

# Contact Lie poset algebras of types B, C, and D

Nicholas Mayers\* and Nicholas Russoniello\*\*

\*Department of Mathematics, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, 27605

\*\*Department of Mathematics, College of William & Mary, Williamsburg, VA, 23187

March 5, 2024

## Abstract

We extend a recently established combinatorial index formula applying to Lie poset algebras of types B, C, and D. Then, using the extended index formula, we determine a characterization of contact Lie poset algebras of types B, C, and D corresponding to posets of height one in terms of an associated graph.

## 1 Introduction

This article is a sequel to the articles *Contact Lie poset algebras* (see [7], Electron. J. Comb., 2022) and *The index and spectrum of Lie poset algebras of types B, C, and D* (see [9], Electron. J. Comb., 2021). In [7], the authors provide a complete characterization of certain contact subalgebras of  $\mathfrak{sl}(n)$ . The characterized contact Lie algebras were members of the family of “type-A Lie poset algebras.” In [9], the authors, in particular, extend the definition of “Lie poset algebra” to the other classical types and construct combinatorial “index” formulas for such algebras. Here, we initiate an investigation into contact Lie poset algebras of types B, C, and D. To establish our main results, it is necessary to extend some key results of [9] concerning the index of such algebras.

Briefly, recall that a  $(2k+1)$ -dimensional Lie algebra is *contact* if it admits a linear one-form  $\varphi$  satisfying  $\varphi \wedge (d\varphi)^k \neq 0$ . Such a  $\varphi$  is called a (left-invariant) *contact form* and generates a volume form on the algebra’s underlying Lie group. The problem of characterizing contact Lie algebras has its roots in the work of Boothby and Wang ([3], 1958) and has garnered significant recent attention (see [1, 13, 16, 18, 24, 25], cf. [19]). Here, we are concerned with identifying contact Lie algebras among Lie poset subalgebras of  $\mathfrak{sp}(2n)$  and  $\mathfrak{so}(n)$ .

The authors of [9] – following the suggestion put forth by Coll and Gerstenhaber in ([4], 2016) – define a Lie poset subalgebra of a classical simple Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  as any subalgebra  $\mathfrak{p}$  of  $\mathfrak{g}$  satisfying  $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{b}$ , where  $\mathfrak{h}$  is a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , and  $\mathfrak{b}$  is a Borel subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$  corresponding to  $\mathfrak{h}$ . From this definition, it follows that, up to conjugation, each Lie poset algebra can be reckoned as a Lie algebra consisting of upper-triangular matrices whose potentially nonzero entries correspond to relations in an associated poset. In the cases where  $\mathfrak{g}$  is  $\mathfrak{so}(2n+1)$ ,  $\mathfrak{sp}(2n)$ , or  $\mathfrak{so}(2n)$ , the posets associated with a Lie poset algebra  $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{g}$  are called type-B, C, or D posets, respectively (see Definition 2 below).

Now, recall that in [7], the method by which contact Lie poset algebras were identified relied heavily upon a Lie-algebraic invariant called the *index*, which is defined as

$$\text{ind } \mathfrak{g} = \min_{\varphi \in \mathfrak{g}^*} \dim(\ker(d\varphi)).$$

Each contact Lie algebra necessarily has index one, and this fact is used in the prequel to identify candidate contact algebras among the family of type-A Lie poset algebras, which are then subsequently shown to be

contact. In order to initiate a similar study of contact type-B, C, and D Lie poset algebras, we leverage a main result of [9], which is a combinatorial index formula that applies to a restricted class of such algebras associated with posets of “height one,” i.e., whose chains have cardinality at most two. The first main goal of this article is to extend the combinatorial index formula of [9] to all type-B, C, and D Lie poset algebras associated with posets of height one (see Section 3). Upon achieving this goal, we then characterize contact Lie poset algebras of types B, C, and D associated with height-one posets.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we cover the necessary preliminaries from the theory of posets, including definitions and known results concerning posets of types B, C, and D. In Section 3, we extend the index formula of [9] as well as the characterization of Frobenius algebras so that they apply to all type-B, C, and D Lie poset algebras whose associated posets have height one. Following this, in Section 4, we determine a characterization of contact, type-B, C, and D Lie poset algebras whose associated posets have height one. Finally, in Section 5, we discuss directions for future research.

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section, we give the necessary preliminaries from the theory of posets.

Recall that a *finite poset*  $(\mathcal{P}, \preceq_{\mathcal{P}})$  consists of a finite set  $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{Z}$  together with a binary relation  $\preceq_{\mathcal{P}}$  which is reflexive, anti-symmetric, and transitive. We further assume that if  $x \preceq_{\mathcal{P}} y$  for  $x, y \in \mathcal{P}$ , then  $x \leq y$ , where  $\leq$  denotes the natural ordering on  $\mathbb{Z}$ . When no confusion will arise, we simply denote a poset  $(\mathcal{P}, \preceq_{\mathcal{P}})$  by  $\mathcal{P}$ , and  $\preceq_{\mathcal{P}}$  by  $\preceq$ .

Let  $x, y \in \mathcal{P}$ . If  $x \preceq y$  and  $x \neq y$ , then we call  $x \preceq y$  a *strict relation* and write  $x \prec y$ . Recall that if  $x \prec y$  and there exists no  $z \in \mathcal{P}$  satisfying  $x \prec z \prec y$ , then  $y$  *covers*  $x$  and  $x \prec y$  is a *covering relation*. Using this language, the *Hasse diagram* of a poset  $\mathcal{P}$  can be reckoned as the graph whose vertices correspond to elements of  $\mathcal{P}$  and whose edges correspond to covering relations.

**Example 1.** Consider the poset  $\mathcal{P} = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$  with  $1 \prec 2 \prec 3, 4$ . The Hasse diagram of  $\mathcal{P}$  is illustrated in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Hasse diagram of  $\mathcal{P}$

For a subset  $S \subset \mathcal{P}$ , the *induced subposet generated by  $S$*  is the poset  $\mathcal{P}_S$  on  $S$ , where  $i \preceq_{\mathcal{P}_S} j$  if and only if  $i, j \in S$  and  $i \preceq_{\mathcal{P}} j$ . A totally ordered subset  $S \subset \mathcal{P}$  is called a *chain*. The *height* of  $\mathcal{P}$  is one less than the largest cardinality of a chain in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

In this article we are interested in a restricted class of posets which generate subalgebras of the classical Lie algebras of types B, C, and D consisting of upper-triangular matrices. In particular, we are interested in the type-B, C, and D posets of [9] which are defined as follows.

**Definition 2.** A *type-C poset* is a poset  $\mathcal{P} = \{-n, \dots, -1, 1, \dots, n\}$  such that

1. if  $i \preceq_{\mathcal{P}} j$ , then  $i \leq j$ ; and
2. if  $i \neq -j$ , then  $i \preceq_{\mathcal{P}} j$  if and only if  $-j \preceq_{\mathcal{P}} -i$ .

A *type-D poset* is a poset  $\mathcal{P} = \{-n, \dots, -1, 1, \dots, n\}$  satisfying 1 and 2 above as well as

3.  $i$  does not cover  $-i$ , for  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ .

A *type-B* poset is a poset  $\mathcal{P} = \{-n, \dots, -1, 0, 1, \dots, n\}$  satisfying 1 through 3 above.

**Example 3.** In Figure 2, we illustrate the Hasse diagram of the *type-C* (and *D*) poset  $\mathcal{P} = \{-3, -2, -1, 1, 2, 3\}$  with  $-2 \prec 1, 3$ ;  $-3 \prec 2$ ; and  $-1 \prec 2$ . Note that adding 0 to  $\mathcal{P}$  and a vertex labeled 0 to the Hasse diagram of Figure 2 results in a *type-B* poset and its corresponding Hasse diagram.




Figure 2: Hasse diagram of a *type-C* poset

Given a *type-B*, *C*, or *D* poset  $\mathcal{P}$ , let  $\mathcal{P}^+ = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{P} \cap \mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$  and  $\mathcal{P}^- = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{P} \cap \mathbb{Z}_{<0}}$ ; that is,  $\mathcal{P}^+$  (resp.,  $\mathcal{P}^-$ ) is the poset induced by the positive (resp., negative) elements of  $\mathcal{P}$ . Let  $Rel_{\pm}(\mathcal{P})$  denote the set of relations  $x \prec y$  such that  $x \in \mathcal{P}^-$  and  $y \in \mathcal{P}^+$ . We call  $\mathcal{P}$  *separable* if  $Rel_{\pm}(\mathcal{P}) = \emptyset$ , and *non-separable* otherwise; note that if  $\mathcal{P}$  is a *type-B* poset which is either separable or of height one, then 0 cannot be related to any other elements of  $\mathcal{P}$ . For posets of types *B*, *C*, and *D*, we sometimes use a refined notion of height, saying that such a poset  $\mathcal{P}$  is of *height*  $(i, j)$  if  $\mathcal{P}^+$  (resp.,  $\mathcal{P}^-$ ) is of height  $i$  (resp.,  $j$ ).

**Example 4.** If  $\mathcal{P}$  is the poset of Example 3, then  $\mathcal{P}^+ = \{1, 2, 3\}$  and  $\mathcal{P}^- = \{-1, -2, -3\}$ ; both induced posets have no relations. Further, since  $\mathcal{P}$  has chains of cardinality at most two, it follows that  $\mathcal{P}$  is of height  $(0, 1)$ .

In [9] the authors use a condensed version of the Hasse diagram when working with *type-B*, *C*, and *D* posets of height- $(0, 1)$ , called the “relation graph”. Below we extend the notion of relation graph slightly so that it applies to *type-B*, *C*, and *D* posets of height one.

**Definition 5.** Given a *type-B*, *C*, or *D* poset  $\mathcal{P}$  of height one, we define the relation graph  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  as follows:

- each pair of elements  $-i, i \in \mathcal{P}$  is represented by a single vertex in  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  labeled by  $i \in \mathcal{P}^+$  (omitting the vertex representing 0 in *type B*);
- if  $-i \prec j$  in  $\mathcal{P}$ , then there is an edge connecting vertex  $i$  and vertex  $j$  in  $RG(\mathcal{P})$ ;
- if  $-i \prec -j$  in  $\mathcal{P}$ , then there is a dashed edge connecting vertex  $i$  and vertex  $j$  in  $RG(\mathcal{P})$ .

We denote the vertex set and edge set of  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  by  $V(\mathcal{P})$  and  $E(\mathcal{P})$ , respectively. If  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  is connected, then  $\mathcal{P}$  is called *connected*.

**Remark 6.** The extended relations graphs defined above are equivalent to “signed digraphs”, as defined by Reiner (see [22, 23]), with the signs removed and edges with both signs becoming dashed.

**Remark 7.** If  $-i \prec i$  in  $\mathcal{P}$ , then vertex  $i$  defines a self-loop in  $RG(\mathcal{P})$ . Note that  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  can only contain self-loops if  $\mathcal{P}$  is a *type-C* poset.

**Remark 8.** As in [9], we use the notion of *connected* given in Definition 5 for *type-B*, *C*, and *D* posets in place of the standard notion in terms of connectedness of the Hasse diagram.

**Example 9.** In Figure 3, we illustrate the (a) Hasse diagram and (b) relation graph corresponding to the height- $(1, 1)$ , *type-C* poset  $\mathcal{P} = \{-3, -2, -1, 1, 2, 3\}$  with  $-3 \prec -2, 1, 3$  and  $-1, 2 \prec -3$ .




Figure 3: (a) Hasse diagram and (b) relation graph of type-C poset

One obtains a subalgebra of the appropriate classical Lie algebra from a poset of type B, C, or D as described in the following theorem. As in the introduction, we let  $E_{i,j}$  denote an appropriately sized square matrix containing a 1 in the  $i, j$ -entry and 0's elsewhere; the size of  $E_{i,j}$  will be clear from context.

**Theorem 10** ([9]). *Type-C (resp., B or D) posets  $\mathcal{P}$  are in bijective correspondence with type-C (resp., B or D) Lie poset algebras  $\mathfrak{p}$  as follows:*

- $|\mathcal{P}| = n$  if and only if  $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{sp}(n)$  (resp.,  $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{so}(n)$ );
- $-i, i \in \mathcal{P}$  if and only if  $E_{-i,-i} - E_{i,i} \in \mathfrak{p}$ ;
- $-i \prec_{\mathcal{P}} -j$  and  $j \prec_{\mathcal{P}} i$  if and only if  $E_{-i,-j} - E_{j,i} \in \mathfrak{p}$ ;
- $-i \prec_{\mathcal{P}} j$  and  $-j \prec_{\mathcal{P}} i$  if and only if  $E_{-i,j} + E_{-j,i} \in \mathfrak{p}$  (resp.,  $E_{-i,j} - E_{-j,i} \in \mathfrak{p}$ );

and only in type-C

- $-i \prec_{\mathcal{P}} i$  if and only if  $E_{-i,i} \in \mathfrak{p}$ .

**Remark 11.** *Note that as in the type-A case, type-C posets  $\mathcal{P}$  determine the matrix form of the corresponding type-C Lie poset algebra by identifying which entries of a  $|\mathcal{P}| \times |\mathcal{P}|$  matrix can be non-zero. In particular, the  $i, j$ -entry can be non-zero if and only if  $i \leq_{\mathcal{P}} j$ . The same is almost true in types-B and D, except one ignores relations of the form  $-i \prec_{\mathcal{P}} i$ .*

**Example 12.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be the poset of Example 3. The matrix form encoded by  $\mathcal{P}$  and defining the corresponding type-C (and D) Lie poset algebra is illustrated in Figure 4, where \*'s denote potential non-zero entries.*

$$\begin{array}{c}
 -3 \quad -2 \quad -1 \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \\
 \begin{array}{c} -3 \\ -2 \\ -1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \end{array} \begin{bmatrix} * & 0 & 0 & 0 & * & 0 \\ 0 & * & 0 & * & 0 & * \\ 0 & 0 & * & 0 & * & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & * & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & * & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & * \end{bmatrix}
 \end{array}$$

Figure 4: Matrix form for  $\mathcal{P} = \{-3, -2, -1, 1, 2, 3\}$  with  $-2 \prec 1, 3$ ;  $-3 \prec 2$ ; and  $-1 \prec 2$

Given a type-C poset  $\mathcal{P}$ , we denote the corresponding type-C Lie poset algebra by  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$ ; furthermore, we define the following basis for  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P}) = & \{E_{-i,-i} - E_{i,i} \mid -i, i \in \mathcal{P}\} \cup \{E_{-j,-i} - E_{i,j} \mid -i, -j, i, j \in \mathcal{P}, -j \prec -i, i \prec j\} \\
 & \cup \{E_{-i,j} + E_{-j,i} \mid -i, -j, i, j \in \mathcal{P}, -j \prec i, -i \prec j\} \\
 & \cup \{E_{-i,i} \mid -i, i \in \mathcal{P}, -i \prec i\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, given a type-D (resp., B) poset  $\mathcal{P}$  we denote the corresponding type-D (resp., B) Lie poset algebra by  $\mathfrak{g}_D(\mathcal{P})$  (resp.,  $\mathfrak{g}_B(\mathcal{P})$ ) and define the basis  $\mathcal{B}_D(\mathcal{P})$  (resp.,  $\mathcal{B}_B(\mathcal{P})$ ) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_D(\mathcal{P}) = & \{E_{-i,-i} - E_{i,i} \mid -i, i \in \mathcal{P}\} \cup \{E_{-j,-i} - E_{i,j} \mid -i, -j, i, j \in \mathcal{P}, -j \prec -i, i \prec j\} \\ & \cup \{E_{-i,j} - E_{-j,i} \mid -i, -j, i, j \in \mathcal{P}, -j \prec i, -i \prec j, j < i\}. \end{aligned}$$

Ongoing, we set the following notational conventions.

- $D_i = E_{-i,-i} - E_{i,i}$ .
- $R_{i,j}^\pm = E_{-i,j} + E_{-j,i}$ .
- $R_{i,j} = E_{-j,-i} - E_{i,j}$  for  $i < j$ .
- $x_{i,n}$  denotes the  $i$ th standard basis element in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , i.e.,

$$x_{i,n} = \underbrace{[0 \ \cdots \ 0]}_{i-1} \ 1 \ \underbrace{[0 \ \cdots \ 0]}_{n-i}.$$

**Remark 13.** Note that  $R_{i,j}^\pm = R_{j,i}^\pm$ .

In [9], the authors establish the following relationships among Lie poset algebras of types-B, C, and D.

**Theorem 14** (Theorems 17 and 18, [9]).

- (a) If  $\mathcal{P}$  is a type-D poset such that  $-i \not\prec i$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{P}$ , then  $\mathfrak{g}_D(\mathcal{P})$  is isomorphic to  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$ .
- (b) If  $\mathcal{P}$  is a type-B poset for which 0 is not related to any other element of  $\mathcal{P}$ ,  $-i \not\prec i$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{P}$ , and  $\mathcal{P}_0 = \mathcal{P} \setminus \{0\}$ , then  $\mathfrak{g}_B(\mathcal{P})$  is isomorphic to  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}_0)$ .

With respect to index, the authors of [9] established the following index formula for type-B, C, and D Lie poset algebras associated with posets of height (0, 1).

**Theorem 15.** Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a height-(0, 1) poset of type-B, C, or D and  $\mathfrak{g}$  be the corresponding type-B, C, or D Lie poset algebra, respectively. Then

$$\text{ind } \mathfrak{g} = |E(\mathcal{P})| - |V(\mathcal{P})| + 2\eta(\mathcal{P}),$$

where  $\eta(\mathcal{P})$  denotes the number of connected components of  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  containing no odd cycles.

Moreover, combining Theorem 30 of [9] with Theorems 2 and 4 of [5] we obtain the following.

**Theorem 16.** Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a separable, type-B, C, or D poset of height one and  $\mathfrak{g}$  be the corresponding type-B, C, or D Lie poset algebra, respectively. Then

$$\text{ind } \mathfrak{g} = |E(\mathcal{P})| - |V(\mathcal{P})| + 2.$$

In the following section, we combine and extend Theorems 15 and 16 to obtain a single index formula which applies to all type-B, C, and D Lie poset algebras associated with posets of height one.

