . Then  $(\mathcal{O}', g, f)$  is a Euclidean oriented matroid program.*

*Proof.* That follows directly from Theorem 4.1 and from the fact that we needed the assumptions (ii) and (iii) in the proof of that theorem only where we applied Corollary 3.1 (at the end of the proof) and where we applied the second case of Lemma 4.13. That case does not appear if  $f$  and  $g$  are in general position. Hence we can replace these assumptions with the weaker assumptions of Corollary 3.1.  $\square$

From that follows directly:

**Theorem 1.2.** *A lexicographic extension of a Euclidean oriented matroid stays Euclidean.*

## 5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be a Euclidean oriented matroid program. Then  $G_f$  defines a partial order of the cocircuits of  $(\mathcal{O} \setminus f)$ . Let  $f$  be in general position. Every linear extension of that order defines a non-degenerate topological sweep and vice versa.*

**5.1. Sketch of the Proof.** The fact that a topological sweep (which is an ordering of the cocircuits of  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  together with a set of parallel extensions going through each cocircuit) always respects the partial order defined by  $G_f$  follows directly from the definition. The other way around is more complicated. We construct a sweep by adding parallel extensions going through the cocircuits in order of the given linear order. Using induction we show that these extensions form a sweep. We use here that  $G_f$  is connected which we prove in Lemma 5.2.

**5.2. Topological Sweeping (adding results from paper [1]).** We start considering paths in the cocircuit graph  $G_f$  of an oriented matroid. Concerning the connectivity of  $G_f$  we cite some definitions and a theorem from [3].

**Definition 5.1** (see, [3], chapter 3). *Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the set of covectors of an oriented matroid  $\mathcal{O}$  let  $j \in \{+, -\}$  and let  $e$  be an element of the groundset of  $\mathcal{O}$ . We call  $S_e^j = \{X \in \mathcal{L} \mid X_e = j\}$  an open hemisphere and  $\tilde{S}_e^j = \{X \in \mathcal{L} \mid X_e = j \text{ or } 0\}$  a closed hemisphere of an oriented matroid. We call an intersection of closed hemispheres of an oriented matroid a supercell. We call a supercell  $\mathcal{S}$   $e$ -positive if  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \tilde{S}_e^+$  and  $\mathcal{S} \cap S_e^+ \neq \emptyset$ . A path in the cocircuit graph of an oriented matroid is called  $e$ -positive if all intermediate cocircuits in the path have  $e = +$ .*

We cite a theorem, see [3], Lemma 3.3.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be an oriented matroid and let  $e$  be an element of its groundset. Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be an  $e$ -positive supercell. Then there exists an  $e$ -positive path between two vertices of the cocircuit graph of  $\mathcal{S}$ .*

**Theorem 5.2.** *Let  $(P) = (\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be a feasible and bounded Euclidean oriented matroid program with groundset  $E_n \dot{\cup} f \dot{\cup} g$ . Let  $P(E_n)$  be the feasible region of  $(P)$ ,  $I$  a covector in  $P(E_n)$  and let  $G_f$  be the graph defined in Definition 2.2. Moreover assume that  $Y_f = +$  for all cocircuits  $Y$  of the feasible region.*

- (i) *The graph  $G_f$  is connected.*
- (ii) *The subgraph  $G_{f|I}$  of  $G_f$  induced from the cocircuits of  $[0, I]$  is connected.*
- (iii) *The subgraph  $G_{f|P(E_n)}$  of  $G_f$  induced from the cocircuits of  $[0, P(E_n)]$  is connected.*

*Proof.* ad (i):  $G_f$  is the cocircuit graph of an oriented matroid with the cocircuits with  $g = +$ . It is hence a the cocircuit graph of a supercell. We can apply theorem 5.1 and get a path in  $G_f$  between any vertices  $X, Y$  of  $G_f$ . ad (ii):  $[0, I]$  is a supercell, see [3], beginning of chapter 3. If  $I_g = 0$  then the subgraph  $G_{f|I}$  is empty. If  $I_g = +$  it is  $g$ -positive and two vertices in  $G_{f|I}$  are connected by a path in  $G_{f|I}$  because of Theorem 5.1. (iii) follows directly from (ii).  $\square$

Concerning parallel extensions we cite as a Lemma a part of the proof of [2], Theorem 10.5.5.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be a Euclidean oriented matroid program let  $\mathcal{C}$  the set of its cocircuits and let  $Y^0$  be a cocircuit of  $(\mathcal{O}, g)$ . We define a localization  $\sigma: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \{+, -, 0\}$  as follows. For any cocircuit  $Y \in \mathcal{C}$  holds*

- (i) *If  $Y_g = +$ , then*

$$\sigma(Y) = \begin{cases} + & \text{if there is a directed path in } G_f \text{ from } Y^0 \text{ to } Y, \\ 0 & \text{if there is an undirected path in } G_f \text{ from } Y^0 \text{ to } Y, \\ - & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- (ii) *If  $Y_g = 0$ , then  $\sigma(Y) := Y_f$ , and*
- (iii) *If  $Y_g = -$ , then  $\sigma(Y) := -\sigma(-Y)$ .*

*That localization corresponds to an extension of  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  with an element  $h$  through  $Y^0$  parallel to  $f$  with respect to  $g$ .*

We add a lemma concerning parallel extensions and the graph  $G_f$ .

**Lemma 5.2** (see [1] 10.5.3). *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be an oriented matroid program,  $Y^0 \in (\mathcal{O}, g)$  a cocircuit, and  $(\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O} \cup h, g, f)$  be an extension through  $Y^0$  parallel to  $f$  wrt.  $g$ . Let  $X, Y \in (\mathcal{O}, g)$  be two conformal cocircuits such that  $X \circ Y$  is an edge. Let  $X', Y'$  denote the corresponding cocircuits in  $\mathcal{O}'$ . If  $Dir_{g,f}(X, Y) = 0$  we have  $X'_h = Y'_h$ . If  $Dir_{g,f}(X, Y) = +$  (or  $Dir_{g,f}(X, Y) = -$ ) we have  $X'_h \preceq Y'_h$  (or  $Y'_h \preceq X'_h$ ) and  $X'_h = Y'_h = 0$  cannot occur.*

*Proof.* The Lemma follows directly from  $Dir_{g,f}(X, Y) = Dir_{g,h}(X', Y')$ .  $\square$

We show a Lemma considering the new cocircuits of the parallel extension.

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be an oriented matroid program and  $(\mathcal{O}', g, f) = (\mathcal{O} \cup h, g, f)$  an extension such that  $h$  is parallel to  $f$  wrt.  $g$ . Let  $X, Y$  be two cocircuits in  $(\mathcal{O}', g, f)$  with  $X_g = Y_g = +$  and  $X_h = Y_h = 0$ . Then there is an undirected path in  $(\mathcal{O}', g, f)$  from  $X$  to  $Y$  with only cocircuits with  $g = +$ .*

*Proof.* Because  $X_h = Y_h = 0$  we look at the contraction  $(\mathcal{O}'/h, g)$  and see if there is a path.  $(\mathcal{O}'/h, g)$  is a closed hemisphere with  $g$ -positive cocircuits hence a  $g$ -positive supercell. We apply theorem 5.1 and obtain a  $g$ -positive path between  $X$  and  $Y$  in  $(\mathcal{O}'/h, g)$  which is then an undirected  $g$ -positive path in the cocircuit graph of  $(\mathcal{O}', g, f)$ .  $\square$

We add some results from a paper by W. Hochstättler [1]. We start with a definition.

**Definition 5.2.** [see [1] Definition 8] Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be a Euclidean oriented matroid program and let  $\mathcal{C}_+$  denote the cocircuits  $Y \in (\mathcal{O}, g)$  with  $Y_g = +$ . A topological sweep of  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  is a total order  $Y^1, \dots, Y^s$  of  $\mathcal{C}_+$ , the sweep order, together with an extension  $\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O} \cup \{h_1, \dots, h_s\}$  by  $s$  elements such that

- (i) for all  $1 \leq i \leq s$  holds that  $h_i$  is parallel to  $f$  wrt.  $g$
- (ii) for all  $1 \leq i \leq s$  there exists  $1 \leq i_1 \leq i \leq i_2$  such that

$$Y_{h_j}^i = \begin{cases} - & \text{if } j < i_1 \\ 0 & \text{if } i_1 \leq j \leq i_2 \\ + & \text{if } j > i_2 \end{cases}$$

We call the sweep non-degenerate, if there is always  $i_1 = i_2$ .

