

HIGHER CONTIGUITY DISTANCE

NILAY EKİZ YAZICI¹, AYŞE BORAT^{1,2}

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we introduce the higher analogues of contiguity distance and its relations with simplicial Lusternik-Schnirelmann category and discrete topological complexity. Also we study the effects of geometric realisation and barycentric subdivision in the sense that how the geometric realisation of the simplicial maps and the induced simplicial maps on barycentric subdivisions affects higher contiguity distance.

1. INTRODUCTION

Homotopic distance ([12]) is a mathematical tool which can be realised as a generalisation of the homotopy invariants topological complexity ([6]) and Lusternik-Schnirelmann category ([5]). All these invariants are important since that they can be used to analyze motion planning problem. Moreover, n -th topological complexity is related to the motion planning problem which requires a rule to assign any n points in the space to an n -legged path. The concept of higher topological complexity is introduced by Rudyak in [13] and is developed by Basabe, Gonzalez, Rudyak and Tamaki in [2]. Motivated from that fact, in [12] Macias-Virgos, Mosquera-Lois and in [3] Borat, Vergili construct n -th homotopic distance in a way that for some special continuous maps it coincides with n -th topological complexity and Lusternik-Schnirelmann category.

One of the importance of considering motion planning problem in the simplicial realm is that it gives a more computable approach on motion planning problem. Regarding the problem in a combinatorial way leads one to ask how the ideas in the preceding paragraph are modelled in a combinatorial way. The answer comes from Fernandez-Ternero, Macias-Virgos, Minuz and Vilches for discrete topological complexity in [7], from the same authors for simplicial Lusternik-Schnirelmann category in [8] and [9], from Borat, Pamuk and Vergili for simplicial analogue of homotopic distance so-called contiguity distance in [4], from Alabay, Borat, Cihangirli and Dirican Erdal for n -th discrete topological complexity in [1].

Moreover, Gonzalez studied simplicial analogue of topological complexity from a different viewpoint in [10].

Date: March 26, 2024.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 55M30, 55U10, 55U05.

Key words and phrases. contiguity distance, homotopic distance, discrete topological complexity, simplicial Lusternik Schnirelmann category, simplicial complex.

¹The authors are supported by the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK) [grant number 123F268].

²The corresponding author.

In this paper, we turn our face towards contigutiy distance and focus on to build its higher analogues.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we will recall some combinatorial definitions which will be used to construct the main tools of this paper.

Definition 2.1. *Two simplicial maps $\varphi, \psi : K \rightarrow L$ are called contiguous if for every simplex $\{v_0, \dots, v_k\}$ in K , $\{\varphi(v_0), \dots, \varphi(v_k), \psi(v_0), \dots, \psi(v_k)\}$ constitutes a simplex in L . Such maps are denoted by $\varphi \sim_c \psi$.*

Definition 2.2. *Two simplicial maps $\varphi, \psi : K \rightarrow L$ are said to be in the same contiguity class if one can find a finite sequence of simplicial maps $\varphi_i : K \rightarrow L$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, m$ such that $\varphi = \varphi_0 \sim_c \varphi_1 \sim_c \varphi_2 \sim_c \dots \sim_c \varphi_m = \psi$. Such maps are denoted by $\varphi \sim \psi$.*

Definition 2.3. *Let K be a simplicial complex. A finite or infinite sequence of vertices such that any two consecutive vertices span an edge is called an edge path in K . If any two vertices in K can be joined by a finite edge path, K is said to be edge-path connected.*

Lemma 2.1. [7] *K is edge-path connected simplicial complex iff any two constant simplicial maps $L \rightarrow K$ are in the same contiguity class.*

Since the cartesian product of simplicial complexes is not necessarily a simplicial complex, a "new" product on simplicial complexes is defined so that two simplicial complexes under the new product constitutes a simplicial complex.

Suppose that K_1 and K_2 are simplicial complexes. The categorical product of K_1 and K_2 (denoted by $K_1 \amalg K_2$) is defined as follows.

- (i) The set of vertices of $K_1 \amalg K_2$ is defined to be $V(K_1) \times V(K_2)$ where $V(K_i)$ stands for the set of vertices of K_i for $i = 1, 2$.
- (ii) Let $p_i : V(K_1 \amalg K_2) \rightarrow V(K_i)$ be the projection maps for $i = 1, 2$. A simplex σ is said to be in $K_1 \amalg K_2$, if $p_1(\sigma) \in K_1$ and $p_2(\sigma) \in K_2$.

(for more details, see [11]).

The following concept can be realised as the simplicial analogue to the homotopy type of topological spaces.

