

# An algorithmic discrete gradient field for non-colliding cell-like objects and the topology of pairs of points on skeleta of simplexes

Emilio J. González and Jesús González

## Abstract

For a positive integer  $n$  and a finite simplicial complex  $K$ , we describe an algorithmic procedure constructing a maximal discrete gradient field  $W(K, n)$  on Abrams' discretized configuration space  $\text{DConf}(K, n)$ . Computer experimentation shows that the field is generically optimal. We study the field  $W(K, n)$  for  $n = 2$  and  $K = \Delta^{m,d}$ , the  $d$ -dimensional skeleton of the  $m$ -dimensional simplex. In particular, we prove that  $\text{DConf}(\Delta^{m,d}, 2)$  is  $(\min\{d, m - 1\} - 1)$ -connected, has torsion-free homology and admits a minimal cell structure. We compute the Betti numbers of  $\text{DConf}(\Delta^{m,d}, 2)$  and, for certain values of  $d$ , we prove that  $\text{DConf}(\Delta^{m,d}, 2)$  breaks, up to homotopy, as a wedge of (not necessarily equidimensional) spheres.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 55P15, 55R80, 57Q70.

Keywords and phrases: Discretized configuration spaces, discrete Morse theory.

## 1 Introduction and main results

For a cell complex  $X$  and a positive integer  $n$ , a discrete analogue of the configuration space

$$\text{Conf}(X, n) = \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in X^n : x_i \neq x_j \text{ for } i \neq j\} \quad (1)$$

was introduced in Abrams Ph.D. thesis [2]. Abrams' model, denoted here by  $\text{DConf}(X, n)$ , is the subcomplex of the product complex  $X^n$  resulting by removing all open cells whose closure intersects the fat diagonal  $X^n \setminus \text{Conf}(X, n)$ . In other words,  $\text{DConf}(X, n)$  is the largest subcomplex of  $X^n$  contained in  $\text{Conf}(X, n)$ .

Abrams discrete configuration spaces are particularly interesting objects on their own right, that have proven to be a highly valuable tool for understanding the algebraic topology properties of classifying spaces of graph braid groups, i.e., of spaces (1) for 1-dimensional complexes  $X$  ([9, 18, 19, 20]). In addition, and from a more practical viewpoint, discrete configuration spaces have certain advantages over their classical counterparts. For instance, consider  $n$  autonomous robots moving on a system of tracks forming a graph  $G$ . Then, by using  $\text{DConf}(G, n)$  as a model for the corresponding collision-free motion planning problem, we force a *safety* rule, namely, the requirement that the shortest path among any two robots always includes a complete edge of  $G$ . This allows us to replace the (dimensionless, in principle) notion of “robot” by actual trains whose lengths are no larger than the shortest edge in  $G$ .

In general, the homotopy type of  $\text{DConf}(X, n)$  may be different from that of  $\text{Conf}(X, n)$ . When  $\dim(X) = 1$ , there are well understood (subdivision-type) conditions assuring that Abrams discrete model captures the homotopy type of its classical counterpart (1), see [18, Theorem 2.4] and [21]. However, for larger dimensional complexes  $X$ , no analogous conditions are known implying a potential homotopy equivalence  $\text{Conf}(X, n) \simeq \text{DConf}(X, n)$ . The situation for  $n = 2$  and  $X$  an arbitrary

*simplicial* complex is exceptional, as it has been known for a long time that  $\text{DConf}(X, 2)$  sits inside the “deleted product”  $\text{Conf}(X, 2)$  as a strong deformation retract (see [16, Theorem 11.2] for the case of a finite  $X$  and, for a general simplicial complex, [22, Lemma 2.1], noticing the fix in [1]). This is particularly appealing, as deleted products are important objects playing a central role, for instance, in the Euclidean embedding problem for complexes ([22]).

As suggested in [3], a systematic study of discrete configuration spaces could then start by considering the case of simplices, the basic building blocks of complexes. In such a direction, Abrams, Gay and Hower have shown that the discrete configuration space  $\text{DConf}(\Delta^m, n)$  associated to an  $m$ -dimensional simplex  $\Delta^m$  splits, up to homotopy, as a wedge sum of spheres all of the same dimension. While their techniques are based on classical homotopy theory, the problem of finding a combinatorially flavored argument arises (see [3, page 1085]). In this paper we pave the way for addressing such a challenge (see Theorem 1.5 below). In particular, for  $1 \leq d \leq m$ , we study, from a purely computational topology perspective, the homotopy type of  $\text{DConf}(\Delta^{m,d}, 2)$ , where  $\Delta^{m,d}$  stands for the  $d$ -dimensional skeleton of  $\Delta^m$ . This leads us to a major generalization of the results in [13] regarding the algebraic topology of 2-point configuration spaces on complete graphs (i.e., 1-dimensional skeleta  $\Delta^{m,1}$ ).

Much of our interest in the complex  $\Delta^{m,d}$  stems from the fact that any finite simplicial complex  $X$  can be thought of as a subcomplex of  $\Delta^{m,d}$ , where  $d = \dim(X)$  and  $m$  is one less than the number of vertices of  $X$ . Thus, Abrams’  $\text{DConf}(X, 2)$  (or  $\text{DConf}(X, n)$ , for that matter) becomes a subcomplex of  $\text{DConf}(\Delta^{m,d}, 2)$  (respectively, of  $\text{DConf}(\Delta^{m,d}, n)$ ). In other words, instead of considering basic building blocks of complexes, i.e., the Abrams-Gay-Hower motivation, we propose to focus on universally large complexes.

Before stating in detail our main contributions, we briefly summarize them. We prove that  $\text{DConf}(\Delta^{m,d}, 2)$  has torsion free homology admitting a minimal cell structure in the sense of [15, Section 4.C] —even in the non-simply-connected case. We compute the Betti numbers of  $\text{DConf}(\Delta^{m,d}, 2)$  and show that, for  $d \geq m - 3$ ,  $\text{DConf}(\Delta^{m,d}, 2)$  is homotopy equivalent to a wedge of spheres. Our calculations suggest that a homotopy decomposition of  $\text{DConf}(\Delta^{m,d}, 2)$  as a wedge of spheres holds as long as

$$d > \max \left\{ 1, \frac{m-2}{2} \right\}. \quad (2)$$

Although we do not prove such assertion, we provide indirect evidence in Remark 1.3 below.

**Remark 1.1.** A homotopy decomposition of  $\text{DConf}(\Delta^{m,d}, 2)$  as a wedge of spheres does not hold outside the range in (2). For instance, as proved in [13], nontrivial cup products exist in the cohomology ring of 2-point configuration spaces of complete graphs (i.e., the case  $d = 1$  above). Likewise, there are nontrivial cup products in  $\text{DConf}(\Delta^{m,d}, 2)$  for  $d = \frac{m-2}{2}$ , though the situation is much subtler. Indeed, for  $d \geq 1$ ,

$$\text{DConf}(\Delta^{2d+2,d}, 2) \quad (3)$$

turns out to be homeomorphic to an orientable closed manifold, so nontrivial cup products hold as part of Poincaré duality phenomena. Manifold properties of (3) will be the topic of a separate paper, and here we only remark a couple of appealing facts. For starters, Abrams’ homeomorphism  $\text{DConf}(K_5, 2) \cong S_6$  ([2, Example 2.4]) is just the first instance in the family of manifolds (3), where  $K_5 = \Delta^{4,1}$ , the complete graph on five vertices, and  $S_6$  stands for an orientable closed surface of genus six. In addition, while  $S_6$  is a connected sum of six torii, item (IV) in the next theorem shows<sup>1</sup> that (3) has the homology type of a connected sum of  $\binom{2d+2}{d+1}$  copies of  $S^d \times S^d$ .

---

<sup>1</sup>We thank Daciberg L. Gonçalves for bringing such a fact to our attention.

Our main theoretical result is spelled out next.

**Theorem 1.2.** For  $1 \leq d \leq m \geq 2$ ,  $\text{DConf}(\Delta^{m,d}, 2)$  is

- a path-connected space with torsion free homology, which is
- homotopy equivalent to a cell complex having as many cells in a given dimension  $i$  as the  $i$ -th Betti number  $\beta_i(m, d)$  of  $\text{DConf}(\Delta^{m,d}, 2)$ .

Specifically, setting  $s_{m,d} := \min\{d, m-1\}$  and  $\beta_{m,d} := \beta_{s_{m,d}}(m, d)$ , we have:

(I)  $\text{DConf}(\Delta^{m,d}, 2)$  is  $(s_{m,d} - 1)$ -connected.

(II) For  $d \in \{m-1, m\}$ ,

$$\text{DConf}(\Delta^{m,d}, 2) \simeq S^{m-1}.$$

(III) For  $d = m-2$ ,

$$\text{DConf}(\Delta^{m,m-2}, 2) \simeq \bigvee_{\beta_{m,m-2}} S^{m-2}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\beta_{m,m-2} = 2m+1$ .

(IV) For  $\frac{m-2}{2} \leq d \leq m-3$  (so that  $m \geq 4$ ),

$$\text{DConf}(\Delta^{m,d}, 2) \simeq \left( \bigvee_{\beta_{m,d}} S^d \right) \cup_{\alpha_{m,d}} e^{m-2}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\beta_{m,d} = 2\binom{m}{d+1}$ . Furthermore, the attaching map  $\alpha_{m,d}: S^{m-3} \rightarrow \bigvee_{\beta_{m,d}} S^d$  is null-homotopic provided  $1 < d = m-3$ , so that

$$\text{DConf}(\Delta^{m,m-3}, 2) \simeq \left( \bigvee_{m(m-1)} S^{m-3} \right) \vee S^{m-2} \quad (6)$$

for  $m \geq 5$ .

(V) For  $d < \frac{m-2}{2}$ ,

$$\text{DConf}(\Delta^{m,d}, 2) \simeq \left( \bigvee_{\beta_{m,d}} S^d \right) \cup \left( \bigcup_{\beta_{2d}(m,d)} e^{2d} \right), \quad (7)$$

where  $\beta(m, d) = 2\binom{m}{d+1}$  and

$$\beta_{2d}(m, d) = \binom{m}{d+1} \binom{m-d-1}{d+1} - \sum_{b=m-d}^m \sum_{a=b-d-1}^{b-1} \binom{a-1}{b+d-m} \binom{a-b+m-d-1}{d+1-b+a}.$$

The easy and well-known situation for  $d \in \{m, m-1\}$  in item (II) is included for completeness and comparison purposes. Note that (4) is formally identical to (6), as in both cases the total number of spheres in the wedge sum is  $2\binom{m}{d+1} + 1$ , except that all spheres happen to be of the same dimension when  $d = m-2$ . Note also that, for  $d = m-2 = 1$ , item (III) recovers the fact in [13, Corollary 4.2] that the configuration space of two ordered points in  $\Delta^{3,1} = K_4$ , the complete graph on four vertices, is homotopy equivalent to a wedge of seven circles.

**Remark 1.3.** We have already noted (Remark 1.1) that the attaching map  $\alpha_{m,d}$  in (IV) is essential (and rather interesting) for  $d = \frac{m-2}{2}$ , but null-homotopic for  $1 < d = m - 3$ . Additionally, in the range

$$\frac{m-2}{2} < d < m-3, \tag{8}$$

$\alpha_{m,d}$  is a stable map, so it is forced to be null-homotopic whenever  $m-d-3 \in \{4, 5, 12, 61\}$ , i.e., when the relevant stable stem is known to vanish ([23, 24]). It would be interesting to know if there are further values of  $d$  in the range (8) for which  $\alpha_{m,d}$  is null-homotopic, so that (5) becomes a wedge sum of spheres. On the other hand, we believe that nonzero cup products will always exist in the case of (7) —checking such a situation is within reach with the tools in this paper—, so that some component of the attaching map in (7) would not be null-homotopic.