**Remark 5.4.** Recall that in the non-degenerate case all extensions  $h_{i_1}, \dots, h_{i_2}$  are parallel to each other.

We add a definition here.

**Definition 5.3.** Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be an oriented matroid program and let  $X$  be a cocircuit of  $\mathcal{O}$  with  $X_g = +$  and  $X_f \neq 0$ . If  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  is Euclidean and we have a topological sweep and a cocircuit  $Y^i \in (\mathcal{O}, g)$  with its corresponding extension  $h_i$  then we call the oriented matroid program  $((\mathcal{O} \cup h_i) \setminus f, g, h_i)$  derived from  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  by parallel movement of the target function through  $Y^i$  respecting the sweep order.

The sweep order agrees with the direction of the edges of  $G_f$ .

**Lemma 5.5.** Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be a Euclidean oriented matroid program with a topological sweep. The sweep order is compatible with the orientation of the edges of  $G_f$ . That means if  $X \circ Y$  is an edge in  $G_f$  directed from  $X$  to  $Y$  then  $X$  precedes  $Y$  in the sweep order.

*Proof.* Let  $Y^1, \dots, Y^r$  be a topological sweep of  $(\mathcal{O}, g)$ . Let  $Y^i, Y^j$  be two conformal cocircuits of the sweep with  $Y^i \circ Y^j$  being an edge in  $G_f$  directed from  $Y^i$  to  $Y^j$ . In the extension  $\mathcal{O} \cup \{h_1, \dots, h_r\}$  corresponding to the sweep holds  $Y_{h_j}^j = 0$ . Strong cocircuit elimination of  $g$  holding  $h_j$  between  $-Y^i$  and  $Y^j$  yields a unique cocircuit  $Z$  with  $Z_g = 0$  and  $Z_{h_j} = -Y_{h_j}^i$ . It holds also  $Z_f = +$  because the edge  $Y^i \circ Y^j$  is directed from  $Y^i$  to  $Y^j$ . Because of the parallelity of  $h_j$  and  $f$  wrt.  $g$  we obtain  $Z_{h_j} = Z_f = +$  hence  $Y_{h_j}^i = -Z_{h_j} = -$ . From Definition 5.2 follows  $i < j$  hence  $Y^i$  comes in the sweep order before  $Y^j$ .  $\square$

Because of [1], Proposition 4, every extension through a cocircuit  $X$  parallel to  $f$  wrt.  $g$  goes through the cocircuits reachable from  $X$  with an undirected path. It follows directly:

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be a Euclidean oriented matroid program. If a non-degenerate topological sweep of  $\mathcal{O}$  exists, the graph  $G_f$  contains no undirected edges between cocircuits that have not both  $f = 0$ .*

But we have to look what happens with the graph  $(G \setminus f)_f$ .

**Proposition 5.2.** *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be a Euclidean oriented matroid program. If a non-degenerate topological sweep of  $\mathcal{O}$  exists, the graph  $(G \setminus f)_f$  contains no undirected edges.*

*Proof.* If an edge is directed in  $G_f$  it is also directed in  $(G \setminus f)_f$  if existing. Edges in  $(G \setminus f)_f$  which are not in  $G_f$  are also directed, see Definition 2.2.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.3.** *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be a Euclidean oriented matroid program with a topological sweep with  $f$  being in general position. Let  $X, Y \in (G \setminus f)_f$  cocircuits with  $X$  coming before  $Y$  in the sweep order. Then there exist no (un-)directed path in  $G_f$  from  $Y$  to  $X$ .*

*Proof.* If there would be a path directed from  $X$  to  $Y$  (or undirected) it would have at least one edge  $(P^i, P^j)$  in  $(G \setminus f)_f$  with  $i < j$  in the sweep order. But that edge would have the wrong direction then.  $\square$

$G_f$  induces a partial order of the cocircuits. Improving the result of Theorem 9 in [1], we show that every linear extension of that ordering yields a topological sweep and vice versa.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be a Euclidean oriented matroid program. Then  $G_f$  defines a partial order of the cocircuits of  $(\mathcal{O} \setminus f)$ . Let  $f$  be in general position. Every linear extension of that order defines a non-degenerate topological sweep and vice versa.*

*Proof.* We have a non-degenerate topological sweep and let  $X \neq Y$  be two different cocircuits in  $(\mathcal{O} \setminus f)$ . We know that the sweep respects the order of  $G_f$ . If  $X$  comes before  $Y$  in the sweep order we set  $X \prec Y$  which is an extension of the poset.

On the other hand let  $P = P^1, \dots, P^n$  be a linear extension of the partial order induced by  $G_f$ . We extend  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  in  $n$  steps as follows. Let  $(\mathcal{O}^{n+1}, g, f) = (\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  and let  $i = n$ .

- (i) Let  $(\mathcal{O}^i, g, f) = (\mathcal{O}^{i+1} \cup h, g, f)$  such that  $h$  is an extension through  $P^i$  parallel to  $f$  with respect to  $g$  like in Lemma 5.1.
- (ii) Let  $i = i - 1$ . Goto (i) until  $i = 0$ .

We show now that  $(\mathcal{O}^1, g, f)$  together with  $P = P^1, \dots, P^n$  is the desired sweep. We use induction to show the following *statement A*.

$$P_{h_i}^j = \begin{cases} + & \text{if } j > i, \\ - & \text{if } j < i \text{ and} \\ 0 & \text{if } j = i. \end{cases}$$

First let  $i = n$ . Proposition 5.3 yields that there is no (un-)directed path in  $G_f$  from  $P^n$  to a  $P^j$  with  $j < n$ . Hence we have  $P_{h_n}^j = -$  and  $P_{h_n}^n = 0$  in  $(\mathcal{O}^n, g, f)$ . Statement A holds for  $i = n$ .

Let now statement A hold for all  $i + 1, \dots, n$ . Let  $P^j$  be a cocircuit with  $j > i$ . Then because  $G_f$  is connected there is a path from  $P^i$  to  $P^j$  in  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$ . Let  $P^i \circ Y$  be the first edge of that path. We have  $Y_g = +$ . The edge is directed because

$f$  is in general position. Cocircuit elimination of  $g$  between  $-P^i$  and  $Y$  yields a cocircuit  $Z'$  with  $Z'_f \neq 0$ . If  $Z'_f = -$  let  $Z = -Z'$  otherwise let  $Z = Z'$ . In  $(\mathcal{O}^{i+1}, g, f)$  we have  $Z_{h_j} = Z_f = +$  because of the parallelity of  $f$  and  $h_j$ . Also we have  $P_{h_j}^i = -$  because statement A holds for  $(\mathcal{O}^{i+1}, g, f)$ .  $P^i \circ Z$  is still an edge in  $(\mathcal{O}^{i+1}, g, f)$ . Cocircuit elimination of  $h_j$  between  $P^i$  and  $Z$  yields a cocircuit  $X$  and a directed path in the cocircuit graph  $G_f^{i+1}$  of  $(\mathcal{O}^{i+1}, g, f)$  from  $P^i$  to  $X$ . Because  $X_{h_j} = P_{h_j}^j = 0$  Lemma 5.3 yields an undirected path in  $G_f^{i+1}$  from  $X$  to  $P^j$  hence we obtain a directed path from  $P^i$  to  $P^j$  in  $G_f^{i+1}$  and we have  $P_{h_i}^j = +$  in  $(\mathcal{O}^i, g, f)$ .