### 3 Extended Index Formula

In this section, for the sake of brevity, all results will be stated for type-C Lie poset algebras; considering Theorem 14, though, all results still apply with “type-C” replaced by “type-B” or “type-D”. The main result of this section is Theorem 17 below.

**Theorem 17.** *If  $\mathcal{P}$  is a type-C poset of height one and  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$ , then*

$$\text{ind } \mathfrak{g} = |E(\mathcal{P})| - |V(\mathcal{P})| + 2\eta(\mathcal{P}),$$

where  $\eta(\mathcal{P})$  denotes the number of connected components of  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  containing no odd cycles.

To prove Theorem 17, we make use of an alternative characterization of the index. Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  be an  $n$ -dimensional Lie algebra with ordered basis  $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{g}) = \{E_1, \dots, E_n\}$ , and define

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{g})) = ([E_i, E_j])_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$$

to be the *commutator matrix* associated with  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Now, for any  $\varphi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ , define the matrix

$$\varphi(\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{g}))) = (\varphi([E_i, E_j]))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}.$$

Using the above notation, we have that

$$\text{ind } \mathfrak{g} = \dim \mathfrak{g} - \max_{\varphi \in \mathfrak{g}^*} \text{rank } \varphi(\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{g}))).$$

Now, in proving Theorem 17, the following result of [9] allows us to focus on connected posets.

**Theorem 18** (Theorem 46, [9]). *If  $\mathcal{P}$  is a type-C poset of height one such that  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  consists of connected components  $\{K_1, \dots, K_n\}$ , then*

$$\text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}_{K_i}),$$

where  $\mathcal{P}_{K_i}$  is the unique type-C poset satisfying  $RG(\mathcal{P}_{K_i}) = K_i$ .

**Remark 19.** *In [9], Theorem 18 was stated only for type-C Lie poset algebras associated with posets of height (0, 1), but the proof applies to type-C Lie poset algebras associated with posets of height one in general.*

Considering Theorems 15, 16, and 18, our first step towards proving Theorem 17 is to establish an index formula which applies to type-C Lie poset algebras associated with connected, type-C posets of height (1, 1). As the desired index formula is in terms of  $RG(\mathcal{P})$ , let us first determine restrictions on the extended version of  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  required for  $\mathcal{P}$  to be of height one. In Figure 5, we illustrate all possible subgraphs of  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  consisting of two adjacent edges with at least one dashed edge.




Figure 5: Subgraphs consisting of dashed and non-dashed edge

**Lemma 20.** *If  $\mathcal{P}$  is a type-C poset of height one, then  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  does not contain the following subgraphs with vertex set  $V$ , dashed edge set  $E_D$ , and non-dashed edge set  $E_{\overline{D}}$ :*

- (a)  $V = \{i, j\}$ ,  $E_D = \{\{i, j\}\}$ ,  $E_{\overline{D}} = \{\{j, j\}\}$  with  $i > j$ . See Figure 5 (a).
- (b)  $V = \{i, j\}$ ,  $E_D = \{\{i, j\}\}$ ,  $E_{\overline{D}} = \{\{i, j\}\}$ . See Figure 5 (b).
- (c)  $V = \{i, j, k\}$ ,  $E_D = \{\{i, j\}\}$ ,  $E_{\overline{D}} = \{\{j, k\}\}$  with  $i > j$ . See Figure 5 (c).

(d)  $V = \{i, j, k\}$ ,  $E_D = \{\{i, j\}, \{j, k\}\}$  with  $i > j > k$  or  $i < j < k$ . See Figure 5 (d).

*Proof.* Assume otherwise. For (a), the poset  $\mathcal{P}$  would contain the chain  $-j \prec j \prec i$ . For (b), assume without loss of generality that  $i > j$ . In this case,  $\mathcal{P}$  would contain the chain  $-i \prec j \prec i$ . For (c), the poset would contain the chain  $-k \prec j \prec i$ . Finally, for (d), assume without loss of generality that  $i < j < k$ . In this case,  $\mathcal{P}$  would contain the chain  $i \prec j \prec k$ .  $\square$

**Remark 21.** Note that, as a consequence of Lemma 20, the only subgraphs of  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  for  $\mathcal{P}$  of height one that can occur consisting of two adjacent edges with one dashed edge and one non-dashed are of the form (a) and (c) in Figure 5 with  $i < j$ .

Next, we show how one can relate the index of a connected, type-C Lie poset algebra associated with a poset of height (1, 1) to the index of one associated with a poset of height (0, 1). Set  $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}), \mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})) = \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}))$ , where the elements of  $\mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})$  are ordered as follows:

1. the elements  $D_i$  in increasing order of  $i$  in  $\mathbb{Z}$  followed by
2. the elements  $R_{i,j}$  in increasing lexicographic order of  $(i, j)$  in  $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$  followed by
3. the elements  $E_{-i,i}$  in increasing order of  $i$  in  $\mathbb{Z}$  followed by
4. the elements  $R_{i,j}^\pm$  in increasing lexicographic order of  $(i, j)$  for  $i < j$  in  $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ .

With this ordering, since type-C posets of height one have no non-trivial transitivity relations,  $\varphi(\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})))$  for  $\varphi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$  has the form illustrated in Figure 6.

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -M_\varphi(\mathcal{P})^T \\ M_\varphi(\mathcal{P}) & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Figure 6: Matrix form of  $\varphi(\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})))$ , for  $\mathcal{P}$  a type-C poset of height one

Here,  $M_\varphi(\mathcal{P})$  is the restriction of  $\varphi(\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})))$  to rows  $i > |V(\mathcal{P})|$  and columns  $1 \leq j \leq |V(\mathcal{P})|$ , and  $-M_\varphi(\mathcal{P})^T$  is the restriction of  $\varphi(\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})))$  to rows  $1 \leq i \leq |V(\mathcal{P})|$  and columns  $j > |V(\mathcal{P})|$ . Since  $\text{rank}(M_\varphi(\mathcal{P})) = \text{rank}(M_\varphi(\mathcal{P})^T)$ , to calculate  $\text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  it suffices to determine the maximum possible rank of  $M_\varphi(\mathcal{P})$ , for  $\varphi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ .

Now, since the  $i^{\text{th}}$  basis element of  $\mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is equal to  $D_i$  if  $1 \leq i \leq |V(\mathcal{P})|$  and is of the form  $R_{j,k}$ ,  $E_{-j,j}$ , or  $R_{j,k}^\pm$  if  $i > |V(\mathcal{P})|$ , it follows that for each row of  $M_\varphi(\mathcal{P})$ , there exists a unique element  $x \in \mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})$  of the form  $R_{j,k}$ ,  $E_{-j,j}$  or  $R_{j,k}^\pm$  such that all nonzero entries of the row are multiples of  $\varphi(x)$ . Thus, in determining the maximum possible rank of  $M_\varphi(\mathcal{P})$ , we may assume that  $\varphi(x) = 1$  for all basis elements  $x \in \mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})$ ; that is, taking  $\varphi' \in \mathfrak{g}^*$  satisfying  $\varphi'(x) = 1$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})$  and setting  $M(\mathcal{P}) = M_{\varphi'}(\mathcal{P})$ , we have

$$\text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}) = \dim \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}) - 2 \text{rank}(M(\mathcal{P})). \quad (1)$$

Note that each edge of  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  corresponds to a unique row of  $M(\mathcal{P})$ . Ongoing, it will be helpful to have a generalization of  $M(\mathcal{P})$  which can be associated with arbitrary graphs consisting of dashed edges, non-dashed self-loops, and non-dashed edges. Thus, we extend the definition of  $M(\mathcal{P})$  as follows.

**Definition 22.** Given a graph  $G = (V, E)$ , define  $M(G)$  to be the  $|E| \times |V|$  matrix where for each

- dashed edge  $e = \{i, j\} \in E$  with  $i < j$ , there exists a corresponding row of  $M(G)$ , denoted  $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}(\mathbf{G})$ , of the form  $x_{i,|V|} - x_{j,|V|}$ ;
- non-dashed self-loop  $e = \{i, i\} \in E$ , there exists a corresponding row of  $M(G)$ , denoted  $\mathbf{E}_{-i,i}(\mathbf{G})$ , of the form  $-2x_{i,|V|}$ ;

- non-dashed edge  $e = \{i, j\} \in E$  with  $i \neq j$ , there exists a corresponding row of  $M(G)$ , denoted  $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}^\pm(\mathbf{G})$  or  $\mathbf{R}_{j,i}^\pm(\mathbf{G})$ , of the form  $-x_{i,|V|} - x_{j,|V|}$ .

With this definition, if  $G = RG(\mathcal{P})$ , then (up to rearranging rows)  $M(\mathcal{P}) = M(G)$ .

**Remark 23.** Note that if a graph  $G$  contains only non-dashed edges and no two edges between the same vertices, then there exists a type-C poset  $\mathcal{P}$  of height  $(0, 1)$  such that  $RG(\mathcal{P}) = G$ . To see this, recall that non-dashed edges correspond to relations of the form  $-i \prec j$  and  $-j \prec i$ . For such collections of relations, no nontrivial transitivity relations can arise and antisymmetry is immediate. On the other hand, considering Lemma 20, graphs with both dashed and non-dashed edges may not correspond to type-C posets of height one.

**Proposition 24.** Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a connected, non-separable, type-C poset of height  $(1, 1)$  for which  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  is a tree. Then there exists a connected, type-C poset  $\mathcal{P}'$  of height  $(0, 1)$  such that  $|V(\mathcal{P})| = |V(\mathcal{P}')|$ ,  $|E(\mathcal{P})| = |E(\mathcal{P}')|$ ,  $RG(\mathcal{P}')$  is a tree, and  $\text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}) = \text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}')$ .

*Proof.* Let  $|E_D|$  denote the number of dashed edges in  $RG(\mathcal{P})$ . We define  $\mathcal{P}'$  by constructing  $RG(\mathcal{P}')$  from  $RG(\mathcal{P})$ , removing one dashed edge at a time and adding a new non-dashed one. Let  $G_0 = RG(\mathcal{P})$  and  $N = |V(\mathcal{P})|$ .

**Step 1:** Since  $\mathcal{P}$  is connected, non-separable, and of height  $(1, 1)$ , there must exist a dashed edge  $e_d$  that shares a vertex with a non-dashed edge  $e_{\bar{d}}$ . Considering Lemma 20, since  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  is a tree,  $e_d = \{i, j\}$  with  $i < j$  and  $e_{\bar{d}} = \{j, k\}$ . Form  $G_1$  by removing  $e_d$  from  $G_0$  and adding the non-dashed edge  $\{i, k\}$ . Note that  $\{i, k\}$  is not an edge of  $G_0$ , since otherwise  $G_0$  would contain a cycle defined by the vertices  $i, j, k$ , contradicting our assumption that  $G_0$  is a tree. Moreover, note that  $G_1$  is a tree. To see this, note that if  $G_1$  contains a cycle, say  $\mathcal{C}$ , then by construction  $\mathcal{C}$  must contain the edge  $\{i, k\}$ . There are two cases.

- If  $\mathcal{C}$  also contains the edge  $e_{\bar{d}}$ , then replacing  $\{i, k\}$  and  $e_{\bar{d}} = \{j, k\}$  by  $\{i, j\}$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  results in a cycle contained in  $G_0$ , a contradiction.
- If  $\mathcal{C}$  does not contain the edge  $e_{\bar{d}}$ , then replacing  $\{i, k\}$  by  $e_d$  and  $e_{\bar{d}}$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  results in a cycle of  $G_0$ , a contradiction.

Now, since one can form  $M(G_1)$  from  $M(G_0)$  by replacing

$$\mathbf{R}_{i,j}(\mathbf{G}_0) = x_{i,N} - x_{j,N}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathbf{R}_{i,j}(\mathbf{G}_0) + \mathbf{R}_{j,k}^\pm(\mathbf{G}_0) &= -(x_{i,N} - x_{j,N}) + (-x_{j,N} - x_{k,N}) \\ &= -x_{i,N} - x_{k,N} \\ &= \mathbf{R}_{i,k}^\pm(\mathbf{G}_1), \end{aligned}$$

it follows that  $\text{rank}(M(G_1)) = \text{rank}(M(G_0)) = \text{rank}(M(\mathcal{P}))$ . Note that, considering Remark 23,  $G_1$  may not correspond to the relations graph of a type-C poset of height one.

**Step m:** By construction,  $G_{m-1}$  is a tree with  $|V(\mathcal{P})|$  vertices and  $|E(\mathcal{P})|$  edges. If there are no dashed edges, we are finished. Otherwise, there exists a dashed edge  $e_d = \{i, j\}$  which shares a vertex with a non-dashed edge  $e_{\bar{d}} = \{j, k\}$ . Note that it is not necessarily the case that  $i < j$  because  $G_{m-1}$  may not be the relations graph of a type-C poset of height one. Form  $G_m$  by replacing  $e_d$  in  $G_{m-1}$  by the non-dashed edge  $\{i, k\}$ . Arguing as in Step 1, we find that  $\{i, k\}$  is not an edge of  $G_{m-1}$  and  $G_m$  is a tree. Now, let  $\mathbf{R}(G_{m-1})$  denote the row of  $M(G_{m-1})$  corresponding to the edge  $\{i, j\}$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{R}(G_{m-1}) = \mathbf{R}_{i,j}(G_{m-1})$  if  $i < j$  and  $\mathbf{R}(G_{m-1}) = \mathbf{R}_{j,i}(G_{m-1})$  otherwise. Then we can form  $M(G_m)$  from  $M(G_{m-1})$  by replacing

$$\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{G}_{m-1}) = (1 - 2\delta_{i>j})(x_{i,N} - x_{j,N})$$

of  $M(G_{m-1})$  with

$$\begin{aligned}
(1 - 2\delta_{i < j})\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{G}_{m-1}) + \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}}^{\pm}(\mathbf{G}_{m-1}) &= (1 - 2\delta_{i < j})(1 - 2\delta_{i > j})(x_{i,N} - x_{j,N}) + (-x_{j,N} - x_{k,N}) \\
&= -(x_{i,N} - x_{j,N}) + (-x_{j,N} - x_{k,N}) \\
&= -x_{i,N} - x_{k,N} \\
&= \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{k}}^{\pm}(\mathbf{G}_m).
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that  $\text{rank}(G_{m-1}) = \text{rank}(G_m)$ .

Since in each step a dashed edge is removed and none are added, it follows that  $G_{|E_D|}$  is a tree which contains no dashed edges. Consequently, considering Remark 23,  $G_{|E_D|}$  is the relations graph for some connected, type-C poset  $\mathcal{P}'$  of height  $(0, 1)$ . Moreover, our work above shows that

$$\text{rank}(M(\mathcal{P}')) = \text{rank}(M(G_{|E_D|})) = \text{rank}(M(\mathcal{P}))$$

and

$$\dim \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}') = |E(\mathcal{P}')| + |V(\mathcal{P}')| = |E(\mathcal{P})| + |V(\mathcal{P})| = \dim \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}).$$

Therefore,  $\text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}) = \text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}')$ . □

In order to obtain an analogous result in the case where  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  contains a self loop, we require the following technical lemma.

**Lemma 25.** *If  $1 \leq i_0 \neq i_1 \neq \dots \neq i_n \leq N$  with  $n \geq 1$ , then*

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^{j+1} (-x_{i_j, N} - x_{i_{j+1}, N}) = x_{i_0, N} - (-1)^n x_{i_n, N}.$$

*Proof.* By induction. When  $n = 1$  the result is trivial. Assume that the result holds for  $n - 1 \geq 0$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^{j+1} (-x_{i_j, N} - x_{i_{j+1}, N}) &= (-1)^n (-x_{i_{n-1}, N} - x_{i_n, N}) + \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} (-1)^{j+1} (-x_{i_j, N} - x_{i_{j+1}, N}) \\
&= (-1)^n (-x_{i_{n-1}, N} - x_{i_n, N}) + x_{i_0, N} - (-1)^{n-1} x_{i_{n-1}, N} \\
&= x_{i_0, N} - (-1)^n x_{i_n, N},
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from our inductive hypothesis. Thus, the result follows by induction. □

**Proposition 26.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a connected, non-separable, type-C poset of height  $(1, 1)$  for which  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  contains a self-loop. Then there exists a connected, type-C poset  $\mathcal{P}'$  of height  $(0, 1)$  such that  $|V(\mathcal{P})| = |V(\mathcal{P}')|$ ,  $|E(\mathcal{P})| = |E(\mathcal{P}')|$ ,  $RG(\mathcal{P}')$  contains a self-loop, and  $\text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}) = \text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}')$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $|E_D|$  denote the number of dashed edges in  $RG(\mathcal{P})$ . As in Proposition 24, we define  $\mathcal{P}'$  by constructing  $RG(\mathcal{P}')$  from  $RG(\mathcal{P})$ . Let  $G_0 = RG(\mathcal{P})$ ,  $N = |V(\mathcal{P})|$ , and  $p$  denote a vertex of  $G_0$  which defines a self-loop.