**Remark 1.4.** The main result in [3], namely, the fact that  $\text{DConf}(\Delta^m, n)$  is homotopy equivalent to a wedge of spheres of dimension  $m-n+1$ , suggests that (parts of) Theorem 1.2 would admit suitable extensions for  $\text{DConf}(\Delta^{m,d}, n)$  when  $n \geq 2$ .

We prove Theorem 1.2 by using Forman’s discrete Morse theory techniques. In fact, as a second main contribution in this work, we describe an algorithmic construction of an efficient discrete gradient field  $W(X, n)$  on  $\text{DConf}(X, n)$ , for any finite simplicial complex  $X$  and any  $n \geq 2$ .

**Theorem 1.5.** *The gradient field  $W(X, n)$  is maximal in the sense that no  $(p-1)$ -dimensional face and no  $(p+1)$ -dimensional coface of a critical  $p$ -dimensional face is critical.*

The gradient field  $W(X, n)$  is inspired by the construction in [13] of a maximal gradient field  $W(X)$  on any finite simplicial complex  $X$ . As described in [13],  $W(X)$  can be constructed through two different algorithms  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ , where the former one is suitable for studying theoretical properties of  $W(X)$ , while the latter one leads to a fast computer implementation. Our construction of  $W(X, n)$  is a blend of the two algorithms  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ . Indeed, while  $W(X, 1) = W(X)$  is the output of  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ , the construction of  $W(X, n)$  for  $n > 1$  follows a strategy similar to the one supporting  $\mathcal{A}$ .

The construction of  $W(X, n)$  depends on the lexicographic order of faces of  $X$  induced by a given total ordering of the vertices of  $X$ . Yet, the actual constructing process and, therefore, the resulting gradient field, are far more elaborate than the lexicographic gradient field introduced in [17] to study random Vietoris-Rips complexes above the thermodynamic limit —later extended to the filtered realm in [5]. Indeed, in the notation of Section 2, all Morse pairings  $\alpha \nearrow \beta$  in Kahle’s construction have the form  $\beta = \alpha \cup \{v\}$  where  $v$  is a vertex smaller than any of the vertices of  $\alpha$ . The fact that such a situation seldom holds in our construction leads to the efficiency property of  $W(X, n)$  formalized in Theorem 1.5 and exemplified in Remark 1.7 below as well as by the optimality of  $W(\Delta^{m,d}, 2)$ .

Most of the assertions in Theorem 1.2 depend on the fact that  $W(\Delta^{m,d}, 2)$  is optimal. The full strength of Theorem 1.2 then comes from the achievement of two major goals:

- (a) We give an explicit classification of the resulting structure of  $\text{DConf}(\Delta^{m,d}, 2)$  into collapsible, redundant and critical cells.
- (b) We describe the dynamics of the resulting gradient paths.

The first task generalizes (to the higher dimensional complexes  $\Delta^{m,d}$ ) Farley-Sabalka’s classification of critical, redundant and collapsible cells in Abrams’ discrete homotopy model for graph configuration spaces (see [7, Theorem 3.6] for the unordered case, and [4, Theorem 3.2] for the ordered case). Likewise, the second task generalizes the corresponding goal that lead in [14] to a complete

understanding of the cohomology ring of full braid groups on trees. Explicit proof details of both tasks are necessarily technical, and explicit computer outputs played a central role in assembling our general arguments.

As a way of illustration, we highlight:

**Theorem 1.6** (See Corollary 4.5). *For integers  $p$  and  $q$ , let  $\langle p, q \rangle$  stand for the set of integers  $\{p, p+1, \dots, q-1, q\}$ . Cells in  $\text{DConf}(\Delta^{m,d}, 2)$  are in one-to-one correspondence with ordered pairs  $(A, B)$ , where  $A$  and  $B$  are disjoint subsets of  $\{0, 1, \dots, m\}$ , each of cardinality at most  $d+1$ , i.e.,  $|A| \leq d+1 \geq |B|$ . For  $1 \leq d \leq m-2$ , the cell corresponding to  $(A, B)$  is critical if and only if one of the following seven mutually exclusive conditions hold:*

*In dimension 0:*

1.  $(A, B) = (\{m-1\}, \{m\})$ .

*In dimension  $d$ :*

2.  $B = \{b\}$  with  $b \geq 1$ ,  $b-1 \notin A$ ,  $\langle b+1, m \rangle \subseteq A$  and  $|A| = d+1$ .
3.  $A = \{m\}$ ,  $\max B < m-1$  and  $|B| = d+1$ .
4.  $\max B = m-1$ ,  $\langle 0, m-1 \rangle \neq B$ ,  $A = \{\max(\langle 0, m-1 \rangle - B)\}$ ,  $|B| = d+1$ .

*In dimension  $2d$ :*

5.  $\max A < m$ ,  $\langle 1 + \max B, m-1 \rangle \not\subseteq A$  and  $|A| = |B| = d+1$  and  $2(d+1) \leq m$ .
6.  $\max(A \cup B) < m$ ,  $\langle 1 + \max B, m-1 \rangle \subseteq A$ ,  $\langle 0, \max B \rangle \neq B$ ,  $\max(\langle 0, \max B \rangle - B) \notin A$ ,  $|A| = |B| = d+1$  and  $2(d+1) < m$ .

*In dimension  $m-2$ :*

7.  $(A, B) = (\langle d+1, m-1 \rangle, \langle 0, d \rangle)$  and  $m \leq 2(d+1)$ .

Here is a brief roadmap for the paper. The gradient field  $W(X, n)$  is constructed in Section 3, where its maximality property (Theorem 1.5) is proved. The characterization of collapsible (Theorems 4.2 and 4.3), redundant (Corollary 4.4) and critical cells (Corollary 4.5), accomplished in Section 4, leads to a proof of most assertions in Theorem 1.2. The second assertion in item (IV) of Theorem 1.2, i.e., the fact that the attaching map for the top cell in the critical CW model for  $\text{DConf}(\Delta^{m, m-3}, 2)$  is homotopically trivial for  $m \geq 5$ , requires the close analysis in Section 5 of the corresponding gradient flow. In all cases, the optimality of  $W(\Delta^{m,d}, 2)$  and the minimality of the corresponding critical CW structure follow from the triviality of the corresponding Morse differential.

**Remark 1.7.** The  $n$ -th symmetric group  $\Sigma_n$  acts cellularly on  $\text{DConf}(X, n)$  by permuting coordinates. The fact that our gradient field  $W(X, n)$  is *not*  $\Sigma_n$ -equivariant should be interpreted as one of its key features. For instance, for  $X = \Gamma$  a graph,  $\Sigma_n$ -equivariantness prevents Farley-Sabalka's gradient field on  $\text{DConf}(\Gamma, n)$  to be optimal, as the number of critical cells in any given dimension is always divisible by  $n!$  (After all, Farley-Sabalka's gradient field was introduced as a tool to study *full* graph braid groups.) In contrast,  $W(\Gamma, n)$  happens to be optimal in many instances, including complete graphs  $\Delta^{m,1}$ . As a result, (co)homological calculations for  $\text{DConf}(\Gamma, n)$  are far more accessible via our gradient field than via Farley-Sabalka's. In particular, just as Farley-Sabalka's gradient field has been a key tool for characterizing in [8, 18, 19] *full* braid groups that are right-angled Artin groups (RAAG's), we believe that  $W(\Gamma, n)$  will lay an effective strategy in an eventual RAAG-characterization in the case of *pure* graph braid groups —Ghrist's original question in [12].

All in all, the use of our discrete gradient field  $W(X, n)$  opens up a gateway for a systematic study, both theoretical as well as computer-assisted, of the algebraic topology properties of general discrete configuration spaces  $\text{DConf}(X, n)$ , their eventual comparison to  $\text{Conf}(X, n)$ , and potential applications (e.g., the one noted at the end of Remark 1.7).

## 2 Review of discrete Morse theory

We start by reviewing the basics on Forman’s discrete Morse theory for the type of cell complexes we are interested in. The reader is referred to [10, 11] for details.

Let  $X$  be a finite regular CW complex, and let  $F$  denote the set of cells of  $X$  (also called “faces”, even if  $X$  fails to be simplicial). We write  $\alpha^{(p)}$  to indicate that  $\alpha \in F$  is  $p$ -dimensional. The directed Hasse diagram  $H$  of  $X$  is the directed graph with vertex set  $F$  and directed edges

$$\alpha^{(p+1)} \searrow \beta^{(p)}$$

whenever  $\beta \subset \alpha$  with  $p \geq 0$ . Recall that the degree of a vertex  $v$  in a directed graph is the number of outgoing edges from  $v$  plus the number of ingoing edges to  $v$ .

**Definition 2.1.** *1. In the context above, a directed subgraph  $W$  of  $H$  is called a discrete field provided all vertices of  $W$  have degree 1. The directed graph obtained from  $H$  by reversing the orientation of all arrows in  $W$  defines the  $W$ -modified Hasse diagram  $H_W$ . We use the notation  $\beta^{(p)} \nearrow \alpha^{(p+1)}$  to indicate the edge in  $H_W$  resulting from reversing the orientation of an edge  $\alpha^{(p+1)} \searrow \beta^{(p)}$  in  $W$ . In such a case,  $\alpha$  is said to be collapsible while  $\beta$  is said to be redundant. Any other vertex of  $H_W$ , i.e. those not belonging to  $W$ , are called critical.*

*2. A gradient path  $\gamma$  is a chain*

$$\alpha_0 \nearrow \beta_1 \searrow \alpha_1 \nearrow \cdots \nearrow \beta_k \searrow \alpha_k$$

*of alternating up-going/down-going directed edges in  $H_W$  with  $k > 0$ . We say that  $\gamma$  is a cycle provided  $\alpha_0 = \alpha_k$ . (By construction,  $\alpha_i \neq \alpha_{i+1}$  for  $0 \leq i < k$ , so the cycle condition is possible only with  $k > 1$ .) The discrete field  $W$  is said to be gradient if no gradient path is a cycle.*

*3. A lower gradient path  $\gamma$  is a chain*

$$\alpha_0 \searrow \beta_1 \nearrow \alpha_1 \searrow \cdots \searrow \beta_k \nearrow \alpha_k$$

*of alternating down-going/up-going directed edges in  $H_W$  with  $k > 0$ .*

A discrete gradient field  $W$  on a finite regular CW complex  $X$  should be understood as an organized set of instructions that allow us to simplify the cell structure of  $X$  without altering its homotopy type. The simplification is achieved by extrapolating, from the simplicial setting, the concept of “collapse”. Assume that  $\tau^{(p)}$  is a free face of  $\sigma^{(p+1)}$  in  $X$ , i.e.,  $\sigma$  is the only  $(p + 1)$ -dimensional face of  $X$  containing  $\tau$ . We can then squeeze  $\sigma$  towards  $\partial\sigma - \text{Int}(\tau)$  by pushing  $\tau$  through  $\text{Int}(\sigma)$ . See Figure 1, where a linear squeezing is depicted at the level of domains of characteristic maps. Here “Int” stands for the interior of a simplex. Since we do not want to change the homotopy type of  $X$ , the boundary of  $\tau$  must stay fixed throughout the squeezing process. On the other hand, at the level of the characteristic-map domain, the squeezing is maximal at the barycenter of  $\tau$ . Once the squeezing is complete, we get a new complex, which is homotopy equivalent to  $X$ , and with the