Now let  $P^j$  be a cocircuit with  $j < i$  in  $(\mathcal{O}^{i+1}, g, f)$ . Because statement A holds in  $(\mathcal{O}^{i+1}, g, f)$  we have  $P_{h_{i+1}}^j = P_{h_{i+1}}^i = -$ . A directed path from  $P^i$  to  $P^j$  in  $G_f^{i+1}$  can not have cocircuits with  $h_{i+1} \in \{0, +\}$  because otherwise we would obtain two edges in the path of opposite direction because for an edge  $X \circ Y$  with  $X_{h_{i+1}} = -$  and  $Y_{h_{i+1}} = 0$  holds  $Dir_{g,f}(X, Y) = +$ . Hence all cocircuits in the path must have  $h_j = -$  for all  $j > i$ . But that means the cocircuits are old, exist already in  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  and form a directed path in  $G_f$  (see also Proposition 3.1 and Lemma 3.2) But that path would at least contain one edge  $(P^k, P^l)$  in  $G_f$  with  $k > l$  directed from  $P^k$  to  $P^l$  violating the fact that  $P$  is a linear extension of the partial order of  $G_f$ . We obtain  $P_{h_i}^j = -$  for all  $j < i$  in  $(\mathcal{O}^i, g, f)$ .

Finally  $P_{h_i}^i = 0$  in  $(\mathcal{O}^i, g, f)$  follows directly from the construction. Statement A holds for  $(\mathcal{O}^i, g, f)$  and hence for  $(\mathcal{O}^1, g, f)$  which proves everything.  $\square$

## 6. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.4

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a Euclidean oriented matroid with  $f \in \mathcal{O}$  lying in general position. Then each tope cell of  $\mathcal{O} \setminus f$  is vertex-shellable.*

**6.1. Sketch of Proof.** It is enough to show the theorem for the feasible region  $P$  of a feasible and bounded oriented matroid program  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  because each tope cell of  $\mathcal{O} \setminus f$  can (maybe after reorienting some elements) be seen like that. We take a sweep  $Y^1, \dots, Y^n$  of the cocircuits of  $P$  respecting the order of the cocircuit graph of  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  and prove that it is a vertex-shelling. We show in Subsection 6.3 that for each cocircuit  $Y^j$  the intersection of the interval  $[Y^j, P]$  with the union of the intervals  $[Y^i, P]$  for all  $i < j$  equals a union of some intervals  $[Y^k \circ Y^j, P]$  with  $k \in J_j$  and  $J_j \subseteq \{1, \dots, j-1\}$ . That is the non-recursive part of the definition of a vertex-shelling. In Subsection 6.4 we handle the recursive part of the definition. We show that there is again a vertex-shelling of the interval  $[Y^j, P]$  such that in the ordering of its atoms (which are edges in the original oriented matroid), the edges  $Y^k \circ Y^j$  with  $k \in J_j$  come first. To achieve that recall that in the sweep order of a Euclidean oriented matroid program  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  the cocircuits with  $f = -$  come first. Moving the target function  $f$  over the cocircuit  $Y_j$  yields the oriented matroid program  $(\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O} \cup f' \setminus f, g, f')$ . Applying induction on the rank we may assume that in that program the interval  $[Y^j, P]$  has a vertex-shelling where the cocircuits with  $f' = -$  come first. But these are exactly the edges  $Y^j \circ Y^k$  with  $k \in J_j$  in the original ordering. To get the inductive assumption fulfilled we have to solve the problem that in the interval  $[Y^j, P]$  of  $\mathcal{O}'$  the element  $g$  does not exist anymore. We have to substitute  $g$  with an other element  $e$  which exists in the minor. Moving the target function  $f$  in  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  preserves Euclideaness in  $(\mathcal{O}', g, f')$  but it does not necessarily preserve the Euclideaness of another program  $(\mathcal{O}', e, f')$ . We handle that

problem in Subsection 6.2. But substituting the element  $g$  with another element still is not quite enough to fulfill the inductive assumption because we could maybe lose the boundedness of the oriented matroid program in the minor. We solve that problem in the proof of the main theorem in Subsection 6.4 using a lexicographic extension preserving Euclideaness.

**6.2. Preservation of Euclideaness in Minors from Parallel Movements of the Target Function.** For the definition of Euclideaness of oriented matroids and parallel single-element extensions, see [2], 10.5.1, 10.5.2. Concerning the Dir-function we get immediately from the definition of parallel extensions.

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be a Euclidean oriented matroid program. Let  $\mathcal{O} \cup f'$  be a single-element extension parallel to  $f$  wrt.  $g$ . Then it holds*

$$\text{Dir}_{g,f}(X, Y) = \text{Dir}_{g,f'}(X, Y) \text{ for all cocircuits } X, Y \in (\mathcal{O}, g).$$

First we add an important definition.

**Definition 6.1.** *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be an oriented matroid program and let  $X$  be a cocircuit of  $\mathcal{O}$  with  $X_g = +$  and  $X_f \neq 0$ . Let  $\mathcal{O} \cup f'$  be an extension of  $\mathcal{O}$  parallel to  $f$  wrt.  $g$  satisfying  $\sigma(X) = 0$ . Then we call the oriented matroid  $((\mathcal{O} \cup f') \setminus f)$  derived from  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  by parallel movement of the target function (through  $X$ ).*

The next lemma follows directly.

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be an oriented matroid program with graph  $G_f$ . Let  $(\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O} \cup h)$  be derived from  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  by parallel movement of the target function. Then it holds for the graph  $G'_h$  of  $(\mathcal{O}', g, h)$  that  $(G \setminus f)_f = (G' \setminus h)_h$ . If  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  is Euclidean, feasible and bounded so is  $(\mathcal{O}, g, h)$ .*

*Proof.* The identity of the graphs follows from the identity of the graphs  $G''_f = G''_h$  of the oriented matroid programs  $(\mathcal{O} \cup \{f, h\}, g, f)$  and  $(\mathcal{O} \cup \{f, h\}, g, h)$ . The feasible region of  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  and  $(\mathcal{O}, g, h)$  stays the same, Euclideaness and boundedness are also clear.  $\square$

We add a small remark.

**Remark 6.2.** *If  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  is an oriented matroid program and  $(\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O} \cup f' \setminus f)$  is derived from  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  by parallel movement of the target function then the cocircuits with  $g = 0$  are identical in  $\mathcal{O}$  and in  $\mathcal{O}'$  because it holds  $\mathcal{O}/g = \mathcal{O}'/g$ .*

Now we show that in a special situation Euclideaness is preserved in minors of Euclidean oriented matroid programs derived by parallel movement of the target function. We define the following objects.

**Definition 6.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{O}^1$  be a Euclidean oriented matroid of rank  $r$ . Let  $f \neq g \in \mathcal{O}^1$  be elements in general position. Let  $X$  be a cocircuit of  $\mathcal{O}^1$  with  $X_g = +$  and  $X_f \neq 0$ .*

- (i) *Let  $\mathcal{O}^2 = (\mathcal{O}^1 \cup f') \setminus f$  derived from  $\mathcal{O}^1$  by parallel movement of the target function through  $X$  (hence  $X_{f'} = 0$  in  $\mathcal{O}^2$ ).*
- (ii) *Let  $\mathcal{O}^3 = (\mathcal{O}^2 \setminus (\text{supp}(X) \setminus \{g\}))$  hence  $f' \in \mathcal{O}^3$ .*
- (iii) *Let  $\mathcal{O}^4 = (\mathcal{O}^1 \setminus (\text{supp}(X) \setminus \cup\{f, g\}))$ .*
- (iv) *Let  $\mathcal{O}^5 = (\mathcal{O}^4 \cup f'') \setminus f$  be derived from  $(\mathcal{O}^4, g, f)$  by parallel movement of the target function through  $X$ .*



We consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathcal{O}^1 & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & \mathcal{O}^2 & & \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 \mathcal{O}^4 & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & \mathcal{O}^5 \cong \mathcal{O}^3 & & \\
 \downarrow & \searrow & \downarrow & & \\
 \mathcal{O}^4 \setminus g \neq \mathcal{O}^5 \setminus g \cong \mathcal{O}^3 \setminus g & & & & 
 \end{array}$$

Considering the ranks of these objects we get:

**Proposition 6.2.** *All objects in the diagram have rank  $r$  except that  $\mathcal{O}^5 \setminus g$  and  $\mathcal{O}^3 \setminus g$  which have rank  $r - 1$ .*

*Proof.* All oriented matroids of the diagram contain  $z(X)$  hence they have at least rank  $r - 1$  but all objects except  $\mathcal{O}^3 \setminus g$  contain elements  $\notin z(X)$  hence have rank  $\geq r$  but because  $\mathcal{O}$  has rank  $r$  and a parallel extension does not increase the rank they have all rank equal to  $r$ .  $\square$

Because  $f$  is in general position in  $\mathcal{O}^1$  we obtain:

**Proposition 6.3.**

- (i)  $f$  is in general position in  $\mathcal{O}^4$ .
- (ii)  $f'$  is in  $X$  in general position in  $\mathcal{O}^2$  hence also in  $\mathcal{O}^3$ .