**Step  $i$ :** If  $G_{i-1}$  contains no dashed edges, then we are done. Otherwise, since  $G_{i-1}$  is a connected graph with a self-loop at vertex  $p$ , there must exist a path defined by the sequence of vertices  $p = p_0, p_1, \dots, p_t$  such that  $\{p_{t-1}, p_t\}$  is a dashed edge and  $\{p_{l-1}, p_l\}$  is non-dashed, for  $1 \leq l < t$ . Note that it is not necessarily the case that  $p_{t-1} > p_t$  since  $G_{i-1}$  may not be the relations graph of a type-C poset of height one. Form  $G_i$  by replacing the dashed edge  $\{p_{t-1}, p_t\}$  by a non-dashed edge between the same vertices. Let  $\mathbf{R}(G_{i-1})$  denote the row of  $M(G_{i-1})$  corresponding to the edge  $\{p_{t-1}, p_t\}$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{G}_{i-1}) = \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{p}_t, \mathbf{p}_{t-1}}(\mathbf{G}_{i-1})$  if  $p_t < p_{t-1}$  and  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{G}_{i-1}) = \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{p}_{t-1}, \mathbf{p}_t}(\mathbf{G}_{i-1})$  otherwise. Then we can form  $M(G_i)$  from  $M(G_{i-1})$  by replacing

$$\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{G}_{i-1}) = (1 - 2\delta_{p_t > p_{t-1}})(x_{p_t, N} - x_{p_{t-1}, N})$$

of  $M(G_{i-1})$  with

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1 - 2\delta_{p_t < p_{t-1}})\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{G}_{i-1}) + (-1)^{t-1}\mathbf{E}_{-\mathbf{p}_0, \mathbf{p}_0}(\mathbf{G}_{i-1}) + 2\sum_{i=2}^t (-1)^i \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{p}_{t-i}, \mathbf{p}_{t-i+1}}^\pm(\mathbf{G}_{i-1}) \\
&= (x_{p_{t-1}, N} - x_{p_t, N}) + (-1)^{t-1}(-2x_{p_0, N}) + 2\sum_{i=2}^t (-1)^i (-x_{p_{t-i}, N} - x_{p_{t-i+1}, N}) \\
&= (x_{p_{t-1}, N} - x_{p_t, N}) + (-1)^{t-1}(-2x_{p_0, N}) + 2\sum_{j=0}^{t-2} (-1)^{j+t} (-x_{p_j, N} - x_{p_{j+1}, N}) \\
&= (x_{p_{t-1}, N} - x_{p_t, N}) + (-1)^{t-1}(-2x_{p_0, N}) + 2(-1)^{t-1} \sum_{j=0}^{t-2} (-1)^{j+1} (-x_{p_j, N} - x_{p_{j+1}, N}) \\
&= (x_{p_{t-1}, N} - x_{p_t, N}) + (-1)^{t-1}(-2x_{p_0, N}) + 2(-1)^{t-1}(x_{p_0, N} - (-1)^{t-1}x_{p_{t-1}, N}) \\
&= x_{p_{t-1}, N} - x_{p_t, N} + 2(-1)^t x_{p_0, N} + 2(-1)^{t-1}x_{p_0, N} - 2x_{p_{t-1}, N} \\
&= -x_{p_{t-1}, N} - x_{p_t, N} \\
&= \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{p}_t, \mathbf{p}_{t-1}}^\pm(\mathbf{G}_i),
\end{aligned}$$

where for the fourth equality we applied Lemma 25. It follows that  $\text{rank}(M(G_{i-1})) = \text{rank}(M(G_i))$ .

After Step  $|E_D|$ , each dashed edge of  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  has been replaced by a non-dashed edge. Note that, considering Lemma 20, no pair of vertices in  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  can be connected by both a dashed and a non-dashed edge. Consequently, considering Remark 23,  $G_{|E_D|}$  corresponds to  $RG(\mathcal{P}')$  for some height  $-(0, 1)$  poset  $\mathcal{P}'$  with a self-loop at vertex  $p$ . Moreover, our work above shows that

$$\text{rank}(RG(\mathcal{P}')) = \text{rank}(M(G_{|E_D|})) = \text{rank}(M(G_0)) = \text{rank}(RG(\mathcal{P}))$$

and

$$\dim \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}') = |E(\mathcal{P}')| + |V(\mathcal{P}')| = |E(\mathcal{P})| + |V(\mathcal{P})| = \dim \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}).$$

Therefore,  $\text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}) = \text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}')$ . □

To handle the cases where  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  contains an even or an odd cycle (consisting of more than one edge), we require the following two lemmas.

**Lemma 27.** *Let  $1 \leq i_0 \neq i_1 \neq \dots \neq i_n \leq N$ ,  $L_j = x_{i_j, N} - x_{i_{j+1}, N}$  or  $-x_{i_j, N} - x_{i_{j+1}, N}$  for  $0 \leq j < n$ , and  $L_n = x_{i_n, N} - x_{i_0, N}$  or  $-x_{i_n, N} - x_{i_0, N}$ . If*

$$|\{L_k \mid L_k = -x_{i_j, N} - x_{i_{j+1}, N} \text{ or } -x_{i_n, N} - x_{i_0, N}\}|$$

*is odd, then there exist constants  $c_j \in \{-1, 1\}$  such that  $\sum_{j=0}^n c_j L_j = -2x_{i_0, N}$ .*

*Proof.* By induction on  $n$ . If  $n = 1$ , the result is trivial. Assume the result holds for  $n - 1 \geq 0$ . There are three cases.

**Case 1:**  $L_j = -x_{i_j, N} - x_{i_{j+1}, N}$  for  $0 \leq j \leq n - 1$  and  $L_n = -x_{i_n, N} - x_{i_0, N}$ . In this case, note that  $n$  must be even. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
L_n + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^j L_j &= (-x_{i_n, N} - x_{i_0, N}) + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^j (-x_{i_j, N} - x_{i_{j+1}, N}) \\
&= (-x_{i_n, N} - x_{i_0, N}) - \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^{j+1} (-x_{i_j, N} - x_{i_{j+1}, N}) \\
&= (-x_{i_n, N} - x_{i_0, N}) - (x_{i_0, N} - (-1)^n x_{i_n, N}) \\
&= -2x_{i_0, N},
\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality follows from Lemma 25.

**Case 2:** There exists  $0 \leq k < n - 1$  such that  $L_k = x_{i_k, N} - x_{i_{k+1}, N}$  and  $L_{k+1} = -x_{i_{k+1}, N} - x_{i_{k+2}, N}$ , or  $L_k = -x_{i_k, N} - x_{i_{k+1}, N}$  and  $L_{k+1} = x_{i_{k+1}, N} - x_{i_{k+2}, N}$ . Assume that  $L_k = x_{i_k, N} - x_{i_{k+1}, N}$  and  $L_{k+1} = -x_{i_{k+1}, N} - x_{i_{k+2}, N}$ ; the other case follows via similar reasoning (replacing subtraction by addition). Note that, in this case,  $L_{k+1} + (-1)L_k = -x_{i_k, N} - x_{i_{k+2}, N}$ . Consequently, applying the induction hypothesis to the sequence of vectors

$$L'_j = \begin{cases} L_j, & 0 \leq j < k \\ L_{k+1} + (-1)L_k, & j = k \\ L_{j+1}, & k < j \leq n - 1 \end{cases},$$

for  $0 \leq j \leq n - 1$ , the result follows.

**Case 3:**  $L_{n-1} = x_{i_{n-1}, N} - x_{i_n, N}$  and  $L_n = -x_{i_n, N} - x_{i_0, N}$  or  $L_{n-1} = -x_{i_{n-1}, N} - x_{i_n, N}$  and  $L_n = x_{i_n, N} - x_{i_0, N}$ . Assume that  $L_{n-1} = x_{i_{n-1}, N} - x_{i_n, N}$  and  $L_n = -x_{i_n, N} - x_{i_0, N}$ ; the other case follows via similar reasoning (replacing subtraction by addition). Note that in this case  $L_n + (-1)L_{n-1} = -x_{i_{n-1}, N} - x_{i_0, N}$ . Consequently, applying the induction hypothesis to the sequence of vectors

$$L'_j = \begin{cases} L_j, & 0 \leq j < n - 1 \\ L_n + (-1)L_{n-1}, & j = n - 1 \end{cases},$$

for  $0 \leq j \leq n - 1$ , the result follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 28.** Let  $1 \leq i_0 \neq i_1 \neq \dots \neq i_n \leq N$ ,  $L_j = x_{i_j, N} - x_{i_{j+1}, N}$  or  $-x_{i_j, N} - x_{i_{j+1}, N}$  for  $0 \leq j < n$ , and  $L_n = x_{i_n, N} - x_{i_0, N}$  or  $-x_{i_n, N} - x_{i_0, N}$ . If

$$|\{L_k \mid L_k = -x_{i_j, N} - x_{i_{j+1}, N} \text{ or } -x_{i_n, N} - x_{i_0, N}\}|$$

is even, then there exists constants  $c_j \in \{-1, 1\}$  such that  $\sum_{j=0}^n c_j L_j = 0$ .

*Proof.* By induction on  $n$ . If  $n = 1$ , the result is trivial. Assume the result holds for  $n - 1 \geq 0$ . There are four cases.

**Case 1:**  $L_j = -x_{i_j, N} - x_{i_{j+1}, N}$  for  $0 \leq j \leq n - 1$  and  $L_n = -x_{i_n, N} - x_{i_0, N}$ . In this case, note that  $n$  is odd. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} -L_n - \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^{j+1} L_j &= -(-x_{i_n, N} - x_{i_0, N}) - \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^{j+1} (-x_{i_j, N} - x_{i_{j+1}, N}) \\ &= (x_{i_n, N} + x_{i_0, N}) - (x_{i_0, N} - (-1)^n x_{i_n, N}) \\ &= x_{i_n, N} + x_{i_0, N} - (x_{i_0, N} + x_{i_n, N}) \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from Lemma 25.

**Case 2:**  $L_j = x_{i_j, N} - x_{i_{j+1}, N}$  for  $0 \leq j \leq n - 1$  and  $L_n = x_{i_n, N} - x_{i_0, N}$ . In this case, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} L_n + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} L_j &= (x_{i_n, N} - x_{i_0, N}) + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (x_{i_j, N} - x_{i_{j+1}, N}) \\ &= (x_{i_n, N} - x_{i_0, N}) + (x_{i_0, N} - x_{i_n, N}) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

**Case 3:** There exists  $0 \leq k < n - 1$  such that  $L_k = x_{i_k, N} - x_{i_{k+1}, N}$  and  $L_{k+1} = -x_{i_{k+1}, N} - x_{i_{k+2}, N}$ , or  $L_k = -x_{i_k, N} - x_{i_{k+1}, N}$  and  $L_{k+1} = x_{i_{k+1}, N} - x_{i_{k+2}, N}$ . Assume that  $L_k = x_{i_k, N} - x_{i_{k+1}, N}$  and  $L_{k+1} = -x_{i_{k+1}, N} - x_{i_{k+2}, N}$ ; the other case follows via similar reasoning (replacing subtraction by addition). Note that, in this case,  $L_{k+1} + (-1)L_k = -x_{i_k, N} - x_{i_{k+2}, N}$ . Consequently, applying the induction hypothesis to the sequence of vectors

$$L'_j = \begin{cases} L_j, & 0 \leq j < k \\ L_{k+1} + (-1)L_k, & j = k \\ L_{j+1}, & k < j \leq n - 1 \end{cases}$$

for  $0 \leq j \leq n - 1$ , the result follows.

**Case 4:**  $L_{n-1} = x_{i_{n-1}, N} - x_{i_n, N}$  and  $L_n = -x_{i_n, N} - x_{i_0, N}$  or  $L_{n-1} = -x_{i_{n-1}, N} - x_{i_n, N}$  and  $L_n = x_{i_n, N} - x_{i_0, N}$ . Assume that  $L_{n-1} = x_{i_{n-1}, N} - x_{i_n, N}$  and  $L_n = -x_{i_n, N} - x_{i_0, N}$ ; the other case follows via similar reasoning (replacing addition by subtraction). Note that, in this case,  $L_n + (-1)L_{n-1} = -x_{i_{n-1}, N} - x_{i_0, N}$ . Consequently, applying the induction hypothesis to the sequence of vectors

$$L'_j = \begin{cases} L_j, & 0 \leq j < n - 1 \\ L_n + (-1)L_{n-1}, & j = n - 1 \end{cases}$$

for  $0 \leq j \leq n - 1$ , the result follows.  $\square$

**Proposition 29.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a connected, non-separable, type-C poset of height  $(1, 1)$  for which  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  contains an odd cycle and no self-loops. Then there exists a connected, type-C poset  $\mathcal{P}'$  of height  $(0, 1)$  such that  $|V(\mathcal{P})| = |V(\mathcal{P}')|$ ,  $|E(\mathcal{P})| = |E(\mathcal{P}')|$ ,  $RG(\mathcal{P}')$  contains a self-loop, and  $\text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}) = \text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}')$ .*

*Proof.* Set  $N = |V(\mathcal{P})|$  and  $G = RG(\mathcal{P})$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}$  denote an odd cycle of  $G$  and assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is defined by the sequence of vertices  $p_0, p_1, \dots, p_n, p_0$ . Set

$$\begin{aligned} L_j &= \begin{cases} \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{p}_j, \mathbf{p}_{j+1}}^\pm(\mathbf{G}), & \{p_j, p_{j+1}\} \text{ is non-dashed in } G \\ \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{p}_j, \mathbf{p}_{j+1}}(\mathbf{G}), & \{p_j, p_{j+1}\} \text{ is dashed in } G \text{ and } p_j < p_{j+1} \\ -\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{p}_{j+1}, \mathbf{p}_j}(\mathbf{G}), & \{p_j, p_{j+1}\} \text{ is dashed in } G \text{ and } p_{j+1} < p_j \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} -x_{p_j, N} - x_{p_{j+1}, N}, & \{p_j, p_{j+1}\} \text{ is non-dashed in } G \\ x_{p_j, N} - x_{p_{j+1}, N}, & \{p_j, p_{j+1}\} \text{ is dashed in } G \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

for  $0 \leq j \leq n - 1$  and

$$\begin{aligned} L_n &= \begin{cases} \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{p}_n, \mathbf{p}_0}^\pm(\mathbf{G}), & \{p_n, p_0\} \text{ is non-dashed in } G \\ \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{p}_n, \mathbf{p}_0}(\mathbf{G}), & \{p_n, p_0\} \text{ is dashed in } G \text{ and } p_n < p_0 \\ -\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{p}_0, \mathbf{p}_n}(\mathbf{G}), & \{p_n, p_0\} \text{ is dashed in } G \text{ and } p_0 < p_n \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} -x_{p_n, N} - x_{p_0, N}, & \{p_0, p_n\} \text{ is non-dashed in } G \\ x_{p_n, N} - x_{p_0, N}, & \{p_0, p_n\} \text{ is dashed in } G. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Note that by Lemma 20 (d), if  $\{p_s, p_r\}$  and  $\{p_r, p_t\}$  are adjacent dashed edges of  $\mathcal{C}$ , then either  $p_r < p_s, p_t$  or  $p_r > p_s, p_t$ . It then follows that  $\mathcal{C}$  must contain at least one non-dashed edge since  $\mathcal{C}$  is defined by an odd number of vertices. Further, by Lemma 20 (c), if  $\{p_s, p_r\}$  is a dashed edge of  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\{p_r, p_t\}$  is a non-dashed edge of  $\mathcal{C}$ , then  $p_r < p_s$ . Consequently, each path in  $\mathcal{C}$  that consists entirely of dashed edges and is maximal under containment contains an odd number of vertices, i.e., an even number of edges. Since  $\mathcal{C}$  is defined

by an odd number of edges, it follows that  $|\{L_j \mid L_j = -x_{p_j,N} - x_{p_{j+1},N} \text{ or } -x_{p_n,N} - x_{p_0,N}\}|$  is odd, and Lemma 27 implies that there exist constants  $c_j \in \{-1, 1\}$  such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^n c_j L_j = -2x_{p_0,N}.$$

Denote by  $G'$  the graph formed from  $G$  by removing the dashed edge  $\{p_0, p_n\}$  and adding a self-loop at vertex  $p_0$ . Let  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{G})$  denote the row of  $M(G)$  corresponding to  $\{p_0, p_n\}$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{G}) = \mathbf{R}_{p_0, p_n}(\mathbf{G})$  if  $p_0 < p_n$  and  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{G}) = \mathbf{R}_{p_n, p_0}(\mathbf{G})$  otherwise. Since one can form  $M(G')$  from  $M(G)$  by replacing  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{G})$  with

$$\sum_{j=0}^n c_j L_j = -2x_{p_0,N} = \mathbf{E}_{-p_0, p_0}(\mathbf{G}'),$$

it follows that  $\text{rank}(M(G')) = \text{rank}(M(G))$ . Now, applying a recursive argument similar to that in the proof of Proposition 26, the result follows.  $\square$

**Proposition 30.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a connected, non-separable, type-C poset of height  $(1, 1)$  for which  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  contains an even cycle and no odd cycles. Then there exists a connected, type-C poset  $\mathcal{P}'$  of height  $(0, 1)$  such that  $RG(\mathcal{P}')$  is a tree,  $|V(\mathcal{P})| = |V(\mathcal{P}')|$ , and  $\text{ind } \mathbf{g}_C(\mathcal{P}) = \text{ind } \mathbf{g}_C(\mathcal{P}') + |E(\mathcal{P})| - |V(\mathcal{P})| + 1$ .*

*Proof.* Set  $G = RG(\mathcal{P})$  and  $N = |V(\mathcal{P})|$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}$  denote an even cycle in  $G$  defined by the sequence of vertices  $p_0, p_1, \dots, p_n, p_0$ . Since  $\mathcal{P}$  is non-separable, there must exist a non-dashed edge  $e$  in  $G$ . Assume that  $e \neq \{p_0, p_n\}$ . Note that this does not imply that  $\{p_0, p_n\}$  is a dashed edge. Let  $G'$  denote the graph formed from  $G$  by removing the edge  $\{p_0, p_n\}$ . We claim that  $\text{rank}(M(G)) = \text{rank}(M(G'))$ . To see this, set

$$\begin{aligned} L_j &= \begin{cases} \mathbf{R}_{p_j, p_{j+1}}^{\pm}(\mathbf{G}), & \{p_j, p_{j+1}\} \text{ is non-dashed in } G \\ \mathbf{R}_{p_j, p_{j+1}}(\mathbf{G}), & \{p_j, p_{j+1}\} \text{ is dashed in } G \text{ and } p_j < p_{j+1} \\ -\mathbf{R}_{p_{j+1}, p_j}(\mathbf{G}), & \{p_j, p_{j+1}\} \text{ is dashed in } G \text{ and } p_{j+1} < p_j \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} -x_{p_j, N} - x_{p_{j+1}, N}, & \{p_j, p_{j+1}\} \text{ is non-dashed in } G; \\ x_{p_j, N} - x_{p_{j+1}, N}, & \{p_j, p_{j+1}\} \text{ is dashed in } G, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

for  $0 \leq j \leq n-1$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} L_n &= \begin{cases} \mathbf{R}_{p_n, p_0}^{\pm}(\mathbf{G}), & \{p_n, p_0\} \text{ is non-dashed in } G \\ \mathbf{R}_{p_n, p_0}(\mathbf{G}), & \{p_n, p_0\} \text{ is dashed in } G \text{ and } p_n < p_0 \\ -\mathbf{R}_{p_0, p_n}(\mathbf{G}), & \{p_n, p_0\} \text{ is dashed in } G \text{ and } p_0 < p_n \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} -x_{p_n, N} - x_{p_0, N}, & \{p_0, p_n\} \text{ is non-dashed in } G; \\ x_{p_n, N} - x_{p_0, N}, & \{p_0, p_n\} \text{ is dashed in } G; \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Arguing as in the proof of Proposition 29, we invoke Lemma 20 (c) and (d) to find that  $\mathcal{C}$  must contain an even number of non-dashed edges, i.e.,  $|\{L_j \mid L_j = -x_{p_j, N} - x_{p_{j+1}, N} \text{ or } -x_{p_n, N} - x_{p_0, N}\}|$  is even. Thus, applying Lemma 28, there exist constants  $c_j \in \{-1, 1\}$  such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^n c_j L_j = 0.$$

Let  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{G})$  denote the row of  $M(G)$  corresponding to  $\{p_0, p_n\}$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{G}) = \mathbf{R}_{p_0, p_n}(\mathbf{G})$  if  $p_0 < p_n$  and  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{G}) = \mathbf{R}_{p_n, p_0}(\mathbf{G})$  otherwise. Since one can form  $M(G')$  with an additional zero row from  $M(G)$  by replacing  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{G})$  with

$$\sum_{j=0}^n c_j L_j = 0,$$

it follows that  $\text{rank}(M(G')) = \text{rank}(M(G))$ , as claimed.