Definition 2.4. *The simplicial complexes K and K' are said to have the same strong homotopy type if there exist simplicial maps $\varphi : K \rightarrow K'$ and $\psi : K' \rightarrow K$ such that $\varphi \circ \psi \sim \text{id}_K$ and $\psi \circ \varphi \sim \text{id}_{K'}$, and is denoted by $K \sim K'$. Here, the simplicial maps φ and ψ are called strong homotopy equivalences.*

Definition 2.5. *Let K be a simplicial complex and v_0 be a vertex in K . A simplicial complex K is said to be strongly collapsible if K and $\{v_0\}$ is of the same strong homotopy type.*

Definition 2.6. [12] For simplicial maps $\varphi, \psi : K \rightarrow K'$, the contiguity distance between φ and ψ , denoted by $\text{SD}(\varphi, \psi)$, is the least integer $k \geq 0$ such that there exists a covering of K by subcomplexes $\Omega_0, \Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_k$ with the property that $\varphi|_{\Omega_j}$ and $\psi|_{\Omega_j}$ are in the same contiguity class for all $j = 0, 1, \dots, k$. If there is no such a covering, it is defined to be $\text{SD}(\varphi, \psi) = \infty$.

Definition 2.7. [9] Let K be a simplicial complex. For a subcomplex $\Omega \subset K$, if the inclusion $i : \Omega \hookrightarrow K$ and a constant map $c_{v_0} : \Omega \rightarrow K$, where $v_0 \in K$ is some fixed vertex, are in the same contiguity class, then Ω is called categorical.

Definition 2.8. [9] Let K be a simplicial complex. The simplicial Lusternik-Schnirelmann category $\text{scat}(K)$ is the least integer $k \geq 0$ such that one can find categorical subcomplexes $\Omega_0, \Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_k$ of K covering K .

Definition 2.9. [1] Let K be a simplicial complex. For a subcomplex $\Omega \subset K^n$, if there is a simplicial map $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow K$ such that $\Delta \circ \sigma \sim \iota_\Omega$ where $\Delta : K \rightarrow K^n$, $\Delta(v) = (v, v, \dots, v)$ is the diagonal map and $\iota_\Omega : \Omega \hookrightarrow K^n$ is the inclusion map, then Ω is called an n -Farber subcomplex.

Definition 2.10. [1] Let K be a simplicial complex. The n -th discrete topological complexity $\text{TC}_n(K)$ of a simplicial complex K is the least integer $k \geq 0$ such that one can find n -Farber subcomplexes $\Omega_0, \Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_k$ of K^n covering K^n .

The following theorem gives a characterisation of n -Farber subcomplexes.

Theorem 2.1. [1] Let $\Omega \subset K^n$ be a subcomplex and $\Delta : K \rightarrow K^n$ denote the diagonal map, then the followings are equivalent.

- (1) Ω is an n -Farber subcomplex.
- (2) $(p_i)|_\Omega \sim (p_j)|_\Omega$ for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.
- (3) One of the restrictions $(p_1)|_\Omega, (p_2)|_\Omega, \dots, (p_n)|_\Omega$ is a section of Δ (up to contiguity).

If $n = 2$ is in Definition 2.9 and Definition 2.10, then one obtains Farber subcomplexes and discrete topological complexity, respectively, as introduced in [7].

3. HIGHER CONTIGUITY DISTANCE

Definition 3.1. For simplicial maps $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n : K \rightarrow K'$, the n -th contiguity distance between $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n : K \rightarrow K'$, denoted by $\text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$, is the least integer $k \geq 0$ such that there exists a covering of K by subcomplexes K_0, K_1, \dots, K_k with the property that $\varphi_1|_{K_j}, \varphi_2|_{K_j}, \dots, \varphi_n|_{K_j} : K_j \rightarrow K'$ are in the same contiguity class for all $j = 0, 1, \dots, k$. If there is no such a covering, it is defined to be $\text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) = \infty$.

Proposition 3.1. $\text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) = \text{SD}(\varphi_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, \varphi_{\sigma(n)})$ holds for any permutation σ of $\{1, \dots, n\}$. \square

Proposition 3.2. $\text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) = 0$ if and only if $\varphi_i \sim \varphi_{i+1}$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$. \square

Proposition 3.3. Given simplicial maps $\varphi_i : K \rightarrow K'$ and $\psi_i : K \rightarrow K'$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. If $\varphi_i \sim \psi_i$ for each i , then $\text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) = \text{SD}(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n)$. \square

Proposition 3.4. If $1 < m < n$ and $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m, \dots, \varphi_n : K \rightarrow K'$ are simplicial maps, then $\text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m) \leq \text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$. \square

Example 3.1. Consider the simplicial complex K given in Figure 3.1. Given the constant simplicial maps $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 : K \rightarrow K$ at the vertices $\{0\}$ and $\{1\}$, respectively, and the simplicial map

$$\varphi_3 : K \rightarrow K \text{ by}$$

$$\varphi_3(\{0\}) = \varphi_3(\{1\}) = \{0\}, \quad \varphi_3(\{2\}) = \varphi_3(\{3\}) = \varphi_3(\{4\}) = \{1\}.$$




Figure 3.1

For $i, j = 1, 2, 3$, $\varphi_i(v) \cup \varphi_j(v)$ is a simplex whenever v is a vertex of K .