*Proof.* Only (ii) needs a proof. If  $f'$  would not lie in general position in  $X$  in  $\mathcal{O}^2$  then it would lie in an edge  $F$  with  $f' \in \text{cl}(z(F) \setminus f')$ . We do not have  $g \in z(F)$  because otherwise we would have  $X_g = 0$  which is impossible. But then there is a cocircuit  $Y$  with  $z(Y) \supseteq z(F) \cup g$ . We have  $Y_{f'} = 0$  hence  $Y_f = 0$  hence  $f$  is not in general position.  $\square$

We start analyzing the smaller objects:

**Proposition 6.4.**

- (i) In  $\mathcal{O}^5$  resp.  $\mathcal{O}^3$  we have  $X_{f''} = X_{f'} = 0$  and  $X_g \neq 0$ . All the other cocircuits  $Y$  have  $Y_g = 0$  and  $Y_{f''} = Y_{f'}$ .
- (ii) For a cocircuit  $Y$  in  $\mathcal{O}^4$  with  $Y_f \neq 0$  holds  $Y = \pm X$  or  $Y_g = 0$ .

*Proof.* If  $Y \neq \pm X$  in  $\mathcal{O}^3$  (or  $\mathcal{O}^5$ ) we have  $z(Y) \neq z(X)$  hence there is a  $h \in z(Y)$  with  $h \notin z(X)$ . Thus  $h = g$  and we obtain  $Y_g = 0$ . This and Remark 6.2 prove (i). Statement (ii) works analogously using the fact that  $X_f \neq 0$  in  $\mathcal{O}^4$ .  $\square$

We obtain directly.

**Corollary 6.1.** *It holds  $\mathcal{O}^3 \cong \mathcal{O}^5$  hence also  $\mathcal{O}^3 \setminus g \cong \mathcal{O}^5 \setminus g$ . The isomorphism maps  $f'$  to  $f''$  and is the identity for the rest.*

*Proof.* It holds  $\mathcal{O}^3 \setminus f' = \mathcal{O}^5 \setminus f''$  and the first statement follows from Proposition 6.4 (i). The second statement is immediate.  $\square$

Because of that Corollary we will identify  $\mathcal{O}^5$  and  $\mathcal{O}^3$  in the following.

**Proposition 6.5.**

$$\mathcal{O}^4 \setminus f = \mathcal{O}^3 \setminus f'$$

*Proof.* This follows from

$$\mathcal{O}^4 \setminus f = (\mathcal{O}^1 \setminus \text{supp}(X)) \cup g = \mathcal{O}^2 \setminus \{\text{supp}(X) \cup f'\} \cup g = \mathcal{O}^3 \setminus f'. \quad \square$$

**Lemma 6.3.** *The cocircuits of  $\mathcal{O}^4$  and  $\mathcal{O}^3$  with  $g = 0$  are identical. The cocircuits with  $f, f' \neq 0$  are also identical except  $X$  with  $X_{f'} = 0$  in  $\mathcal{O}^3$  and  $X_f \neq 0$  in  $\mathcal{O}^4$ .*

*Proof.* The first statement is Remark 6.2. The second statement follows from Proposition 6.4.  $\square$

We start to compare the Euclideaness of the objects.

**Lemma 6.4.**  *$(\mathcal{O}^3, g, e)$  is Euclidean for all  $e \in \mathcal{O}^3 \setminus g$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $Y$  be a cocircuit in  $\mathcal{O}^3$  with  $Y_g = +$ . Then we have  $z(Y) \subseteq z(X)$  hence  $Y = X$ , we can not have directed cycles in  $(\mathcal{O}^3, g, e)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 6.5.** *If  $(\mathcal{O}^4, e, f)$  is Euclidean for an  $e \in \mathcal{O}^4 \setminus \{f, g\}$  then is also  $(\mathcal{O}^5, e, f'')$ .*

*Proof.* We assume there is a directed cycle in the graph  $G_{f''}$  of  $(\mathcal{O}^5, e, f'')$ . Then we know from Proposition 2.6 (iv) that a directed cycle can only have cocircuits with  $f'' \neq 0$  hence we know from Proposition 6.4 that it has to hold  $g = 0$  for such cocircuits. But from Lemma 6.3 we know that these cocircuits  $Y$  correspond to cocircuits  $Y'$  in  $\mathcal{O}^4$  with  $Y_{f''} = Y'_f$ . Edges  $Y^1 \circ Y^2$  with  $\text{sep}(Y^1, Y^2) = \emptyset$  and  $Y_g^1 = Y_g^2 = 0$  in  $\mathcal{O}^5$  correspond to edges  $Y'^1 \circ Y'^2$  with  $\text{sep}(Y'^1, Y'^2) = \emptyset$  and  $Y_g'^1 = Y_g'^2 = 0$  in  $\mathcal{O}^4$  and because cocircuit elimination of  $e$  between  $-Y^1$  and  $Y^2$  yields a cocircuit  $Z$  with  $Z_g = 0$  in  $\mathcal{O}^5$  cocircuit elimination of  $e$  between  $Y'^1$  and  $Y'^2$  yields the corresponding cocircuit  $Z'$  with  $Z'_g = 0$  in  $\mathcal{O}^4$  and  $Z'_f = Z_{f''}$ . The edge  $Y'^1 \circ Y'^2$  has the same direction like the edge  $Y^1 \circ Y^2$  hence we obtain a directed cycle in  $\mathcal{O}^4$  which proves everything.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.6.** *If  $(\mathcal{O}^4, e_1, e_2)$  is Euclidean for  $e_1 \neq e_2 \in \mathcal{O}^4 \setminus \{f, g\}$  then is also  $(\mathcal{O}^5, e_1, e_2)$ .*

*Proof.* We assume we have a directed cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}^5, e_1, e_2)$ .  $X$  is not involved in the cycle since we have  $e_1 \notin \text{supp}(X)$  hence  $X_{e_1} = 0$ . Because of Proposition 6.4 (i) we have only cocircuits in the cycle with  $g = 0$  and have a directed cycle in  $(\mathcal{O}^4, e_1, e_2)$  like in the lemma before.  $\square$

Now we put everything together, we repeat again the assumptions.

