

Strong collapsibility of the arc complexes of orientable and non-orientable crowns

Pallavi Panda

Abstract. We prove that the arc complex of a polygon with a marked point in its interior is a strongly collapsible combinatorial ball. We also show that the arc complex of a Möbius strip, with finitely many marked points on its boundary, is a simplicially collapsible combinatorial ball but is not strongly collapsible.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we study the topology and the collapsibility of three families of finite simplicial complexes called the arc complexes.

Collapsibility. In 1939, Whitehead [21] introduced the notion of *simplicial collapse* of a finite simplicial complex. It is the operation of removing the open star of a simplex that is contained in a unique maximal simplex (see Section 2 for the definition). The remaining complex is then simple homotopy equivalent to the original complex. A simplicial complex is said to be *collapsible* if there is a finite sequence of simplicial collapses resulting in a 0-simplex. Collapsibility is the combinatorial version of contractibility of topological spaces. It was studied extensively by Bing, Cohen, Lickorish and Zeeman. This resulted in examples of contractible complexes that were not collapsible: Zeeman’s Dunce hat [23], Bing’s house [6]. Welker [20] proved that if a complex is collapsible then its barycentric subdivision is *non-evasive*. Every non-evasive complex is collapsible but the converse is false. He also showed that the join of two complexes is collapsible if at least one of them is collapsible.

Collapsible manifolds. An important direction of research has been to find a relationship between topological balls and the condition of collapsibility of manifolds. Whitehead proved that all collapsible piecewise-linear (PL) d -manifolds are d -balls. All 2-balls are collapsible but for $d \geq 3$, there exist PL d -balls that are not collapsible. In [2], authors Adiprasito–Benedetti–Lutz construct an example of a 5-manifold that is collapsible but not homeomorphic to the 5-ball. In [4], Benedetti shows that all *endo-collapsible* manifolds with boundary are balls using the concept of duality in discrete Morse theory. Crowley [9] proved that all 3-dimensional pseudomanifolds that are CAT(0) with some equilateral metric, are collapsible. Benedetti–Adiprasito [1] generalised this result to higher dimensions: any complex that is CAT(0) with a metric for which all vertex stars are convex, is collapsible.

Strong collapses. A strengthening of the notion of a simplicial collapse is given by a strong collapse. In [13], Matoušek introduced the notion of *LC-removable* vertices or *dominated vertices* of a simplicial complex. The link of such a vertex is a cone. The process of deleting such a vertex from the complex is called a *LC-reduction* or *strong collapse*. Strong collapsibility implies collapsibility but the converse is not

true. Matoušek showed the existence and uniqueness of *cores* (subcomplexes with no dominated vertices) of a finite complex. Such a core does not exist in the case of simplicial collapsibility: in [5], Benedetti–Lutz constructed a simplicial 3-ball that is collapsible but also collapses onto a Dunce hat. In [12], Lofano–Newman give further examples of collapsing sequences of a simplex that get stuck at a non-collapsible subcomplex. In [3], Barmak–Minian study the notion of strong homotopy theory. Two complexes are said to be strongly homotopic to one another if one can be strongly collapsed onto the other. They gave a sufficient condition for strong collapsibility using the *nerve* operation. They introduced the notion of strong d -collapse: this is the removal of a d -simplex whose link is a cone. This forms an intermediary between simplicial collapse and strong collapse. They also show that a simplicial complex is strong collapsible if and only if its barycentric subdivision is strongly collapsible and that the join of two simplicial complexes is strong collapsible if and only if either of them is strongly collapsible. In [8], Boissonnat–Pritam–Pareek give an application of strong collapses in creating an efficient algorithm to compute the persistent homology of a chain of simplicial complexes. In [7], Boissonnat–Pritam show that the efficacy of their algorithm increases when restricted to flag complexes.

Arc complexes. A family of examples of flag PL-manifolds arises from the arc complexes of surfaces with boundary. For a finite-type orientable surface with finitely many marked points (called *vertices*) on its boundary as well as its interior, one constructs its arc complex using non-trivial embedded arcs whose endpoints are among these vertices (see Section 3.2 for the formal definition). These were first studied by Harvey in [11]. The maximal simplices of this complex correspond to triangulations of the surface. Barring certain surfaces with low topological complexity, the arc complexes of most of the surfaces are locally non-compact. The exceptions are given by a convex polygon, a crown, a three-holed 2-sphere and the Möbius strip with marked points on the boundary, called *non-orientable crown* in this paper. It is a classical result of combinatorics that the arc complex of a convex n -gon is a piecewise linear sphere of dimension $n - 4$. Penner [17] proved this result in the context of hyperbolic surfaces and Teichmüller theory. He studied the arc complex of an *ideal polygon*, which is the convex hull in the hyperbolic plane \mathbb{H}^2 of finitely many points (called *ideal*) on the boundary $\partial_\infty \mathbb{H}^2$. The diagonals in this case are bi-infinite hyperbolic geodesics with endpoints in this finite set. He attributes the original proof to Whitney. In [17], Penner studied the topology of the quotient of the arc complex under the canonical action of the pure mapping class group of the surface. He conjectured that this quotient space is a sphere of a certain dimension, but this was later proved to be false by Sullivan. There is a complete list of surfaces (see [16]) for which the statement is true. The dual graph, with respect to the codimension zero and one faces, to the arc complex, called the *flip graph*, has also been extensively studied. The flip graph of a convex polygon forms the 1-skeleton of the famous polytope called the *associahedron*. Sleator–Tarjan–Thurston [19] showed that the d -dimensional associahedron has diameter at most $2d - 4$ when $d \geq 9$ and that this bound is asymptotically exact using hyperbolic geometry. Later, Pournin [18] proved the equality for all $d \geq 9$ using combinatorial methods. In [15], Parlier–Pournin proved that the flip graph for a crown with $n \geq 1$ vertices is connected and its diameter is given by $2n - 2$. This graph is a topological analogue of the flip-graph of a Euclidean convex polygon with an interior point.

In the case of a general topological surface with marked points, Harer showed that a specific open dense subset of the arc complex, called the *pruned arc complex*, is an open ball of dimension one less than that of the deformation space of the surface.

Wilson [22] proved that the arc complexes of a convex polygon, a punctured crown $\mathcal{P}_n \setminus \{0\}$ and a non-orientable crown are shellable. This is an ordering of all the maximal simplices of the complex so that the intersection of the k -th simplex with the union of the first $(k - 1)$ simplices is always a pure complex of codimension one. He also reproved the sphericity of the arc complexes of the first two surfaces by using a result by Danaraj and Klee [10] which states that a shellable d -pseudo-manifold without boundary is a

PL-sphere. Collapsible complexes are shellable.

Contributions. In this paper, firstly we show that the arc complex of a crown is strongly collapsible.

Main Theorem 1. *For $n \geq 1$, the full arc complex $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_n^\circ)$ of a crown \mathcal{P}_n° is strongly collapsible.*

As a corollary, we get that

Corollary. *For $n \geq 1$, the full arc complex $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_n^\circ)$ of a crown \mathcal{P}_n° is a combinatorial ball of dimension $n - 1$.*

Secondly, we show that the *inner arc complex* of a non-orientable crown, generated by arcs that intersect core curve of the surface, is strongly collapsible.

Main Theorem 2. *For $n \geq 1$, the inner arc complex $\mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{M}_n)$ of a non-orientable crown \mathcal{M}_n is strongly collapsible.*

Thirdly, we show that the full arc complex non-orientable crown is collapsible.