Moreover, we have the following.

$\varphi_1(\sigma) \cup \varphi_2(\sigma)$ is either $\{0\}$ or $\{1\}$ or $\{0, 1\}$;

$\varphi_1(\sigma) \cup \varphi_3(\sigma)$ is either $\{0\}$ or $\{0, 1\}$;

$\varphi_2(\sigma) \cup \varphi_3(\sigma)$ is either $\{1\}$ or $\{0, 1\}$.

So one can conclude that φ_1 , φ_2 and φ_3 are contiguous, so are in the same contiguity class. Therefore $\text{SD}(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3) = 0$.

Proposition 3.5. Let $\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_n : K \rightarrow K'$ and $\mu : M \rightarrow K$ be simplicial maps. Then we have

$$\text{SD}(\varphi_1 \circ \mu, \dots, \varphi_n \circ \mu) \leq \text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n).$$

Proof. Let $\text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) = k$. Then there exist subcomplexes K_0, \dots, K_k of K such that $\varphi_1|_{K_i} \sim \dots \sim \varphi_n|_{K_i}$ for all i . Define $M_i := \mu^{-1}(K_i)$. Then

$(\varphi_s \circ \mu)|_{M_i} = \varphi_s|_{K_i} \circ \mu|_{M_i} = \varphi_s \circ \mu|_{M_i} \sim \varphi_t \circ \mu|_{M_i} = \varphi_t|_{K_i} \circ \mu|_{M_i} = (\varphi_t \circ \mu)|_{M_i}$
for all $s, t \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Therefore, $\text{SD}(\varphi_1 \circ \mu, \dots, \varphi_n \circ \mu) \leq k$. \square

The following proposition is a generalisation of Proposition 3.5.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_n : K \rightarrow K'$ and $\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n : M \rightarrow K$ be simplicial maps. If $\mu_1 \sim \mu_2 \sim \dots \sim \mu_n$ then we have*

$$\text{SD}(\varphi_1 \circ \mu_1, \dots, \varphi_n \circ \mu_n) \leq \text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n).$$

Proof. Let $\text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) = k$. Then there exist subcomplexes K_0, \dots, K_k of K such that $\varphi_1|_{K_i} \sim \dots \sim \varphi_n|_{K_i}$ for all i . Define $M_i := \mu_1^{-1}(K_i)$. Then

$$(\varphi_s \circ \mu_1)|_{M_i} = \varphi_s|_{K_i} \circ \mu_1|_{M_i} = \varphi_s \circ \mu_1|_{M_i} \sim \varphi_t \circ \mu_{t'}|_{M_i} = \varphi_t|_{K_i} \circ \mu_{t'}|_{M_i} = (\varphi_t \circ \mu_{t'})|_{M_i}$$

for all $s, t, t' \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. So $\text{SD}(\varphi_1 \circ \mu_1, \dots, \varphi_n \circ \mu_n) \leq k$. \square

Corollary 3.1. *Let $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n : M \rightarrow K$ be the simplicial maps that satisfy the condition in Proposition 3.6 which also have right strong equivalence. Then for simplicial maps $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n : K \rightarrow K'$, we have*

$$\text{SD}(\varphi_1 \circ \mu_1, \dots, \varphi_n \circ \mu_n) = \text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n).$$

Proof. If μ_i has right strong equivalence (for all $i = 1, \dots, n$), then we have $\mu_i \circ \alpha \sim id_K$. Here, since $\mu_i \sim \mu_{i+1}$ for all i , the same α can be used for each i . It follows that $\varphi \circ \mu_i \circ \alpha \sim \varphi_i$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) &= \text{SD}(\varphi_1 \circ \mu_1 \circ \alpha, \dots, \varphi_n \circ \mu_n \circ \alpha) \\ &\leq \text{SD}(\varphi_1 \circ \mu_1, \dots, \varphi_n \circ \mu_n) \\ &\leq \text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) \end{aligned}$$

where the equality and the inequalities follow from Proposition 3.3 and Proposition 3.6, respectively. Hence, we have $\text{SD}(\varphi_1 \circ \mu_1, \dots, \varphi_n \circ \mu_n) = \text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$. \square