**Theorem 6.1.** (i) *Let  $\mathcal{O}^1$  be an oriented matroid of rank  $r$ .*

(ii) *Let  $f \neq g \in \mathcal{O}^1$  be elements in general position.*

(iii) *Let  $X$  be a cocircuit of  $\mathcal{O}^1$  with  $X_g = +$  and  $X_f \neq 0$ .*

(iv) *Let  $\mathcal{O}^2 = (\mathcal{O} \cup f') \setminus f$  derived from  $(\mathcal{O}^1, g, f)$  by parallel movement of the target function through  $X$  (hence  $X_{f'} = 0$  in  $\mathcal{O}^2$ ).*

(v) *Let  $\mathcal{O}^3 = (\mathcal{O}^2 \setminus \text{supp}(X)) \cup \{g\}$ .*

*If  $\mathcal{O}^1$  is Euclidean then  $\mathcal{O}^3$  is a Euclidean oriented matroid, too. If  $(\mathcal{O}^1, e, f)$  is a Euclidean oriented matroid program for an  $e \in z(X)$  then  $(\mathcal{O}^3 \setminus g, e, f')$  is a Euclidean oriented matroid program, too.*

*Proof.*  $(\mathcal{O}^1, e, f)$  resp.  $(\mathcal{O}^1, e, e_2)$  is a Euclidean oriented matroid program for all  $e \neq e_2 \in \mathcal{O}^1 \setminus f$ . Let  $e \neq e_2 \in \mathcal{O}^3 \setminus \{g, f'\}$ . We know that  $(\mathcal{O}^4, e, f)$  resp.  $(\mathcal{O}^4, e, e_2)$  is Euclidean as a minor of  $(\mathcal{O}^1, e, f)$  resp.  $(\mathcal{O}^1, e, e_2)$ . From Corollary 6.1, Lemmas 6.4, 6.5 resp. 6.6 follows the Euclideaness of  $(\mathcal{O}^5, g, e)$ ,  $(\mathcal{O}^5, e, f'')$  resp.  $(\mathcal{O}^5, e, e_2)$ .

The Euclideaness of  $(\mathcal{O}^5, g, f'')$  follows from the Euclideaness of  $(\mathcal{O}^4, g, f)$  because of Lemma 6.1. Hence  $\mathcal{O}^5$  is a Euclidean oriented matroid and because of the isomorphism of Corollary 6.1 that holds also for  $\mathcal{O}^3$ . The last statement follows analogously using Lemma 6.5, Corollary 6.1 and the fact that minors of Euclidean matroid programs stay Euclidean.  $\square$

### 6.3. The Sweep Orders and the Graph $G_f$ .

**Lemma 6.7.** *Let  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  a feasible, bounded Euclidean oriented matroid program with a topological sweep. Let  $Y^0, \dots, Y^s$  be the the cocircuits of the feasible region  $P(E_n)$  of  $\mathcal{O} \setminus f$  in sweep order. Moreover we assume  $Y_f^0 = -$  (resp.  $Y_f^s = +$ ).*

- (i) *Then  $Y^0$  is a minimal resp.  $Y^s$  is an maximal solution.*
- (ii) *Let  $X, Y$  be two cocircuits of  $P(E_n)$ , which both are minimal (resp. maximal) solutions. Then there is an undirected path in  $G_{f|P(E_n)}$  from  $X$  to  $Y$ .*
- (iii) *If the sweep is non-degenerate  $Y^0$  (resp.  $Y^s$ ) is the unique minimal (maximal) solution of the program.*

*Proof.* ad (i): There exist no  $Y^i \neq Y^s$  with a conformal edge directed from  $Y^s$  to  $Y^i$  otherwise Lemma 5.5 would imply  $i > s$ . Also there does not exist a cocircuit  $Y$  with  $f = 0$  with a conformal edge directed from  $Y^s$  to  $Y$ . From [2], Lemma 10.1.15 and the boundedness of  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  follows that  $Y^s$  is an maximal solution and analogously that  $Y^0$  is a minimal solution.

ad (ii): If  $X$  and  $Y$  are both maximal (minimal) solutions, then  $X \circ Y$  and all cocircuits contained in the interval  $I = [0, X \circ Y]$  are maximal (minimal) solutions, see [5], (2:26) for a proof of that. The graph  $G_{f|I}$  is also connected, which means that there is a path from  $X$  to  $Y$  with only edges and cocircuits of  $[0, I]$ . Since all cocircuits of  $G_{f|I}$  are maximal (minimal) solutions, the edges between them must be undirected, that means there exists an undirected path from  $X$  to  $Y$  in  $G_{f|I}$  hence in  $G_f$ . (iii) follows directly from (ii).  $\square$

We need here a small lemma for the preservations of Euclideaness in contractions.

**Lemma 6.8.** *Let  $P = (\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  be a feasible and bounded Euclidean oriented matroid program. Let  $S \subseteq E \setminus \{f, g\}$ . Then  $P' = (\mathcal{O}/S, g, f)$  is a bounded Euclidean oriented matroid program.*

*Proof.* Minors of Euclidean matroids are Euclidean, see [2], Corollary 10.5.6.  $(P')$  is also bounded because if there would exist a cocircuit  $Y'$  in the feasible region of  $(P')$  with  $Y'_g = 0$ , there would exist a corresponding cocircuit  $Y$  in  $(P)$  with  $Y_e = Y'_e$  for all  $e \in E \setminus S$  and  $Y_e = 0$  for  $e \in S$ . Then  $Y$  would lie in  $P(E_n)$  with  $Y_g = 0$  contradicting the boundedness of  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$ .  $\square$

Now we obtain our first main result concerning the recursive atom-ordering.

**Theorem 6.2.** *Let  $P = (\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  a feasible, bounded Euclidean oriented matroid program with a non-degenerate topological sweep. Let  $Y^0, \dots, Y^s$  be the the cocircuits of the feasible region  $P(E_n)$  of  $\mathcal{O} \setminus f$  in sweep order.*

- (i) *For each  $j > 0$  there exists a directed path in the feasible region of  $\mathcal{O} \setminus f$  from  $Y^0$  to  $Y^j$ .*
- (ii) *For all  $j > 0$  there exists  $i < j$  and a directed edge from  $Y^i$  to  $Y^j$ .*

- (iii) For all  $j, k$  with  $0 \leq k < j \leq s$  there exists a directed edge from a  $Y^i$  to  $Y^j$  with  $i < j$  such that  $Y^i \circ Y^j \preceq Y^k \circ Y^j$ .
- (iv) For all  $0 \leq j \leq s$  let

$$Q_j = \{Y^i \circ Y^j \text{ for all } i < j \text{ where } Y^i \circ Y^j \text{ is an edge with } \text{sep}(Y^i, Y^j) = \emptyset \text{ in } \mathcal{O} \setminus f\}$$

Then it holds (also if we substitute 1 by  $P(E_n)$ )

$$[Y^j, 1] \cap \left( \bigcup_{i < j} [Y^i, 1] \right) = \bigcup_{Y \in Q_j} [Y, 1]$$

- (v) If we have  $Y_f^j = 0$  and  $Y_f^i = -$  for all  $i < j$  then it holds

$$Q_j = \{Z \text{ such that } Z_f = - \text{ and } Z \text{ is an atom in } [Y^j, P(E_n)]\}.$$

*Proof.* We will assume throughout the proof that  $Y^j$  is a cocircuit with  $0 < j$ . Because parallel movement of the target function does neither change the cocircuits  $Y^0, \dots, Y^s$  nor their sweep order nor the feasibility or boundedness of  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$ , we may assume that  $Y_f^j = 0$ ,  $Y_f^i = -$  for  $i < j$  and  $Y_f^i = +$  for  $i > j$ .  $Y^0$  is the unique minimal solution of the program  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$ . Note, that we assume that  $Y^j$  is a degenerate vertex in  $\mathcal{O}$  and “still is” a vertex in  $\mathcal{O} \setminus f$ .

ad (i): Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be the set of cocircuits of  $P(E_n)$  from which there exist a directed or undirected path to  $Y^j$  (note, that  $Y^j \in \mathcal{D}$ ). Let  $Y^i \in \mathcal{D}$  be the element which is minimal in the sweep order. By Lemma 5.5 there are no cocircuits  $X$  in the feasible region of  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  with  $X \circ Y^i$  being an edge in  $G_f$  directed from  $X$  to  $Y^i$ . By [2], Lemma 10.1.15, and the boundedness of  $(\mathcal{O}', g, f')$  it follows that  $Y^i$  is a minimal solution in  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  hence  $Y^i = Y^0$ . There is a directed path in  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  from  $Y^0$  to  $Y^j$ . Because all cocircuits in the path except  $Y^j$  have  $f = -$ , they “are” also cocircuits in  $\mathcal{O} \setminus f$ . Hence we have a directed path already there.

ad (ii): For each  $Y^j$  there exist a directed path from  $Y^0$  to  $Y^j$  in  $\mathcal{O} \setminus f$ . The last edge in this path is the desired edge (it is directed because we assume the sweep to be non-degenerate).

ad (iii): See also [2], Lemma 4.1.8 and the remarks after the lemma. We use contraction and consider the program

$$(P') = (\mathcal{O}/z(Y^k \circ Y^j), g, f).$$

Note that  $f, g \in \text{supp}(Y^k \circ Y^j)$ . Its face lattice is isomorphic to the interval  $[0, Y^k \circ Y^j]$ .