Figure 1: Squeezing of  $\sigma$  by pushing through its free face  $\tau$  in the regular complex  $X$

same face structure as that of  $X$ , except that  $\tau$  and  $\sigma$  have now been removed. Although a pair of cells  $(\tau, \sigma)$  as above would typically be the start of a largest possible gradient path in  $X$ , the squeezing process can be performed even if  $\tau$  is not a free face of  $\sigma$ . In such a case, and in order to avoid tearing apart the fabric of  $X$ , we have to elongate all other cells having  $\tau$  as a face, so to match the squeezing into  $\sigma$ . The process can then be iterated following the instructions provided by each maximal gradient path

$$\alpha_0 \nearrow \beta_1 \searrow \alpha_1 \nearrow \cdots \nearrow \beta_k \searrow \alpha_k,$$

pushing in turn each  $\alpha_i$  so to squeeze the corresponding  $\beta_{i+1}$ . As the process continues, all pushable and all squeezable faces get deformed establishing a flow leading to critical faces. At the end, we get a cell complex which (1) is homotopy equivalent to  $X$  and (2) has a  $p$ -cell for each critical  $p$ -cell in  $X$ . Formally:

**Theorem 2.2** ([10, Corollary 3.5]). *A discrete gradient field  $W$  on a finite regular CW complex  $X$  determines a homotopy equivalence  $X \simeq Y$ , where the CW complex  $Y$  has a  $p$ -dimensional cell for each  $p$ -dimensional critical face of  $X$ .*

In particular, gradient-path dynamics on  $W$  yield a way to compute the homology groups of  $X$ . Explicitly, start by choosing an arbitrary orientation for each cell of  $X$ . For faces  $\alpha^{(p)} \subset \beta^{(p+1)}$  of  $X$ , let  $\iota_{\alpha, \beta}$  denote the incidence number of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , i.e., the coefficient of  $\alpha$  in the expression of the cellular boundary  $\partial(\beta)$ . Note that  $\iota_{\alpha, \beta} = \pm 1$ , in view of the regularity assumption on  $X$ . In these terms, the multiplicity of a gradient path  $\lambda = (\alpha_0 \nearrow \beta_1 \searrow \alpha_1 \nearrow \cdots \nearrow \beta_k \searrow \alpha_k)$  is

$$\mu(\lambda) := \prod_{i=1}^k \left( -\iota_{\alpha_{i-1}, \beta_i} \cdot \iota_{\alpha_i, \beta_i} \right). \quad (9)$$

Then, the homology of  $X$  with coefficients in a commutative unital ring  $R$  can be computed through the *Morse chain complex*  $(\mu_*(X; R), \partial)$ , which is degree-wise  $R$ -free, with basis in dimension  $p \geq 0$  given by the set of oriented  $p$ -dimensional critical faces of  $X$ . The *Morse boundary* is given at a critical cell  $\beta^{(p+1)}$  by

$$\partial(\beta) = \sum_{\gamma^{(p)} \text{ critical}} \iota_{\gamma, \beta}^{\mu} \cdot \gamma. \quad (10)$$

Here, the Morse-type incidence number  $\iota_{\gamma, \beta}^{\mu}$  is given by

$$\iota_{\gamma, \beta}^{\mu} = \sum_{\alpha^{(p)}} \iota_{\alpha, \beta} \left( \sum_{\lambda} \mu(\lambda) \right) \cdot \gamma, \quad (11)$$

where the outer summation runs over all faces  $\alpha$  of  $\beta$ , and the inner summation runs over all gradient paths  $\lambda$  from  $\alpha$  to  $\gamma$ .

### 3 The gradient field

The regular complexes we are interested in arise as subcomplexes of powers of simplicial complexes.<sup>2</sup> We fix notation on such a context. Let  $K$  denote a finite (abstract) simplicial complex, with set of simplices  $F$  and with a chosen linear ordering  $\preceq$  on its vertex set  $V$ . Without loss of generality, we may as well assume

$$V = \{1, 2, \dots, m\},$$

with  $\preceq$  corresponding to the usual ordering of integers. As above, we write  $\alpha^{(p)}$  to indicate that  $\alpha \in F$  is  $p$ -dimensional, and use the more specific list-type notation

$$\alpha = \alpha_0 \alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_p,$$

where  $\alpha$  is oriented according to the ordered listing

$$\alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < \cdots < \alpha_p$$

of its vertices. In these terms, the set of  $p$ -dimensional simplices is ordered lexicographically. Namely,

$$\alpha_0 \alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_p < \beta_0 \beta_1 \cdots \beta_p \iff \text{there is } \ell \in \{0, 1, \dots, p\} \text{ with } \alpha_\ell < \beta_\ell \text{ but } \alpha_i = \beta_i \text{ for } 0 \leq i < \ell.$$

The latter order is then extended to all of  $F$  by declaring that any  $p$ -dimensional simplex is smaller than any  $q$ -dimensional simplex whenever  $p < q$ .

Next, take the product cell decomposition in the  $n$ -th power  $K^n$  of  $K$ . Thus, cells of  $K^n$  are prism-like products of simplices  $\alpha = \alpha_1 \times \alpha_2 \times \cdots \times \alpha_n$ , with each  $\alpha_i$  a simplex of  $K$ . It will be convenient to use the notation  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)$  or, more explicitly,

$$\alpha = \left( \alpha_{1,0} \alpha_{1,1} \cdots \alpha_{1,p_1}, \alpha_{2,0} \alpha_{2,1} \cdots \alpha_{2,p_2}, \cdots, \alpha_{n,0} \alpha_{n,1} \cdots \alpha_{n,p_n} \right). \quad (12)$$

For  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $0 \leq j \leq p_i$ , the  $(i, j)$ -th codimension-1 face of  $\alpha$ , denoted by  $\partial_{i,j}(\alpha)$ , is obtained by removing the  $j$ -th vertex from the  $i$ -th coordinate of (12). Explicitly,

$$\partial_{i,j}(\alpha) = \left( \alpha_{1,0} \cdots \alpha_{1,p_1}, \cdots, \alpha_{i,0} \cdots \widehat{\alpha_{i,j}} \cdots \alpha_{i,p_i}, \cdots, \alpha_{n,0} \alpha_{n,1} \cdots \alpha_{n,p_n} \right).$$

For instance, with the chosen orientations, the incidence number of  $\alpha$  and  $\partial_{i,j}(\alpha)$  is given by

$$[\alpha : \partial_{i,j}(\alpha)] = (-1)^{\epsilon_{i,j}},$$

where  $\epsilon_{i,j} = p_1 + \cdots + p_{i-1} + j$ . Lastly, the lexicographic order on  $F$  defined at the end of the previous paragraph is extended, again lexicographically over the  $n$  coordinates, to all cells (12).

The goal in this section is the construction of a discrete gradient field  $W(K, n)$  on the subcomplex  $\text{DConf}(K, n)$  of  $K^n$ . Although it is not explicit from the notation,  $W(K, n)$  certainly depends on  $\preceq$ , that is, on the chosen ordering of vertices leading to the identification of the vertex set of  $K$  with  $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ .

By definition, the  $(p_1 + \cdots + p_n)$ -dimensional cell  $\alpha$  in (12) belongs to  $\text{DConf}(K, n)$  precisely when the  $n$  sets of vertices

$$\{\alpha_{1,0}, \dots, \alpha_{1,p_1}\}, \dots, \{\alpha_{n,0}, \dots, \alpha_{n,p_n}\} \quad (13)$$

---

<sup>2</sup>The methods in this section can be extended to subcomplexes of cartesian products of simplicial complexes; details will be given elsewhere.



are pairwise disjoint. Let  $V(\alpha)$  stand for the union of the sets in (13). For  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  and a vertex  $v \notin V(\alpha)$  such that  $\{\alpha_{i,0}, \dots, \alpha_{i,p_i}\} \cup \{v\}$  is a simplex of  $K$ , we let

$$\alpha +_i v \tag{14}$$

stand for the cell of  $\text{DConf}(K, n)$  obtained from (12) by inserting the vertex  $v$  in the list of vertices in the  $i$ -th entry of  $\alpha$ . Of course, in terms of the list-type notation above, insertion of  $v$  is made at a position that renders an ordered list of vertices. Accordingly, the face  $\partial_{i,j}(\alpha)$  will also be denoted as

$$\alpha -_i \alpha_{i,j}. \tag{15}$$

We will need to iterate the notation in (14) and (15). For instance, we will write  $\alpha -_i u +_j v$  as a shorthand of  $(\alpha -_i u) +_j v$ , whenever the constructions make sense.

### 3.1 Algorithmic construction

With the preparation above, set  $d := \dim(X)$  where  $X := \text{DConf}(K, n)$ . The field  $W := W(K, n)$  is constructed through an algorithmic procedure initialized by  $W := \emptyset$ , together with the initialization of auxiliary variables  $A^p := F^p$ , for  $0 \leq p \leq d$ . Here  $F^p$  stands for the set of  $p$ -dimensional cells of  $\text{DConf}(K, n)$  with the ordering inherited from the cells of  $K^n$  discussed at the end of the second paragraph of Section 3. Throughout the construction of  $W$ , we will remove elements from each  $A^p$ , keeping the restricted order on the resulting sets  $A^p$ . The role of  $A^p$  is to keep track of the  $p$ -dimensional faces of  $\text{DConf}(K, n)$  that are *available* at any given stage of the algorithm, i.e.,  $p$ -dimensional faces of  $\text{DConf}(K, n)$  that, at the given stage, are not part of any (so far constructed) directed edge in  $W$ . Throughout the algorithm, new directed edges

$$\alpha^{(p)} \nearrow \beta^{(p+1)},$$

with  $(\alpha, \beta) \in A^p \times A^{p+1}$ , are added to  $W$  by means of a family of processes  $\mathcal{P}(p)$  executed for  $p = d - 1, d - 2, \dots, 1, 0$  (in that order). Process  $\mathcal{P}(p)$ , which is executed provided the current sets of available faces  $A^p$  and  $A^{p+1}$  are not empty (so there is a chance to add new directed edges to  $W$ ), consists of a family of subprocesses  $\mathcal{P}(p, r)$  executed for  $r = n, n - 1, \dots, 1$  (in that order). The goal of  $\mathcal{P}(p, r)$  is to add to  $W$  directed edges of the form

$$\alpha^{(p)} \nearrow \alpha^{(p)} +_r u, \tag{16}$$

for some vertex  $u \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ . To accomplish that,  $\mathcal{P}(p, r)$  consists of a family of subprocesses  $\mathcal{P}(p, r, u)$  executed for  $u = m, m - 1, \dots, 1$  (in that order), while each  $\mathcal{P}(p, r, u)$  consists of a family of instructions  $\mathcal{P}(p, r, u, \alpha)$  executed for  $\alpha$  in (the current)  $A^p$  following its lexicographic order, though this time from the smaller cell to the larger cell. At the core of the nested family of processes,  $\mathcal{P}(p, r, u, \alpha)$  checks whether, at the moment of its execution,

$$(\alpha, \alpha +_r u) \in A^p \times A^{p+1}, \tag{17}$$

i.e., whether (16) is available to form a new directed edge. If so,  $\mathcal{P}(p, r, u, \alpha)$  adds (16) to  $W$  and sets  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha +_r u$  as no longer available by removing them from  $A^p$  and  $A^{p+1}$ , respectively.

From its construction we see that the family  $W$  of directed edges resulting at the end of the algorithm forms a discrete field. Furthermore, if  $\alpha^{(p)}$  is a critical cell, i.e., a cell in a final  $A^p$ , then no face  $\beta^{(p-1)}$  and no coface  $\gamma^{(p+1)}$  of  $\alpha$  can be critical. This yields Theorem 1.5 in view of Proposition 3.3 below.