Proposition 3.7. *Let $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n : K \rightarrow K'$ and $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n : K' \rightarrow M$ be simplicial maps. If $\mu_i \sim \mu_{i+1}$ for every $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ then*

$$\text{SD}(\mu_1 \circ \varphi_1, \dots, \mu_n \circ \varphi_n) \leq \text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n).$$

Proof. Suppose that $\text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) = k$. There exist subcomplexes K_0, \dots, K_k of K such that $\varphi_1|_{K_i} \sim \dots \sim \varphi_n|_{K_i}$ for all i . Then

$$(\mu_s \circ \varphi_{s'})|_{K_i} = \mu_s \circ \varphi_{s'}|_{K_i} \sim \mu_s \circ \varphi_{t'}|_{K_i} \sim \mu_t \circ \varphi_{t'}|_{K_i} = (\mu_t \circ \varphi_{t'})|_{K_i}$$

for all $s, s', t, t' \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. So $\text{SD}(\mu_1 \circ \varphi_1, \dots, \mu_n \circ \varphi_n) \leq k$. \square

Corollary 3.2. *Let $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n : K' \rightarrow M$ be the simplicial maps that satisfy the condition in Proposition 3.7 which also have left strong equivalence. Then for simplicial maps $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n : K \rightarrow K'$, we have*

$$\text{SD}(\mu_1 \circ \varphi_1, \dots, \mu_n \circ \varphi_n) = \text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n).$$

Proof. If μ_i has left strong equivalence (for all $i = 1, \dots, n$), then $\beta \circ \mu_i \sim id_K$. Here, since $\mu_i \sim \mu_{i+1}$ for all i , the same β can be used for each i . It follows that $\beta \circ \mu_i \circ \varphi_i \sim \varphi_i$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) &= \text{SD}(\beta \circ \mu_1 \circ \varphi_1, \dots, \beta \circ \mu_n \circ \varphi_n) \\ &\leq \text{SD}(\mu_1 \circ \varphi_1, \dots, \mu_n \circ \varphi_n) \\ &\leq \text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) \end{aligned}$$

where the equality and the inequalities follow from Proposition 3.3 and Proposition 3.7, respectively. Hence, we have $\text{SD}(\mu_1 \circ \varphi_1, \dots, \mu_n \circ \varphi_n) = \text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$. \square

As a result of Corollary 3.1 and Corollary 3.2, one can write the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n : K' \rightarrow K$ and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n : L \rightarrow L'$ be right and left strong equivalences, respectively. If the simplicial maps $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n : K \rightarrow L$ and $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n : K' \rightarrow L'$ make the following diagram commutative up to contiguity for each $j = 1, \dots, n$ (i.e., $\alpha_j \circ \varphi_j \circ \beta_j \sim \psi_j$ for each j), then we have $\text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) = \text{SD}(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n)$.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K & \xrightarrow{\varphi_j} & L \\ \uparrow \beta_j & & \downarrow \alpha_j \\ K' & \xrightarrow{\psi_j} & L' \end{array}$$

Remark 3.1. *In particular, the above theorem is valid if one consider only one right strong equivalence β and one left strong equivalence α . Therefore one can say that if $K \sim K'$ and $L \sim L'$, the result of the above theorem is still valid and it can be realised as a theorem which mentions the strong homotopy invariance of the higher contiguity distance.*

Theorem 3.2. $\text{SD}(p_1, \dots, p_n) = \text{TC}_n(K)$ where $p_i : K^n \rightarrow K$ is the projection to the i -th factor for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Proof. First of all, we show that $\text{SD}(p_1, \dots, p_n) \leq \text{TC}_n(K)$. Suppose that $\text{TC}_n(K) = k$. Then there exist n -Farber subcomplexes K_1, \dots, K_k covering K^n . From Theorem 2.1 it becomes $p_1|_{K_i} \sim \dots \sim p_n|_{K_i}$ for all i . So $\text{SD}(p_1, \dots, p_n) \leq k$. On the other hand, let $\text{SD}(p_1, \dots, p_n) = k$. Then there exist subcomplexes K_1, \dots, K_k such that $p_1|_{K_i} \sim \dots \sim p_n|_{K_i}$ for all i . By Theorem 2.1, for each i , K_i is n -Farber subcomplex. Therefore $\text{TC}_n(K) \leq k$. \square

Corollary 3.3. *The n -th discrete topological complexity TC_n is an invariant of strong homotopy type.*