$(P')$  is an oriented matroid program which is feasible, because  $z(Y^j)$  and  $z(Y^k)$  are supersets of  $z(Y^k \circ Y^j)$ , hence  $Y^j$  and  $Y^k$  are also cocircuits of  $(P')$  lying in the feasible region of  $(P')$ . It is also bounded and Euclidean because of Lemma 6.8 hence there is a topological sweep of the cocircuits of  $(P')$ . Because the edges between the cocircuits in the graph  $G_{f|P'}$  of  $(P')$  are oriented like in the graph  $G_f$  in  $(P)$  and because of Theorem 1.3 we can choose the sweep order of the cocircuits of  $(P')$  as a restriction of the sweep order of  $(P)$ . Hence (ii) holds for  $(P')$  and there is an edge from an  $Y^i$  to  $Y^j$  in  $(P')$  with  $i < j$ . But this is also an edge in  $(P)$  lying in  $[0, Y^k \circ Y^j]$  which proves everything.

ad (iv): We always have

$$[Y^j, 1] \cap \left( \bigcup_{i < j} [Y^i, 1] \right) = \bigcup_{i < j} [Y^i \circ Y^j, 1] \text{ for all } 0 \leq j \leq r.$$

If  $Y^k \circ Y^j$  is not an edge for  $k < j$  then because of (iii) we have another  $i < j$  such that  $Y^i \circ Y^j$  is an edge and  $Y^i, Y^j$  conformal (hence  $Y^i \circ Y^j \in Q_j$ ) and  $[Y^k \circ Y^j, 1] \subset [Y^i \circ Y^j, 1]$ . The equation from (iv) follows. The substitution of 1 by  $P(E_n)$  works analogously.

ad (v): Let  $Y_f^j = 0$  and  $Y_f^i = -$  for all  $i < j$ . Let  $Z \in Q_j$ . Then since  $Z = Y^i \circ Y^j$  is an edge for an  $i < j$  it is an atom in  $[Y^j, P(E_n)]$  and  $Z_f = -$ . On the other hand, if  $Z$  is an atom of  $[Y^j, P(E_n)]$  and  $Z_f = -$ , then  $Z = Y^i \circ Y^j$  for a  $i \neq j$  with  $Y^i \circ Y^j$  being an edge and  $Y^i, Y^j$  being conformal cocircuits. Clearly, we must have  $i < j$ .  $\square$

**6.4. The Recursive Atom-ordering.** So far we have proven 'first level' in the shellability of the feasible region of the program in Theorem 6.2. For shellability, we have to show that we can proceed recursively this way.

We start with an important Lemma.

**Lemma 6.9.** *Let  $(\mathcal{O}^1, g, f)$  be a feasible, bounded Euclidean oriented matroid program of rank  $r > 2$ . Let  $X$  be a cocircuit of the feasible region  $P(E_n)$  of  $\mathcal{O}^1$  with  $X_f = 0$  and  $X \setminus f$  being a cocircuit in  $\mathcal{O}^1 \setminus f$  and let  $\mathcal{O}^3 = \mathcal{O}^1 \setminus \text{supp}(X)$ . Let*

$$f: \mathcal{O}^3 \rightarrow [X, 1]: Y \mapsto Y' \text{ such that } Y'_e = \begin{cases} Y_e & \text{if } e \in z(X) \\ X_e & \text{if } e \in \text{supp}(X) \end{cases}$$

and let  $f^{-1}(Y') = Y' \setminus \text{supp}(X)$ . Then  $f$  is an isomorphism from  $\mathcal{O}^3 \setminus f$  to  $[X, 1]$  in  $\mathcal{O}^1 \setminus f$  mapping the feasible region  $P'$  of  $\mathcal{O}^3 \setminus f$  to  $[X, P(E_n)]$  in  $\mathcal{O}^1 \setminus f$ .

*Proof.* See also [2], Proposition 4.1.9. It is clear that  $f^{-1}(Y') \in \mathcal{O}^3$  if  $Y' \in [X, 1]$ . Let now  $Y \in \mathcal{O}^3$ . Then we have  $Y = Z \setminus \text{supp}(X)$  for a covector  $Z \in \mathcal{O}^1$ . Then we have  $X \circ Z = f(Y) \in [X, 1]$ . Hence  $f$  is a bijection of covectors. Also it holds  $Y^1 \prec Y^2$  iff  $f(Y^1) \prec f(Y^2)$  hence  $f$  is an isomorphism. If now  $Y$  is in the feasible region of  $\mathcal{O}^3$  then (because  $X$  is in the feasible region of  $\mathcal{O}^1$ ) also  $f(Y)$  lies in the feasible region of  $\mathcal{O}^1$  and vice versa.  $\square$

We recall the definition of a recursive atom-ordering.

**Definition 6.3** (see [2], Definition 4.7.17). *Let  $P$  be a graded poset. A linear ordering  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_s$  of its atoms is a recursive atom-ordering if either  $\text{length}(P) \leq 2$ , or if  $\text{length}(P) > 2$  and for all  $1 \leq j \leq s$  there is a distinguished subset  $Q_j$  of the atoms of  $[x_j, 1]$  such that*

- (i)  $[x_j, 1] \cap (\bigcup_{i < j} [x_i, 1]) = \bigcup_{y \in Q_j} [y, 1]$ , and
- (ii)  $[x_j, 1]$  has a recursive atom-ordering in which the elements of  $Q_j$  come first.

Now we are prepared for our main theorem:

**Theorem 6.3.** (i) *Let  $\mathcal{O}^1$  be a Euclidean oriented matroid of rank  $r$ .*  
 (ii) *Let  $f \neq g \in \mathcal{O}^1$  be elements in general position and not coloops.*  
 (iii) *Let  $(\mathcal{O}^1, g, f)$  be a feasible, bounded Euclidean oriented matroid program.*  
 (iv)  *$(\mathcal{O}^1, g, f)$  has a non-degenerate topological sweep because of Theorem 1.3.*  
 (v) *Let  $Y^0, \dots, Y^s$  be the cocircuits of the feasible region  $P(E_n)$  in  $\mathcal{O}^1 \setminus f$  in sweep order.*

*Then the sweep-order  $Y^0, \dots, Y^s$  induces a recursive atom-ordering of the face lattice  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $P(E_n)$  in  $\mathcal{O}^1 \setminus f$ .*

*Proof.* We prove the theorem by using induction over the rank  $r(\mathcal{F})$ . If  $r(\mathcal{F}) \leq 2$  there is nothing to prove. Now let the claim be true for  $r(\mathcal{F}) \leq r-1$  and we assume  $r(\mathcal{F}) = r$ .

We consider a cocircuit  $Y^j \in P(E_n)$  with  $j \leq s$  and let  $(\mathcal{O}^2, g, f')$  be the parallel movement of the target function through  $Y^j$  respecting the sweep order.  $(\mathcal{O}^2, g, f')$  is also a Euclidean oriented matroid program and  $\mathcal{O}^2 \setminus f'$  has the same feasible region. It holds  $Y_{f'}^i = -$  for  $i < j$  and  $Y_{f'}^i = +$  for  $i > j$  in  $(\mathcal{O}^2, g, f')$ . We know from Theorem 6.2 that the  $Y^0, \dots, Y^s$  and the set

$Q_j = \{Y^i \circ Y^j \text{ for all } i < j \text{ where } Y^i \circ Y^j \text{ is an edge with } \text{sep}(Y^i \circ Y^j) = \emptyset \text{ in } \mathcal{O} \setminus f\}$  fulfill the part (i) of Definition 6.3. Theorem 6.2 yields also

$$(6.1) \quad Q_j = \{Z \text{ is an atom in } [Y^j, P(E_n)] \text{ such that } Z_{f'} = -\}.$$

Now let  $\mathcal{O}^3 = (\mathcal{O}^2 \setminus \text{supp}(Y_j))$ . We have  $\mathcal{O}^3 \setminus f' = (\mathcal{O}^1 \setminus \text{supp}(Y_j)) \setminus f'$  and  $r(\mathcal{O}^3) = r-1$ . Let  $S' = [e_1, \dots, e_{r-1}]$  be an ordered set of independent elements of  $\mathcal{O}^3 \setminus f'$  and let  $(\mathcal{O}^3 \cup p)$  be the lexicographic extension  $\mathcal{O}^3[e_1^+, \dots, e_{r-1}^+]$ .