Theorem. *For all $n \geq 1$, the simplicial complex $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_n)$ simplicially collapses onto $\mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{M}_n)$.*

Again, as a corollary we get that

Corollary. *For all $n \geq 1$, the simplicial complex $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_n)$ is a combinatorial ball of dimension $n - 1$.*

Finally, we prove that the full arc complex is not strongly collapsible.

Main Theorem 3. *For $n \geq 4$, the full arc complex $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_n)$ of the surface \mathcal{M}_n is not strongly collapsible.*

In [14], we endowed convex polygons and once-punctured crowns with a bicolouring (red-blue) of the vertices and proved that the arc complex generated by the blue-blue and red-blue arcs is a shellable closed ball. In this paper we will show that in the case of a particular bicolouring of an n -gon (called *integral strip*, see Section 3), the arc complex generated by red-blue arcs only is strongly collapsible.

Main Theorem 4. *For $m, n \geq 1$ and $m + n \geq 5$, the arc complex $\mathcal{A}_{m,n}$ of an integral strip $P(m, n)$ is strongly collapsible.*

Plan of the paper In Section 2, we recall the necessary concepts on simplicial topology, collapses and strong collapses along with some results that will be used later in the proofs. In Section 3, we introduce the two surfaces, their arcs and their arc complexes. In Section 4, we give the proofs of the four theorems stated above.

Acknowledgments This work was done in and was funded by Université Sorbonne Paris Nord. I would like to thank Lionel Pournin for his helpful comments and encouragement.

2 Simplicial Topology

In this section, we will recall all the vocabulary and important results related to simplicial collapses that will be used in the proofs of this paper.

Combinatorial manifolds. A simplicial complex is called *pure* if all of its maximal simplices have the same dimension. The *dual graph* of a pure simplicial complex is the graph whose vertices are the maximal simplices and two vertices are joined by an edge if the corresponding maximal simplices share a codimension one face. A pure simplicial complex is said to be *strongly connected* if its dual graph is connected. A *d-pseudo-manifold with boundary* is a pure strongly connected d -simplicial complex in which every $(d - 1)$ -simplex is contained in at most two d -simplices. A simplicial complex X is called a *combinatorial d -manifold with boundary* if the link of each 0-simplex is either a combinatorial $(d - 1)$ -sphere or a combinatorial $d - 1$ -ball and there exists a 0-simplex such that its link is of the latter kind.

Simplicial collapses. Let X be a simplicial complex and σ a simplex of X . The *face-deletion* of σ in X is the subcomplex defined as $\text{fdel}(\sigma, X) := \{\eta \in X \mid \sigma \not\subseteq \eta\}$. In particular, the face deletion of a 0-simplex v in X is denoted by $X \setminus \{v\}$. Let $\sigma \subseteq \tau \in X$ be two simplices such that τ is the only maximal simplex containing σ . Then σ is called a *free face* of X . The tuple (σ, τ) is called a *collapsible pair*. The complex X is said to *simplicially collapse* onto its subcomplex $\text{fdel}(\sigma, X)$, if σ is a free simplex of X . The complex X is said to be *collapsible* if there is a finite sequence of simplicial collapses leading to a 0-simplex. By $X \searrow Y$, we mean that the complex X simplicially collapses onto the complex Y . Whitehead 2.2 showed that if X, Y are two simplicial complexes such that $X \searrow Y$, then X has the same homotopy type as Y . The following theorems about collapsible complexes were proved by Welker in [20].

Proposition 2.1. a) Let X and Y be two simplicial complexes such that X is collapsible. Then the join $X \bowtie Y$ is collapsible.

b) Let X be a simplicial complex and $\sigma \in X$ be a simplex such that $\text{Link}(\sigma, X)$ is collapsible. Then, $X \searrow \text{fdel}(\sigma, X)$.

As mentioned in the introduction, the following theorem was proved by Whitehead [21].

Theorem 2.2. *A collapsible combinatorial d -manifold is a combinatorial d -ball.*

Strong collapses. A 0-simplex $v \in X$ is said to be *vertex-dominated* if there exists another 0-simplex $v' \in X$ such that $\text{Link}(v, X) = v' \bowtie L$, where L is a subcomplex of X . In other words, any maximal simplex containing v must also contain v' . A complex X is said to *strongly collapse* on $X \setminus \{v\}$ if the 0-simplex v is vertex-dominated in X . We will denote this operation as $X \searrow\!\!\!\searrow X \setminus \{v\}$.

Example 2.3. For $n \geq 0$, any n -simplex is strongly collapsible.

Barmak-Minian [3] proved the following theorems about strong collapsibility which will be used later.

Theorem 2.4. a) *Let L be a subcomplex of a complex K such that every vertex of K which is not in L is dominated by some vertex in L . Then $K \searrow\!\!\!\searrow L$.*

b) *If X, Y are two simplicial complexes such that $X \searrow\!\!\!\searrow Y$, then $X \searrow Y$.*

c) *Given two simplicial complexes X, Y , their join $X \bowtie Y$ is strongly collapsible if and only if either X or Y is strongly collapsible.*

3 Vocabulary

3.1 The surfaces

For each of the following topological 2-manifolds S , we choose a boundary component and mark $n \geq 1$ distinct points on it. These points are called *vertices* and the set of all vertices is denoted by P . The portion of the boundary contained between two consecutive vertices is called an *edge*. The set of all boundary edges is denoted by \mathcal{E} . Now we will define each surface individually.

Convex polygons. For $n \geq 1$, we denote by \mathcal{P}_n , a closed disk with $n \geq 1$ marked points on its boundary. For $n \geq 3$, this surface, when endowed with a convex Euclidean metric, becomes the usual convex polygon. Also for $n \geq 3$, the surface $\mathcal{P}_n \setminus P$, obtained by removing the marked points, admits a convex hyperbolic metric. In this metric, the vertices are on the ideal boundary of the hyperbolic plane and the edges are hyperbolic geodesics joining any two consecutive pair of ideal points. This surface is called an ideal polygon.




Figure 1: A crown with three vertices.

Orientable Crowns. For $n \geq 1$, we denote by \mathcal{P}_n° , the closed disk \mathcal{P}_n with one marked point in its interior labeled as 0. The topological surface $S = \mathcal{P}_n^\circ \setminus P \cup \{0\}$ is homeomorphic to an annulus. Let γ be the generator of its fundamental group. This surface S admits two types of convex hyperbolic metrics, depending on whether $[\gamma]$ is mapped to a parabolic or a hyperbolic element by the holonomy representation of the metric. See Fig. 1. In either case, the marked points in the boundary are represented by ideal points in $\partial_\infty \mathbb{H}^2$, like in the case of ideal polygons. We will refer to this topological surface \mathcal{P}_n° as a *crown*.

Non-orientable crowns. For $n \geq 1$, we denote by \mathcal{M}_n the Mö strip with n vertices on its boundary. We will refer to this surface as the *non-orientable crown*. Once again, the surface obtained by removing the vertices admits a convex hyperbolic metric. See Fig. 2. The top left figure is the surface $\mathcal{M}_n \setminus P$ endowed with a hyperbolic metric. The figure on the top right depicts the topological surface \mathcal{M}_3 — the the crossed circle at the centre represents a copy of the projective plane. The bottom figure represents the universal cover of this surface.




Figure 2: A non-orientable crown with three vertices.