Remark 3.2. *Corollary 3.3 is proved in Theorem 2.3 in [1] and the case for $n = 2$ is proved in Theorem 3.3 in [7].*

Theorem 3.3. *For a vertex v_0 in K , define $i_j : K^{n-1} \rightarrow K^n$ by $i_j(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n-1}) = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{j-1}, v_0, \sigma_j, \dots, \sigma_{n-1})$. Then we have $\text{scat}(K^{n-1}) = \text{SD}(i_1, \dots, i_n)$.*

Proof. Assume that $\text{scat}(K^{n-1}) = k$. Then there exist categorical subcomplexes L_0, \dots, L_k of K^{n-1} covering K^{n-1} . More precisely, the inclusion map $\overline{t}_j : L_j \rightarrow K^{n-1}$ and the constant map $\overline{c}_{v_0} : L_j \rightarrow K^{n-1}$ are in the same contiguity class for all $j = 0, \dots, k$, that is, $\overline{t}_j \sim \overline{c}_{v_0}$ on each L_j . Here, $\overline{t}_j = (pr_1, \dots, pr_{n-1})$ where $pr_i : K^{n-1} \rightarrow K$ is the projection to the i -th factor and $\overline{c}_{v_0} = (c_{v_0}, c_{v_0}, \dots, c_{v_0})$ is the constant map. Since K is edge-path connected and by Lemma 2.1, one can choose all the constant maps as the constant map $c_{v_0} : K^{n-1} \rightarrow K$. So, $pr_1 \sim c_{v_0}$, $pr_2 \sim c_{v_0}, \dots, pr_{n-1} \sim c_{v_0}$.

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} i_1 &:= (c_{v_0}, pr_1, \dots, pr_{n-1}), \\ i_2 &:= (pr_1, c_{v_0}, \dots, pr_{n-1}), \\ &\dots \\ i_n &:= (pr_1, pr_2, \dots, pr_{n-1}, c_{v_0}). \end{aligned}$$

Since from the above paragraph

$$pr_1|_{L_j} \sim pr_2|_{L_j} \sim \dots \sim pr_{n-1}|_{L_j} \sim c_{v_0}|_{L_j},$$

we have

$$i_1|_{L_j} \sim i_2|_{L_j} \sim \dots \sim i_n|_{L_j}.$$

Let us prove the other way around. Suppose that $\text{SD}(i_1, \dots, i_n) = k$. Then there exist subcomplexes L_0, \dots, L_k of K covering K such that $i_1|_{L_j} \sim \dots \sim i_n|_{L_j}$ for all j . Our aim is to show that the inclusion map $\overline{t}_j : L_j \rightarrow K^{n-1}$ and the constant map $\overline{c}_{v_0} : L_j \rightarrow K^{n-1}$ are in the same contiguity class for all $j = 0, \dots, k$. Let $pr_i : K^{n-1} \rightarrow K$ be the projection map to the i -th factor for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} pr_1 \circ i_1|_{L_j} &\sim pr_1 \circ i_2|_{L_j}, \\ pr_2 \circ i_2|_{L_j} &\sim pr_2 \circ i_3|_{L_j}, \\ &\dots \\ pr_{n-1} \circ i_{n-1}|_{L_j} &\sim pr_{n-1} \circ i_n|_{L_j} \end{aligned}$$

so that $(pr_1, \dots, pr_{n-1}) \sim (c_{v_0}, c_{v_0}, \dots, c_{v_0})$. Therefore $\overline{t}_j \sim \overline{c}_{v_0}$.

□

In the previous theorem, we studied the relation between the simplicial LS category and the higher contiguity distance of the inclusion maps from K^{n-1} to K^n , and as a result, we found that $\text{scat}(K^{n-1}) = \text{SD}(i_1, \dots, i_n)$. On the other hand, one can find another equality saying that $\text{scat}(K) = \text{SD}(\tilde{i}_1, \dots, \tilde{i}_n)$ where the inclusion maps \tilde{i}_j are from K to K^n as introduced in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.4. *Let v_0 be a vertex of the simplicial complex K . For the simplicial maps $\tilde{i}_j : K \rightarrow K^n$, which take σ to the n -tuple whose j -th factor is σ whereas the other factors are v_0 , we have $\text{scat}(K) = \text{SD}(\tilde{i}_1, \dots, \tilde{i}_n)$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\text{scat}(K) = k$. Then there exist categorical subcomplexes L_0, \dots, L_k of K covering K , that is, the inclusion map $\iota : L_i \hookrightarrow K$ and the constant map $c_{v_0} : L_i \rightarrow K$ are in the same contiguity class for all $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$.