- (i)  $\mathcal{O}^3$  is Euclidean because of Theorem 6.1.
- (ii)  $f' \neq p$  are in general position in  $\mathcal{O}^3 \cup p$  and are no coloops.
- (iii)  $(\mathcal{O}^3 \cup p, p, f')$  is Euclidean because of Corollary 3.1, feasible if  $\mathcal{O}^3$  is feasible and bounded because of Lemma 2.6.
- (iv)  $(\mathcal{O}^3 \cup p, p, f')$  has a topological sweep because of Theorem 1.3.
- (v) Let  $Z = (Z^0, \dots, Z^s)$  be the cocircuits of the feasible region  $P'(E_n)$  in  $\mathcal{O}^3 \setminus f'$  in sweep order.

Let  $\mathcal{F}'$  be the face lattice of the feasible region of  $\mathcal{O}^3 \setminus f'$ . Because  $r(\mathcal{F}') = r(\mathcal{O}^3) = r-1$  the induction assumption is fulfilled and  $Z$  induces a recursive atom ordering of the cocircuits of the feasible region of  $\mathcal{O}^3 \setminus f'$ .

Lemma 6.9 yields that  $\mathcal{F}'$  is isomorphic to  $[Y^j, P(E_n)]$ . Let  $f$  be the isomorphism defined in Lemma 6.9. Then  $f(Z)$  is a recursive atom ordering of the cocircuits of  $[Y^j, P(E_n)]$ . In  $Z$  the cocircuits with  $f' = -$  come first. Then also the cocircuits with  $f' = -$  come first in the recursive atom-ordering  $f(Z)$  of  $[Y^j, P(E_n)]$ . Because of Equation 6.1 these are exactly the cocircuits of  $Q_j$ . Be aware that the new order of the sweep can differ to the old one. The definition of the recursive atom-ordering is completely fulfilled for  $\mathcal{F}$ .  $\square$

We have the following Corollary.

**Corollary 6.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a Euclidean oriented matroid with  $f \in \mathcal{O}$  lying in general position. Then each tope cell of  $\mathcal{O} \setminus f$  is vertex-shellable.*

*Proof.* With reorientation of some elements  $\neq f$  of the matroid the cocircuit graph  $G_f$  stays the same. We can hence always assume that for the tope  $X$  holds only  $X_e \in \{0, +\}$  for all  $e \in \mathcal{O} \setminus f$ . Since  $X$  is not empty it contains a cocircuit. Let  $r$  be the rank of  $\mathcal{O}$ . We pick independent elements  $e_1, \dots, e_r \in \mathcal{O} \setminus f$  and construct the lexicographical extension  $\mathcal{O} \cup g = \mathcal{O}[e_1^+, \dots, e_r^+]$ . Because of Corollary 3.1 and Lemma 2.6 the program  $(\mathcal{O}, g, f)$  is Euclidean, feasible and bounded, fulfilling the assumptions of Theorem 6.3.  $\square$

**6.5. Vertex-shelling of the Edmonds-Mandel Face Lattice of a Euclidean Oriented Matroid.** We conclude that the whole Euclidean oriented matroid is vertex-shellable.

**Theorem 6.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a Euclidean oriented matroid of rank  $r$  with  $f \in \mathcal{O}$  in general position and not a coloop. Let  $S = [e_1, \dots, e_r]$  be an ordered set of independent elements of  $\mathcal{O}$ . We define an ordering of the cocircuits of  $\mathcal{O} \setminus f$  as follows.*

- (i) *Start with the unique cocircuit  $X$  such that  $X_{e_1} = \dots = X_{e_{r-1}} = 0$  and  $X_f = -$ . Let  $i = r - 1$ .*
- (ii) *Continue with the cocircuits of index  $i$  with  $e_i = +$  and  $f = -$  and order them in the sweep order yielded by the Euclidean program  $(\mathcal{O}/\{e_1, \dots, e_{i-1}\}, e_i, f)$ . Then continue with the cocircuits of index  $i$  with  $e_i = -$  and  $f = -$  and order them in the sweep order yielded by the same program of its negative cocircuits. Let  $i = i - 1$  and repeat (ii) until  $i = 0$ .*
- (iii) *Let  $i = i + 1$ . Continue with the cocircuits of index  $i$  with  $e_i = +$  and  $f = +$  and order them in the sweep order yielded by the Euclidean program  $(\mathcal{O}/\{e_1, \dots, e_{i-1}\}, e_i, f)$ . Then continue with the cocircuits of index  $i$  with  $e_i = -$  and  $f = +$ . Let  $i = i + 1$  and repeat (iii) until  $i = r$ .*
- (iv) *Stop with the cocircuit  $-X$ .*

*That is a vertex-shelling of the oriented matroid  $\mathcal{O} \setminus f$ .*

*Proof.* We proceed by induction on the rank  $r \geq 2$  of  $\mathcal{O}$ . If the rank is two, there are only two cocircuits of index 2 and all others are of index 1. In this case the Euclidean program sorts the cocircuits along the circle of its realization which clearly yields a shelling.

Let the Theorem hold for all oriented matroids of rank  $r - 1$  and let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a Euclidean oriented matroid of rank  $r > 2$ . Let  $S = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_r)$  be an ordered set of independent elements of  $\mathcal{O}$ . We use the algorithm and obtain an ordering of the cocircuits  $X^1, \dots, X^m, Y^1, \dots, Y^n, Z^1, \dots, Z^o$  of  $\mathcal{O} \setminus f$  such that  $X^1, \dots, X^m$  are the cocircuits of  $\mathcal{O}$  with  $e_1 = 0$  and  $f = -$  and  $Y^1, \dots, Y^n$  the cocircuits with  $e_1 \neq 0$  and  $Z^1, \dots, Z^o$  are the cocircuits with  $e_1 = 0$  and  $f = +$ . The inductive assumption yields that  $X^1, \dots, X^m, Z^1, \dots, Z^o$  is a vertex shelling of  $(\mathcal{O}/e_1) \setminus f$ .

Let now  $W^k$  be a cocircuit with  $e_1 \neq 0$  and  $f \neq 0$  and let  $W^i$  be a cocircuit coming before  $W^k$  in the sweep order. Then let  $\mathcal{O}' = (\mathcal{O} \setminus f \cup f')$  be the oriented matroid yielded by moving the target function through  $W^k$  (using the localization of Lemma 5.1) hence we have  $W_{f'}^k = 0$ . We have  $W_{f'}^i = -$  in the case that  $W_{e_1}^i = 0$  because of the parallelity of  $f$  and  $f'$  wrt.  $e_1$  and otherwise because of Proposition 5.3 and because  $W^i$  comes before  $W^k$  in the sweep order. We may assume  $\text{sep}(W^i, W^k) = \emptyset$  otherwise [2], Proposition 3.7.2 yields a cocircuit  $W^j$  with  $\text{sep}(W^j, W^k) = \emptyset$ ,  $W^k \circ W^j \preceq W^k \circ W^i$  and  $W_{f'}^j = -$ . We can go on with  $W^j$  then because we want to prove that Theorem 6.2 (iii) holds.