Integral strip. For $m, n \geq 1$, let $P(m, n)$ be the quadrilateral whose corners are given by $(1, 0)$, $(1, 1)$, $(n, 1)$ and $(m, 0)$. Next we place $m - 2$ vertices at the points $(2, 0), \dots, (m - 1, 0)$ on the x -axis and $n - 2$ vertices $(2, 1), \dots, (n, 1)$ on the $y = 1$ line. These two sets are called the x and y vertices, respectively. In Fig. 16, we have coloured the x -vertices in blue and the y -vertices in red. Topologically, this is a polygon \mathcal{P}_{m+n} with a bicolouring.

3.2 Arcs and arc complexes

Next we consider simple arcs on the surfaces defined in the previous section.

Simple arcs. A *simple arc* is an embedding $a : [0, 1] \rightarrow S$ such that $a[0, 1] \cap \partial S = \{a(0), a(1)\}$ where $a(0), a(1)$ are two vertices. A simple arc is said to be *trivial* if it is homotopic, relative to its endpoints, to a vertex or an edge of the given surface. Since in this paper, we will consider only simple non-trivial arcs, therefore we will often omit the adjectives "non-trivial" and "simple" before the noun "arc". The homotopy class of an arc a is denoted by $[a]$. Two homotopy classes of arcs are said to be disjoint if there exist two arcs in the respective equivalence classes which are disjoint. When endowed with a convex metric, Euclidean or hyperbolic, the minimal intersection between two homotopy classes is realised by geodesics. For example, in a convex polygon, these arcs are the diagonals.

Next we introduce the vocabulary for some specific types of arcs.

Definition 3.1. An arc of $S = \mathcal{P}_n^\circ, \mathcal{M}_n$ is called *maximal* if both its endpoints coincide.

Definition 3.2. In an orientable crown \mathcal{P}_n° , any arc that does not have an endpoint on the vertex 0, is called a *boundary arc* or a b-arc in short. In a non-orientable crown \mathcal{M}_n , any arc that decomposes the strip into one

orientable and one non-orientable subsurface is called a boundary arc or b-arc. In either case, a non-boundary arc is called *core arc* or simply *c-arc*.

Remark 3.1. In [22], Wilson introduced this terminology of arcs in the case of a non-orientable crown. There, a b-arc is short for *bounding arc* and c-arc is short for *cross-cap arc*. Since in this paper we are defining these two arcs for the orientable crown as well, we renamed the full-forms while keeping the shorthand.

Remark 3.2. A c-arc of a non-orientable crown \mathcal{M}_n always intersects its one-sided core curve. Similarly, any c-arc of a one-holed polygon \mathcal{P}_n° intersects the two-sided core curve of $\mathcal{P}_n^\circ \setminus \{0\}$.

Notation 3.3. a) Any c-arc of the surface \mathcal{P}_n° joins the internal point 0 with some vertex $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ in the boundary. So these arcs are going to be denoted by c_i . These are coloured green in the top panel of Fig. 3.

b) For $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ and $S = \mathcal{P}_n^\circ, \mathcal{M}_n$, we denote by M_i the maximal b-arc with both its endpoints at the vertex labeled i . These are coloured in red in Figs. 3, 4.

c) For $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ and $S = \mathcal{M}_n$, we denote by L_i the maximal c-arc with both its endpoints at the vertex labeled i . These are coloured in orange in Fig. 4.

d) Given two vertices i, j of \mathcal{M}_n such that $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, we denote by (i, j) the unique c-arc joining these two vertices. These are coloured in green in Fig. 4.

e) An arc of $S = \mathcal{P}_n, \mathcal{P}_n^\circ, \mathcal{M}_n$ is called *minimal* if it separates a disk homeomorphic to triangle \mathcal{P}_3 from the surface. In Fig. 3 and 4, the blue arcs in the top right panels are minimal arcs.

Next we introduce the arc complex of every surface.

Let S be any of the three surfaces defined above. Let \mathcal{X} be the set of homotopy classes of all non-trivial arcs. Let $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{X}$ be the subset containing the homotopy classes of c-arcs. Finally, let $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{X}$ be the subset containing the homotopy classes of b-arcs.

Definition 3.3. The arc complex $\mathcal{A}_K(S)$ generated by $K \subset \mathcal{X}$ of the surface S is a simplicial complex whose

- 0-simplices are given by the elements of K ;
- for $k \geq 1$, every k -simplex is given by a $(k+1)$ -tuple of pairwise disjoint and distinct homotopy classes.

The complex $\mathcal{A}_X(S)$ is called the full arc complex and is denoted simply by $\mathcal{A}(S)$. In Fig. 3 and 4, the full arc complexes of the two surfaces \mathcal{P}_n° and \mathcal{M}_n have been illustrated, for $n = 1, 2, 3$.

Definition 3.4. For $S = \mathcal{P}_n^\circ, \mathcal{M}_n$, the complexes $\mathcal{A}_C(S)$ and $\mathcal{A}_B(S)$ are called the internal and the boundary arc complexes. A simplex of $\mathcal{A}_C(S)$ (resp. $\mathcal{A}_B(S)$) is called a *core* (resp. *boundary*) simplex.

Definition 3.5. For $S = P(m, n)$, let K be the set of all arcs that have one blue and one red endpoint. Then the arc complex $\mathcal{A}_K(P(m, n))$ will be denoted as $\mathcal{A}_{m,n}$. For $i \in \llbracket 1, m \rrbracket$ and $j \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$, an arc joining the i -th blue vertex with the j -th red vertex will be denoted by (i, j) .

Example 3.6. The internal arc complex $\mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{P}_n^\circ)$ of a crown \mathcal{P}_n° is an $(n-1)$ -simplex whose vertices are given by $[c_i]$, for $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$.

Remark 3.4. If the surface S embeds into the surface S' and $K \subset K'$, then the complex $\mathcal{A}_K(S)$ embeds into the bigger complex $\mathcal{A}_{K'}(S')$.

Remark 3.5. The boundary arc complexes of \mathcal{P}_n° and \mathcal{M}_n are isomorphic.

Remark 3.6. Let a, b be two non-homotopic arcs. Then the 0-simplex $[a]$ is vertex-dominated by the 0-simplex $[b]$ if and only if any arc disjoint from a is also be disjoint from b .




Figure 3: The arc complexes of \mathcal{P}_1° , \mathcal{P}_2° and \mathcal{P}_3°

3.3 Tiles

Definition 3.7. Let σ be a simplex of the arc complex $\mathcal{A}(S)$ of a surface S . Let a_1, \dots, a_k be pairwise disjoint and distinct arcs such that the 0-simplices of σ are given by $\sigma^{(0)} = \bigcup_{i=1}^k [a_i]$. Then we say that σ decomposes the surface S into the tiles $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_p$ if

$$S \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^k a_i = \delta_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup \delta_p,$$

where $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_p$ are the connected components.

Notation: A b-arc of a (resp. non-orientable) crown \mathcal{P}_n° (resp. \mathcal{M}_n) decomposes the surface into two tiles: one homeomorphic to a polygon and one homeomorphic to a (resp. non-orientable) crown with at most $n+1$ vertices. Given two vertices i, j such that $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$, there are at most two b-arcs joining them. When $j-i > 1$, let a_i^j be the b-arc whose polygonal tile is homeomorphic to \mathcal{P}_{j-i+1} , containing the vertices $i, i+1, \dots, j$; its non-polygonal tile is homeomorphic to $\mathcal{P}_{n-j+i+1}$ (resp. $\mathcal{M}_{n-j+i+1}$), containing the vertices $j+1, \dots, n, 1, \dots, i$. When $j-i < n-1$, we denote the second b-arc by a_j^i . See Fig. 7.