We can write $\tilde{i}_j|_{L_i}$ as a composition as follows, for each i and j :

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{i}_1|_{L_i} &= (\iota, c_{v_0}, \dots, c_{v_0}) \circ \Delta_{L_i} \\ \tilde{i}_2|_{L_i} &= (c_{v_0}, \iota, c_{v_0}, \dots, c_{v_0}) \circ \Delta_{L_i} \\ &\dots \\ \tilde{i}_n|_{L_i} &= (c_{v_0}, \dots, c_{v_0}, \iota) \circ \Delta_{L_i}\end{aligned}$$

where Δ_{L_i} is the diagonal map for L_i .

Since L_i is categorical, $\iota \sim c_{v_0}$ on each L_i . Hence

$$\begin{aligned}(\iota, c_{v_0}, \dots, c_{v_0}) &\sim (c_{v_0}, c_{v_0}, \dots, c_{v_0}) \\ (c_{v_0}, \iota, c_{v_0}, \dots, c_{v_0}) &\sim (c_{v_0}, c_{v_0}, \dots, c_{v_0}) \\ &\dots \\ (c_{v_0}, \dots, c_{v_0}, \iota) &\sim (c_{v_0}, c_{v_0}, \dots, c_{v_0}).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\tilde{i}_1|_{L_i} \sim \tilde{i}_2|_{L_i} \sim \dots \sim \tilde{i}_n|_{L_i}$ which proves our claim.

On the other hand, suppose that $\text{SD}(\tilde{i}_1, \dots, \tilde{i}_n) = k$. Then there exist subcomplexes L_0, \dots, L_k of K covering K such that $\tilde{i}_1|_{L_i} \sim \dots \sim \tilde{i}_n|_{L_i}$ for all i . Let us consider the first projection $p_1 : K^n \rightarrow K$, then

$$p_1 \circ \tilde{i}_1|_{L_i} \sim p_1 \circ \tilde{i}_2|_{L_i} \sim \dots \sim p_1 \circ \tilde{i}_n|_{L_i}.$$

Therefore, we obtain $\iota \sim c_{v_0}$ which completes the proof. □

Corollary 3.4. *The simplicial Lusternik-Schnirelmann category is an invariant of strong homotopy type.*

Proof. This follows from Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.4. □

The continuous version of Theorem 3.3 can be realised as a discretisation of Theorem 3.4 in [3] whereas Theorem 3.4 is not yet given in the literature. So we introduce its continuous correspondence as Theorem 3.5.

Theorem 3.5. *Fix a point x_0 in X and consider the inclusions $j_i : X \rightarrow X^n$ given by $j_i(x) = (x_0^1, \dots, x_0^{i-1}, x, x_0^{i+1}, \dots, x_0^n)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, here the superscripts of x_0 's stand for to emphasize in which factor x_0 's belong to. Then $D(j_1, \dots, j_n) = \text{cat}(X)$.*

Proof. Let $D(j_1, \dots, j_n) = k$. Then there exist open subsets U_0, \dots, U_k of X covering X such that $j_1|_{U_s} \simeq \dots \simeq j_n|_{U_s}$ for all $s = 0, \dots, k$. Assume that for each $s = 0, 1, \dots, k$, there exists a homotopy $H_s^i : U_s \times I \rightarrow X^n$ such that $H_s^i(x, 0) = j_i(x)$ and $H_s^i(x, 1) = j_{i+1}(x)$ for each $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. We want to show that $id|_{U_s} \simeq c|_{U_s}$ for $s = 0, \dots, k$ where $id : X \rightarrow X$ is the identity map and $c : X \rightarrow X$ is a constant map. For each $s = 0, \dots, k$, define $F_s^i : U_s \times I \rightarrow X$ by $F_s^i(x, t) = pr_i \circ H_s^i(x, t)$ where $pr_i : X^n \rightarrow X$ is the projection map into the i -th factor and which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} F_s^i(x, 0) &= pr_i \circ H_s^i(x, 0) = pr_i \circ j_i(x) = x, \\ F_s^i(x, 1) &= pr_i \circ H_s^i(x, 1) = pr_i \circ j_{i+1}(x) = x_0^i. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\text{cat}(X) \leq D(j_1, \dots, j_n)$.