In preparation for the arguments in the rest of the paper, the reader will find particularly enlightening the following situation:

**Example 3.1.** Consider the case of the complex  $\text{DConf}(K_3, 2)$  for the complete graph  $K_3$ . Since  $\dim(\text{DConf}(K_3, 2)) = 1$ , the construction of  $W(K_3, 2)$  reduces to the process  $\mathcal{P}(0)$ . At the start of the construction, the ordered list of available faces are

$$A^0 = \{(1, 2), (1, 3), (2, 1), (2, 3), (3, 1), (3, 2)\}$$

and

$$A^1 = \{(1, 23), (2, 13), (3, 12), (12, 3), (13, 2), (23, 1)\}.$$

Then  $\mathcal{P}(0)$  evolves in the following order:

- $\mathcal{P}(0, 2, 3)$  constructs the directed edges  $(1, 2) \nearrow (1, 23)$  and  $(2, 1) \nearrow (2, 13)$  (in that order), which renders  $A^0 = \{(1, 3), (2, 3), (3, 1), (3, 2)\}$  and  $A^1 = \{(3, 12), (12, 3), (13, 2), (23, 1)\}$ .
- $\mathcal{P}(0, 2, 2)$  constructs the directed edge  $(3, 1) \nearrow (3, 12)$ , which renders  $A^0 = \{(1, 3), (2, 3), (3, 2)\}$  and  $A^1 = \{(12, 3), (13, 2), (23, 1)\}$ .
- $\mathcal{P}(0, 1, 2)$  constructs the directed edge  $(1, 3) \nearrow (12, 3)$ , which renders  $A^0 = \{(2, 3), (3, 2)\}$  and  $A^1 = \{(13, 2), (23, 1)\}$ .
- $\mathcal{P}(0, 1, 1)$  constructs the directed edge  $(3, 2) \nearrow (13, 2)$ , which renders the critical cells  $(2, 3)$  and  $(23, 1)$  in dimensions 0 and 1, respectively. This is of course compatible with the well known homotopy equivalence  $\text{Conf}(S^1, 2) \simeq S^1$ .

### 3.2 Acyclicity

**Lemma 3.2.** *Assume  $\alpha^{(p)} \nearrow \beta = \alpha +_i v$  lies in  $W$  and take  $\gamma = \beta -_j w$ . If  $i < j$  or, else, if  $i = j$  with  $v < w$ , then  $\gamma$  is redundant with  $\gamma \nearrow \delta = \gamma +_k u$ , where either  $j < k$  or, else  $j = k$  and  $w < u$ .*

*Proof.* In the algorithm, the instruction  $\mathcal{P}(p, j, w, \gamma)$ , which assesses the availability of the pair  $(\gamma, \beta)$ , is executed before  $\mathcal{P}(p, i, v, \alpha)$ , which is responsible for the construction of the assumed  $\alpha \nearrow \beta$ . This means that, although  $\beta$  is available at the moment of executing  $\mathcal{P}(p, j, w, \gamma)$ ,  $\gamma$  is not. So  $\gamma$  must have been identified as redundant through in instruction  $\mathcal{P}(p, k, u, \gamma)$  previous to  $\mathcal{P}(p, j, w, \gamma)$ . This yields the result.  $\square$

The crux of the matter in the previous proof is the observation that, in the algorithmic construction of  $W$ , the directed edge  $\gamma \nearrow \delta$  must have already been constructed by the time of the construction of  $\alpha \nearrow \beta$ . Such a “timing” issue will be crucial for later arguments in the paper.

**Proposition 3.3.** *The field  $W$  is gradient.*

*Proof.* Assume, for a contradiction, a gradient cycle in  $H_W$

$$\alpha_0 \nearrow \beta_0 \searrow \alpha_1 \nearrow \beta_1 \searrow \cdots \searrow \alpha_n \nearrow \beta_n \searrow \alpha_0,$$

with  $|\{\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}| = n + 1$  (so  $n \geq 1$ ), and set

$$\alpha_{n+1} := \alpha_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_{n+1} := \beta_0.$$

We can arrange the start of the cycle so to assume that  $\alpha_0 \nearrow \beta_0$  is constructed before any other  $\alpha_r \nearrow \beta_r$ ,  $1 \leq r \leq n$ . Say  $\alpha_r \nearrow \beta_r = \alpha_r +_{i_r} v_r$ , for  $0 \leq r \leq n$ , so that

- (i)  $i_r \leq i_0$ ,

$$(ii) \quad i_r = i_0 \Rightarrow v_r \leq v_0,$$

for  $1 \leq r \leq n$ . Let  $t$  be the first integer in  $\{1, 2, \dots, n+1\}$  so that  $v_0 \notin V(\alpha_t)$  (this uses  $\alpha_0 = \alpha_{n+1}$  and  $v_0 \notin V(\alpha_0)$ ). Note that  $t \geq 2$ , as  $\alpha_0 \neq \alpha_1$ . So,  $v_0$  is kept as a vertex in the  $i_0$ -th entry of each  $\alpha_\ell$  with  $1 \leq \ell \leq t-1$ , while

$$(iii) \quad \alpha_{t-1} \nearrow \beta_{t-1} = \alpha_{t-1} +_{i_{t-1}} v_{t-1}, \text{ with } v_{t-1} \neq v_0,$$

$$(iv) \quad \alpha_t = \beta_{t-1} -_{i_0} v_0 \text{ (in particular } t \leq n).$$

However, in view of conditions (i) and (ii) for  $r = t-1$  and  $r = t$ , the conclusion of Lemma 3.2 applied to the situation in conditions (iii) y (iv) yields  $v_{t-1} = v_0$ , which contradicts (iii).  $\square$

## 4 Classification of cells

In the rest of the paper we focus on the case of  $\text{DConf}(\Delta^{m,d}, 2)$ , assuming  $1 \leq d \leq m-2$  so to avoid the two exceptional but well-known cases  $\text{Conf}(\Delta^m, 2) \simeq S^{m-1} \simeq \text{Conf}(S^{m-1}, 2)$ . For exposition purposes, it is convenient to make the following notational adjustments, which will be in force from now on. Firstly, the simplex under consideration is thought of as  $\Delta^{\mu-1}$ , with vertex set  $\{1, 2, \dots, \mu\}$ , and the skeleton under consideration is  $\Delta^{\mu-1, \mu-\kappa-1}$ . Thus

$$2 \leq \kappa \leq \mu - 2 \quad (\text{so } 4 \leq \mu). \quad (18)$$

Secondly, following the notation of (12), cells of  $X_{\mu, \kappa} := \text{DConf}(\Delta^{\mu-1, \mu-\kappa-1}, 2)$  are written in the form  $(A, B) := (a_1 a_2 \cdots a_r, b_1 b_2 \cdots b_s)$ , with

$$\begin{aligned} 1 \leq a_1 < a_2 < \cdots < a_r \leq \mu, \quad 1 \leq r \leq \mu - \kappa, \\ 1 \leq b_1 < b_2 < \cdots < b_s \leq \mu, \quad 1 \leq s \leq \mu - \kappa, \\ \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r\} \cap \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_s\} = \emptyset. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

If we need to refer to the sets  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r\}$  or  $\{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_s\}$  (as in the third condition above), we write  $\{A\}$  or  $\{B\}$ . Also, when dealing with multiple cells of  $X_{\mu, \kappa}$  at once, we use a (multi-)primed notation, e.g.,  $(A', B')$  with ingredients  $a'_i, b'_i, r'$  and  $s'$ . Lastly, recall from the introduction that  $\langle p, q \rangle$  stands for the set of integers  $\{p, p+1, \dots, q-1, q\}$ .

Note that  $\dim(A, B) = r + s - 2 \leq \min\{\mu - 2, 2(\mu - \kappa - 1)\}$ . In fact:

**Proposition 4.1.** *All maximal cells of  $X_{\mu, \kappa}$  have dimension  $\min\{\mu - 2, 2(\mu - \kappa - 1)\}$ , i.e.,  $X_{\mu, \kappa}$  is pure of degree  $\min\{\mu - 2, 2(\mu - \kappa - 1)\}$ .*

*Proof.* We give the straightforward argument for completeness. The situation for  $\mu \leq 2\kappa$ , i.e., when  $\min\{\mu - 2, 2(\mu - \kappa - 1)\} = 2(\mu - \kappa - 1)$ , is easier, as any cell  $(A, B)$  can then be realized as a face of a cell  $(A', B')$  with  $r' = s' = \mu - \kappa$ . So, assume  $2\kappa \leq \mu$ , i.e.,  $\min\{\mu - 2, 2(\mu - \kappa - 1)\} = \mu - 2$ .

**Case  $\kappa \leq r$ .** We can add the  $\mu - r - s$  vertices in  $\langle 1, \mu \rangle - V(A, B)$  into the  $B$ -entry, so to realize  $(A, B)$  as a face of a cell  $(A, B')$ , as  $|B'| = s + \mu - r - s \leq \mu - \kappa$ .

**Case  $\kappa \leq s$ .** We can add the  $\mu - r - s$  vertices in  $\langle 1, \mu \rangle - V(A, B)$  into the  $A$ -entry, so to realize  $(A, B)$  as a face of a cell  $(A', B)$ , as  $|A'| = r + \mu - r - s \leq \mu - \kappa$ .

**Case  $r < \kappa < s$ .** Then there are  $(\kappa - r) + (\kappa - s)$  vertices in  $\langle 1, \mu \rangle - V(A, B)$ , and we add  $\kappa - r$  (respectively,  $\kappa - s$ ) of them into the  $A$ -entry (respectively,  $B$ -entry), so to realize  $(A, B)$  as a face of a cell  $(A', B')$ , with  $r' \geq \kappa \leq s'$ . We are then done in view of any of the two previous cases.  $\square$

Let  $W_{\mu,\kappa} := W(\Delta^{\mu-1,\mu-\kappa-1}, 2)$ . We describe in Theorem 4.2 below all directed edges in  $W_{\mu,\kappa}$  of the form  $(A, B) \nearrow (A, B) +_2 u$ . The corresponding description for the totality of directed edges in  $W_{\mu,\kappa}$  of the form  $(A, B) \nearrow (A, B) +_1 u$  is then given in Theorem 4.3.

**Theorem 4.2.** *Any cell  $(A, B)$  of  $X_{\mu,\kappa}$  with  $s > 1$  and*

$$\langle b_s + 1, \mu \rangle \subseteq \{A\} \quad (20)$$

*is collapsible. In fact*

$$(A, B) -_2 b_s \nearrow (A, B) \quad (21)$$

*is a directed edge in  $W_{\mu,\kappa}$ . Furthermore, the directed edges in (21) account for all directed edges in  $W_{\mu,\kappa}$  that arise by insertion of a vertex on the second coordinate of a cell in  $X_{\mu,\kappa}$ .*

Of course, condition (20) might hold just because  $\langle b_s + 1, \mu \rangle = \emptyset$ , i.e.,  $b_s = \mu$ .

*Proof.* Recall  $\dim(A, B) = r + s - 2$ . We show below that  $(A, B)$  is not redundant, so that it is available at the start of process  $\mathcal{P}(r + s - 3)$ . Then  $\mathcal{P}(r + s - 3, 2, b_s)$  is the first subprocess that could make  $(A, B)$  lose the availability condition, namely, with  $\mathcal{P}(r + s - 3, 2, b_s, (A, B) -_2 b_s)$  assessing (as in (17)) the pair

$$\left( (A, B) -_2 b_s, (A, B) \right).$$

By (20),  $(A, B) -_2 b_s$  is available at the moment of executing  $\mathcal{P}(r + s - 3, 2, b_s, (A, B) -_2 b_s)$ , so the latter instruction does construct (21).

To complete the proof of the first part of the theorem, it remains to show that  $(A, B)$  is not redundant. Assume for a contradiction that a directed edge

$$(A, B) \nearrow (A, B) +_j u \quad (22)$$

belongs to  $W_{\mu,\kappa}$  for  $j \in \{1, 2\}$ . Note that condition (20) forces  $u < b_s$ . Therefore, before (22) is constructed by  $\mathcal{P}(r + s - 2, j, u, (A, B))$ , the earlier instruction  $\mathcal{P}(r + s - 2, 2, b_s, (A, B) +_j u -_2 b_s)$  is in charge of assessing the pair

$$\left( (A, B) +_j u -_2 b_s, (A, B) +_j u \right).$$

In such an assessment, both coordinates are available: the second one because it stays available up to  $\mathcal{P}(r + s - 2, j, u, (A, B))$ , and the first one in view of (20). So  $\mathcal{P}(r + s - 2, 2, b_s, (A, B) +_j u -_2 b_s)$  constructs  $(A, B) +_j u -_2 b_s \nearrow (A, B) +_j u$ , which contradicts (22).