Figure 4: The arc complexes of \mathcal{M}_1 , \mathcal{M}_2 and \mathcal{M}_3

A simplex of $\mathcal{A}(S)$ is called a *triangulation* if it decomposes the surface into tiles homeomorphic to triangles, \mathcal{P}_3 . These are the maximal simplices of $\mathcal{A}(S)$.

Example 3.8. For every $i \leq j \leq k \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$, let $\Delta_i^f \llbracket j, k \rrbracket$ be the simplex of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_n)$ whose 0-simplices are given by the isotopy classes of the c -arcs $(i, j), (i, j+1), \dots, (i, k)$. When $i = j = k$, this simplex is maximal in $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_n)$ and is called a *fan triangulation* based at the vertex i , denoted by Δ_i^f . See Fig. 6.

Remark 3.7. Any triangulation of the surfaces \mathcal{P}_n° and \mathcal{M}_n always has at least one c -arc. In fact, it is possible to triangulate the surface using only c -arcs.

Wilson [22] proved the following theorem about the shellability of the arc complexes of the two type of crowns:

Theorem 3.9 (Wilson). *a) For $n \geq 3$, the full arc complex $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_n)$ of a convex n -gon is a shellable sphere of dimension $n - 4$.*

b) For $n \geq 1$, the internal arc complex $\mathcal{A}_B(\mathcal{M}_n)$ of a non-orientable crown \mathcal{M}_n is a shellable pseudo-manifold of dimension $n - 1$.

Botany. When $S = \mathcal{P}_n^\circ$, exactly one tile in the tiling of a boundary simplex contains the vertex 0 in its interior. When $S = \mathcal{M}_n$, exactly one tile in the tiling of a boundary simplex is non-orientable. In both the cases, this unique tile is called the *trunk*. The boundary of the trunk consists of arcs of σ called *branch arcs*. The simplex generated by the branch arcs of σ is called the *stem* and is denoted by $\text{stem}(\sigma)$. The boundary may also contain some edges of the original surface – these are called *roots*. See Fig. 8.

Definition 3.10. Let $S = \mathcal{P}_n^\circ, \mathcal{M}_n$. For any boundary simplex $\sigma \in \mathcal{A}(S)$, the *dual tree* \mathcal{T}_σ is a graph defined in the following way:




Figure 5: The arc complexes $\mathcal{A}_{2,3}$, $\mathcal{A}_{4,1}$ are strongly collapsible.

- The vertices are given by the tiles of σ and the roots, if any;
- Every root is joined by an edge to the trunk. Any two non-root vertices are joined by an edge if and only if the corresponding tiles share an arc of σ .

The dual tree is a tree in the sense of graphs. The vertices of the dual tree that are non-roots and have degree one are called *leaves*. The degree of the trunk is the sum of the total number of roots and branches. A boundary simplex σ is said to have *degree* $d \geq 1$ if the degree of the trunk of σ in the dual tree is d . A boundary simplex, all of whose branches are leaves in its dual tree, is called a *sapling* and is denoted by σ_s . Finally, let η be a simplex of $\mathcal{A}(S)$ with at least one *b*-arc and at least one *c*-arc. Then we denote by η_b the subsimplex of η spanned only by *b*-arcs. The degree of η is then defined as the degree of the boundary simplex η_b . See Fig.8 for boundary simplices of degree 4 of the arc complex of a non-orientable crown.




Figure 6: A coincidence in dimension 2




Figure 7




Figure 8: Boundary simplices of degree 4 in $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_8)$

Example 3.11. A sapling of degree one is a maximal arc and a sapling of degree $n - 1$ is a minimal arc. Any 0-simplex of $\mathcal{A}(S)$ is a sapling with only one branch arc.

4 Collapsibility of the arc complexes

In this section, we will give the proofs of our main results on collapsibility.

4.1 The arc complex of a crown

Firstly, we prove the strong collapsibility of the arc complex of a crown.

Theorem 4.1. *For $n \geq 1$, the full arc complex $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_n^\circ)$ of a crown \mathcal{P}_n° is strongly collapsible.*

Proof. We will prove that the complex $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_n^\circ)$ strongly collapses onto $\mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{P}_n^\circ)$, which is an $(n - 1)$ -simplex. For $k \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$, let \mathcal{B}_k be the set of all arcs that decompose the surface into two tiles homeomorphic to \mathcal{P}_k°




Figure 9: An arc $a_j^i \in \mathcal{B}_{k+1}$ is vertex-dominated by c_i in Y^k .

and \mathcal{P}_{n-k+2} , respectively. Define the following subcomplexes of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_n^\circ)$:

$$Y^k := \begin{cases} \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_n^\circ), & \text{when } k = 0, \\ Y^{k-1} \setminus \{[a] \mid a \in \mathcal{B}_k\} & \text{when } k \in \llbracket 1, n-1 \rrbracket \end{cases}$$

Claim. For $k = 0, \dots, n-2$, Y^k strongly collapses onto Y^{k+1} .

We prove this claim by induction on k .

Base step: The set \mathcal{B}_1 comprises of all the maximal arcs of \mathcal{P}_n° . Indeed, any maximal arc M_i decomposes the surface \mathcal{P}_n° into a tile homeomorphic to \mathcal{P}_{n+1} and a tile homeomorphic to \mathcal{P}_1° , containing the vertex 0 in its interior and the vertex i in its boundary. Hence the link of the 0-simplex $[M_i]$ in the full arc complex is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Link}([M_i], Y_0) &= \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{n+1}) \bowtie \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_1^\circ) \\ &= \mathbb{S}^{n-3} \bowtie [c_i]. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that for every $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$, the 0-simplex $[M_i]$ is vertex-dominated by $[c_i]$. Using Theorem 2.4a), we get that $Y^0 \searrow Y^1$. This finishes the base step $k = 0$.

Induction step: Suppose that for $k' = 0, \dots, k-1$, we have $Y^{k'} \searrow Y^{k'+1}$. We need to show that $Y^k \searrow Y^{k+1}$. Let $a \in \mathcal{B}_{k+1}$ have endpoints on the vertices $i \neq j$. Without loss of generality, suppose that the tile homeomorphic to \mathcal{P}_{k+1}° also contains the vertex $i+1$. Then following Notation 7, we have that $a = a_j^i$. We claim that the 0-simplex $[a]$ is vertex-dominated by the c -arc $[c_i]$. Any triangulation containing the arc a either contains the arc c_i or the b -arc a_j^{i+1} joining $i+1$ and j which intersects c_i . See Fig. 9. But the arc a_j^{i+1} decomposes the surface into \mathcal{P}_k° and \mathcal{P}_{n-k+2} . So it lies in \mathcal{B}_k . The 0-simplex $[a_j^{i+1}]$ is absent from Y^k , by induction hypothesis. Thus every arc in \mathcal{B}_{k+1} is vertex dominated in Y^k . Using Theorem 2.4a), as in the base step, we conclude that $Y^k \searrow Y^{k+1}$. Since any boundary arc lies in \mathcal{B}_k for some k , we get that $Y^{k-1} = \mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{P}_n^\circ)$. This concludes the proof. \square

Remark 4.1. Using a similar argument, it can be shown that the arc in a_j^i is vertex-dominated by c_j in Y^k .