Now, since  $G$  is a finite graph with only even cycles, it is possible to form a tree  $G''$  from  $G$  by recursively removing edges from even cycles. Moreover, considering our construction of  $G'$  from  $G$  given above, one can do so in such a way that  $G''$  contains a non-dashed edge. Since  $G$  has  $|E(\mathcal{P})|$  edges and  $|V(\mathcal{P})|$  vertices, it follows that one must remove  $|E(\mathcal{P})| - |V(\mathcal{P})| + 1$  edges to form  $G''$ . Considering our work above, it follows that  $\text{rank}(M(\mathcal{P})) = \text{rank}(M(G''))$ . Now, applying an argument similar to that of the proof of Proposition 24, we find that there exists a connected, type-C poset  $\mathcal{P}'$  of height  $(0, 1)$  such that  $RG(\mathcal{P}')$  is a tree,  $|V(\mathcal{P}')| = |V(G'')| = |V(\mathcal{P})|$ ,  $|E(\mathcal{P}')| = |E(G'')|$ , and  $\text{rank}(M(\mathcal{P}')) = \text{rank}(M(G'')) = \text{rank}(M(\mathcal{P}))$ . Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}) &= |E(\mathcal{P})| + |V(\mathcal{P})| - 2 \text{rank}(M(\mathcal{P})) \\ &= |E(\mathcal{P})| + |V(\mathcal{P})| - 2 \text{rank}(M(\mathcal{P}')) \\ &= [|E(\mathcal{P}')| + |V(\mathcal{P}')| - 2 \text{rank}(M(\mathcal{P}'))] + |E(\mathcal{P})| - |V(\mathcal{P})| + 1 \\ &= \text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}') + |E(\mathcal{P})| - |V(\mathcal{P})| + 1. \end{aligned}$$

The result follows. □

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 17. Note that, considering Theorem 18, it suffices to consider the case where  $\mathcal{P}$  is connected.

**Theorem 31.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a connected, type-C poset of height one and  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$ . Then*

$$\text{ind } \mathfrak{g} = |E(\mathcal{P})| - |V(\mathcal{P})| + 2\delta_o,$$

where  $\delta_o$  is the indicator function for  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  containing no odd cycles.

*Proof.* There are five cases.

**Case 1:**  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  contains no dashed edge. In this case, the result follows from Theorem 15.

**Case 2:**  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  contains no non-dashed edge, i.e.,  $\mathcal{P}$  is separable. In this case, applying Theorem 16, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}) &= |E(\mathcal{P})| - |V(\mathcal{P})| + 2 \\ &= |E(\mathcal{P})| - |V(\mathcal{P})| + 2\delta_0, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  cannot contain an odd cycle by Lemma 20 (d).

**Case 3:**  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  contains an odd cycle as well as both dashed and non-dashed edges. In this case, applying either Proposition 26 or Proposition 29, it follows that there exists a poset  $\mathcal{P}'$  of height  $(0, 1)$  for which  $RG(\mathcal{P}')$  contains an odd cycle,  $|E(\mathcal{P})| = |E(\mathcal{P}')|$ ,  $|V(\mathcal{P})| = |V(\mathcal{P}')|$ , and  $\text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}) = \text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}')$ . Now, by Theorem 15, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}) &= \text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}') \\ &= |E(\mathcal{P}')| - |V(\mathcal{P}')| \\ &= |E(\mathcal{P})| - |V(\mathcal{P})| \\ &= |E(\mathcal{P})| - |V(\mathcal{P})| + 2\delta_o, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  contains an odd cycle, i.e.,  $\delta_o = 0$ .

**Case 4:**  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  is a tree that contains both dashed and non-dashed edges. In this case, applying Proposition 24 it follows that there exists a poset  $\mathcal{P}'$  of height  $(0, 1)$  for which  $RG(\mathcal{P}')$  is a tree,  $|E(\mathcal{P})| = |E(\mathcal{P}')|$ ,

$|V(\mathcal{P})| = |V(\mathcal{P}')|$ , and  $\text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}) = \text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}')$ . Now, by Theorem 15, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}) &= \text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}') \\ &= |E(\mathcal{P}')| - |V(\mathcal{P}')| + 2 \\ &= |E(\mathcal{P})| - |V(\mathcal{P})| + 2 \\ &= |E(\mathcal{P})| - |V(\mathcal{P})| + 2\delta_o, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  contains no odd cycles, i.e.,  $\delta_o = 1$ .

**Case 5:**  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  contains an even cycle, no odd cycles, and both dashed and non-dashed edges. In this case, applying Proposition 30 it follows that there exists a poset  $\mathcal{P}'$  of height  $(0, 1)$  for which  $RG(\mathcal{P}')$  is a tree,  $|V(\mathcal{P})| = |V(\mathcal{P}')|$ , and  $\text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}) = \text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}') + |E(\mathcal{P})| - |V(\mathcal{P})| + 1$ . Note that since  $RG(\mathcal{P}')$  is a tree with  $|V(\mathcal{P}')|$  vertices, it follows that  $|E(\mathcal{P}')| = |V(\mathcal{P}')| - 1$ . Now, by Theorem 15, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}) &= \text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}') + |E(\mathcal{P})| - |V(\mathcal{P})| + 1 \\ &= |E(\mathcal{P}')| - |V(\mathcal{P}')| + 2 + |E(\mathcal{P})| - |V(\mathcal{P})| + 1 \\ &= |V(\mathcal{P}')| - 1 - |V(\mathcal{P}')| + 2 + |E(\mathcal{P})| - |V(\mathcal{P})| + 1 \\ &= |E(\mathcal{P})| - |V(\mathcal{P})| + 2 \\ &= |E(\mathcal{P})| - |V(\mathcal{P})| + 2\delta_o, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  contains no odd cycles, i.e.,  $\delta_o = 1$ . □

As noted above, combining Theorems 18 and 31 establishes Theorem 17. Using Theorem 17, the characterization of Frobenius, type-C Lie poset algebras provided by Theorem 49 in [9] can be extended mutatis mutandis.

**Theorem 32.** *If  $\mathcal{P}$  is a type-C poset of height one, then  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is Frobenius if and only if each connected component of  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  contains a single cycle which consists of an odd number of vertices.*

In the next section, we use Theorem 17 to help characterize type-C posets of height one for which  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is contact.

## 4 Contact Posets

In this section, we characterize those type-B, C, and D posets of height one which correspond to contact Lie poset algebras. Ongoing, we refer to such posets as “contact posets”. As in Section 3, for the sake of brevity, all results will concern type-C Lie poset algebras; considering Theorem 14, though, all results still apply with “type-C” replaced by “type-B” or “type-D”. The main result of this section is Theorem 33 below.

**Theorem 33.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a type-C poset of height one. Then  $\mathcal{P}$  is contact if and only if*

- *exactly one connected component of  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  is a tree, and*
- *all remaining connected components contain a single cycle which consists of an odd number of vertices.*

In order to prove Theorem 33, we make use of an alternative characterization of contact Lie algebras. Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  be a Lie algebra with ordered basis  $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{g}) = \{E_1, \dots, E_n\}$ . Recall that  $\mathfrak{g}$  is contact only if it is odd-dimensional, so assume  $\dim \mathfrak{g} = 2k + 1$ . Let  $[I] = [E_1 \dots E_{2k+1}]^t$  and define

$$\widehat{C}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{g})) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & [I]^t \\ -[I] & C(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{g})) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Take  $\varphi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ . If  $\{E_1^*, \dots, E_{2k+1}^*\}$  is the “dual basis” associated to  $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{g})$ , i.e.,  $E_i^*(E_j) = \delta_{i=j}$  for  $1 \leq i, j \leq 2k+1$ , then  $\varphi$  can be written as a linear combination  $\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^{2k+1} a_i E_i^*$ . In vector notation,  $[\varphi] = [a_1, \dots, a_{2k+1}]^t$ . Applying  $\varphi$  to each entry of  $\widehat{C}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{g}))$  yields the  $(2k+2)$ -dimensional skew-symmetric matrix

$$\varphi \left( \widehat{C}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{g})) \right) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & [\varphi]^t \\ -[\varphi] & \varphi(C(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{g}))) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Straightforward computations yield the following convenient characterization of contact Lie algebras.

**Theorem 34** (Salgado [25]). *Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  be an  $n$ -dimensional Lie algebra with basis  $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{g})$  and  $\varphi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ . If  $n$  is odd, then  $\mathfrak{g}$  is contact with contact form  $\varphi$  if and only if  $\det \varphi \left( \widehat{C}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{g})) \right) \neq 0$ .*

Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a type-C poset and  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$ . Ongoing, we will want to refer to certain rows of  $\varphi(\widehat{C}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})))$ . Since throughout  $\varphi$  will be clear from the context, it is omitted from the notation. We denote the first row by  $\mathbf{I}(\mathcal{P})$ . Note that the remaining rows correspond to rows of  $\varphi(C(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{g})))$  which are indexed by elements of  $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{g})$ . Consequently, we denote the row of  $\varphi(\widehat{C}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})))$  corresponding to the basis element

- $D_i \in \mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})$  by  $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathcal{P})$ ,
- $E_{-i,i} \in \mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})$  by  $\widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{-i,i}(\mathcal{P})$ ,
- $R_{i,j}^\pm \in \mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})$  by  $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{i,j}^\pm(\mathcal{P})$ , and
- $R_{i,j} \in \mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})$  by  $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{i,j}(\mathcal{P})$ .

**Remark 35.** *Note that if  $\mathcal{P}$  is a height-one type-C poset, then for  $b \in \mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})$  of the form  $R_{i,j}^\pm$ ,  $R_{i,j}$ , or  $E_{-i,i}$ , the entries of  $\widehat{\mathbf{b}}(\mathcal{P})$  are all multiples of  $\varphi(b)$ . Consequently, if  $\varphi$  is a contact form, then  $\varphi(b) \neq 0$  for all  $b \in \mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})$  of the form  $R_{i,j}^\pm$ ,  $R_{i,j}$ , and  $E_{-i,i}$ .*

With the notation set, we proceed toward the proof of Theorem 33. In Propositions 36, 40, 41, 42, 43, and 44 below, we show that if  $\mathcal{P}$  is a connected, contact, type-C poset of height one, then  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  cannot contain a cycle.

**Proposition 36.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a connected, type-C poset of height one. If  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  contains either*

- (a) *a self-loop and no other cycles or*
- (b) *a single cycle that consists of an odd number of vertices,*

*then  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is not contact.*

*Proof.* Applying Theorem 17,  $\text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}) = 0 \neq 1$ . Since an algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  is contact only if  $\text{ind } \mathfrak{g} = 1$ , the result follows.  $\square$

For the cases when  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  contains an even cycle or multiple odd cycles we require the following lemmas.

**Lemma 37.** *Let  $n \geq 1$  and  $1 < i_0 \neq i_1 \neq \dots \neq i_n \leq N$ . Define*

$$L_0 = x_{1,N} + x_{i_0,N} + x_{i_1,N} \text{ or } x_{1,N} + x_{i_0,N} - x_{i_1,N},$$

$$L_j = x_{1,N} + x_{i_j,N} + x_{i_{j+1},N}, \quad x_{1,N} + x_{i_j,N} - x_{i_{j+1},N}, \quad \text{or } x_{1,N} - x_{i_j,N} + x_{i_{j+1},N}$$

*for  $1 \leq j \leq n-2$ , and*

$$L_{n-1} = x_{1,N} + x_{i_{n-1},N} + x_{i_n,N} \text{ or } x_{1,N} - x_{i_{n-1},N} + x_{i_n,N}.$$

*Suppose that  $L_j = v_{1,N} + v_{i_j,N} - v_{i_{j+1},N}$  if and only if  $L_{j+1} = v_{1,N} - v_{i_{j+1},N} + v_{i_{j+2},N}$  for  $0 \leq j < n-1$ . Then there exist constants  $c_j \in \{-1, 1\}$  for  $0 \leq j < n$  such that*

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} c_j L_j = \begin{cases} x_{1,N} + x_{i_0,N} + x_{i_n,N}, & n \text{ is odd} \\ x_{i_0,N} - x_{i_n,N}, & n \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* By induction on  $n$ . The cases  $n = 1$  or  $n = 2$  can be checked directly. Assume the result holds for  $n - 1 \geq 2$ . There are three cases.

**Case 1:**  $L_j = x_{1,N} + x_{i_j,N} + x_{i_{j+1},N}$  for  $0 \leq j < n$ . In this case,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^j L_j &= (-1)^{n-1} L_{n-1} + \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} (-1)^j L_j \\ &= (-1)^{n-1} (x_{1,N} + x_{i_{n-1},N} + x_{i_n,N}) + \begin{cases} x_{1,N} + x_{i_0,N} + x_{i_{n-1},N}, & n-1 \text{ is odd} \\ x_{i_0,N} - x_{i_{n-1},N}, & n-1 \text{ is even} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} -(x_{1,N} + x_{i_{n-1},N} + x_{i_n,N}) + x_{1,N} + x_{i_0,N} + x_{i_{n-1},N}, & n-1 \text{ is odd} \\ (x_{1,N} + x_{i_{n-1},N} + x_{i_n,N}) + x_{i_0,N} - x_{i_{n-1},N}, & n-1 \text{ is even} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} x_{i_0,N} - x_{i_n,N}, & n \text{ is even} \\ x_{1,N} + x_{i_0,N} + x_{i_n,N}, & n \text{ is odd,} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from our induction hypothesis. So, taking  $c_j = (-1)^j$  yields the result.

**Case 2:**  $L_j = x_{1,N} + (-1)^j x_{i_j,N} + (-1)^{j+1} x_{i_{j+1},N}$  for  $0 \leq j < n$ . Note that, in this case,  $n$  must be even, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^j L_j &= \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{n-2}{2}} (L_{2j} - L_{2j+1}) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{n-2}{2}} [(x_{1,N} + x_{i_{2j},N} - x_{i_{2j+1},N}) - (x_{1,N} - x_{i_{2j+1},N} + x_{i_{2j+2},N})] \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{n-2}{2}} (x_{i_{2j},N} - x_{i_{2j+2},N}) \\ &= x_{i_0,N} - x_{i_n,N}. \end{aligned}$$

So, as in Case 1, taking  $c_j = (-1)^j$  yields the result.

**Case 3:** There exists  $k$  such that  $0 \leq k < n - 2$  and either

$$L_k = x_{1,N} + x_{i_k,N} + x_{i_{k+1},N}, \quad L_{k+1} = x_{1,N} + x_{i_{k+1},N} - x_{i_{k+2},N}, \quad \text{and} \quad L_{k+2} = x_{1,N} - x_{i_{k+2},N} + x_{i_{k+3},N}$$

or

$$L_k = x_{1,N} + x_{i_k,N} - x_{i_{k+1},N}, \quad L_{k+1} = x_{1,N} - x_{i_{k+1},N} + x_{i_{k+2},N}, \quad \text{and} \quad L_{k+2} = x_{1,N} + x_{i_{k+2},N} + x_{i_{k+3},N}.$$

Without loss of generality, assume that

$$L_k = x_{1,N} + x_{i_0,N} + x_{i_1,N}, \quad L_{k+1} = x_{1,N} + x_{i_1,N} - x_{i_2,N}, \quad \text{and} \quad L_{k+2} = x_{1,N} - x_{i_2,N} + x_{i_3,N}.$$

For  $0 \leq j \leq n - 3$ , define

$$\begin{aligned} L'_j &= \begin{cases} L_k - L_{k+1} + L_{k+2}, & j = 0 \\ L_{j+2}, & 0 < j < n - 2 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} x_{1,N} + x_{i_0,N} + x_{i_3,N}, & j = 0 \\ L_{j+2}, & 0 < j < n - 2. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Note that our induction hypothesis applies to the  $L'_j$  for  $0 \leq j \leq n-3$ . Thus, there exist constants  $c'_j \in \{-1, 1\}$  for  $0 \leq j \leq n-3$  such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n-3} c'_j L'_j = \begin{cases} x_{1,N} + x_{i_0,N} + x_{i_n,N}, & n-2 \text{ is odd} \\ x_{i_0,N} - x_{i_n,N}, & n-2 \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

Now, setting

$$c_j = \begin{cases} c'_0, & j = 0, 2 \\ -c'_0, & j = 1 \\ c'_{j-2}, & 2 < j \leq n \end{cases}$$

for  $0 \leq j \leq n$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} c_j L_j &= c_0 L_0 + c_1 L_1 + c_2 L_2 + \sum_{j=3}^{n-1} c_j L_j \\ &= c'_0 L_0 - c'_0 L_1 + c'_0 L_2 + \sum_{j=3}^{n-1} c_j L_j \\ &= c'_0 (L_0 - L_1 + L_2) + \sum_{j=3}^{n-1} c_j L_j \\ &= c'_0 L'_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{n-3} c'_j L'_j \\ &= \begin{cases} x_{1,N} + x_{i_0,N} + x_{i_n,N}, & n-2 \text{ is odd} \\ x_{i_0,N} - x_{i_n,N}, & n-2 \text{ is even} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} x_{1,N} + x_{i_0,N} + x_{i_n,N}, & n \text{ is odd} \\ x_{i_0,N} - x_{i_n,N}, & n \text{ is even.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The result follows. □

**Lemma 38.** *Let  $n \geq 2$  and  $1 < i_0 \neq i_1 \neq \dots \neq i_n \leq N$ . Define*

$$L_0 = x_{1,N} + x_{i_0,N} + x_{i_1,N} \text{ or } x_{1,N} + x_{i_0,N} - x_{i_1,N},$$

$$L_j = x_{1,N} + x_{i_j,N} + x_{i_{j+1},N}, \quad x_{1,N} + x_{i_j,N} - x_{i_{j+1},N}, \text{ or } x_{1,N} - x_{i_j,N} + x_{i_{j+1},N}$$

for  $0 \leq j < n$ , and

$$L_n = x_{1,N} + x_{i_0,N} + x_{i_n,N} \text{ or } x_{1,N} + x_{i_0,N} - x_{i_n,N}.$$

Suppose that

- $L_j = x_{1,N} + x_{i_j,N} - x_{i_{j+1},N}$  if and only if  $L_{j+1} = x_{1,N} - x_{i_{j+1},N} + x_{i_{j+2},N}$  for  $0 \leq j < n-1$ , and
- $L_{n-1} = x_{i_n,N} + x_{i_{n-1},N} - x_{i_n,N}$  if and only if  $L_n = x_{1,N} - x_{i_n,N} + x_{i_0,N}$ .