To complete the proof, assume —again for a contradiction— that there is a directed edge

$$(A', B') -_2 b'_i \nearrow (A', B') \quad (23)$$

in  $W_{\mu-\kappa}$  with either  $i < s'$  or so that the corresponding (primed) condition (20) is not fulfilled. In the latter case set  $u_0 := \max\{u: b'_{s'} < u \leq \mu \text{ and } u \notin A'\}$ , so that  $(A', B') -_2 b'_i \nearrow (A', B') -_2 b'_i +_2 u_0$  has already been proved to lie in  $W_{\mu,\kappa}$ , which prevents (23). Therefore, we can assume  $i < s'$  with  $\{u: b'_{s'} < u \leq \mu \text{ and } u \notin A'\} = \emptyset$ . But then  $(A', B') -_2 b'_s \nearrow (A', B')$  has already been proved to lie in  $W_{\mu,\kappa}$ , again preventing (23).  $\square$

**Theorem 4.3.** *Let  $(A, B)$  be a cell of  $X_{\mu,\kappa}$  with  $r > 1$ .*

(1) *Assume (20) holds and  $s = 1$ . If  $b_1 - 1 \in \{A\}$ , then  $(A, B) -_1 (b_1 - 1) \nearrow (A, B)$  is a directed edge in  $W_{\mu,\kappa}$ .*

(2) Assume (20) fails (in particular  $b_s < \mu$ ) and  $s = \mu - \kappa$ .

(a) If  $a_r = \mu$ , then  $(A, B) -_1 \mu \nearrow (A, B)$  is a directed edge in  $W_{\mu, \kappa}$ .

(b) If  $a_r < \mu$  and

(b.1)  $\langle b_s + 1, \mu - 1 \rangle \subseteq \{A\}$ ;

(b.2)  $\langle 1, b_s - 1 \rangle \not\subseteq \{B\}$ ;

(b.3)  $\bar{a} := \max(\langle 1, b_s - 1 \rangle - \{B\}) \in \{A\}$ ,

then  $(A, B) -_1 \bar{a} \nearrow (A, B)$  is a directed edge in  $W_{\mu, \kappa}$ .

Furthermore, the three types of directed edges described above account for all directed edges in  $W_{\mu, \kappa}$  that arise by insertion of a vertex on the first coordinate of a cell in  $X_{\mu, \kappa}$ .

Note that, if  $b_s < \mu - 1$  in (b), then (b.1) forces  $a_r = \mu - 1$ . Yet, it might just as well be the case that  $b_s = \mu - 1$  in item (b), in which case (b.1) is vacuously true.

*Proof.* Let  $(A, B)$  be a cell in  $X_{\mu, \kappa}$  satisfying  $r > 1$  together with the conditions in item (1) of the theorem. In particular  $B = b$  with  $b = b_1$ . First, we assert that  $(A, b)$  is not redundant. Indeed, no directed edge  $(A, b) \nearrow (A, b) +_2 u$  can lie in  $W_{\mu, \kappa}$ , in view of Theorem 4.2 (as  $u < b - 1$  is forced). On the other hand, before some directed edge

$$(A, b) \nearrow (A, b) +_1 u \tag{24}$$

can be constructed, necessarily by  $\mathcal{P}(r - 1, 1, u, (A, b))$  and with  $u < b - 1$  (the latter condition in view of the hypotheses in (1)), the earlier instruction  $\mathcal{P}(r - 1, 1, b - 1, (A, b) +_1 u -_1 (b - 1))$  would have to assess the pair

$$\left( (A, b) +_1 u -_1 (b - 1), (A, b) +_1 u \right),$$

both of whose entries are found to be available at that moment: the second one because it is supposed to stay available up to  $\mathcal{P}(r - 1, 1, u, (A, b))$ , and the first one in view of Theorem 4.2, which rules out a possible insertion of a vertex in the second entry, and because of the hypotheses in (1), which rule out a possible earlier insertion of a vertex in the first entry. This prevents (24) and completes the argument for the non-redundancy of  $(A, b)$ . Then, in order to prove that the directed edge  $(A, b) -_1 (b - 1) \nearrow (A, b)$  lies in  $W_{\mu, \kappa}$ , it remains to show that  $(A, b) -_1 (b - 1)$  and  $(A, b)$  remain available, the former one as non-redundant and the latter one as non-collapsible, up to the moment of executing  $\mathcal{P}(r - 2, 1, b - 1, (A, b) -_1 (b - 1))$ . Taking into account the current hypotheses, the task amounts to ruling out the following two types of directed edges from lying in  $W_{\mu, \kappa}$ :

- $(A, b) -_1 w \nearrow (A, b)$ , with  $b < w$ ;
- $(A, b) -_1 (b - 1) \nearrow (A, b) -_1 (b - 1) +_2 w$ , with  $w < b$ .

Theorem 4.2 accounts for the latter option. On the other hand, the former option cannot hold because, for  $b < w \in \{A\}$ , the directed edge  $(A, b) -_1 w \nearrow (A, b) -_1 w +_2 w$  lies in  $W_{\mu, \kappa}$ , in view of Theorem 4.2. This completes the proof of item (1) of the theorem.

For the rest of the proof, let  $(A, B)$  with  $r > 1$  and  $s = \mu - \kappa$ , but so that (20) fails (in particular  $b_s < \mu$ ).

**Case**  $a_r = \mu$ . We show below that  $(A, B)$  is not redundant. Furthermore, Theorem 4.2 rules out a directed edge of the form  $(A, B) -_2 b_i \nearrow (A, B)$  from lying in  $W_{\mu, \kappa}$ . Therefore, the first instruction

that could make  $(A, B)$  lose its availability condition is  $\mathcal{P}(r+s-3, 1, \mu, (A, B)_{-1}\mu)$ , which assesses the pair  $((A, B)_{-1}\mu, (A, B))$  and constructs the asserted directed edge  $(A, B)_{-1}\mu \nearrow (A, B)$ . Indeed, just as  $(A, B)$ ,  $(A, B)_{-1}\mu$  is available at the moment of executing  $\mathcal{P}(r+s-3, 1, \mu, (A, B)_{-1}\mu)$  because of the hypothesis  $s = \mu - \kappa$ . It thus remains to show that  $(A, B)$  is not redundant. Assume, for a contradiction, that a directed edge

$$(A, B) \nearrow (A, B) +_j u \quad (25)$$

lies in  $W_{\mu, \kappa}$ . The hypotheses  $s = \mu - \kappa$  and  $a_r = \mu$  force  $j = 1$  and  $u < \mu$ , respectively. As in similar arguments above, the contradiction comes from observing that, before (25) is constructed by  $\mathcal{P}(r+s-2, 1, u, (A, B))$ , the earlier instruction  $\mathcal{P}(r+s-2, 1, \mu, (A, B) +_1 u_{-1}\mu)$ , which is in charge of assessing the pair

$$\left( (A, B) +_1 u_{-1}\mu, (A, B) +_1 u \right), \quad (26)$$

constructs the directed edge  $(A, B) +_1 u_{-1}\mu \nearrow (A, B) +_1 u$ . Indeed, at the moment of executing  $\mathcal{P}(r+s-2, 1, \mu, (A, B) +_1 u_{-1}\mu)$ , the second entry in (26) is available, as it actually stays available up to  $\mathcal{P}(r+s-2, 1, u, (A, B))$ , while the hypothesis  $s = \mu - \kappa$  gives the corresponding availability of the first entry in (26). This completes the proof of item (a) of the theorem.

**Case  $a_r < \mu$  with (b.1)–(b.3) holding.** Start by noticing that, under the current hypotheses, Theorem 4.2 implies that

$$\text{the directed edge } (A, B) +_1 \mu_{-2} b_s \nearrow (A, B) +_1 \mu \text{ lies in } W_{\mu, \kappa}. \quad (27)$$

(Note that  $s = \mu - \kappa > 1$ , in view of (18)). Next, we prove that  $(A, B)$  is not redundant. Suppose, for a contradiction, that a directed edge

$$(A, B) \nearrow ((A, B) +_j u) \quad (28)$$

lies in  $W_{\mu, \kappa}$ . The hypothesis  $s = \mu - \kappa$  forces  $j = 1$ , while (b.1)–(b.3) force either  $u = \mu$  or  $u < \bar{a}$ . The contradiction then comes from observing that option  $u = \mu$  is impossible in view of (27), while option  $u < \bar{a}$  is impossible for, in such a case, before  $\mathcal{P}(r+s-2, 1, u, (A, B))$  can construct (28), the earlier instruction  $\mathcal{P}(r+s-2, 1, \bar{a}, (A, B) +_1 u_{-1}\bar{a})$ , which assesses the pair

$$\left( (A, B) +_1 u_{-1}\bar{a}, (A, B) +_1 u \right), \quad (29)$$

constructs the directed edge  $(A, B) +_1 u_{-1}\bar{a} \nearrow (A, B) +_1 u$ . Indeed, at the moment of executing  $\mathcal{P}(r+s-2, 1, \bar{a}, (A, B) +_1 u_{-1}\bar{a})$ , the second entry in (29) is available, as it is supposed to stay available up to  $\mathcal{P}(r+s-2, 1, u, (A, B))$ . Likewise, in view of the hypothesis  $s = \mu - \kappa$ , the only way in which the corresponding availability of the first entry in (29) could fail is with the directed edge  $(A, B) +_1 u_{-1}\bar{a} \nearrow (A, B) +_1 u_{-1}\bar{a} +_1 \mu$  lying in  $W_{\mu, \kappa}$ . But such a possibility is ruled out by Theorem 4.2, which shows that, just as (27), the directed edge

$$(A, B) +_1 u_{-1}\bar{a} +_1 \mu_{-2} b_2 \nearrow (A, B) +_1 u_{-1}\bar{a} +_1 \mu$$

lies in  $W_{\mu, \kappa}$ . This completes the argument for the non-redundancy of  $(A, B)$ . Then, the proof of item (b) of the theorem will be complete as soon as we argue that  $(A, B)_{-1}\bar{a}$  and  $(A, B)$  are available, the former one as non-redundant and the latter one as non-collapsible, at the moment of executing the instruction  $\mathcal{P}(r+s-3, 1, \bar{a}, (A, B)_{-1}\bar{a})$ . Taking into account Theorem 4.2 and the current hypotheses, the task amounts to ruling out the following two types of directed edges from lying in  $W_{\mu, \kappa}$ :

- $(A, B)_{-1} w \nearrow (A, B)$ , with  $b_s < w \in \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r\}$  (in particular  $w < \mu$ );
- $(A, B)_{-1} \bar{a} \nearrow (A, B)_{-1} \bar{a} +_1 \mu$ .

The former one is ruled out by item (a) of the theorem under argumentation, which has already been proved to give  $(A, B)_{-1} w \nearrow (A, B)_{-1} w +_1 \mu$  as a directed edge lying in  $W_{\mu, \kappa}$ . The latter one is ruled out by Theorem 4.2, which shows that the directed edge  $(A, B)_{-1} \bar{a} +_1 \mu -_2 b_s \nearrow (A, B)_{-1} \bar{a} +_1 \mu$  lies in  $W_{\mu, \kappa}$ . This completes the proof of item (b) of the theorem.