Corollary 4.2. For $n \geq 1$, the arc complex of an orientable crown \mathcal{P}_n° is a combinatorial ball of dimension $n-1$.

Proof. We know already that the arc complex is pure of dimension $n - 1$ and strongly connected. Firstly, we show that every $(n - 2)$ -simplex σ is contained in at most two $(n - 1)$ -simplices. Suppose that σ is a boundary simplex. Then it decomposes the surface into triangles and a crown \mathcal{M}_1 with only one vertex, say $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$. The only way to triangulate this tile is to take the c-arc c_i . So σ is contained in the unique maximal simplex $\sigma \cup \{c_i\}$. Next, we suppose that σ contains an internal arc c . Cutting the surface along this arc we get a surface homeomorphic to the convex $n + 2$ -gon. The restriction of σ on this polygon gives a $(n - 3)$ -simplex, say σ' , of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{n+2})$. Since the latter is a $(n - 2)$ -pseudo-manifold, σ' is contained in at exactly two $(n - 2)$ -simplices of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{n+1})$. Taking the join of these two maximal simplices with $[c]$ we get that σ is contained in exactly two $(n - 1)$ -simplices of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_n^\circ)$. So we get that the simplicial complex $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_n^\circ)$ is a pseudo-manifold.

Now, we prove that the arc complex is a combinatorial ball of dimension $n - 1$, by induction. From Fig. 3, we know that the statement is true for $n = 1, 2, 3$. Suppose that the statement is true for $n' = 1, \dots, n - 1$. Let α be a c-arc. Then it decomposes the surfaces into a \mathcal{P}_{n+2} . Its link is then given by

$$\text{Link}([\alpha], \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_n^\circ)) = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{n+2}) = \mathbb{S}^{n-2}.$$

Next, suppose that α is a b-arc of the form a_i^j with $j - i \geq 2$. Then it decomposes the surface into a polygon \mathcal{P}_{j-i+1} and a crown $\mathcal{P}_{n-j+i+1}^\circ$. Then its link is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Link}([\alpha], \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_n^\circ)) &= \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{j-i+1}) \bowtie \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{n-j+i+1}^\circ) \\ &= \mathbb{S}^{j-i+1-4} \bowtie \mathbb{B}^{n-j+i+1-1} \\ &= \mathbb{B}^{n-2}. \end{aligned}$$

So we get that $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_n^\circ)$ is a combinatorial manifold of dimension $n - 1$. Finally, using Whitehead's Theorem 2.2 and our Theorem 4.1, we get that the full arc complex is a combinatorial $n - 1$ -ball. \square

4.2 The inner arc complex of a non-orientable crown

Firstly, we prove that the inner arc complex of a non-orientable crown is collapsible.

Theorem 4.3. *For $n \geq 1$, the inner arc complex $\mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{M}_n)$ of a non-orientable crown \mathcal{M}_n is strongly collapsible.*

Proof. We prove the statement by induction on the number of vertices n . When $n = 1$, there is only one (homotopy class of) arc, namely the maximal c-arc L_1 . So the inner arc complex is the 0-simplex $[L_1]$, which is strongly collapsible.

Next we suppose that the statement holds for all $n' \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$. Given the surface \mathcal{M}_n , without loss of generality, we add a new vertex labeled $n + 1$ between the vertices 1 and n to get the surface \mathcal{M}_{n+1} . The idea is to strongly collapse the complex $\mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{M}_{n+1})$ onto the complex $\mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{M}_n)$ by removing all new arcs that arise in \mathcal{M}_{n+1} due to the addition of the new vertex. All these new arcs have an endpoint at the vertex $n + 1$.

Let $a_i := [(i, n + 1)]$, for $i \in \llbracket 1, n + 1 \rrbracket$. In particular, $a_{n+1} = [L_{n+1}]$. We show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{M}_{n+1}) &\searrow \mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{M}_{n+1}) \setminus \{a_{n+1}\} \\ &\searrow \mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{M}_{n+1}) \setminus \{a_{n+1}, a_n\} \\ &\searrow \dots \\ &\searrow \mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{M}_{n+1}) \setminus \{a_{n+1}, a_n, \dots, a_2, a_1\} \\ &= \mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{M}_n). \end{aligned}$$

Step 1. $\mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{M}_{n+1}) \searrow \mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{M}_{n+1}) \setminus \{a_{n+1}\}$: the 0-simplex $[L_{n+1}]$ is contained in a unique maximal simplex, namely, Δ_{n+1}^f . So it is vertex-dominated by $[a_i]$ for any $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$. See Fig. 6.




Figure 10: Step 2 of Theorem 4.3

Step 2. Suppose that for $i' = n+1, n, \dots, i+1$, the 0-simplex $a_{i'}$ is vertex-dominated in $\mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{M}_{n+1}) \setminus \{a_{n+1}, a_n, \dots, a_{i+1}\}$. Then we need to show that the 0-simplex $[a_i]$ is vertex-dominated in $\mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{M}_{n+1}) \setminus \{a_{n+1}, a_n, \dots, a_{i+1}\}$. See Fig. 10. The arc a_i decomposes the Möbius strip into an integral strip whose x -vertices are $n+1, 1, \dots, i$ and y -vertices are $i, i+1, \dots, n+1$. By induction hypothesis, none of the 0-simplices of $\mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{M}_{n+1}) \setminus \{a_{n+1}, a_n, \dots, a_i\}$ corresponds to an arc that has an endpoint on the y -vertex labeled $n+1$. So we have that

$$\text{Link}(a_i, \mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{M}_{n+1}) \setminus \{a_{n+1}, a_n, \dots, a_{i+1}\}) = \mathcal{A}_{i, n-i+2} \bowtie [(1, i)].$$

So a_i is vertex-dominated by $[(1, i)]$. This finishes the induction on i' . By induction hypothesis on n , the complex $\mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{M}_n)$ is strongly collapsible, which implies that the complex $\mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{M}_{n+1})$ is strongly collapsible. This finishes the induction on n . □




Figure 11: Two disjoint saplings of degree 6 are together forming a sapling of degree 4

Theorem 4.4. For all $n \geq 1$, the simplicial complex $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_n)$ simplicially collapses onto $\mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{M}_n)$.

Proof. Let Sap^d be the set of all saplings of degree d . Define

$$Y^d := \begin{cases} \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_n), & \text{when } d = 0, \\ \bigcap_{\sigma_s \in \text{Sap}^d} \text{fdel}(\sigma_s, Y^{d-1}) & \text{when } d \in \llbracket 1, n-1 \rrbracket \end{cases}$$

Claim. For $d = 0, \dots, n-2$, Y^d collapses onto Y^{d+1} .

We prove this claim by induction on d .

Base step: We need to show that Y^0 collapses onto Y^1 . The saplings of degree 1 correspond to the maximal b-arcs M_i , for $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$. Any such arc decomposes the surface \mathcal{M}_n into two tiles homeomorphic to \mathcal{P}_{n+1} and \mathcal{M}_1 , containing the vertex i in its boundary. Hence the link of the 0-simplex M_i in Y_0 is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Link}([M_i], \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_n)) &= \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{n+1}) \bowtie \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_1) \\ &= \mathbb{S}^{n-3} \bowtie [L_i]. \end{aligned}$$

which shows that for every $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ the 0-simplex $[M_i]$ is vertex-dominated in Y^0 . Using Lemma 2.4a), we get that $Y^0 \searrow Y^1$. Finally, from Theorem 2.4b), we get that $Y^0 \searrow Y^1$. This finishes the base step $d = 0$.