Then there exists constants  $c_j \in \{-1, 1\}$  for  $0 \leq j \leq n$  such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^n c_j L_j = \begin{cases} x_{1,N} + 2x_{i_0,N}, & n \text{ even} \\ 0, & n \text{ odd.} \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* By induction on  $n$ . The cases  $n = 2$  and  $n = 3$  can be checked directly. Assume the result holds for  $n - 1 \geq 3$ . There are three cases.

**Case 1:**  $L_j = x_{1,N} + x_{i_j,N} + x_{i_{j+1},N}$ , for  $0 \leq j < n$ , and  $L_n = x_{1,N} + x_{i_0,N} + x_{i_n,N}$ . In this case,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j L_j &= (-1)^n L_n + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^j (x_{1,N} + x_{i_j,N} + x_{i_{j+1},N}) \\
&= (-1)^n (x_{1,N} + x_{i_0,N} + x_{i_n,N}) + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^j (x_{1,N} + x_{i_j,N} + x_{i_{j+1},N}) \\
&= (-1)^n (x_{i_0,N} + x_{i_n,N}) + \sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j x_{1,N} + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^j (x_{i_j,N} + x_{i_{j+1},N}) \\
&= (-1)^n (x_{i_0,N} + x_{i_n,N}) + \sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j x_{1,N} + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^{j+1} (-x_{i_j,N} - x_{i_{j+1},N}) \\
&= (-1)^n (x_{i_0,N} + x_{i_n,N}) + \sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j x_{1,N} + (x_{i_0,N} - (-1)^n x_{i_n,N}) \\
&= \begin{cases} x_{i_0,N} + x_{i_n,N} + x_{1,N} + x_{i_0,N} - x_{i_n,N}, & n \text{ even} \\ -x_{i_0,N} - x_{i_n,N} + x_{i_0,N} + x_{i_n,N}, & n \text{ odd} \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} x_{1,N} + 2x_{i_0,N}, & n \text{ even} \\ 0, & n \text{ odd}, \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

where the fifth equality follows from Lemma 25. So, taking  $c_j = (-1)^j$  yields the result.

**Case 2:**  $L_j = x_{1,N} + x_{i_j,N} - x_{i_{j+1},N}$  or  $x_{1,N} - x_{i_j,N} + x_{i_{j+1},N}$  for  $0 \leq j < n$  and  $L_n = x_{1,N} + x_{i_0,N} - x_{i_n,N}$ . Note that this case can only occur when  $n$  is odd. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j L_j &= (-1)^n L_n + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^j L_j \\
&= (-1)^n (x_{1,N} + x_{i_0,N} - x_{i_n,N}) + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^j (x_{1,N} + (-1)^j x_{i_j,N} + (-1)^{j+1} x_{i_{j+1},N}) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j x_{1,N} - x_{i_0,N} + x_{i_n,N} + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^j ((-1)^j x_{i_j,N} + (-1)^{j+1} x_{i_{j+1},N}) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j x_{1,N} + \sum_{j=0}^n (x_{i_j,N} - x_{i_{j+1},N}) \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

So, as in Case 1, taking  $c_j = (-1)^j$  yields the result.

**Case 3:** There exists  $0 \leq k < n$  such that  $L_k = x_{1,N} - x_{i_k,N} + x_{i_{k+1},N}$  or  $x_{1,N} + x_{i_k,N} - x_{i_{k+1},N}$  and either there exists  $0 \leq j \neq k < n$  such that  $L_j = x_{1,N} + x_{i_j,N} + x_{i_{j+1},N}$  or  $L_n = x_{1,N} + x_{i_0,N} + x_{i_n,N}$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $L_0 = x_{1,N} + x_{i_0,N} + x_{i_1,N}$ ,  $L_1 = x_{1,N} + x_{i_1,N} - x_{i_2,N}$ , and  $L_2 = x_{1,N} - x_{i_2,N} + x_{i_3,N}$ .

For  $0 \leq j \leq n-2$ , define

$$\begin{aligned} L'_j &= \begin{cases} L_0 - L_1 + L_2, & j = 0 \\ L_{j+2}, & 0 < j \leq n-2 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} x_{1,N} + x_{i_0,N} + x_{i_3,N}, & j = 0 \\ L_{j+2}, & 0 < j \leq n-2. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Note that our inductive hypothesis applies to the collection of vectors  $L'_j$  for  $0 \leq j \leq n-2$ . Thus, there exist constants  $c'_j \in \{-1, 1\}$  for  $0 \leq j \leq n-2$  such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n-2} c'_j L'_j = \begin{cases} x_{1,N} + 2x_{i_0,N}, & n-2 \text{ even} \\ 0, & n-2 \text{ odd.} \end{cases}$$

Now, setting

$$c_j = \begin{cases} c'_0, & j = 0, 2 \\ -c'_0, & j = 1 \\ c'_{j-2}, & 2 < j \leq n \end{cases}$$

for  $0 \leq j \leq n$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^n c_j L_j &= c_0 L_0 + c_1 L_1 + c_2 L_2 + \sum_{j=3}^n c_j L_j \\ &= c'_0 L_0 - c'_0 L_1 + c'_0 L_2 + \sum_{j=3}^n c_j L_j \\ &= c'_0 (L_0 - L_1 + L_2) + \sum_{j=3}^n c_j L_j \\ &= c'_0 L'_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} c'_j L'_j \\ &= \begin{cases} x_{1,N} + 2x_{i_0,N}, & n-2 \text{ even} \\ 0, & n-2 \text{ odd} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} x_{1,N} + 2x_{i_0,N}, & n \text{ even} \\ 0, & n \text{ odd.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The result follows. □

**Lemma 39.** *Let  $n \geq 2$  even and  $1 < i_0 \neq i_1 \neq \dots \neq i_n \leq N$ . Define*

$$L_0 = x_{1,N} - x_{i_0,N} + x_{i_1,N},$$

$$L_j = x_{1,N} + x_{i_j,N} + x_{i_{j+1},N}, \quad x_{1,N} + x_{i_j,N} - x_{i_{j+1},N}, \quad \text{or } x_{1,N} - x_{i_j,N} + x_{i_{j+1},N}$$

for  $0 \leq j < n$ , and

$$L_n = x_{1,N} - x_{i_0,N} + x_{i_n,N}.$$

Suppose that  $L_j = x_{1,N} + x_{i_j,N} - x_{i_{j+1},N}$  if and only if  $L_{j+1} = x_{1,N} - x_{i_{j+1},N} + x_{i_{j+2},N}$  for  $1 \leq j < n-1$ . Then there exists constants  $c_j \in \{-1, 1\}$  for  $0 \leq j \leq n$  such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^n c_j L_j = -x_{1,N} + 2x_{i_0,N}.$$

*Proof.* Note that the collection of vectors  $L_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq n-1$  satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 37. So, applying Lemma 37, there exists constants  $c_j \in \{-1, 1\}$  such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} c_j L_j = x_{1,N} + x_{i_1,N} + x_{i_n,N}.$$

Consequently, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} -L_0 - L_n + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} c_j L_j &= -x_{1,N} + x_{i_0,N} - x_{i_1,N} - x_{1,N} + x_{i_0,N} - x_{i_n,N} + x_{1,N} + x_{i_1,N} + x_{i_n,N} \\ &= -x_{1,N} + 2x_{i_0,N}, \end{aligned}$$

as desired.  $\square$

**Proposition 40.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a connected, type-C poset of height one. If  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  contains an even cycle, then  $\mathcal{P}$  is not contact.*

*Proof.* Assume that  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is contact and fix a choice of contact form  $\varphi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ . Set  $N = |V(\mathcal{P})| + |E(\mathcal{P})| + 1$  and let  $\mathcal{C}$  denote an even cycle of  $RG(\mathcal{P})$ . We assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is defined by the sequence of vertices  $p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{2k+1}, p_0$  where if  $\{p_0, p_1\}$  (resp.,  $\{p_{2k+1}, p_0\}$ ) is dashed, then  $p_0 > p_1$  (resp.,  $p_0 > p_{2k+1}$ ). For  $0 \leq j \leq 2k+1$ , let  $R_j$  (resp.,  $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j$ ) denote the element of  $\mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})$  (resp., row of  $\varphi(\widehat{C}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})))$ ) corresponding to  $\{p_j, p_{j+1}\}$  when  $0 \leq j < 2k+1$  and  $\{p_{2k+1}, p_0\}$  when  $j = 2k+1$ , i.e.,

$$R_j = \begin{cases} R_{p_j, p_{j+1}}, & 0 \leq j < 2k+1, \{p_j, p_{j+1}\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_j < p_{j+1} \\ R_{p_{j+1}, p_j}, & 0 \leq j < 2k+1, \{p_j, p_{j+1}\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_j > p_{j+1} \\ R_{p_j, p_{j+1}}^\pm, & 0 \leq j < 2k+1 \text{ and } \{p_j, p_{j+1}\} \text{ is non-dashed} \\ R_{p_{2k+1}, p_0}, & j = 2k+1 \text{ and } \{p_0, p_{2k+1}\} \text{ is dashed} \\ R_{p_{2k+1}, p_0}^\pm, & j = 2k+1 \text{ and } \{p_0, p_{2k+1}\} \text{ is non-dashed} \end{cases}$$

and similarly for  $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j$ . Order the elements of  $\mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})$  so that

- $D_{p_i}$  for  $0 \leq i \leq 2k+1$  occur first, listed in increasing order of  $i$  followed by
- $D_i$  for  $i \in \mathcal{P}^+ \setminus \{p_0, \dots, p_{2k+1}\}$  in increasing order of  $i$  in  $\mathbb{Z}$  followed by
- $E_{-i, i}$  in increasing order of  $i$  in  $\mathbb{Z}$  followed by
- $R_{i, j}^\pm$  for  $i < j$  such that  $-i \prec j$  and  $-j \prec i$  in increasing lexicographic order of  $(i, j)$  followed by
- $R_{i, j}$  for  $i < j$  such that  $-j \prec -i$  and  $i \prec j$  in increasing lexicographic order of  $(i, j)$ .

With this ordering of  $\mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})$ , for  $0 \leq j \leq 2k+1$ , we have that

$$\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j = \begin{cases} -\varphi(R_j)(x_{1,N} - x_{j+2,N} + x_{j+3,N}), & 0 < j < 2k+1, \{p_j, p_{j+1}\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_j < p_{j+1} \\ -\varphi(R_j)(x_{1,N} + x_{j+2,N} - x_{j+3,N}), & 0 \leq j < 2k+1, \{p_j, p_{j+1}\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_j > p_{j+1} \\ -\varphi(R_j)(x_{1,N} + x_{j+2,N} + x_{j+3,N}), & 0 \leq j < 2k+1 \text{ and } \{p_j, p_{j+1}\} \text{ is non-dashed} \\ -\varphi(R_j)(x_{1,N} + x_{2,N} - x_{2k+3,N}), & j = 2k+1 \text{ and } \{p_0, p_{2k+1}\} \text{ is dashed} \\ -\varphi(R_j)(x_{1,N} + x_{2,N} + x_{2k+3,N}), & j = 2k+1 \text{ and } \{p_0, p_{2k+1}\} \text{ is non-dashed.} \end{cases}$$

Since  $\varphi$  is a contact form, considering Remark 35 we have that  $\varphi(R_j) \neq 0$  for  $0 \leq j \leq 2k+1$ . Thus, we can define the collection of vectors  $L_j = \frac{1}{-\varphi(R_j)} \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j$  for  $0 \leq j \leq 2k+1$ . Considering our assumptions on the edges of  $\mathcal{C}$  along with Lemma 20, it is straightforward to verify that the collection of vectors  $L_j$  for  $0 \leq j \leq 2k+1$  satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 38. Consequently, applying Lemma 38, there exist constants  $c_j \in \{-1, 1\}$  such that  $\sum_{j=0}^{2k+1} c_j L_j = 0$ ; but this implies that  $\varphi(\widehat{C}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{g})))$  does not have full rank, which contradicts that  $\varphi$  is a contact form. Therefore,  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is not contact.  $\square$

**Proposition 41.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a connected, type-C poset of height one. If  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  contains two self-loops, then  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is not contact.*

*Proof.* Assume that  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is contact and fix a choice of contact form  $\varphi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ . Set  $N = |V(\mathcal{P})| + |E(\mathcal{P})| + 1$  and let  $p$  and  $q$  denote two distinct vertices of  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  that define self-loops. Since  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  is connected, there exists a path in  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  between  $p$  and  $q$  defined, say, by the sequence of vertices  $p = p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{k-1}, p_k = q$ . For  $0 \leq j \leq k-1$ , let  $R_j$  (resp.,  $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j$ ) denote the element of  $\mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})$  (resp., row of  $\varphi(\widehat{C}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})))$ ) corresponding to  $\{p_j, p_{j+1}\}$ , i.e.,

$$R_j = \begin{cases} R_{p_j, p_{j+1}}, & \{p_j, p_{j+1}\} \text{ is dashed and } p_j < p_{j+1} \\ R_{p_{j+1}, p_j}, & \{p_j, p_{j+1}\} \text{ is dashed and } p_j > p_{j+1} \\ R_{p_j, p_{j+1}}^\pm, & \{p_j, p_{j+1}\} \text{ is non-dashed} \end{cases}$$

and similarly for  $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j$ . Order the elements of  $\mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})$  so that

- $D_{p_i}$  for  $0 \leq i \leq k$  occur first, listed in increasing order of  $i$  followed by
- $D_p$  for  $p \in \mathcal{P}^+ \setminus \{p_0, \dots, p_k\}$  in increasing order of  $p$  in  $\mathbb{Z}$  followed by
- $E_{-i, i}$  in increasing order of  $i$  in  $\mathbb{Z}$  followed by
- $R_{i, j}^\pm$  for  $i < j$  such that  $-i \prec j$  and  $-j \prec i$  in increasing lexicographic order of  $(i, j)$  followed by
- $R_{i, j}$  for  $i < j$  such that  $-j \prec -i$  and  $i \prec j$  in increasing lexicographic order of  $(i, j)$ .

With this ordering of  $\mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})$ , we have

$$\widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{-\mathbf{p}_0, \mathbf{p}_0}(\mathcal{P}) = -\varphi(E_{-p_0, p_0})(x_{1, N} + 2x_{2, N}),$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{-\mathbf{p}_k, \mathbf{p}_k}(\mathcal{P}) = -\varphi(E_{-p_k, p_k})(x_{1, N} + 2x_{k+2, N}),$$

and

$$\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j = \begin{cases} -\varphi(R_j)(x_{1, N} - x_{j+2, N} + x_{j+3, N}), & \{p_j, p_{j+1}\} \text{ is dashed and } p_j < p_{j+1} \\ -\varphi(R_j)(x_{1, N} + x_{j+2, N} - x_{j+3, N}), & \{p_j, p_{j+1}\} \text{ is dashed and } p_j > p_{j+1} \\ -\varphi(R_j)(x_{1, N} + x_{j+2, N} + x_{j+3, N}), & \{p_j, p_{j+1}\} \text{ is non-dashed} \end{cases}$$

for  $0 \leq j \leq k-1$ . Since  $\varphi$  is a contact form, considering Remark 35, we have that  $\varphi(E_{-p_0, p_0}), \varphi(E_{-p_k, p_k}) \neq 0$  and  $\varphi(R_j) \neq 0$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k-1$ . Thus, we can define the collection of vectors  $L_j = \frac{1}{-\varphi(R_j)} \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k-1$ . Considering Lemma 20, it is straightforward to verify that the collection of vectors  $L_j$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k-1$  satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 37. Consequently, applying Lemma 37, there exist constants  $c_j \in \{-1, 1\}$  such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} c_j L_j = \begin{cases} x_{1, N} + x_{2, N} + x_{k+2, N}, & k \text{ is odd} \\ x_{2, N} - x_{k+2, N}, & k \text{ is even} \end{cases}$$

so that

$$\frac{1}{2\varphi(E_{-p_0, p_0})} \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{\mathbf{p}_0, \mathbf{p}_0}(\mathcal{P}) + (-1)^{k+1} \frac{1}{2\varphi(E_{-p_k, p_k})} \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{\mathbf{p}_k, \mathbf{p}_k}(\mathcal{P}) + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} c_j L_j = 0;$$

but this implies that  $\varphi(\widehat{C}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{g})))$  does not have full rank, contradicting that  $\varphi$  is a contact form. Therefore,  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is not contact.  $\square$

**Proposition 42.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a connected, type-C poset of height one. If  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  contains two odd cycles that share more than one vertex, then  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is not contact.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{C}_1$  and  $\mathcal{C}_2$  be two odd cycles in  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  that share more than one vertex. We claim that  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  contains an even cycle. Assume  $\mathcal{C}_i$  consists of  $2k_i + 1$  vertices with  $k_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Starting from one intersection point between the two, say  $p$ , move along  $\mathcal{C}_1$  until reaching another intersection point, say  $q$ , and call the resulting path  $P_1$ . Now, there must exist a path within  $\mathcal{C}_2$  connecting  $p$  and  $q$  that contains no other intersection points with  $\mathcal{C}_1$ , call such a path  $P_2$ . Form the subgraph  $\mathcal{C}_3$  of  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  whose edges are those of  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ . Note that either

- (1)  $P_1 = P_2$  so that  $\mathcal{C}_3$  is the graph consisting of  $p$ ,  $q$ , and the edge between them or
- (2)  $\mathcal{C}_3$  is a cycle whose intersection with  $\mathcal{C}_i$  is  $P_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ .

In case (1), consider the subgraph  $\mathcal{C}_4$  of  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  induced by all edges of both  $\mathcal{C}_1$  and  $\mathcal{C}_2$  except the shared edge between  $p$  and  $q$ . Note that  $\mathcal{C}_4$  is a cycle containing

$$(2k_1 + 1) + (2k_2 + 1) - 2 = 2(k_1 + k_2)$$

vertices, i.e.,  $\mathcal{C}_4$  is an even cycle and the claim follows. In case (2), we may assume that  $\mathcal{C}_3$  is an odd cycle containing  $2k_3 + 1$  vertices for  $k_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ . Now, if  $P_1$  contains  $t$  vertices for  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1}$ , then consider the subgraph  $\mathcal{C}_4$  of  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  induced by all edges of both  $\mathcal{C}_1$  and  $\mathcal{C}_3$  except those corresponding to  $P_1$ . Note that  $\mathcal{C}_4$  is a cycle containing

$$(2k_1 + 1) + (2k_3 + 1) - 2(t - 2) - 2 = 2(k_1 + k_3 - t + 2)$$

vertices, i.e.,  $\mathcal{C}_4$  is an even cycle and the claim follows. We have shown that, in both cases,  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  contains an even cycle; therefore,  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is not contact, by Proposition 40.  $\square$

**Proposition 43.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a connected, type-C poset of height one. If  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  contains two odd cycles that share exactly one vertex, then  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is not contact.*

*Proof.* Assume that  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is contact and fix a contact form  $\varphi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ . Set  $N = |V(\mathcal{P})| + |E(\mathcal{P})| + 1$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}_1$  and  $\mathcal{C}_2$  denote the two odd cycles, and  $p$  denote the shared vertex. Throughout, for  $i = 1, 2$ , we assume that if  $\mathcal{C}_i$  is not a self-loop, then  $\mathcal{C}_i$  is defined by the sequence of vertices  $p = p_0^i, p_1^i, \dots, p_{k_i}^i, p_0^i = p$ . Moreover, for  $i = 1, 2$  and  $0 \leq j \leq k_i$ , we let  $R_j^i$  (resp.,  $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^i$ ) denote the element of  $\mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})$  (resp., row of  $\varphi(\widehat{C}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})))$ ) corresponding to  $\{p_j^i, p_{j+1}^i\}$  when  $0 \leq j < k_i$  and  $\{p, p_{k_i}^i\}$  when  $j = k_i$ , i.e.,

$$R_j^i = \begin{cases} R_{p_j^i, p_{j+1}^i}, & 0 \leq j < k_i, \{p_j^i, p_{j+1}^i\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_j^i < p_{j+1}^i \\ R_{p_{j+1}^i, p_j^i}, & 0 \leq j < k_i, \{p_j^i, p_{j+1}^i\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_j^i > p_{j+1}^i \\ R_{p_j^i, p_{j+1}^i}^\pm, & 0 \leq j < k_i \text{ and } \{p_j^i, p_{j+1}^i\} \text{ is non-dashed} \\ R_{p, p_{k_i}^i}, & j = k_i, \{p, p_{k_i}^i\} \text{ is dashed, and } p < p_{k_i}^i \\ R_{p_{k_i}^i, p}, & j = k_i, \{p, p_{k_i}^i\} \text{ is dashed, and } p > p_{k_i}^i \\ R_{p, p_{k_i}^i}^\pm, & j = k_i \text{ and } \{p, p_{k_i}^i\} \text{ is non-dashed} \end{cases}$$

and similarly for  $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^i$ . Order the elements of  $\mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})$  so that

- $D_{p_j^1}$ , for  $0 \leq j \leq k_1$ , occur first listed in increasing order of  $j$  followed by
- $D_{p_j^2}$ , for  $1 \leq j \leq k_2$ , listed in increasing order of  $j$  followed by
- $D_q$ , for  $q \in \mathcal{P}^+ \setminus \{p_0^1, \dots, p_{k_1}^1, p_0^2, \dots, p_{k_2}^2\}$ , in increasing order of  $q$  in  $\mathbb{Z}$  followed by
- $R_{i,j}^\pm$ , for  $i < j$ , such that  $-i < j$  and  $-j < i$  in increasing lexicographic order of  $(i, j)$  followed by
- $R_{i,j}$ , for  $i < j$ , such that  $-j < -i$  and  $i < j$  in increasing lexicographic order of  $(i, j)$ .

With this ordering, if  $\mathcal{C}_1$  is not a self-loop, then

$$\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^1 = \begin{cases} -\varphi(R_j^1)(x_{1,N} - x_{j+2,N} + x_{j+3,N}), & 0 \leq j < k_1, \{p_j^1, p_{j+1}^1\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_j^1 < p_{j+1}^1 \\ -\varphi(R_j^1)(x_{1,N} + x_{j+2,N} - x_{j+3,N}), & 0 \leq j < k_1, \{p_j^1, p_{j+1}^1\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_j^1 > p_{j+1}^1 \\ -\varphi(R_j^1)(x_{1,N} + x_{j+2,N} + x_{j+3,N}), & 0 \leq j < k_1 \text{ and } \{p_j^1, p_{j+1}^1\} \text{ is non-dashed} \\ -\varphi(R_j^1)(x_{1,N} - x_{2,N} + x_{k_1+2,N}), & j = k_1, \{p, p_{k_1}^1\} \text{ is dashed, and } p < p_{k_1}^1 \\ -\varphi(R_j^1)(x_{1,N} + x_{2,N} - x_{k_1+2,N}), & j = k_1, \{p, p_{k_1}^1\} \text{ is dashed, and } p > p_{k_1}^1 \\ -\varphi(R_j^1)(x_{1,N} + x_{2,N} + x_{k_1+2,N}), & j = k_1 \text{ and } \{p, p_{k_1}^1\} \text{ is non-dashed} \end{cases}$$

for  $0 \leq j \leq k_1$ . Similarly, if  $\mathcal{C}_2$  is not a self-loop, then

$$\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^2 = \begin{cases} -\varphi(R_j^2)(x_{1,N} - x_{2,N} + x_{k_1+3,N}), & j = 0, \{p, p_1^2\} \text{ is dashed, and } p < p_1^2 \\ -\varphi(R_j^2)(x_{1,N} + x_{2,N} - x_{k_1+3,N}), & j = 0, \{p, p_1^2\} \text{ is dashed, and } p > p_1^2 \\ -\varphi(R_j^2)(x_{1,N} + x_{2,N} + x_{k_1+3,N}), & j = 0 \text{ and } \{p, p_1^2\} \text{ is non-dashed} \\ -\varphi(R_j^2)(x_{1,N} - x_{j+k_1+2,N} + x_{j+k_1+3,N}), & 0 < j < k_2, \{p_j^2, p_{j+1}^2\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_j^2 < p_{j+1}^2 \\ -\varphi(R_j^2)(x_{1,N} + x_{j+k_1+2,N} - x_{j+k_1+3,N}), & 0 < j < k_2, \{p_j^2, p_{j+1}^2\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_j^2 > p_{j+1}^2 \\ -\varphi(R_j^2)(x_{1,N} + x_{j+k_1+2,N} + x_{j+k_1+3,N}), & 0 < j < k_2 \text{ and } \{p_j^2, p_{j+1}^2\} \text{ is non-dashed} \\ -\varphi(R_j^2)(x_{1,N} - x_{2,N} + x_{k_1+k_2+2,N}), & j = k_2, \{p, p_{k_2}^2\} \text{ is dashed, and } p < p_{k_2}^2 \\ -\varphi(R_j^2)(x_{1,N} + x_{2,N} - x_{k_1+k_2+2,N}), & j = k_2, \{p, p_{k_2}^2\} \text{ is dashed, and } p > p_{k_2}^2 \\ -\varphi(R_j^2)(x_{1,N} + x_{2,N} + x_{k_1+k_2+2,N}), & j = k_2 \text{ and } \{p, p_{k_2}^2\} \text{ is non-dashed} \end{cases}$$

for  $0 \leq j \leq k_2$ . Finally, if one of  $\mathcal{C}_1$  or  $\mathcal{C}_2$  is a self-loop, then

$$\widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{-\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{P}) = -\varphi(E_{-p,p})(x_{1,N} + 2x_{2,N}).$$

Considering Lemma 20, there are two cases.

**Case 1:**  $\mathcal{C}_1$  or  $\mathcal{C}_2$  is a self-loop. Without loss of generality, assume that  $\mathcal{C}_2$  is a self-loop. Since  $\varphi$  is a contact form, considering Remark 35, we have that  $\varphi(E_{-p,p}) \neq 0$  and  $\varphi(R_j^1) \neq 0$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_1$ . Thus, we can define the collection of vectors  $L_j = \frac{1}{-\varphi(R_j^1)} \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^1$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_1$ . Considering Lemma 20, it is straightforward to verify that the collection of vectors  $L_j$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_1$  satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 38. Since  $k_1$  is even by assumption, applying Lemma 38, we find that there exist constants  $c_j \in \{-1, 1\}$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_1$  such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_1} c_j L_j = x_{1,N} + 2x_{2,N}.$$

However, this implies that

$$\frac{1}{\varphi(E_{-p,p})} \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{-\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{P}) + \sum_{j=0}^{k_1} c_j L_j = 0,$$

i.e.,  $\varphi\left(\widehat{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{g}))\right)$  does not have full rank, contradicting that  $\varphi$  is a contact form. Therefore,  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is not contact.

**Case 2:** Neither  $\mathcal{C}_1$  nor  $\mathcal{C}_2$  is a self-loop and one of the following holds:

- (1) at least one of  $\{p, p_1^1\}$ ,  $\{p, p_1^2\}$ ,  $\{p, p_{k_1}^1\}$ , and  $\{p, p_{k_2}^2\}$  is non-dashed;
- (2)  $\{p, p_1^1\}$ ,  $\{p, p_1^2\}$ ,  $\{p, p_{k_1}^1\}$ , and  $\{p, p_{k_2}^2\}$  are all dashed and  $p_1^1, p_1^2 < p > p_{k_1}^1, p_{k_2}^2$ ; or
- (3)  $\{p, p_1^1\}$ ,  $\{p, p_1^2\}$ ,  $\{p, p_{k_1}^1\}$ , and  $\{p, p_{k_2}^2\}$  are all dashed and  $p_1^1, p_1^2 > p < p_{k_1}^1, p_{k_2}^2$ .

Since  $\varphi$  is a contact form, considering Remark 35 we have that  $\varphi(R_j^i) \neq 0$  for  $i = 1, 2$  and  $0 \leq j \leq k_i$ . Thus, we can define the collection of vectors  $L_j^i = \frac{1}{-\varphi(R_j^i)} \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^i$  for  $i = 1, 2$  and  $0 \leq j \leq k_i$ . Considering Lemma 20, in cases (1) and (2) it is straightforward to verify that, for  $i = 1, 2$ , the collection of vectors  $L_j^i$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_i$  satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 38. On the other hand, in case (3), the collections of vectors satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 39. Since  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  are even by assumption, in cases (1) and (2) (resp., case (3)), we apply Lemma 38 (resp., Lemma 39) to find that there exist constants  $c_j^i \in \{-1, 1\}$  for  $i = 1, 2$  and  $0 \leq j \leq k_i$  such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_i} c_j^i L_j^i = x_{1,N} + 2x_{2,N} \quad \left( \text{resp., } \sum_{j=0}^{k_i} c_j^i L_j^i = -x_{1,N} + 2x_{2,N} \right).$$

In all cases, we have that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_1} c_j^1 L_j^1 - \sum_{j=0}^{k_2} c_j^2 L_j^2 = 0,$$

which implies that  $\varphi(\widehat{C}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{g})))$  does not have full rank, contradicting that  $\varphi$  is a contact form. Therefore,  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is not contact.  $\square$

**Proposition 44.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a connected, type-C poset of height one. If  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  contains two disjoint odd cycles, then  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is not contact.*

*Proof.* Assume that  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is contact and fix a contact form  $\varphi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ . Set  $N = |V(\mathcal{P})| + |E(\mathcal{P})| + 1$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}_1$  and  $\mathcal{C}_2$  denote the two odd cycles. Since  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  is connected, there exists a path, say  $T$ , that connects a vertex  $p_0^1$  of  $\mathcal{C}_1$  to a vertex  $p_0^2$  of  $\mathcal{C}_2$  and contains no other vertices of either cycle. For  $i = 1, 2$ , if  $\mathcal{C}_i$  is not a self-loop, then assume that  $\mathcal{C}_i$  is defined by the sequence of vertices  $p_0^i, p_1^i, \dots, p_{k_i}^i, p_0^i$ . Moreover, we assume that  $T$  is defined by the sequence of vertices  $p_0^1 = p_0^3, p_1^3, \dots, p_{k_3}^3 = p_0^2$ . For  $i = 1, 2$  and  $0 \leq j \leq k_i$ , we let  $R_j^i$  (resp.,  $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^i$ ) denote the element of  $\mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})$  (resp., row of  $\varphi(\widehat{C}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})))$ ) corresponding to  $\{p_j^i, p_{j+1}^i\}$  when  $0 \leq j < k_i$  and  $\{p, p_{k_i}^i\}$  when  $j = k_i$ , i.e.,

$$R_j^i = \begin{cases} R_{p_j^i, p_{j+1}^i}, & 0 \leq j < k_i, \{p_j^i, p_{j+1}^i\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_j^i < p_{j+1}^i \\ R_{p_{j+1}^i, p_j^i}, & 0 \leq j < k_i, \{p_j^i, p_{j+1}^i\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_j^i > p_{j+1}^i \\ R_{p_j^i, p_{j+1}^i}^\pm, & 0 \leq j < k_i \text{ and } \{p_j^i, p_{j+1}^i\} \text{ is non-dashed} \\ R_{p_0^i, p_{k_i}^i}, & j = k_i, \{p_0^i, p_{k_i}^i\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_0^i < p_{k_i}^i \\ R_{p_{k_i}^i, p_0^i}, & j = k_i, \{p_0^i, p_{k_i}^i\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_0^i > p_{k_i}^i \\ R_{p_0^i, p_{k_i}^i}^\pm, & j = k_i \text{ and } \{p_0^i, p_{k_i}^i\} \text{ is non-dashed} \end{cases}$$

and similarly for  $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^i$ . For  $0 \leq j < k_3$ , we let  $R_j^3$  (resp.,  $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^3$ ) denote the element of  $\mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})$  (resp., row of  $\varphi(\widehat{C}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})))$ ) corresponding to  $\{p_j^3, p_{j+1}^3\}$ , i.e.,

$$R_j^3 = \begin{cases} R_{p_j^3, p_{j+1}^3}, & 0 \leq j < k_3, \{p_j^3, p_{j+1}^3\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_j^3 < p_{j+1}^3 \\ R_{p_{j+1}^3, p_j^3}, & 0 \leq j < k_3, \{p_j^3, p_{j+1}^3\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_j^3 > p_{j+1}^3 \\ R_{p_j^3, p_{j+1}^3}^\pm, & 0 \leq j < k_3 \text{ and } \{p_j^3, p_{j+1}^3\} \text{ is non-dashed} \end{cases}$$

and similarly for  $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^3$ . Order the elements of  $\mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})$  so that

- $D_{p_j^1}$ , for  $0 \leq j \leq k_1$ , occur first listed in increasing order of  $j$  followed by
- $D_{p_j^3}$ , for  $1 \leq j \leq k_3$ , in increasing order of  $j$  followed by

- $D_{p_j^2}$ , for  $1 \leq j \leq k_2$ , in increasing order of  $j$  followed by
- $D_p$ , for  $p \in \mathcal{P}^+ \setminus \{p_0^1, \dots, p_{k_1}^1, p_0^2, \dots, p_{k_2}^2, p_0^3, \dots, p_{k_3}^3\}$ , in increasing order of  $p$  in  $\mathbb{Z}$  followed by
- $R_{i,j}^\pm$ , for  $i < j$  such that  $-i \prec j$  and  $-j \prec i$ , in increasing lexicographic order of  $(i, j)$  followed by
- $R_{i,j}$ , for  $i < j$  such that  $-j \prec -i$  and  $i \prec j$ , in increasing lexicographic order of  $(i, j)$ .