The final assertion in this theorem is equivalent to the statement of Proposition 4.6 below, and will be proved after recording two straightforward consequences of the explicit description of directed edges in Theorems 4.2 and 4.3.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.4.** *The redundant cells  $(A, B)$  associated to the directed edges in Theorems 4.2 and 4.3 fall in one of the following cases (with labels according to the relevant items in those two theorems):*

- (4.2) *If  $s < \mu - \kappa$  and (20) fails, then  $(A, B) \nearrow (A, B) +_2 \max(\langle b_s + 1, \mu \rangle - \{A\})$  is a directed edge in  $W_{\mu, \kappa}$ .*
- (4.3.1) *If  $r < \mu - \kappa$ ,  $s = 1$ ,  $1 \leq b_1 - 1 \notin \{A\}$  and (20) holds, then  $(A, B) \nearrow (A, B) +_1 (b_1 - 1)$  is a directed edge in  $W_{\mu, \kappa}$ .*
- (4.3.2.a) *If  $r < \mu - \kappa = s$ ,  $a_r < \mu$  and  $\langle b_s + 1, \mu - 1 \rangle \not\subseteq \{A\}$ , then  $(A, B) \nearrow (A, B) +_1 \mu$  is a directed edge in  $W_{\mu, \kappa}$ . (Note that in this case (20) fails.)*
- (4.3.2.b) *If  $r < \mu - \kappa = s$ ,  $\max\{a_r, b_s\} < \mu$  and*

- (c.1)  $\langle b_s + 1, \mu - 1 \rangle \subseteq \{A\}$ ;
- (c.2)  $\langle 1, b_s - 1 \rangle \not\subseteq \{B\}$ ;
- (c.3)  $\bar{a} := \max(\langle 1, b_s - 1 \rangle - \{B\}) \notin \{A\}$ ,

*then  $(A, B) \nearrow (A, B) +_1 \bar{a}$  is a directed edge in  $W_{\mu, \kappa}$ . (Note that in this case (20) fails.)*

**Corollary 4.5.** *The cells  $(A, B)$  that are not involved in any of the directed edges described in Theorems 4.2 and 4.3 are listed below.*

1. *All cases where (20) holds have  $s = 1$  and one of:*

- (i)  $1 = b_1$ .
- (ii)  $1 \leq b_1 - 1 \in \{A\}$  and  $r = 1$ .
- (iii)  $1 \leq b_1 - 1 \notin \{A\}$  and  $r = \mu - \kappa$ .

2. *All cases where (20) fails (so  $b_s < \mu$ ) have  $s = \mu - \kappa$  and one of:*

- (iv)  $a_r = \mu$  and  $r = 1$ .
- (v)  $a_r < \mu$ ,  $\langle b_s + 1, \mu - 1 \rangle \not\subseteq \{A\}$  and  $r = \mu - \kappa$ .
- (vi)  $a_r < \mu$ ,  $\langle b_s + 1, \mu - 1 \rangle \subseteq \{A\}$  and  $\langle 1, b_s - 1 \rangle \subseteq \{B\}$ .
- (vii)  $a_r < \mu$ ,  $\langle b_s + 1, \mu - 1 \rangle \subseteq \{A\}$ ,  $\langle 1, b_s - 1 \rangle \not\subseteq \{B\}$  with  $\bar{a} := \max(\langle 1, b_s - 1 \rangle - \{B\}) \in \{A\}$ , and  $r = 1$ .
- (viii)  $a_r < \mu$ ,  $\langle b_s + 1, \mu - 1 \rangle \subseteq \{A\}$ ,  $\langle 1, b_s - 1 \rangle \not\subseteq \{B\}$  with  $\bar{a} := \max(\langle 1, b_s - 1 \rangle - \{B\}) \notin \{A\}$ , and  $r = \mu - \kappa$ .

**Proposition 4.6.** *All cells listed in Corollary 4.5 are critical, i.e., Theorems 4.2 and 4.3 describe the complete gradient field  $W_{\mu,\kappa}$ .*

*Proof.* Any directed edge in  $W_{\mu,\kappa}$  that could be missing in the descriptions of Theorems 4.2 and 4.3 would have to involve two of the cells described in Corollary 4.5. Therefore, it suffices to show that any  $(p-1)$ -dimensional face of a  $p$ -dimensional cell in Corollary 4.5 is involved in a directed edge of Theorems 4.2 and 4.3. The situation for cells in (i) and (ii) is elementary. Indeed, the only possible cell in (i) is  $(23 \dots \mu, 1)$ , which is not a cell of  $X_{\mu,\kappa}$  in view of (18) and (19). On the other hand, the only cell in (ii) is  $(\mu-1, \mu)$ , which has no proper faces. All other instances are analyzed next on a case-by-case basis.

- The situation for a cell  $(A, b)$  in (iii) follows by noticing that

$$\begin{aligned} (A, b) -_1 u \nearrow (A, b) -_1 u +_2 u, & \quad \text{for } b < u, \text{ in view of Theorem 4.2;} \\ (A, b) -_1 u \nearrow (A, b) -_1 u +_1 (b-1), & \quad \text{for } u < b-1, \text{ in view of Theorem 4.3(1).} \end{aligned}$$

- A cell  $(\mu, B)$  in (iv) has  $b_s < \mu-1$ , as (20) fails, so the desired property follows by noticing that  $(\mu, B) -_2 u \nearrow (\mu, B) -_2 u +_2 (\mu-1)$ , in view of Theorem 4.2.
- The situation for a cell  $(A, B)$  in (v) follows by noticing that

$$\begin{aligned} (A, B) -_2 u \nearrow (A, B) -_2 u +_2 \mu, & \quad \text{in view of Theorem 4.2;} \\ (A, B) -_1 u \nearrow (A, B) -_1 u +_1 \mu, & \quad \text{in view of Theorem 4.3(2.a).} \end{aligned}$$

- The only possible cell in (vi) is  $(A, B) = ((\mu-\kappa+1) \dots (\mu-1), 1 \dots (\mu-\kappa))$ , which lies in  $X_{\mu,\kappa}$  only when  $2\kappa \leq \mu+1$ . In such a case, the desired property follows by noticing that

$$\begin{aligned} (A, B) -_2 u \nearrow (A, B) -_2 u +_2 \mu, & \quad \text{in view of Theorem 4.2;} \\ (A, B) -_1 u \nearrow (A, B) -_1 u +_1 \mu, & \quad \text{in view of Theorem 4.3(2.a).} \end{aligned}$$

- The situation for a cell  $(a, B)$  in (vii) follows by noticing that  $(a, B) -_2 u \nearrow (a, B) -_2 u +_2 \mu$ , in view of Theorem 4.2.
- The situation for a cell  $(A, B)$  in (viii) follows by noticing that

$$\begin{aligned} (A, B) -_2 u \nearrow (A, B) -_2 u +_2 \mu, & \quad \text{in view of Theorem 4.2;} \\ (A, B) -_1 u \nearrow (A, B) -_1 u +_1 \mu, & \quad \text{if } b_s < u, \text{ in view of Theorem 4.3(2.a);} \\ (A, B) -_1 u \nearrow (A, B) -_1 u +_1 \bar{a}, & \quad \text{if } u < \bar{a}, \text{ in view of Theorem 4.3(2.b).} \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

## 4.1 Counting critical cells

We next take a closer look at the critical cells as listed in Corollary 4.5. We have observed that (due to our preparatory assumptions (18) and (19)) there are no critical cells fitting in item (i), and that the only critical cell of type (ii) is  $(\mu-1, \mu)$ , which is the only critical 0-dimensional cell. A similar situation holds for cells of type (vi). Namely, as observed in the previous proof, the only possible such cell is

$$((\mu-\kappa+1)(\mu-\kappa+2) \dots (\mu-1), 12 \dots (\mu-\kappa)), \quad (30)$$

which lies in dimension  $\mu-3$ , and which is a cell of  $X_{\mu,\kappa}$  if and only if  $2\kappa-1 \leq \mu$ .



type	existence	dimension
(i)	never	
(ii)	always	0
(iii)	always	$\mu - \kappa - 1$
(iv)	always	$\mu - \kappa - 1$
(vii)	always	$\mu - \kappa - 1$
(v)	$\mu < 2\kappa - 1$	$2(\mu - \kappa - 1)$
(viii)	$\mu < 2\kappa - 1$	$2(\mu - \kappa - 1)$
(vi)	$\mu \geq 2\kappa - 1$	$\mu - 3$

Figure 2: Critical cells by type, dimension and condition granting their existence

**Proposition 4.7.** *There is a total of  $2\binom{\mu-1}{\mu-\kappa}$  critical cells of types either (iii), (iv) or (vii), all of which have dimension  $\mu - \kappa - 1$ . Furthermore, critical cells of types (v) or (viii) have dimension  $2(\mu - \kappa - 1)$  and appear only when  $\mu < 2\kappa - 1$ .*

*Proof.* Elementary counting gives that there are:

- $\binom{\mu-1}{\mu-\kappa}$  critical cells of type (iii);
- $\binom{\mu-2}{\mu-\kappa}$  critical cells of type (iv);
- $\binom{\mu-2}{\mu-\kappa-1}$  critical cells of type (vii).

This makes a total of  $\binom{\mu-1}{\mu-\kappa} + \binom{\mu-2}{\mu-\kappa} + \binom{\mu-2}{\mu-\kappa-1} = \binom{\mu-1}{\mu-\kappa} + \binom{\mu-1}{\mu-\kappa}$  critical cells, all of which clearly have dimension  $\mu - \kappa - 1$ . For the second assertion of the proposition observe that a critical cell  $(A, B)$  of type (v) or (viii) satisfies a strict inclusion

$$\{A\} \cup \{B\} \subset \langle 1, \mu - 1 \rangle. \quad (31)$$

which follows from the condition  $\langle b_s + 1, \mu - 1 \rangle \not\subseteq \{A\}$ , in the case of (v), and from the condition  $\max(\langle 1, b_s - 1 \rangle - \{B\}) \not\subseteq \{A\}$ , in the case of (viii). The result follows since (31) holds only with  $2(\mu - \kappa) < \mu - 1$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* Recall we have neglected the two elementary cases in item (II) so, in terms of the notational adjustments in Section 4, (18) holds. Item (I) then follows from Theorem 2.2 and the summary in Figure 2. For item (III), where  $\kappa = 2$ , use in addition Proposition 4.7. Likewise, the numeric hypothesis in item (IV), which becomes  $\kappa \geq 3$  and  $2\kappa - 1 \leq \mu$ , yields (5), while the numeric hypothesis in item (V) is  $\mu < 2\kappa - 1$  and leads to (7) once we count the number of critical cells in dimension  $2(\mu - \kappa - 1)$ . Counting details are provided by Proposition 4.8 below.

Apart from the second assertion in item (IV), whose proof is given in the next section, the only missing argument is the one about the minimality of the cell structures in (5) and (7), i.e., the precise values of the relevant Betti numbers. In both cases it suffices to show the vanishing of the corresponding Morse differentials (10). Such a condition follows from sparseness, provided  $d < m - 3$  in the case of (5), and provided  $d > 1$  in the case of (7). Non-sparse situations are dealt with next.

The case  $1 < d = m - 3$  in (5) will follow once we prove the second assertion in item (IV) —in the next section. On the other hand, the case  $1 = d = m - 3$  in (5) corresponds to  $\text{DConf}(\Delta^{4,1}, 2)$ , in which case the triviality of the Morse differential follows from Abrams' homeomorphism in Remark 1.1. Lastly, the case  $d = 1$  in (7) follows from Proposition 4.9 below.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.8.** *For  $\mu < 2k - 1$ , the number of critical cells in dimension  $2(\mu - \kappa - 1)$  is*

$$\binom{\mu - 1}{\mu - \kappa} \binom{\kappa - 1}{\mu - \kappa} - \sum_{b=\kappa}^{\mu-1} \sum_{a=b-(\mu-\kappa)}^{b-1} \binom{a-1}{b-\kappa} \binom{a-b+\kappa-1}{\mu-\kappa-b+a}. \quad (32)$$

*Proof.* The cells under consideration are those of types (v) and (viii) in Corollary 4.5. Note that  $\binom{\mu-1}{\mu-\kappa} \binom{\kappa-1}{\mu-\kappa}$  counts the number of cells  $(A, B)$  satisfying the conditions

$$a_r < \mu > b_s \quad \text{and} \quad r = \mu - \kappa = s, \quad (33)$$

which are common to (v) and (viii). The result will follow once we explain how the double summation in (32) counts the cardinality of the set  $\mathcal{C}$  of cells satisfying (33) without being of type (v) or (viii).