Induction step: Suppose that for all $d' = 1, \dots, d-1$, the complex $Y^{d'}$ collapses onto the complex $Y^{d'+1}$. We need to show that Y^d collapses onto Y^{d+1} .

Let σ_s be any sapling of degree $d+1$. Then the arcs of σ_s decompose the surface into finitely many tiles homeomorphic to $\mathcal{P}_{n_1}, \dots, \mathcal{P}_{n_p}$, and the trunk homeomorphic to \mathcal{M}_{d+1} , containing the vertices i_1, \dots, i_{d+1} of \mathcal{M}_{n+1} . Then we have that

$$\text{Link}(\sigma_s, Y^{d+1}) \simeq \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{n_1}) \bowtie \dots \bowtie \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{n_p}) \bowtie \mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{M}_d).$$

This is because any b-arc inside the trunk \mathcal{M}_{d+1} gives a sapling of degree less than d . By induction hypothesis, Y^d does not contain such a sapling. From Theorem 4.3, we have that $\mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{M}_d)$ is collapsible. So from Proposition 2.1a), the link of the sapling σ_s is collapsible. Finally, from Lemma 2.1b) we get that Y^{d-1} collapses onto $\text{fdel}(\sigma_s, Y^{d-1})$. Now if possible, let η be a simplex of Y^d containing 2 saplings of degree $d+1$. Then the degree of η is necessarily less than $d+1$. By induction hypothesis, Y^d cannot contain such a simplex. See Fig. 11. Thus we can face delete the saplings of degree $d+1$ in any order. Hence we have that Y^d collapses onto Y^{d+1} . This finishes the induction step. Since Y^{n-1} does not contain any boundary simplex, it is isomorphic to $\mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{P}_n^\circ)$, which is collapsible. \square

Corollary 4.5. *For $n \geq 1$, the full arc complex of a non-orientable crown is a combinatorial ball of dimension $n-1$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Corollary 4.2. \square

4.3 The full arc complex of a non-orientable crown

Proposition 4.6. For $n \geq 4$, the inner arc complex $\mathcal{A}_C(\mathcal{M}_n)$ is not a cone.

Proof. We need to show that for $n \geq 4$, there does not exist any c-arc that is disjoint from every other c-arc. We prove this by contradiction. If possible, let (i, j) be such an arc, with $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$. WLOG, we can assume that $i = 1$. Furthermore, since any two maximal c-arcs intersect, we can assume that $1 < j$. Since $n \geq 3$, there exists a vertex i' such that either $1 < i' < j$ or $j < i' \leq n$. See Fig. 12. Then the arc $L_{i'}$ intersects $(1, j)$. Hence there cannot be any c-arc that is disjoint from every other c-arc. \square




Figure 12: Proposition 4.6: $j < i' \leq n$

Proposition 4.7. For $n \geq 2$, there does not exist any b-arc that is disjoint from every c-arc of \mathcal{M}_n .

Proof. Any b-arc separates a polygon \mathcal{P}_k from the surface, where $3 \leq k \leq n$. In particular, there is a vertex i on \mathcal{P}_k that is different from the endpoints of the given b-arc. Any c-arc with an endpoint on i intersects this b-arc. This concludes the proof. \square

Proposition 4.8. For $n \geq 3$ and $k \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$, the complex $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_n) \setminus \{[M_1], \dots, [M_k]\}$ is not a cone.

Proof. This follows from the proofs of Propositions 4.6, 4.7. \square

Lemma 4.9. For every $n \geq 1$, the only vertex-dominated 0-simplices in $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_n)$ are given by $[M_i]$, for $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$.

Proof. In the base step of the proof of Theorem 4.4, we showed that for every $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$, the 0-simplex $[M_i]$ is vertex-dominated by $[L_i]$. Next, the link in $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_n)$ of any c-arc is a sphere, so it cannot be a cone. So no c-arc can be vertex-dominated. Finally consider any non-maximal b-arc a . It decomposes the surface into two tiles homeomorphic to \mathcal{M}_m and \mathcal{P}_k , with $m \in \llbracket 2, n \rrbracket$ and $k \in \llbracket 3, n \rrbracket$. Therefore, $\text{Link}([a], \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_n)) = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_m) \times \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_k)$. Since a is not a maximal arc, we have that $m > 1$ and so neither of the smaller arc complexes are a 0-simplex. Hence, $\text{Link}([a], \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_n))$ is not a cone. \square




Figure 13: Proposition 4.10: $[L_1]$ is not vertex-dominated in X_1 .

Lemma 4.10. Let $n \geq 2$ and $j_0 \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$. Then the only vertex-dominated 0-simplices of $X_1 := \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_n) \setminus \{[M_{j_0}]\}$ are $\{[M_j] \mid j \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket \setminus \{j_0\}\}$.

Proof. WLOG, we can assume that $j_0 = 1$. The links of all the arcs that intersect M_1 remain unchanged after the removal of $[M_1]$ from $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_n)$. In particular, the 0-simplices $[M_2], \dots, [M_n]$ remain vertex-dominated, while the 0-simplices corresponding to every other c-arc intersecting M_1 , remain non-dominated. Now we consider the arcs that are disjoint from M_1 :

1. the maximal c-arc L_1 ,
2. the b-arcs in the polygonal tile of M_1 .

Firstly, we show that $[L_1]$ cannot be vertex-dominated. We prove this by contradiction. See Fig. 13. Suppose that there exists an arc α which is disjoint from any arc that is disjoint from L_1 . If the arc α is a c-arc then it must be of the form $\alpha = (1, j)$ where $j \in \llbracket 2, n \rrbracket$. But the b-arcs a_{j-1}^{j+1}, a_{j-1}^1 are both disjoint to L_1 and at least one of them intersects α . In Fig. 13, we have $j = 4 = n$; the b-arc a_3^1 intersects the c-arc $(1, 4)$. So we have a contradiction. Next we suppose that α is a b-arc. Then it separates a vertex, say j from the rest of the surface, where $j \in \llbracket 2, n \rrbracket$. Then the c-arc $(1, j)$ is disjoint from L_1 and intersects α . So the 0-simplex $[L_1]$ cannot be vertex-dominated in X_1 .

Finally, we check for vertex-domination in the case of b-arcs that are disjoint from M_1 . The link of such an arc β in X_1 becomes

$$\text{Link}([\beta], X_1) = (\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_m) \setminus [M_1]) \bowtie \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_k).$$

If $m \geq 3$, then from Proposition 4.8, we know that the complex $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_m) \setminus [M_1]$ is not a cone. So the 0-simplex $[\beta]$ is not vertex-dominated. Since $\beta \neq M_1$, we have $m > 1$. So we need to treat the remaining case $m = 2$. From Fig. 4, we conclude that the complex $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_m) \setminus [M_1]$ is not a cone. \square

Lemma 4.11. *Let $n \geq 4$ and $\mathcal{J}_n := \{(i, i+1) \mid i \in \llbracket 1, n-1 \rrbracket\} \cup \{(n, 1)\}$. Let $I \subset \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ of size at least 2. Then the 0-simplices that are vertex-dominated in $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_n) \setminus \{[M_k] \mid k \in I\}$ are given by $\{[M_j]\}$ for $j \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket \setminus I$ and $\{a_j^i\}$ for $(i, j) \in \mathcal{J}_n \cap I \times I$.*

Proof. Let $X_I := \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_n) \setminus \{[M_k] \mid k \in I\}$. Since any two maximal b-arcs always intersect, we have that for every $j \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket \setminus I$, $\text{Link}([M_j], X_I) = \text{Link}([M_j], \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_n))$, which is a cone. So the 0-simplices $[M_j]$, $j \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket \setminus I$, remain vertex-dominated. It suffices to check for vertex-dominated arcs that are disjoint from the maximal b-arcs that were removed:

1. the b-arcs in the polygonal tile of M_j .
2. the maximal c-arcs L_j for $j \in I$,




Figure 14: Lemma 4.10: $[a_{21}^1]$ is vertex-dominated in $[(1, 2)]$ in X_I .