On the other hand, assume that $\text{cat}(X) = k$. There exists a categorical cover U_0, \dots, U_k of X such that the inclusion map $\iota : X \rightarrow X$ and the constant map $c : X \rightarrow X$ are homotopic. For simplicity, let us write U 's without indices. Consider the homotopy $F : U \times I \rightarrow X$, satisfying $F(x, 0) = x$ and $F(x, 1) = x_0$. Define the map $H^i : U \times I \rightarrow X$ by

$$H^i(x, t) = \begin{cases} j_i(F(x, 2t)), & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ j_{i+1}(F(x, 2-2t)), & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} \leq t \leq 1, \end{cases}$$

so that $H^i(x, 0) = j_i(x)$ and $H^i(x, 1) = j_{i+1}(x)$ are satisfied. Since

$$H^i(x, 1/2) = j_i(F(x, 1)) = j_i(x_0) = (x_0, x_0, \dots, x_0) = j_{i+1}(F(x, 1)),$$

H^i is continuous for each $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Hence $D(j_1, \dots, j_n) \leq \text{cat}(X)$. □

Proposition 3.8. *Let K, K' and K'' be simplicial complexes, $\eta, \eta' : K'' \rightarrow K$ and $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n : K \rightarrow K'$ be simplicial maps. If $\varphi_1 \circ \eta' \sim \dots \sim \varphi_n \circ \eta'$, then $\text{SD}(\varphi_1 \circ \eta, \dots, \varphi_n \circ \eta) \leq \text{SD}(\eta, \eta')$.*

Proof. Assume that $\text{SD}(\eta, \eta') = k$. There exist subcomplexes K_0, \dots, K_k of K such that $\eta|_{K_i} \sim \eta'|_{K_i}$ for $i = 0, \dots, k$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_1 \circ \eta|_{K_i} &\sim \varphi_1 \circ \eta'|_{K_i} \\ \varphi_2 \circ \eta|_{K_i} &\sim \varphi_2 \circ \eta'|_{K_i} \\ &\dots \\ \varphi_n \circ \eta|_{K_i} &\sim \varphi_n \circ \eta'|_{K_i} \end{aligned}$$

for all $i = 0, \dots, k$. Since $\varphi_1 \circ \eta' \sim \dots \sim \varphi_n \circ \eta'$, we conclude that $\varphi_1 \circ \eta|_{K_i} \sim \varphi_2 \circ \eta|_{K_i} \sim \dots \sim \varphi_n \circ \eta|_{K_i}$. Hence $\text{SD}(\varphi_1 \circ \eta, \dots, \varphi_n \circ \eta) \leq k$. □

Corollary 3.5. *If $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n : K \rightarrow K'$ are arbitrary simplicial maps, then $\text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) \leq \text{scat}(K)$.*

Proof. If we take $K'' = K, \eta = id_K$ and $\eta' = c_{v_0}$ in Proposition 3.5 where id_K is the identity map and c_{v_0} is the constant map. By Proposition 3.5, we have

$$SD(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) = SD(\varphi_1 \circ id_K, \dots, \varphi_n \circ id_K) \leq SD(id_K, c_{v_0}) = scat(K)$$

□

The importance of Corollary 3.5 comes from the following fact. One can say that the contiguity distance of arbitrary two maps can be used to find a lower bound for simplicial LS-category, that is, for two simplicial maps φ and ψ from K , one has $SD(\varphi, \psi) \leq scat(K)$. While this proposition (as introduced in [4]) is taken account, Corollary 3.5 gives a better lower bound for $scat(K)$ when one takes more arbitrary simplicial maps from K (due to Proposition 3.4).

Theorem 3.6. *If K is strongly collapsible if and only if $SD(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) = 0$ for any simplicial maps $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n : K \rightarrow K'$.*

Proof. Assume that K is strongly collapsible, then we have $scat(K) = 0$, more precisely, $id_K \sim c_{v_0}$. By Theorem 3.4, $SD(\tilde{i}_1, \dots, \tilde{i}_n) = 0$ where for each $j, \tilde{i}_j : K \rightarrow K^n$ be the simplicial map as defined in Theorem 3.4. Since $id_k \sim c_{v_0}$, we obtain $\tilde{i}_j \sim \tilde{c}_{v_0}$ for all $j = 1, \dots, n$ where $\tilde{c}_{v_0} := \Delta_K \circ c_{v_0}$ and Δ_K is the diagonal map of K . Consider the following composition of maps

$$K \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\tilde{c}_{v_0}} \\ \xrightarrow{\tilde{i}_k} \end{array} K^n \xrightarrow{\tilde{\varphi}_i} (K')^n$$

$$K \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\tilde{c}_{v_0}} \\ \xrightarrow{\tilde{i}_k} \end{array} K^n \xrightarrow{\tilde{\varphi}_j} (K')^n$$

where $\tilde{\varphi}_i : K^n \rightarrow (K')^n$ defined by $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \mapsto (\varphi_i(\sigma_1), \dots, \varphi_i(\sigma_n))$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then for all i, k , we have $\tilde{\varphi}_i \circ \tilde{c}_{v_0} \sim \tilde{\varphi}_i \circ \tilde{i}_k$ and for all j, k , we have $\tilde{\varphi}_j \circ \tilde{c}_{v_0} \sim \tilde{\varphi}_j \circ \tilde{i}_k$. Since K' is edge-path connected, all constant maps are in the same contiguity class. Therefore $\tilde{\varphi}_i \sim \tilde{\varphi}_{i+1}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. By the definition of $\tilde{\varphi}_i$, we conclude that $\varphi_i \sim \varphi_{i+1}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Hence $SD(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) = 0$.