Note that cells of  $\mathcal{C}$  are described by the conditions

$$a_r < \mu > b_s, \quad r = \mu - \kappa = s, \quad \langle b_s + 1, \mu - 1 \rangle \subseteq A \quad (34)$$

and either  $\langle 1, b_s \rangle = B$  or, else,  $\max(\langle 1, b_s \rangle - B) \in A$ . However, the hypothesis  $\mu < 2\kappa - 1$  implies that condition  $\langle 1, b_s \rangle = B$  is incompatible with those in (34). Therefore, cells of  $\mathcal{C}$  are really described by

$$a_r < \mu > b_s, \quad r = \mu - \kappa = s, \quad \langle b_s + 1, \mu - 1 \rangle \subseteq A, \quad \langle 1, b_s \rangle \not\subseteq B, \quad \bar{a} := \max(\langle 1, b_s \rangle - B) \in A.$$

The latter conditions are schematized as

$$1 \cdots (\bar{a} - 1) \underbrace{\bar{a}}_{\text{in } A} \underbrace{(\bar{a} + 1) \cdots (b_s - 1) b_s}_{b_s - \bar{a} \text{ elements in } B} \underbrace{(b_s + 1) \cdots (\mu - 1)}_{\mu - 1 - b_s \text{ elements in } A},$$

which makes it clear that the double summation in (32) counts the cells in  $\mathcal{C}$  (the index  $b$  in the outer summation stands for  $b_s$ , and the index  $a$  in the inner summation stands for  $\bar{a}$ ).  $\square$

**Proposition 4.9.** *Assume  $\mu < 2\kappa - 1$  and  $\mu - \kappa - 1 = 1$ . Then  $2\binom{\mu-1}{\mu-\kappa}$  and (32) give, respectively, the first and second betti numbers of the 0-connected 2-dimensional space  $X_{\mu,\kappa}$ .*

*Proof.* Under the current hypothesis,  $X_{\mu,\kappa}$  is the discrete configuration space of two ordered points in the complete graph  $K_\mu$  on  $\mu$  vertices, with  $\mu \geq 5$ . The result then follows, after a straightforward calculation, from Proposition 21 and equations (1) and (2) in [6].  $\square$

## 5 Gradient flow

We now prove the second assertion in item (IV) of Theorem 1.2 so, throughout this section, we assume  $1 < d = m - 3$ , i.e.,  $\kappa = 3$  and  $\mu \geq 6$ . We also use the more legible notation  $a_1, \dots, a_r \mid b_1, \dots, b_s$  as an alternative for the cell  $(a_1 \cdots a_r, b_1 \cdots b_s)$  in (19). Thus, the top  $(\mu - 3)$ -dimensional critical cell (30) in  $X_{\mu,\kappa}$  is

$$\mu - 2, \mu - 1 \mid 1, \dots, \mu - 3, \quad (35)$$

while an easy check (using the descriptions in Corollary 4.5) gives that the  $(\mu - 4)$ -dimensional critical cells are

(iii)  $1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{b-1}, \widehat{b}, \dots, \mu | b$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq b-2$  and  $b \leq \mu$ ,

(iv)  $\mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - 2$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq \mu - 2$ ,

(vii)  $a | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 1$ , for  $1 \leq i < a \leq \mu - 2$ ,

where a hat is used to indicate removal, and item enumeration follows the one used in Corollary 4.5.

The homotopy triviality of the relevant attaching map  $S^{\mu-4} \rightarrow \bigvee S^{\mu-4}$  can be verified homologically (as  $\mu \geq 6$ ). By (10), we will be done once the following fact is proved:

**Proposition 5.1.** *Fix a  $(\mu - 4)$ -dimensional critical cell  $\alpha$ . Taking into account multiplicity and incidence numbers as in (11), the total number of gradient paths from faces of (35) to  $\alpha$  is zero.*

For the proof, we think of gradient paths in Proposition 5.1 as *lower* gradient paths from (35) to 1-cofaces  $\beta$  of  $\alpha$ , i.e., with  $\beta \searrow \alpha$ , and make a *backwards* description of the latter paths. For starters, no such  $\beta$  is critical, in view of Theorem 1.5. Furthermore, the lower paths we care about involve a collapsible  $\beta$ , say with  $\alpha_1 \nearrow \beta$ . So, we repeat the description strategy now for any possible non-redundant 1-coface  $\beta_1$  of  $\alpha_1$ ,

$$\beta_1 \searrow \alpha_1 \nearrow \beta \searrow \alpha.$$

This creates a tree  $T_\alpha$  describing all possible paths in Proposition 5.1, with each branch stopping as soon as we get a  $\beta_k \searrow \alpha_k$  with  $\beta_k$  the critical face (35). Much of the hard work in the analysis of  $T_\alpha$  is greatly simplified by the next two auxiliary results.

**Lemma 5.2.** *There are no lower gradient paths*

$$\alpha_0 \searrow \beta_1 \nearrow \alpha_1 \searrow \dots \searrow \beta_k \nearrow \alpha_k \quad (36)$$

starting at the critical  $\alpha_0 = \mu - 2, \mu - 1 | 1, \dots, \mu - 3$  and ending at

(a)  $\alpha_k = \mu - j + 1, \mu - j + 2, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - j$ , if  $3 \leq j \leq \mu - 3$  and  $1 \leq i \leq \mu - j$ .

(b)  $\alpha_k = \ell, \mu - j + 1, \mu - j + 2, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{\ell}, \dots, \mu - j$ , if  $2 \leq j \leq \mu - 4$  and  $1 \leq i < \ell \leq \mu - j$ .

(c)  $\alpha_k = i, \mu - j + 1, \mu - j + 2, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{\ell}, \dots, \mu - j$ , if  $2 \leq j \leq \mu - 4$  and  $1 \leq i < \ell \leq \mu - j$ .

*Proof.* (a) We proceed by induction on the difference  $\mu - 3 - j \geq 0$ , noticing that we can always assume  $i < \mu - j$ , for otherwise  $\alpha_k$  is redundant in view of Corollary 4.4(4.2). The induction starts with the case  $j = \mu - 3$ , for which a potential path (36) is ruled out as it would be forced to end in the form

$$4, \dots, \mu | 1, 2 \searrow 4, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{3} \xrightarrow{4.2} 4, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, 3 = \alpha_k, \quad (37)$$

with  $4, \dots, \mu | 1, 2$  redundant in view of Corollary 4.4(4.2). Here and below, the number on top of an up-going directed edge is the label of the fact granting the edge. Furthermore, the reader should keep in mind that, as explained in the construction of the tree  $T_\alpha$ , this type of gradient paths *must* be verified through a right-to-left reading, as we are restricting attention to paths landing on  $\alpha_k$ . Note that the down-going edge in (37) is forced because  $\{4, \dots, \mu\}$  has maximal allowed cardinality; such a situation will repeat several times in the considerations below. Now, having clarified the previous points, note that, for  $j < \mu - 3$ , a potential path (36) is forced to end in either of the three forms

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \beta_1 := \mu - j + 1, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \mu - j - 1 \\ \beta_2 := \mu - j, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - j - 1 \\ \beta_3 := i, \mu - j + 1, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - j - 1 \end{array} \right\} \searrow \mu - j + 1, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - j - 1$$

$$\xrightarrow{4.2} \mu - j + 1, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - j = \alpha_k.$$

But the first and third options are ruled out since  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_3$  are redundant in view of Corollary 4.4(4.2), while the second option is ruled out by induction.

The arguments for (b) and (c) have only minor variants. We give full details for completeness.

(b) We proceed by induction on the difference  $\mu - 4 - j \geq 0$ , noticing that we can always assume  $\ell < \mu - j$ , for otherwise the result reduces to that in (a). The induction starts with the case  $j = \mu - 4$ , for which a potential path (36) is ruled out as it would be forced to end in the form

$$\ell, 5, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{\ell}, \dots, 3 \searrow \ell, 5, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{\ell}, \dots, 3 \xrightarrow{4.2} \ell, 5, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{\ell}, \dots, 4 = \alpha_k,$$

with  $\ell, 5, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{\ell}, \dots, 3$  redundant in view of Corollary 4.4(4.2). Then, assuming  $j < \mu - 4$ , a potential path (36) is forced to end in either of the three forms

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \beta_1 := i, \ell, \mu - j + 1, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{\ell}, \dots, \mu - j - 1 \\ \beta_2 := \ell, \mu - j, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{\ell}, \dots, \mu - j - 1 \\ \beta_3 := \ell, \mu - j + 1, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{\ell}, \dots, \mu - j - 1 \end{array} \right\} \searrow \\ \searrow \ell, \mu - j + 1, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{\ell}, \dots, \mu - j - 1 \\ \xrightarrow{4.2} \ell, \mu - j + 1, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{\ell}, \dots, \mu - j = \alpha_k.$$

But the first and third options are ruled out since  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_3$  are redundant in view of Corollary 4.4(4.2), while the second option is ruled out by induction.

(c) We proceed by induction on the difference  $\mu - 4 - j \geq 0$ , noticing that we can always assume  $\ell < \mu - j$ , for otherwise  $\alpha_k$  is redundant in view of Corollary 4.4(4.2). The induction starts with the case  $j = \mu - 4$ , for which a potential path (36) is ruled out as it would be forced to end in the form

$$i, 5, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, 3 \searrow i, 5, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{\ell}, \dots, 3 \xrightarrow{4.2} i, 5, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{\ell}, \dots, 4 = \alpha_k,$$

with  $i, 5, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, 3$  redundant in view of Corollary 4.4(4.2). Then, assuming  $j < \mu - 4$ , a potential path (36) is forced to end in either of the three forms

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \beta_1 := i, \ell, \mu - j + 1, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{\ell}, \dots, \mu - j - 1 \\ \beta_2 := i, \mu - j, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{\ell}, \dots, \mu - j - 1 \\ \beta_3 := i, \mu - j + 1, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - j - 1 \end{array} \right\} \searrow \\ \searrow i, \mu - j + 1, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{\ell}, \dots, \mu - j - 1 \\ \xrightarrow{4.2} i, \mu - j + 1, \dots, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{\ell}, \dots, \mu - j = \alpha_k.$$

But the first and third options are ruled out since  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_3$  are redundant in view of Corollary 4.4(4.2), while the second option is ruled out by induction.  $\square$

The case  $j = 2$  in item (a) of Lemma 5.2 is special:

**Lemma 5.3.** *For  $1 \leq \ell \leq \mu - 2$ , there is a single lower gradient path (36) starting at the critical face  $\alpha_0 = \mu - 2, \mu - 1 | 1, \dots, \mu - 3$  and ending at  $\alpha_k = \mu - 1, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{\ell}, \dots, \mu - 2$ .*

*Proof.* The result is easy for  $\ell = \mu - 2$ , as the only such path (36) is

$$\mu - 2, \mu - 1 | 1, \dots, \mu - 3 \searrow \mu - 1 | 1, \dots, \mu - 3 \xrightarrow{4.3(2.a)} \mu - 1, \mu | 1, \dots, \mu - 3 = \alpha_k. \quad (38)$$

For  $\ell \leq \mu - 3$ , a potential path (36) is forced to end in the form

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \beta_1 := \ell, \mu - 1, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{\ell}, \dots, \mu - 3 \\ \beta_2 := \mu - 2, \mu - 1, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{\ell}, \dots, \mu - 3 \\ \beta_3 := \mu - 1, \mu | 1, \dots, \mu - 3 \end{array} \right\} \searrow \mu - 1, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{\ell}, \dots, \mu - 3$$

$$\nearrow^{4.2} \mu - 1, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{\ell}, \dots, \mu - 2 = \alpha_k. \quad (39)$$

But the first option is ruled out since  $\beta_1$  is redundant in view of Corollary 4.4(4.2), while the second option is ruled out in view of item (a) in Lemma 5.2. The result then follows by noticing that the third option is forced to end up as in (38).  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 5.1.* Start by considering the case of a  $(\mu - 4)$ -dimensional type-(iii) critical face  $\alpha = 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{b-1}, \widehat{b}, \dots, \mu | b$ , with  $1 \leq i \leq b - 2$  and  $b \leq \mu$ . Note that  $\alpha$  is face of only two faces of dimension  $\mu - 3$ , namely,  $1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{b-1}, \widehat{b}, \dots, \mu | b-1, b$  and  $1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{b-1}, \widehat{b}, \dots, \mu | i, b$ . Therefore, the analysis of the tree  $T_\alpha$  starts with what are the only two potential branches

$$1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{b-1}, \widehat{b}, \dots, \mu | i, b - 1 \searrow 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{b-1}, \widehat{b}, \dots, \mu | b - 1$$

$$\nearrow^{4.2} 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{b-1}, \widehat{b}, \dots, \mu | b - 1, b$$

$$\searrow 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{b-1}, \widehat{b}, \dots, \mu | b = \alpha$$

and

$$1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{b-1}, \widehat{b}, \dots, \mu | i, b - 1 \searrow 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{b-1}, \widehat{b}, \dots, \mu | i$$

$$\nearrow^{4.2} 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{b-1}, \widehat{b}, \dots, \mu | i, b$$

$$\searrow 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{b-1}, \widehat{b}, \dots, \mu | b = \alpha.$$

But  $1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{b-1}, \widehat{b}, \dots, \mu | i, b - 1$  is redundant by Corollary 4.4(4.2), so  $T_\alpha$  is in fact empty.