Firstly, we consider a 0-simplex $[a_j^i]$ with $(i, j) \in \mathcal{J}_n \cap I \times I$. We claim that it is vertex dominated by the 0-simplex $[(i, j)]$. In Fig 14, we have $n = 4, i = 1, j = 2$. The arc a_j^i decomposes the surface into a polygon

\mathcal{P}_p ($p \geq 3$) and a non-orientable crown \mathcal{M}_2 , containing the two vertices i, j . So the link of this 0-simplex in X_I is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Link}([a_j^i], X_I) &= \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_p) \bowtie (\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_2) \setminus \{[M_i], [M_j]\}) \\ &= \mathbb{S}^{p-4} \bowtie \mathbb{S}^0 \bowtie [(1, 2)], \end{aligned}$$

where the 0-sphere corresponds to the two intersecting maximal c-arcs L_i, L_j . Next, consider any b-arc in the polygonal tile of M_j , with $j \in I$ such that neither $(j-1, j)$ nor $(j, j+1)$ lie in $\mathcal{J}_n \cap I \times I$. Then the argument is same as that in the the second case of Lemma 4.10.

Finally, consider the maximal c-arc L_j for $j \in I$. Then its link is given by $\text{Link}([L_j], \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_n) \setminus [M_j])$ which is not a cone from the proof of Lemma 4.10. \square

Lemma 4.12. *Let n, I, \mathcal{J}_n be as in Lemma 4.11. Let $J \subset \mathcal{J}_n \cap I \times I$. Then the 0-simplices that are vertex-dominated in $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_n) \setminus \{[M_j] \mid j \in I\} \cup \{[a_j^i] \mid (i, j) \in J\}$ are given by $\{[M_j]\}$ for $j \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket \setminus I$ and $\{a_j^i\}$ for $(i, j) \in \mathcal{J}_n \cap I \times I \setminus J$.*

Proof. Denote $X_{I,J} := \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_n) \setminus \{[M_j] \mid j \in I\} \cup \{[a_j^i] \mid (i, j) \in J\}$. It suffices to check for vertex-dominated 0-simplices in the links of the 0-simplices that were removed: $\{[M_j] \mid j \in I\} \cup \{[a_j^i] \mid (i, j) \in J\}$. These correspond to

1. the maximal c-arcs L_j for $j \in I$,
2. the non-maximal c-arcs (i, j) , for $i, j \in J$,
3. all the b-arcs in the polygonal tile of a_j^i , for $i, j \in J$,
4. all the b-arcs in the polygonal tile of M_j , for $j \in I$ such that neither $(j-1, j)$ nor $(j, j+1)$ lie in $\mathcal{J}_n \cap I \times I$.

Firstly, we show that the maximal c-arcs L_j for $j \in I$ cannot be vertex-dominated. Cutting the surface along L_j , we get a polygon \mathcal{P}_{n+2} . The link of $[L_j]$ is given by

$$\text{Link}([L_j], X_{I,J}) = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{n+2}) \setminus \begin{cases} \{[M_j]\}, & \text{when } j \in I \text{ and } (j-1, j), (j, j+1) \notin J, \\ \{[M_j], a_j^{j-1}\}, & \text{when } (j-1, j) \in J \text{ and } (j, j+1) \notin J, \\ \{[M_j], a_{j+1}^j\}, & \text{when } (j, j+1) \in J \text{ and } (j-1, j) \notin J, \\ \{[M_j], a_j^{j-1}, a_{j+1}^j\}, & \text{when } (j-1, j), (j, j+1) \in J \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Suppose that a c-arc vertex-dominates L_j . Then it is of the form (j, i) , for $i \in \llbracket 1, j-1 \rrbracket$ or (i, j) for $i \in \llbracket j+1, n \rrbracket$. See Fig. 15. For $j < i < n$ or $i < n = j$, the b-arc a_{i-1}^{i+1} intersects the arc (j, i) or (i, j) respectively. When $j < i = n$, the b-arc a_{i-1}^{i+1} intersects (j, i) . Since $n \geq 4$, these b-arcs are different from the three arcs $M_j, a_j^{j-1}, a_{j+1}^j$. So we get that L_j cannot be vertex dominated by a c-arc. We have already seen in the proof of Lemma 4.10, that a b-arc cannot dominate a c-arc. So c-arcs L_j , for $j \in I$, cannot be vertex-dominated in $X_{I,J}$.

Next we prove that the non-maximal c-arcs (i, j) , for $i, j \in J$, cannot be vertex-dominated. Suppose that (i, j) is vertex-dominated by another c-arc. See the right panel of Fig. 15. Either $j = i+1$ or $j = n, i = 1$. Suppose that the b-arc is vertex-dominated by c-arc α . Then at least one endpoint of α lies on either i




Figure 15: Lemma 4.12

or j . WLOG, suppose that α has an endpoint on i . Then the maximal arc L_j intersects α . So α cannot vertex dominate (i, j) . We have already seen that a b-arc cannot vertex-dominate. Thus the (i, j) cannot be vertex-dominated in $X_{I,J}$.

Next suppose that α is a b-arc in the polygonal tile of a_j^i , for $i, j \in J$. It divides the surface into a polygon \mathcal{P}_p and a non-orientable crown \mathcal{M}_m , with $m \geq 3$. Then its link is given by

$$\text{Link}([\alpha], X_{I,J}) = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_p) \bowtie \left(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_m) \setminus \{[M_k] \mid \alpha \in \text{Link}([M_k], \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_m))\} \cup \{[a_j^i] \mid \alpha \in \text{Link}([a_j^i], \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_m))\} \right)$$

From Propositions 4.8, 4.7, we get that neither a b-arc nor a c-arc can vertex-dominate α .

Finally, the argument for the 4th type of arcs is identical to that in Lemma 4.10.

This concludes the proof. \square

Theorem 4.13. *For $n \geq 4$, the full arc complex $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_n)$ of the surface \mathcal{M}_n is not strongly collapsible.*

Proof. From Lemma 4.9, we get that the only way to strongly collapse the full arc complex is to remove the 0-simplex corresponding to some maximal b-arc M_j , $j \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$. From Lemma 4.10, we get that the only way to strongly collapse the complex $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_n) \setminus \{M_j\}$ is to remove another maximal b-arc.. Next from Lemma 4.11, we get that if we remove two maximal b-arcs M_i, M_j such that $j = i + 1$ are consecutive or $i = n, j = 1$, then the b-arc a_j^i becomes vertex-dominated. From Lemma 4.12, we get that we can remove the 0-simplices in $\mathcal{D} := \{[M_j] \mid j \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket\} \cup \{[a_j^i] \mid (i, j) \in \mathcal{J}_n\}$ in any order and we will always end up with the complex $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_n) \setminus \mathcal{D}$. Finally, from Lemma 4.12, we get that this complex is minimal. Thus the full arc complex is not strongly collapsible. \square

4.4 Integral strip

In this section we show that the arc complex of an integral strip is strongly collapsible.