Now let  $\mathcal{O}'_T$  be the oriented matroid  $\mathcal{O}'$  reorientated such that all elements of  $\text{supp}(W^i \circ W^k)$  except  $f'$  are positive. We still have  $W_{f'}^i = -$  there. Let  $\mathcal{O}'' = (\mathcal{O}'_T \cup p) = \mathcal{O}'_T[I^+]$  be the lexicographic extension with  $I = (e_1, \dots, e_r)$ . We obtain  $W_p^i = W_p^k = +$  in  $\mathcal{O}''$ . Theorem 6.1 yields that the program  $(\mathcal{O}'', p, f')$  is Euclidean with a topological sweep. It is also bounded because of Lemma 2.6. The cocircuits  $W^i$  and  $W^k$  lie in the feasible region  $(\mathcal{O}'', p, f')$ . Hence Theorem 6.2 (iii) yields a cocircuit  $Z$  with  $Z \circ Y^k$  being a conformal edge lying in  $W^i \circ W^k$  and  $Z_p = +$  directed from  $Z$  to  $W^k$  in  $(\mathcal{O}'', p, f')$ . Hence we have  $Z_{f'} = -$ . Because  $Z_p = +$  it is an old cocircuit (see Proposition 2.8) existing already in  $\mathcal{O}$ . If it holds  $Z_{e_1} = 0$  we have  $Z_f = -$  in  $\mathcal{O}$  because of the parallelity of  $f$  and  $f'$  wrt.  $e_1$ . Hence  $Z$  comes before  $W^k$  in the sweep order. If it holds  $Z_{e_1} \neq 0$  we

obtain  $Dir(Z, W^k) = +$  in  $(\mathcal{O}'_T, e_1, f')$  because of Proposition 2.4 (iii) hence also in  $(\mathcal{O}, e_1, f)$  because of Proposition 6.1, Proposition 2.4 (ii) and because reorienting elements from  $E \setminus \{e_1, f\}$  does not change the direction of any edge. Also in that case  $Z$  comes before  $W^k$  in the original sweep order. Hence Theorem 6.2 (iii) holds in  $(\mathcal{O}, e_1, f)$ . We conclude that the formula in Theorem 6.2 (iv) (see the proof there) holds.

Let now  $W^k$  be a cocircuit with  $W_{e_1}^k = 0$  and  $W_f^k = +$ . Let  $W^i$  be a cocircuit with  $W_f^i = +$  and  $W_{e_1}^i \neq 0$ . Then like before because of [2], Proposition 3.7.2 we may assume  $sep(W^i, W^k) = \emptyset$  and the same Proposition yields a cocircuit  $Z$  conformal to  $W^k$  with  $Z_{e_1} \neq 0$  and  $Z \circ W^k$  being an edge lying in  $W^i \circ W^k$ . It is clear that  $Z$  is coming before  $W^k$  in the sweep order and the formula in Theorem 6.2 (iv) holds again.

Now we have only to consider the case that  $W_{e_1}^k = 0$  and  $W_{e_1}^i = 0$ . Then for the cocircuit  $Z$  must also hold  $Z_{e_1} = 0$  we can look at the contraction  $(\mathcal{O}/e_1, e_2, f)$ . The formula in Theorem 6.2 (iv) holds again because of the induction assumption hence the non-recursive part (i) of Definition 6.3 of a vertex-shelling holds for  $\mathcal{O} \setminus f$ .

Now we have to show the recursive part of the definition. Let  $Y^k$  be a cocircuit in  $\mathcal{O} \setminus f$ . Let  $\mathcal{O}' = (\mathcal{O} \cup p) = \mathcal{O}[I^+]$  be the lexicographic extension with  $I = (e_1, \dots, e_r)$ . We have  $Y_p^k \neq 0$ . The program  $(\mathcal{O}', p, f)$  is Euclidean. The ordering of the cocircuits given by our algorithm is a linear extension of the partial ordering induced by the graph  $G_f$  of that program. This is clear for the cocircuits having the same index because of Lemma 3.3 and with different indices because of Lemma 3.5. Hence Theorem 1.3 yields that we can move the target function on  $Y^k$  obtaining  $\mathcal{O}'' = \mathcal{O}' \setminus f \cup f'$  respecting our given ordering of the cocircuits. Then we go to  $\mathcal{O}''' = \mathcal{O}'' \setminus supp(Y^k)$  which is of rank  $r-1$ , Euclidean because of Theorem 6.1 and  $\mathcal{O}''' \setminus f'$  is isomorphic to  $[Y^k, 1]$  because of Lemma 6.9. By induction assumption there is a vertex shelling of  $\mathcal{O}''' \setminus f'$  where the cocircuits with  $f' = -$  come first, but these are the cocircuits  $W \setminus supp(Y_k)$  with  $W \circ Y^k$  being a conformal edge in  $\mathcal{O} \setminus f$  and  $W$  is coming before  $Y^k$  in our shelling order because  $W_{f'} = -$ .  $\square$

## 7. CONCLUDING REMARKS

If we look carefully at the proofs of Theorem 6.3 and Theorem 6.4 we see that they remain valid if we assume the oriented matroid  $\mathcal{O}$  only to be *Mandel*. Then we extend it to  $\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O} \cup f$  such that all programs  $(\mathcal{O}', g, f)$  are Euclidean for all elements  $g$  of the groundset of  $\mathcal{O}$ . Our last theorem says that  $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}' \setminus f$  has a vertex-shelling then. Hence an oriented matroid that is *Mandel* has also a vertex-shelling. If the equivalence holds here remains an open problem. We can derive from our Theorem 1.2 immediately that every Euclidean oriented matroid is *Mandel* but in general not every oriented matroid needs to be *Mandel* (which was a conjecture made by A. Mandel in [4]). Jürgen Richter-Gebert found an oriented matroid in [9] with a mutation-free element. That oriented matroid is a counterexample for being *Mandel* which was proven by K. Knauer in [10]. It might be a candidate for an oriented matroid not being vertex-shellable at all. It requires further examinations to check that.

For subdivisions of zonotopes (which are corresponding to single-element liftings of realizable oriented matroids) Athanasiadis proved in [8] that they are shellable (which means that the corresponding oriented matroid has a vertex shelling), if the (realizable) oriented matroid corresponding to the zonotope is strongly Euclidean.



Our last Theorem is a generalization of his result and it should be further examined what our results mean in the special case of zonotopal tilings.

8. LITERATURE

- [1] HOCHSTÄTTLER, W.,  
*Topological Sweeping in Oriented Matroids.*  
Technical report (2016)
- [2] A. BJÖRNER, M. LAS VERGNAS, B. STURMFELS, N. WHITE, AND G. M. ZIEGLER  
*Oriented Matroids, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications, Vol. 46, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993*
- [3] RAUL CORDOVIL AND KOMEI FUKUDA  
*Oriented Matroids and Combinatorial Manifolds, European Journal of Combinatorics, 1-14, 1993*
- [4] MANDEL, A.  
*Topology of Oriented Matroids, Ph D Thesis of A. Mandel, University of Waterloo, 1982*
- [5] FUKUDA, K.  
*Oriented Matroid Programming, Ph D Thesis of K. Fukuda, University of Waterloo, 1982*
- [6] H. BRUGGESSER, P. MANI  
*Shellable Decompositions of Cells and Spheres., MATHEMATICA SCANDINAVICA, 29, 197-205. , 1971*
- [7] P. McMULLEN  
*The number of faces of simplicial polytopes, Israel Journal of Mathematics 9 Vol. 4, 559 – 570, 1971*
- [8] ATHANASIADIS, CHRISTOS  
*Zonotopal Subdivisions of Cyclic Zonotopes, Geometriae Dedicata Vol. 86, no 1-3, pp 37 - 57, 2001*
- [9] RICHTER-GEBERT, J.  
*Oriented Matroids With Few Mutations, Discrete Comp. Geom. 10, pp 251 - 269, 193*
- [10] KNAUER, K.  
*Corners and simpliciality in oriented matroids and partial cubes, preprint*

FERNUNIVERSITÄT IN HAGEN

Email address: Winfried.Hochstättler@FernUniversitaet-Hagen.de

Email address: mail@michaelwilhelmi.de