Consider next the case of a  $(\mu - 4)$ -dimensional type-(iv) critical face  $\alpha = \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - 2$ , with  $1 \leq i \leq \mu - 2$ . As above, the analysis of the tree  $T_\alpha$  starts with precisely two potential branches. For  $i = \mu - 2$ , each of those two branches is linear and leads to an actual path in  $T_\alpha$ . Indeed,  $T_\alpha$  reduces to the two branches

$$\mu - 2, \mu - 1 | 1, \dots, \mu - 3 \searrow \mu - 2 | 1, \dots, \mu - 3 \nearrow^{4.3(2.a)} \mu - 2, \mu | 1, \dots, \mu - 3 \searrow \mu | 1, \dots, \mu - 3 = \alpha$$

and

$$\mu - 2, \mu - 1 | 1, \dots, \mu - 3 \searrow \mu - 1 | 1, \dots, \mu - 3 \nearrow^{4.3(2.a)} \mu - 1, \mu | 1, \dots, \mu - 3 \searrow \mu | 1, \dots, \mu - 3 = \alpha,$$

each starting at the required (35). The result then follows from (9) and a straightforward analysis of incidence numbers in the two paths above: the first branch accounts in (11) with a negative sign, while the second branch does it with a positive sign. On the other hand, for  $1 \leq i \leq \mu - 3$ , the analysis of the tree  $T_\alpha$  starts with its only two potential branches

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \beta_1 := \mu - 1, \mu | 1, \dots, \mu - 3 \\ \beta_2 := \mu - 2, \mu - 1, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - 3 \\ \beta_3 := i, \mu - 1, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - 3 \end{array} \right\} \searrow \mu - 1, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - 3$$

$$\nearrow^{4.2} \mu - 1, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - 2$$

$$\searrow \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - 2 = \alpha$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left. \begin{aligned} \beta_1 &= \mu - 1, \mu | 1, \dots, \mu - 3 \\ \beta_2 &= \mu - 2, \mu - 1, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - 3 \\ \beta_3 &= i, \mu - 1, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - 3 \end{aligned} \right\} \searrow \mu - 1, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - 3 \\
& \begin{aligned} & \xrightarrow{4.2} \mu - 1, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - 2 \\ & \searrow \mu - 1 | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - 2 \\ & \xrightarrow{4.3(2.b)} i, \mu - 1 | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - 2 \\ & \searrow i | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - 2 \\ & \xrightarrow{4.3(2.a)} i, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - 2 \\ & \searrow \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - 2 = \alpha. \end{aligned}
\end{aligned}$$

But none of the two options involving  $\beta_2$  leads to an actual path in  $T_\alpha$ , in view of item (a) in Lemma 5.2. Likewise, none of the two options involving  $\beta_3$  leads to an actual path in  $T_\alpha$ , for  $\beta_3$  is redundant by Corollary 4.4(4.2). As above, the result then follows from a straightforward analysis of incidence numbers: the two options involving  $\beta_1$  allow us to pair the actual paths in  $T_\alpha$  in such a way that the two elements in each pair account in (11) with different signs. (It is easy to see that there is only one pair, but such a fact is immaterial for our argument.)

To complete the proof, we next deal with the slightly more involved case of a  $(\mu - 4)$ -dimensional type-(vii) critical face  $\alpha = a | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 1$ , with  $1 \leq i < a \leq \mu - 2$ . As above, the analysis of the corresponding tree  $T_\alpha$  starts with its only two potential branches

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left. \begin{aligned} \beta_1 &:= i, a, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 2 \\ \beta_2 &:= a, \mu - 1, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 2 \\ \beta_3 &:= a, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 2 \end{aligned} \right\} \searrow a, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 2 \\
& \begin{aligned} & \xrightarrow{4.2} a, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 1 \searrow a | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 1 = \alpha \end{aligned}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left. \begin{aligned} \beta_1 &= i, a, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 2 \\ \beta'_2 &:= i, \mu - 1, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 2 \\ \beta'_3 &:= i, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - 2 \end{aligned} \right\} \searrow i, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 2 \\
& \begin{aligned} & \xrightarrow{4.2} i, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 1 \searrow i | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 1 \\ & \xrightarrow{4.3(2.b)} i, a | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 1 \searrow a | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 1 = \alpha. \end{aligned}
\end{aligned}$$

None of the two options involving  $\beta_1$  leads to an actual path in  $T_\alpha$ , for  $\beta_1$  is redundant by Corollary 4.4(4.2). Likewise, none of the two options involving  $\beta_2$  or  $\beta'_2$  leads to an actual path in  $T_\alpha$ , in view of items (b) and (c) in Lemma 5.2. This time, however, we can not use the pairing trick in the previous case, as  $\beta_3 \neq \beta'_3$ . Instead, we continue “one step further” the analysis of  $T_\alpha$  which, all in

all, starts in fact with its only two potential (but now linear) branches

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mu - 1, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 2 \searrow \mu - 1 | 1, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 2 \\
& \nearrow^{4.3(2.b)} a, \mu - 1 | 1, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 2 \searrow a | 1, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 2 \nearrow^{4.3(2.a)} a, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 2 \\
& \searrow a, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 2 \nearrow^{4.2} a, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 1 \searrow a | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 1 = \alpha
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mu - 1, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - 2 \searrow \mu - 1 | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - 2 \nearrow^{4.3(2.b)} i, \mu - 1 | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - 2 \\
& \searrow i | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - 2 \nearrow^{4.3(2.a)} i, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \mu - 2 \searrow i, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 2 \\
& \nearrow^{4.2} i, \mu | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 1 \searrow i | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 1 \nearrow^{4.3(2.b)} i, a | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 1 \\
& \searrow a | 1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, \widehat{a}, \dots, \mu - 1 = \alpha.
\end{aligned}$$

But Lemma 5.3 implies that each of the two branches above is forced to encode a single and fully explicit path in  $T_\alpha$ . The conclusion then follows from a straightforward analysis of the resulting incidence numbers. Indeed, as the reader will readily check, the first branch encodes a path which accounts in (11) with a sign  $(-1)^{i+a}$ , while the second branch does it with sign  $(-1)^{i+a+1}$ .  $\square$

## References

- [1] <https://mathoverflow.net/questions/425679/>.
- [2] Aaron Abrams. *Configuration spaces and braid groups of graphs*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2000. Thesis (Ph.D.)—University of California, Berkeley.
- [3] Aaron Abrams, David Gay, and Valerie Hower. Discretized configurations and partial partitions. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 141(3):1093–1104, 2013.
- [4] Jorge Aguilar-Guzmán, Jesús González, and Teresa Hoekstra-Mendoza. Farley-Sabalka’s Morse-theory model and the higher topological complexity of ordered configuration spaces on trees. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 67(1):258–286, 2022.
- [5] Ulrich Bauer. Ripser: efficient computation of Vietoris-Rips persistence barcodes. *J. Appl. Comput. Topol.*, 5(3):391–423, 2021.
- [6] Michael Farber and Elizabeth Hanbury. Topology of configuration space of two particles on a graph, II. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 10(4):2203–2227, 2010.
- [7] Daniel Farley and Lucas Sabalka. Discrete Morse theory and graph braid groups. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 5:1075–1109, 2005.
- [8] Daniel Farley and Lucas Sabalka. On the cohomology rings of tree braid groups. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 212(1):53–71, 2008.
- [9] Daniel Farley and Lucas Sabalka. Presentations of graph braid groups. *Forum Math.*, 24(4):827–859, 2012.

- [10] Robin Forman. A discrete Morse theory for cell complexes. In *Geometry, topology, & physics*, Conf. Proc. Lecture Notes Geom. Topology, IV, pages 112–125. Int. Press, Cambridge, MA, 1995.
- [11] Robin Forman. Discrete Morse theory and the cohomology ring. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 354(12):5063–5085, 2002.
- [12] Robert Ghrist. Configuration spaces and braid groups on graphs in robotics. In *Knots, braids, and mapping class groups—papers dedicated to Joan S. Birman (New York, 1998)*, volume 24 of *AMS/IP Stud. Adv. Math.*, pages 29–40. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2001.
- [13] Emilio J. González and Jesús González. An algorithmic discrete gradient field and the cohomology algebra of configuration spaces of two points on complete graphs. *To appear in Algebraic and Geometric Topology*.
- [14] Jesús González and Teresa Hoekstra-Mendoza. Cohomology ring of tree braid groups and exterior face rings. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. Ser. B*, 9:1065–1101, 2022.
- [15] Allen Hatcher. *Algebraic topology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.
- [16] Sze-tsen Hu. Isotopy invariants of topological spaces. *Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A*, 255:331–366, 1960.
- [17] Matthew Kahle. Random geometric complexes. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 45(3):553–573, 2011.
- [18] Jee Hyoun Kim, Ki Hyoung Ko, and Hyo Won Park. Graph braid groups and right-angled Artin groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 364(1):309–360, 2012.
- [19] Ki Hyoung Ko, Joon Hyun La, and Hyo Won Park. Graph 4-braid groups and Massey products. *Topology Appl.*, 197:133–153, 2016.
- [20] Ki Hyoung Ko and Hyo Won Park. Characteristics of graph braid groups. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 48(4):915–963, 2012.
- [21] Paul Prue and Travis Scrimshaw. Abrams’s stable equivalence for graph braid groups. *Topology Appl.*, 178:136–145, 2014.
- [22] Arnold Shapiro. Obstructions to the imbedding of a complex in a euclidean space. I. The first obstruction. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 66:256–269, 1957.
- [23] Hirosi Toda. *Composition methods in homotopy groups of spheres*, volume No. 49. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1962.
- [24] Guozhen Wang and Zhouli Xu. The triviality of the 61-stem in the stable homotopy groups of spheres. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 186(2):501–580, 2017.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS  
CENTRO DE INVESTIGACIÓN Y DE ESTUDIOS AVANZADOS DEL I.P.N.  
AV. INSTITUTO POLITÉCNICO NACIONAL NÚMERO 2508, SAN PEDRO ZACATENCO  
MÉXICO CITY 07000, MÉXICO.  
jesus@math.cinvestav.mx  
jgonzalez@math.cinvestav.mx