Theorem 4.14. *For $m, n \geq 1$ and $m + n \geq 5$, the arc complex $\mathcal{A}_{m,n}$ is strongly collapsible.*

Proof. For all $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 1$, the arc complexes $\mathcal{A}_{m,1}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{1,n}$ are simplices of dimension $m - 1$ and $n - 1$, respectively. So they are strongly collapsible. See Fig. 5. Next we verify the statement for $m = 3, n = 2$. There are four arcs $(1, 3), (1, 2), (2, 2), (2, 1)$. The 0-simplices $(1, 3)$ and $(2, 1)$ are vertex-dominated by the 0-simplices $(1, 2)$ and $(2, 2)$, respectively. Removing the two former arcs we get a 1-simplex which is collapsible. This concludes the base step.

Suppose that for $1 \leq m' \leq m$, $1 \leq n' \leq n$ and $m' + n' \geq 5$, the arc complexes $\mathcal{A}_{m'+1,n'}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{m',n'+1}$ are strongly collapsible. For the induction step, we need to show that the arc complex $\mathcal{A}_{m'+1,n'+1}$ is strongly collapsible. The idea is to strongly collapse all the new arcs in $P(m+1, n+1)$ have an endpoint on the red vertex $n+1$. The only other new arc is $(m+1, n)$ which forms a boundary edge for the strip $P(m+1, n)$.

For the ease of notation, let us denote $a_i := [(i, n+1)]$, for all $i \in \llbracket 1, m \rrbracket$. Then we show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{m+1,n+1} &\searrow \mathcal{A}_{m+1,n+1} \setminus \{a_1\} \\ &\searrow \dots \\ &\searrow \mathcal{A}_{m+1,n+1} \setminus \{a_1, \dots, a_m\} \end{aligned}$$

The arc a_1 decomposes the integral strip $P(m+1, n+1)$ into two smaller strips $P(1, n+1)$ and $P(m+1, 1)$. The link of the 0-simplex $[a_1]$ is given by

$$\text{Link}(a_1, \mathcal{A}_{m+1,n+1}) = \Delta_1^f \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket \bowtie \Delta_{n+1}^f \llbracket 1, m \rrbracket,$$

which is a cone. So we get that $\mathcal{A}_{m+1,n+1} \searrow \mathcal{A}_{m+1,n+1} \setminus \{a_1\}$.




Figure 16: In Theorem 4.14, The 0-simplex $a_2 = [(2, n+1)]$ is vertex-dominated by $[(2, n)]$.

Next suppose that for $2 \leq i' \leq i \leq m$, $\mathcal{A}(P(m+1, n+1)) \setminus \{a_1, \dots, a_{i'-1}\} \searrow \mathcal{A}(P(m+1, n+1)) \setminus \{a_1, \dots, a_i\}$. We need to show that a_{i+1} is vertex-dominated in $\mathcal{A}(P(m+1, n+1)) \setminus \{a_1, \dots, a_i\}$. See Fig. 16. The arc a_{i+1} decomposes the integral strip $P(m+1, n+1)$ into two smaller strips $P(i+1, n+1)$ and $P(m+2-i, 1)$. Since then arcs $(i, n+1)$ have been removed, any triangulation of $P(i+1, n+1)$ must contain the arc $(i+1, n)$. So we get that the 0-simplex a_{i+1} is vertex-dominated by $[(i+1, n)]$. This concludes the induction on i . Finally, we have that $\mathcal{A}_{m+1,n+1} \setminus \{a_1, \dots, a_m\} = \mathcal{A}_{m+1,n} \bowtie [(m+1, n)]$, which is strongly collapsible. This concludes the proof. \square

References

- [1] Karim Adiprasito and Bruno Benedetti. Collapsibility of $\text{cat}(0)$ spaces. *Geometriae Dedicata*, 206(1):181–199, 2020.
- [2] Karim A. Adiprasito, Bruno Benedetti, and Frank H. Lutz. Extremal examples of collapsible complexes and random discrete morse theory. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 57(4):824–853, 2017.
- [3] Jonathan Ariel Barmak and Elias Gabriel Minian. Strong homotopy types, nerves and collapses. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 47(2):301–328, 2012.
- [4] Bruno Benedetti. Discrete morse theory for manifolds with boundary. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 364(12):6631–6670, 2012.
- [5] Bruno Benedetti and Frank H. Lutz. The dunce hat in a minimal non-extendably collapsible 3-ball. *arXiv: Algebraic Topology*, 2009.
- [6] R.H. Bing. Some aspects of the topology of 3-manifolds related to the poincaré conjecture. *Lectures on Modern Mathematics*, 2(1):93–128, 1964.
- [7] Jean-Daniel Boissonnat and Siddharth Pritam. Computing persistent homology of flag complexes via strong collapses. In *35th International Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG 2019)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2019.
- [8] Jean-Daniel Boissonnat, Siddharth Pritam, and Divyansh Pareek. Strong collapse and persistent homology. *Journal of Topology and Analysis*, 15(01):185–213, 2023.
- [9] Katherine Crowley. Simplicial collapsibility, discrete morse theory, and the geometry of nonpositively curved simplicial complexes. *Geometriae Dedicata*, 133(1):35–50, 2008.
- [10] Gopal Danaraj and Victor Klee. Shellings of spheres and polytopes. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 41(2):443 – 451, 1974.
- [11] W. J. Harvey. *Boundary Structure of The Modular Group*, pages 245–252. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1981.
- [12] Davide Lofano and Andrew Newman. The worst way to collapse a simplex. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 244(2):625–647, 2021.
- [13] Jiří Matoušek. Lc reductions yield isomorphic simplicial complexes. *Contributions to Discrete Mathematics [electronic only]*, 3, 01 2008.
- [14] Pallavi Panda. The arc complexes of bicoloured polygons are balls. 2023. *arXiv: math/2306.06695*.
- [15] Hugo Parlier and Lionel Pournin. Once punctured disks, non-convex polygons, and pointihedra. *Annals of Combinatorics*, 22(3):619–640, 2018.
- [16] R. C. Penner. The structure and singularities of quotient arc complexes. *Journal of Topology*, 1(3):527–550, 05 2008.
- [17] R. C. Penner. *Decorated Teichmüller Theory*. The QGM master class series. European Mathematical Society, Zürich, Switzerland, 2012. OCLC: ocn773019621.

- [18] Lionel Pournin. The diameter of associahedra. *Advances in Mathematics*, 259:13–42, 2014.
- [19] Daniel D. Sleator, Robert E. Tarjan, and William P. Thurston. Rotation distance, triangulations, and hyperbolic geometry. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 1:647–681, 1988.
- [20] Volkmar Welker. Constructions preserving evasiveness and collapsibility. *Discrete Mathematics*, 207(1):243–255, 1999.
- [21] J. H. C. Whitehead. Simplicial spaces, nuclei and m-groups. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, s2-45(1):243–327, 1939.
- [22] Jon Wilson. Shellability and sphericity of finite quasi-arc complexes. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 59(3):680–706, 2018.
- [23] E.C. Zeeman. On the dunce hat. *Topology*, 2(4):341–358, 1963.