With this ordering, if  $\mathcal{C}_1$  is not a self-loop, then

$$\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^1 = \begin{cases} -\varphi(R_j^1)(x_{1,N} - x_{j+2,N} + x_{j+3,N}), & 0 \leq j < k_1, \{p_j^1, p_{j+1}^1\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_j^1 < p_{j+1}^1 \\ -\varphi(R_j^1)(x_{1,N} + x_{j+2,N} - x_{j+3,N}), & 0 \leq j < k_1, \{p_j^1, p_{j+1}^1\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_j^1 > p_{j+1}^1 \\ -\varphi(R_j^1)(x_{1,N} + x_{j+2,N} + x_{j+3,N}), & 0 \leq j < k_1 \text{ and } \{p_j^1, p_{j+1}^1\} \text{ is nondashed} \\ -\varphi(R_j^1)(x_{1,N} - x_{2,N} + x_{k_1+2,N}), & j = k_1, \{p_0^1, p_{k_1}^1\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_0^1 < p_{k_1}^1 \\ -\varphi(R_j^1)(x_{1,N} + x_{2,N} - x_{k_1+2,N}), & j = k_1, \{p_0^1, p_{k_1}^1\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_0^1 > p_{k_1}^1 \\ -\varphi(R_j^1)(x_{1,N} + x_{2,N} + x_{k_1+2,N}), & j = k_1 \text{ and } \{p_0^1, p_{k_1}^1\} \text{ is nondashed} \end{cases}$$

for  $0 \leq j \leq k_1$ ; on the other hand, if  $\mathcal{C}_1$  is a self-loop, then

$$\widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{-\mathbf{p}_0^1, \mathbf{p}_0^1}(\mathcal{P}) = -\varphi(E_{-p_0^1, p_0^1})(x_{1,N} + 2x_{2,N}).$$

Similarly, if  $\mathcal{C}_2$  is not a self-loop, then

$$\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^2 = \begin{cases} -\varphi(R_j^2)(x_{1,N} - x_{j+k_1+k_3+2,N} + x_{j+k_1+k_3+3,N}), & 0 \leq j < k_2, \{p_j^2, p_{j+1}^2\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_j^2 < p_{j+1}^2 \\ -\varphi(R_j^2)(x_{1,N} + x_{j+k_1+k_3+2,N} - x_{j+k_1+k_3+3,N}), & 0 \leq j < k_2, \{p_j^2, p_{j+1}^2\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_j^2 > p_{j+1}^2 \\ -\varphi(R_j^2)(x_{1,N} + x_{j+k_1+k_3+2,N} + x_{j+k_1+k_3+3,N}), & 0 \leq j < k_2 \text{ and } \{p_j^2, p_{j+1}^2\} \text{ is non-dashed} \\ -\varphi(R_j^2)(x_{1,N} - x_{k_1+k_3+2,N} + x_{k_1+k_2+k_3+2,N}), & j = k_2, \{p_0^2, p_{k_2}^2\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_0^2 < p_{k_2}^2 \\ -\varphi(R_j^2)(x_{1,N} + x_{k_1+k_3+2,N} - x_{k_1+k_2+k_3+2,N}), & j = k_2, \{p_0^2, p_{k_2}^2\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_0^2 > p_{k_2}^2 \\ -\varphi(R_j^2)(x_{1,N} + x_{k_1+k_3+2,N} + x_{k_1+k_2+k_3+2,N}), & j = k_2 \text{ and } \{p_0^2, p_{k_2}^2\} \text{ is non-dashed} \end{cases}$$

for  $0 \leq j \leq k_2$ ; on the other hand, if  $\mathcal{C}_2$  is a self-loop, then

$$\widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{-\mathbf{p}_0^2, \mathbf{p}_0^2}(\mathcal{P}) = -\varphi(E_{-p_0^2, p_0^2})(x_{1,N} + 2x_{k_1+k_3+2,N}).$$

Finally, with the above ordering of  $\mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})$ , we have that

$$\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^3 = \begin{cases} -\varphi(R_j^3)(x_{1,N} - x_{2,N} + x_{k_1+3,N}), & j = 0, \{p_0^3, p_1^3\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_0^3 < p_1^3 \\ -\varphi(R_j^3)(x_{1,N} + x_{2,N} - x_{k_1+3,N}), & j = 0, \{p_0^3, p_1^3\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_0^3 > p_1^3 \\ -\varphi(R_j^3)(x_{1,N} + x_{2,N} + x_{k_1+3,N}), & j = 0 \text{ and } \{p_0^3, p_1^3\} \text{ is non-dashed} \\ -\varphi(R_j^3)(x_{1,N} - x_{j+k_1+2,N} + x_{j+k_1+3,N}), & 0 < j < k_3, \{p_j^3, p_{j+1}^3\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_j^3 < p_{j+1}^3 \\ -\varphi(R_j^3)(x_{1,N} + x_{j+k_1+2,N} - x_{j+k_1+3,N}), & 0 < j < k_3, \{p_j^3, p_{j+1}^3\} \text{ is dashed, and } p_j^3 > p_{j+1}^3 \\ -\varphi(R_j^3)(x_{1,N} + x_{j+k_1+2,N} + x_{j+k_1+3,N}), & 0 < j < k_3 \text{ and } \{p_j^3, p_{j+1}^3\} \text{ is non-dashed} \end{cases}$$

for  $0 \leq j < k_3$ . Note that Proposition 41 covers the case where both  $\mathcal{C}_1$  and  $\mathcal{C}_2$  are self-loops. Considering Lemma 20, there are five cases.

**Case 1:**  $\mathcal{C}_1$  or  $\mathcal{C}_2$  is a self-loop and

- (1) if  $\mathcal{C}_1$  is a self-loop, then  $\{p_{k_3-1}^3, p_k^3 = p_0^2\}$  is non-dashed or  $\{p_{k_3-1}^3, p_0^2\}$  is dashed and  $p_{k_3-1}^3 < p_0^2$ , or
- (2) if  $\mathcal{C}_2$  is a self-loop, then  $\{p_0^3 = p_0^1, p_1^3\}$  is non-dashed or  $\{p_0^1, p_1^3\}$  is dashed and  $p_0^1 > p_1^3$ .

Without loss of generality, assume that  $\mathcal{C}_1$  is not a self-loop and  $\mathcal{C}_2$  is a self-loop. Since  $\varphi$  is a contact form, considering Remark 35, we have that  $\varphi(R_j^1) \neq 0$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_1$ ,  $\varphi(E_{-p_0^2, p_0^2}) \neq 0$ , and  $\varphi(R_j^3) \neq 0$  for  $0 \leq j < k_3$ . Thus, we can define the collection of vectors  $L_j^1 = \frac{1}{-\varphi(R_j^1)} \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^1$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_1$  and  $L_j^3 = \frac{1}{-\varphi(R_j^3)} \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^3$  for  $0 \leq j < k_3$ . Considering Lemma 20, it is straightforward to verify that the collection of vectors  $L_j^1$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_1$  satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 38, and the collection of vectors  $L_j^3$  for  $0 \leq j < k_3$  satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 37. Since  $k_1$  is even by assumption, applying Lemma 38 we find that there exist constants  $c_j^1 \in \{-1, 1\}$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_1$  such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_1} c_j^1 L_j^1 = x_{1,N} + 2x_{2,N}.$$

If  $k_3$  is odd, then applying Lemma 37 we find that there exist constants  $c_j^3 \in \{-1, 1\}$  for  $0 \leq j < k_3$  such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_3-1} c_j^3 L_j^3 = x_{1,N} + x_{2,N} + x_{k_1+k_3+2,N},$$

which implies that

$$\frac{1}{2\varphi(E_{-p_0^2, p_0^2})} \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{-p_0^2, p_0^2}(\mathcal{P}) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{k_1} c_j^1 L_j^1 + \sum_{j=0}^{k_3-1} c_j^3 L_j^3 = 0.$$

On the other hand, if  $k_3$  is even, then applying Lemma 37 we find that there exist constants  $c_j^3 \in \{-1, 1\}$  for  $0 \leq j < k_3$  such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_3-1} c_j^3 L_j^3 = x_{2,N} - x_{k_1+k_3+2,N},$$

which implies that

$$\frac{1}{2\varphi(E_{-p_0^2, p_0^2})} \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{-p_0^2, p_0^2}(\mathcal{P}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{k_1} c_j^1 L_j^1 - \sum_{j=0}^{k_3-1} c_j^3 L_j^3 = 0.$$

In either case, it follows that  $\varphi\left(\widehat{C}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{g}))\right)$  does not have full rank, contradicting that  $\varphi$  is a contact form. Therefore,  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is not contact.

**Case 2:**  $\mathcal{C}_1$  or  $\mathcal{C}_2$  is a self-loop and

- (1) if  $\mathcal{C}_1$  is a self-loop, then  $\{p_{k_3-1}^3, p_{k_3}^3 = p_0^2\}$  is dashed and  $p_{k_3-1}^3 > p_0^2$  or
- (2) if  $\mathcal{C}_2$  is a self-loop, then  $\{p_0^3 = p_0^1, p_1^3\}$  is dashed and  $p_0^1 < p_1^3$ .

Without loss of generality, assume that  $\mathcal{C}_1$  is not a self-loop and  $\mathcal{C}_2$  is a self-loop. As in Case 1,  $\varphi(E_{-p_0^2, p_0^2}) \neq 0$  and we can define the collection of vectors  $L_j^1 = \frac{1}{-\varphi(R_j^1)} \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^1$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_1$  and  $L_j^3 = \frac{1}{-\varphi(R_j^3)} \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^3$  for  $0 \leq j < k_3$ . Considering Lemma 20, it is straightforward to verify that the collection of vectors  $L_j^1$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_1$  satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 39 and, if  $k_3 > 1$ , the collection of vectors  $L_j^3$  for  $1 \leq j < k_3$  satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 37. Since  $k_1$  is even by assumption, applying Lemma 39 we find that there exist constants  $c_j^1 \in \{-1, 1\}$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_1$  such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_1} c_j^1 L_j^1 = -x_{1,N} + 2x_{2,N}.$$

If  $k_3 = 1$ , then we have that

$$\frac{1}{2\varphi(E_{-p_0^2, p_0^2})} \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{-p_0^2, p_0^2}(\mathcal{P}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{k_1} c_j^1 L_j^1 + L_0^3 = 0.$$

If  $k_3 > 1$  is even, then applying Lemma 37 we find that there exist constants  $c_j^3 \in \{-1, 1\}$  for  $1 \leq j < k_3$  such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k_3-1} c_j^3 L_j^3 = x_{1,N} + x_{k_1+3,N} + x_{k_1+k_3+2,N},$$

which implies that

$$2L_0^3 + \sum_{j=0}^{k_1} c_j^1 L_j^1 - \frac{1}{\varphi(E_{-p_0^2, p_0^2})} \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{-p_0^2, p_0^2}(\mathcal{P}) - 2 \sum_{j=1}^{k_3-1} c_j^3 L_j^3 = 0.$$

Finally, if  $k_3 > 1$  is odd, then applying Lemma 37 we find that there exist constants  $c_j^3 \in \{-1, 1\}$  for  $1 \leq j < k_3$  such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k_3-1} c_j^3 L_j^3 = x_{k_1+3,N} - x_{k_1+k_3+2,N},$$

which implies that

$$2L_0^3 + \sum_{j=0}^{k_1} c_j^1 L_j^1 + \frac{1}{\varphi(E_{-p_0^2, p_0^2})} \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{-p_0^2, p_0^2}(\mathcal{P}) - 2 \sum_{j=1}^{k_3-1} c_j^3 L_j^3 = 0.$$

In all cases, it follows that  $\varphi(\widehat{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{g})))$  does not have full rank, contradicting that  $\varphi$  is a contact form. Therefore,  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{P})$  is not contact.

**Case 3:** Neither  $\mathcal{C}_1$  nor  $\mathcal{C}_2$  is a self-loop and one of the following holds:

- (1)  $\{p_0^3 = p_0^1, p_1^3\}$  and  $\{p_{k_3-1}^3, p_{k_3}^3 = p_0^2\}$  are both non-dashed;
- (2)  $\{p_0^3 = p_0^1, p_1^3\}$  is non-dashed and  $\{p_{k_3-1}^3, p_{k_3}^3 = p_0^2\}$  is dashed with  $p_{k_3-1}^3 < p_0^2$ ;
- (3)  $\{p_0^3 = p_0^1, p_1^3\}$  is dashed with  $p_0^1 > p_1^3$  and  $\{p_{k_3-1}^3, p_{k_3}^3 = p_0^2\}$  is non-dashed; or
- (4)  $\{p_0^3 = p_0^1, p_1^3\}$  and  $\{p_{k_3-1}^3, p_{k_3}^3 = p_0^2\}$  are both dashed with  $p_0^1 > p_1^3$  and  $p_{k_3-1}^3 < p_0^2$ .

Since  $\varphi$  is a contact form, considering Remark 35, we have that  $\varphi(R_j^1) \neq 0$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_1$ ,  $\varphi(R_j^2) \neq 0$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_2$ , and  $\varphi(R_j^3) \neq 0$  for  $0 \leq j < k_3$ . Thus, we can define the collection of vectors  $L_j^1 = \frac{1}{-\varphi(R_j^1)} \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^1$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_1$ ,  $L_j^2 = \frac{1}{-\varphi(R_j^2)} \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^2$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_2$ , and  $L_j^3 = \frac{1}{-\varphi(R_j^3)} \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^3$  for  $0 \leq j < k_3$ . Considering Lemma 20, it is straightforward to verify that, for  $i = 1, 2$ , the collection of vectors  $L_j^i$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_i$  satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 38. Moreover, the collection of vectors  $L_j^3$  for  $0 \leq j < k_3$  satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 37. Since  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  are even, applying Lemma 38 we find that there exist constants  $c_j^1 \in \{-1, 1\}$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_1$  and  $c_j^2 \in \{-1, 1\}$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_2$  such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_1} c_j^1 L_j^1 = x_{1,N} + 2x_{2,N}$$

and

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_2} c_j^2 L_j^2 = x_{1,N} + 2x_{k_1+k_3+2,N}.$$

If  $k_3$  is odd, then applying Lemma 37 we find that there exist constants  $c_j^3 \in \{-1, 1\}$  for  $0 \leq j < k_3$  such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_3-1} c_j^3 L_j^3 = x_{1,N} + x_{2,N} + x_{k_1+k_3+2,N}$$

so that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_1} c_j^1 L_j^1 + \sum_{j=0}^{k_2} c_j^2 L_j^2 - 2 \sum_{j=0}^{k_3-1} c_j^3 L_j^3 = 0.$$

On the other hand, if  $k_3$  is even, then applying Lemma 37 we find that there exist constants  $c_j^3 \in \{-1, 1\}$  for  $0 \leq j < k_3$  such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_3-1} c_j^3 L_j^3 = x_{2,N} - x_{k_1+k_3+2,N}$$

so that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_1} c_j^1 L_j^1 - \sum_{j=0}^{k_2} c_j^2 L_j^2 - 2 \sum_{j=0}^{k_3-1} c_j^3 L_j^3 = 0.$$

In either case, it follows that  $\varphi\left(\widehat{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{g}))\right)$  does not have full rank, contradicting that  $\varphi$  is a contact form. Therefore,  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is not contact.

**Case 4:** Neither  $\mathcal{C}_1$  nor  $\mathcal{C}_2$  is a self-loop and one of the following holds:

- (1)  $k_3 = 1$  and  $\{p_0^3 = p_0^1, p_1^3 = p_0^2\}$  is dashed with  $p_0^1 > p_0^2$ ;
- (2)  $\{p_0^3 = p_0^1, p_1^3\}$  is non-dashed and  $\{p_{k_3-1}^3, p_{k_3}^3 = p_0^2\}$  is dashed with  $p_{k_3-1}^3 > p_0^2$ ;
- (3)  $\{p_0^3 = p_0^1, p_1^3\}$  is dashed with  $p_0^1 > p_1^3$  and  $\{p_{k_3-1}^3, p_{k_3}^3 = p_0^2\}$  is dashed with  $p_{k_3-1}^3 > p_0^2$ ;
- (4)  $k_3 = 1$  and  $\{p_0^3 = p_0^1, p_1^3 = p_0^2\}$  is dashed with  $p_0^1 < p_1^3$ ;
- (5)  $\{p_0^3 = p_0^1, p_1^3\}$  is dashed with  $p_0^1 < p_1^3$  and  $\{p_{k_3-1}^3, p_{k_3}^3 = p_0^2\}$  is non-dashed;
- (6)  $\{p_0^3 = p_0^1, p_1^3\}$  is dashed with  $p_0^1 < p_1^3$  and  $\{p_{k_3-1}^3, p_{k_3}^3 = p_0^2\}$  is dashed with  $p_{k_3-1}^3 < p_0^2$ .

Without loss of generality, assume that we are either in subcase (1), (2), or (3); the other subcases follow via a similar argument. Since  $\varphi$  is a contact form, considering Remark 35 we have that  $\varphi(R_j^1) \neq 0$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_1$ ,  $\varphi(R_j^2) \neq 0$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_2$ , and  $\varphi(R_j^3) \neq 0$  for  $0 \leq j < k_3$ . Thus, we can define the collection of vectors  $L_j^1 = \frac{1}{-\varphi(R_j^1)} \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^1$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_1$ ,  $L_j^2 = \frac{1}{-\varphi(R_j^2)} \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^2$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_2$ , and  $L_j^3 = \frac{1}{-\varphi(R_j^3)} \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^3$  for  $0 \leq j < k_3$ . Considering Lemma 20, it is straightforward to verify that the collection of vectors  $L_j^1$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_1$  satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 38, the collection of vectors  $L_j^2$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_2$  satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 39. Moreover, if  $k_3 > 1$ , then the collection of vectors  $L_j^3$  for  $0 \leq j < k_3$  satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 37. Since  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  are even, applying Lemmas 38 and 39 we find that there exist constants  $c_j^1 \in \{-1, 1\}$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_1$  and  $c_j^2 \in \{-1, 1\}$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_2$  such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_1} c_j^1 L_j^1 = x_{1,N} + 2x_{2,N}$$

and

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_2} c_j^2 L_j^2 = -x_{1,N} + 2x_{k_1+k_3+2,N}.$$

If  $k_3 = 1$ , then we have that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_1} c_j^1 L_j^1 - \sum_{j=0}^{k_2} c_j^2 L_j^2 - 2L_0^3 = 0.$$

If  $k_3 > 1$  odd, then applying Lemma 37 we find that there exist constants  $c_j^3 \in \{-1, 1\}$  for  $0 \leq j < k_3 - 1$  such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_3-2} c_j^3 L_j^3 = x_{2,N} - x_{k_1+k_3+1,N},$$

which implies that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_1} c_j^1 L_j^1 - \sum_{j=0}^{k_2} c_j^2 L_j^2 - 2 \sum_{j=0}^{k_3-2} c_j^3 L_j^3 - 2L_{k_3-1}^3 = 0.$$

If  $k_3 > 1$  even, then applying Lemma 37 we find that there exist constants  $c_j^3 \in \{-1, 1\}$  for  $0 \leq j < k_3 - 1$  such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_3-2} c_j^3 L_j^3 = x_{1,N} + x_{2,N} + x_{k_1+k_3+1,N}$$

so that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_1} c_j^1 L_j^1 + \sum_{j=0}^{k_2} c_j^2 L_j^2 - 2 \sum_{j=0}^{k_3-2} c_j^3 L_j^3 + 2L_{k_3-1}^3 = 0.$$

In all cases, it follows that  $\varphi\left(\widehat{C}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{g}))\right)$  does not have full rank, contradicting that  $\varphi$  is a contact form. Therefore,  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is not contact.

**Case 5:** Neither  $\mathcal{C}_1$  nor  $\mathcal{C}_2$  is a self-loop,  $\{p_0^3 = p_0^1, p_1^3\}$  is dashed with  $p_0^1 < p_1^3$ , and  $\{p_{k_3-1}^3, p_{k_3}^3 = p_0^2\}$  is dashed with  $p_{k_3-1}^3 > p_0^2$ . Since  $\varphi$  is a contact form, considering Remark 35 we have that  $\varphi(R_j^1) \neq 0$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_1$ ,  $\varphi(R_j^2) \neq 0$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_2$ , and  $\varphi(R_j^3) \neq 0$  for  $0 \leq j < k_3$ . Thus, we can define the collection of vectors  $L_j^1 = \frac{1}{-\varphi(R_j^1)} \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^1$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_1$ ,  $L_j^2 = \frac{1}{-\varphi(R_j^2)} \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^2$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_2$ , and  $L_j^3 = \frac{1}{-\varphi(R_j^3)} \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_j^3$  for  $0 \leq j < k_3$ . Considering Lemma 20, it is straightforward to verify that, for  $i = 1, 2$ , the collection of vectors  $L_j^i$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_i$  satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 39. Moreover, if  $k_3 > 2$ , then the collection of vectors  $L_j^3$  for  $1 \leq j < k_3 - 1$  satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 37. Since  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  are even, applying Lemma 38 we find that there exist constants  $c_j^1 \in \{-1, 1\}$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_1$  and  $c_j^2 \in \{-1, 1\}$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k_2$  such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_1} c_j^1 L_j^1 = -x_{1,N} + 2x_{2,N}$$

and

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_2} c_j^2 L_j^2 = -x_{1,N} + 2x_{k_1+k_3+2,N}.$$

If  $k_3 = 2$ , then we have that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_1} c_j^1 L_j^1 + 2L_0^2 - \sum_{j=0}^{k_2} c_j^2 L_j^2 - 2L_1^2 = 0.$$

If  $k_3 > 2$  is odd, then applying Lemma 37 we find that there exist constants  $c_j^3 \in \{-1, 1\}$  for  $0 < j < k_3 - 1$  such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k_3-2} c_j^3 L_j^3 = x_{1,N} + x_{k_1+3,N} + x_{k_1+k_3+1,N},$$

which implies that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_1} c_j^1 L_j^1 + 2L_0^3 + \sum_{j=0}^{k_2} c_j^2 L_j^2 + 2L_{k_3-1}^3 - 2 \sum_{j=1}^{k_3-2} c_j^3 L_j^3 = 0.$$

Finally, if  $k_3 > 2$  is even, then applying Lemma 37 we find that there exist constants  $c_j^3 \in \{-1, 1\}$  for  $0 < j < k_3 - 1$  such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k_3-2} c_j^2 L_j^2 = x_{k_1+3, N} - x_{k_1+k_3+1, N}$$

so that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_1} c_j^1 L_j^1 + 2L_0^3 - \sum_{j=0}^{k_2} c_j^2 L_j^2 - 2L_{k_3-1}^3 - 2 \sum_{j=1}^{k_3-2} c_j^2 L_j^2 = 0.$$

In all cases, it follows that  $\varphi\left(\widehat{C}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{g}))\right)$  does not have full rank, contradicting that  $\varphi$  is a contact form. Therefore,  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is not contact.  $\square$

Thus, combining Propositions 36, 40, 41, 42, 43, and 44 we obtain the following.

**Theorem 45.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a type-C poset of height one. If  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is contact, then*

- (a) *no connected component of  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  contains an even cycle, more than one odd cycle, or more than one self-loop; and*
- (b) *if  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  is connected, then  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  contains no cycles.*

*Proof.* (b) follows immediately from Propositions 36, 40, 41, 42, 43, and 44. As for (a), note that the arguments of Propositions 40–44 still apply in the case where the poset  $\mathcal{P}$  is disconnected and the cycles are contained in a single connected component of  $RG(\mathcal{P})$ .  $\square$

Consequently, if a connected, type-C poset  $\mathcal{P}$  of height one is contact, then  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  is necessarily a tree. In the following proposition, we show that this condition is also sufficient.

**Proposition 46.** *If  $\mathcal{P}$  is a type-C poset of height one such that  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  is a tree with  $|V(\mathcal{P})| > 1$ , then  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is contact. Moreover, if  $p_0 \in \mathcal{P}$  corresponds to a fixed vertex of degree one in  $RG(\mathcal{P})$ ,  $E_D$  denotes the collection of dashed edges of  $RG(\mathcal{P})$ , and  $E_{\overline{D}}$  the collection of non-dashed edges, then*

$$\varphi = (D_{p_0})^* + \sum_{\{p,q\} \in E_{\overline{D}}(\mathcal{P})} (R_{p,q}^{\pm})^* + \sum_{\substack{\{p,q\} \in E_D(\mathcal{P}) \\ p < q}} (R_{p,q})^*$$

*is a contact form for  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$ .*

*Proof.* Throughout, for  $\mathcal{P}$  a type-C poset of height one such that  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  is a tree with  $|V(\mathcal{P})| > 1$ , we denote  $\varphi(\widehat{C}(\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}), \mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})))$  by  $\widehat{M}_{\varphi}(\mathcal{P})$ . We show that  $\det \widehat{M}_{\varphi}(\mathcal{P}) = 1$  by induction on  $|E(\mathcal{P})|$ . If  $|E(\mathcal{P})| = 1$ , then either

- $\mathcal{P} = \{-2, -1, 1, 2\}$  with  $-2 \prec 1$  and  $-1 \prec 2$  or
- $\mathcal{P} = \{-2, -1, 1, 2\}$  with  $-2 \prec -1$  and  $1 \prec 2$ ;

in either case, the claim can be checked directly. Assume that the result holds for  $|E(\mathcal{P})| = n - 1 \geq 1$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a height-one, type-C poset such that  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  is a tree with  $|E(\mathcal{P})| = n > 1$ . Set  $N = |V(\mathcal{P})| + |E(\mathcal{P})| + 1$ . Since  $|E(\mathcal{P})| > 1$ , there exists a vertex  $p \neq p_0$  such that  $p$  has degree one in  $RG(\mathcal{P})$ , say  $p$  is adjacent to  $q$  in  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  via a non-dashed edge; the dashed case follows via a similar argument. Removing vertex  $p$  and the edge connecting  $p$  and  $q$  in  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  results in  $RG(\mathcal{P}')$ , where  $\mathcal{P}'$  is the poset induced by the subset  $\mathcal{P} - \{-p, p\} \subset \mathcal{P}$ . Note that  $|E(\mathcal{P}')| = n - 1$ , so that our induction hypothesis applies to  $\mathcal{P}'$  with  $\varphi' = \varphi - (R_{p,q}^{\pm})^*$ , i.e.,  $\det \widehat{M}_{\varphi'}(\mathcal{P}') = 1$ . Since  $p \neq p_0$  is a vertex of degree one in  $RG(\mathcal{P})$ , it follows that one obtains  $\widehat{M}_{\varphi}(\mathcal{P})$  from  $\widehat{M}_{\varphi'}(\mathcal{P}')$  by adjoining two new rows and columns corresponding to the elements of

$\{R_{p,q}^\pm, D_p\} = \mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P}) \setminus \mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P}')$ . Ordering  $\mathcal{B}_C(\mathcal{P})$  so that  $R_{p,q}^\pm$  is second to last and  $D_p$  is last, we have that the last row of  $\widehat{M}_\varphi(\mathcal{P})$ , i.e.,  $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{P})$ , is equal to  $x_{N-1,N}$ ; note that this implies that last column of  $\widehat{M}_\varphi(\mathcal{P})$  is equal to the transpose of  $-x_{N-1,N}$ . Thus, computing  $\det \widehat{M}_\varphi(\mathcal{P})$  by first expanding along the last row followed by the last column we have

$$\det \widehat{M}_\varphi(\mathcal{P}) = (-1)^{2N-1}(-1)^{2N-2}(-1) \det \widehat{M}_\varphi(\mathcal{P}') = (-1)^{4N-4}(1) = 1.$$

The result follows.  $\square$

To finish the proof of Theorem 33, we first require the following lemma.

**Lemma 47.** *If  $\mathcal{P}$  is a type-C poset of height one such that  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  consists of connected components  $\{K_1, \dots, K_n\}$ , then*

$$\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}_{K_i}),$$

where  $\mathcal{P}_{K_i}$  is the unique type-C poset satisfying  $RG(\mathcal{P}_{K_i}) = K_i$ .

*Proof.* Evidently,  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}_{K_i})$  as vector spaces. Moreover, as non-trivial bracket relations can only exist between basis elements corresponding to vertices/edges in the same connected component of  $RG(\mathcal{P})$ , the result follows.  $\square$

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 33.

*Proof of Theorem 33.* Assume that  $RG(\mathcal{P})$  consists of the connected components  $\{K_1, \dots, K_n\}$  and let  $\mathcal{P}_{K_i}$  denote the unique type-C poset such that  $RG(\mathcal{P}_{K_i}) = K_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . For the backward direction, assume that  $K_1$  is the unique connected component which is a tree. Applying Proposition 46 and Theorem 32, we find that  $\mathcal{P}_{K_1}$  is contact and  $\mathcal{P}_{K_i}$  is Frobenius for  $2 \leq i \leq n$ . Now, if  $\mathcal{P}$  is connected, then  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}) = \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}_{K_1})$ , i.e.,  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is contact. On the other hand, if  $\mathcal{P}$  is disconnected, then, applying Lemma 47,  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is the direct sum of a contact Lie algebra with Frobenius Lie algebras, i.e.,  $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P})$  is contact in this case as well.

For the forward direction, since a Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  is contact only if  $\text{ind } \mathfrak{g} = 1$ , applying Theorem 18, we find that  $\text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}_{K_i}) = 1$  for exactly one  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $\text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}_{K_j}) = 0$  for all other values of  $1 \leq j \neq i \leq n$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $\text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathcal{P}_{K_1}) = 1$ . Considering Theorems 17 and 45 above, if  $\mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{P})$  is contact, then  $RG(\mathcal{P}_{K_1})$  must be a tree. Moreover, by Theorem 32 all other connected components must contain a single cycle consisting of an odd number of vertices. The result follows.  $\square$

## 5 Directions for Further Research

The overall objective of this article is to continue the work initiated in [7] and to progress toward an eventual characterization of contact Lie poset algebras of classical type. For the interested reader, below we outline a few approaches that one may consider in pursuit of such a classification.

The approach that is simplest to describe, yet possibly the most cumbersome to execute, is a direct extension of the one used in this article. Specifically, it would be sufficient to extend the index formulas given in [5] and Section 3 so that they apply to type-A, B, C, and D Lie poset algebras associated with posets of arbitrary height and then apply similar arguments to those used here and in [7] to characterize those algebras that admit contact forms. With that said, extensive calculations by the authors suggest that a height-independent index formula for classical Lie poset algebras is out of reach, as the linear-algebraic techniques used here become more impractical as the corresponding posets grow in height.

An alternative approach to extending the techniques used here is to introduce a type-B, C, and D version of (contact) ‘‘toral’’ posets. In [19], the authors extend the definition of ‘‘toral’’ poset – initially defined in [6] – to include posets corresponding to contact type-A Lie poset algebras, and they successfully construct contact forms for such Lie poset algebras. In short, contact ‘‘toral’’ posets are constructed by identifying

pairs of elements of “building-block” posets together in a particular manner. The benefits to this approach lie in the generality of the definitions of (contact) “toral-pairs” and (contact) “toral” posets – in particular, such definitions are height-independent – and the combinatorial nature of the identification, or “gluing,” procedure. The drawback, however, is that it is currently unknown whether there are any contact type-A Lie poset algebras that are not “toral.” That is, while extending the notion of (contact) “toral” poset to posets of types B, C, and D can possibly generate large families of such contact Lie poset algebras, it would be difficult to obtain a full characterization.

The least explored, yet perhaps most interesting, approach we propose here is via the Lie-algebraic concept of “quasi-reductivity.” Briefly, if  $\mathfrak{g}$  is a complex Lie algebra of a connected linear algebraic group  $G$  and has center  $\mathfrak{z}$ , then  $\mathfrak{g}$  is *quasi-reductive* if it admits a one-form  $\varphi$  such that the center of  $\ker(d\varphi)/\mathfrak{z}$  consists of semisimple elements of  $\mathfrak{g}$  (see [2, 15, 21]). Such a one-form is said to be *of reductive type*, and it can be shown that the contact form  $\varphi$  given in Proposition 46 is of reductive type, i.e., each contact type-B, C, and D Lie poset algebra associated with a poset of height one is quasi-reductive. In fact, it is also straightforward to show that the contact forms constructed in the prequel [7] are of reductive type as well; thus, we claim that all contact Lie poset algebras of classical type associated with posets of height one are quasi-reductive. On the other hand, an argument similar to that presented in Theorem 5 of [10] proves that each index-one, quasi-reductive Lie poset algebra is contact. We are led to the following conjecture.

**Conjecture 1.** *An index-one Lie poset algebra of type A, B, C, or D is contact if and only if it is quasi-reductive.*

Upon obtaining a proof of Conjecture 1, the characterization of contact Lie poset algebras could be acquired by investigating quasi-reductive Lie poset algebras, which, to the authors’ knowledge, have not yet been identified. Furthermore, such a proof, in tandem with Theorem 5 of [10], would suggest a more general phenomenon occurring within the family of “Lie poset algebras” (see [10]).

## References

- [1] M. A. Alvarez, M. C. Rodríguez-Vallarte, and G. Salgado. “Contact nilpotent Lie algebras.” *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.*, 145: 1467-1474, 2017.
- [2] K. Baur and A. Moreau. “Quasi-reductive (bi)parabolic subalgebras in reductive Lie algebras.” *Ann. Inst. Fourier*, 61(2): 417-451, 2011.
- [3] W. M. Boothby and H. C. Wang. “On contact manifolds.” *Ann. of Math.*, 68(2): 721-734, 1958.
- [4] V. Coll and M. Gerstenhaber. “Cohomology of Lie semidirect products and poset algebras.” *J. Lie Theory*, 26: 79-95, 2016.
- [5] V. Coll and N. Mayers. “The index of Lie poset algebras.” *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 177, 2021.
- [6] V. Coll and N. Mayers. “Toral posets and the binary spectrum property.” *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 1-29, 2021.
- [7] V. Coll, N. Mayers, and N. Russoniello. “Contact Lie poset algebras.” *Electron. J. Comb.*, 29(3): #P3.35, 2022.
- [8] V. E. Coll, Jr., N. Mayers, N. Russoniello, and G. Salgado. “Contact seaweeds.” *Pac. J. Math.*, 320(1): 45-60, 2022.
- [9] V. Coll, N. Mayers, and N. Russoniello. “The index and spectrum of Lie poset algebras of types B, C, and D.” *Electron. J. Comb.*, 28(3): #P3.47, 2021.
- [10] V. Coll and N. Russoniello. “Classification of contact seaweeds.” arXiv:2303.13260, submitted 2023.

- [11] A. Cameron, V. Coll, N. Mayers, and N. Russoniello. “The breadth of Lie poset algebras.” *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, accepted August 2022.
- [12] V. Dergachev and A. Kirillov. “Index of Lie algebras of seaweed type.” *J. Lie Theory*, 10(2): 331-343, 2000.
- [13] A. Diatta. “Left invariant contact structures on Lie groups.” *Differ. Geom. Appl.*, 26(5):544-552, 2008.
- [14] J. Dixmier. “Enveloping Algebras.” Vol. 14. Newnes, 1977.
- [15] M. Duflo, M. S. Khalgui, and P. Torasso. “Algèbres de Lie quasi-réductives.” *Transform. Groups*, 17: 417-470, 2012.
- [16] M. Goze and E. Remm. “Contact and Frobeniusian forms on Lie groups.” *Differ. Geom. Appl.*, 35: 74-94, 2014.
- [17] A. Joseph. “On semi-invariants and index for biparabolic (seaweed) algebras, I.” *J. Algebra*, 305(1): 487-515, 2006.
- [18] Y. Khakimdjano, M. Goze, and A. Medina. “Symplectic or contact structures on Lie groups.” *Differ. Geom. Appl.*, 21(1): 41-54, 2004.
- [19] N. Mayers and N. Russoniello. “On toral posets and contact Lie poset algebras.” *J. Geom. Phys.*, 190: 2023.
- [20] D. Panyushev. “An extension of Raïs’ theorem and seaweed subalgebras of simple Lie algebras.” *Ann. de l’Institut Fourier*, 55(3): 693-715, 2005.
- [21] D. Panyushev and O. Yakimova. “On seaweed subalgebras and meander graphs in type D.” *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 222(11): 3414-3431, 2018.
- [22] V. Reiner. “Quotients of Coxeter complexes and  $P$ -partitions.” vol 460, AMS, 1992.
- [23] V. Reiner. “Signed posets.” *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 62(2): 324-360, 1993.
- [24] M. C. Rodríguez-Vallarte and G. Salgado. “5-dimensional indecomposable contact Lie algebras as double extensions.” *J. Geom. Phys.*, 100: 20-32, 2016.
- [25] G. Salgado-González. “Invariants of contact Lie algebras.” *J. Geom. Phys.*, 144: 388–396, 2019.
- [26] A. Weinstein. “Contact surgery and symplectic handlebodies.” *Hokkaido Math. J.*, 20(2): 241–251, 1991.