On the other hand, suppose that $SD(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) = 0$. If we choose $\varphi_j = \tilde{i}_j$ for each $j = 1, \dots, n$ we conclude that $scat(K) = 0$. This is the same as K to be strongly collapsible. □

Example 3.2. *Consider the abstract simplicial complex K as given in Figure 3.1. Consider any arbitrary simplicial maps*

$$\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n : K \rightarrow K.$$

If one cover K by the subcomplexes which do not contain any loops, then it is needed at least 3 subcomplexes. This is due to the fact that in order not to draw a loop, the number of edges must be 1 less than the number of vertices.

Also, one can cover K by two subcomplexes which has two loops in total. More precisely, if one can cover K by the subcomplexes U_0 and U_1 , then in the best case, either U_0 and U_1 both have one loop or U_0 has no loop while U_1 has two loops. Explicitly writing, if U_0 and U_1 both have one loop, then they both contains 5 vertices and 5 edges. If U_0 has no loop while U_1 has 2 loops, then U_0 has 5 vertices and 4 edges while U_1 has 5 vertices and 6 edges. Here, U_1 has indeed 2 loops due to the fact that in order to draw the last edge, we need to draw it between non-adjacent vertices.

If we consider the subcomplexes U_0 and U_1 as described in the preceding paragraph, then the least number of strongly collapsible subcomplexes of both U_0 and U_1 is 3. Then from the strongly collapsibility and by Theorem 3.6, we get $\text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) \leq 2$.

On the other hand, if one has no loops in the subcomplexes as described in the first paragraph, then from the strongly collapsibility and by Theorem 3.6, we get $\text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) \leq 2$.

Proposition 3.9. *If K' is strongly collapsible then $\text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) = 0$ for any simplicial maps $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n : K \rightarrow K'$.*

Proof. Assume that K' is strongly collapsible, then we have $\text{id}_{K'} \sim c_{v_0}$ where $\text{id}_{K'} : K' \rightarrow K'$ is the identity map and $c_{v_0} : K' \rightarrow K'$ is the constant map with v_0 being a vertex in K' . Consider the following compositions

$$K \xrightarrow{\varphi_i} K' \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{K'}} \\ \xrightarrow{c_{v_0}} \end{array} K'$$

$$K \xrightarrow{\varphi_j} K' \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{K'}} \\ \xrightarrow{c_{v_0}} \end{array} K'$$

where $i, j = 1, \dots, n$. Then for all i, j , we have $\text{id}_{K'} \circ \varphi_i \sim c_{v_0} \circ \varphi_i$ and $\text{id}_{K'} \circ \varphi_j \sim c_{v_0} \circ \varphi_j$. Since all constant maps are in the same contiguity class, we come to conclusion that $\varphi_i \sim \varphi_j$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$. Therefore $\text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) = 0$.

□

Example 3.3. *Consider the abstract simplicial complex $K = \{\{0\}, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{0, 1\}, \{0, 2\}, \{1, 2\}\}$ as given in Figure 3.3 which is not strongly collapsible.*




Figure 3.2

Consider the identity map $\text{id} : K \rightarrow K$, the constant map c_0 on $\{0\}$ and the simplicial map

$$\varphi : K \rightarrow K \text{ by } \varphi(\{0\}) = \{1\}, \varphi(\{1\}) = \{2\}, \varphi(\{2\}) = \{0\}.$$

Let us take $U_0 = \{\{0\}, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{0, 1\}, \{0, 2\}\}$ and $U_1 = \{\{1\}, \{2\}, \{1, 2\}\}$. On U_0 , $c_0 \sim \varphi$ since that $c_0 \sim_c c_1 \sim_c \varphi$ where $c_1 : K \rightarrow K$ is the constant map on $\{1\}$; and on U_1 , $c_0 \sim \varphi$ since that they are also contiguous. Moreover, since that U_0 and U_1 are strongly collapsible complexes, as mentioned in [4], $\text{id}|_{U_0} \sim c_0|_{U_0}$ and $\text{id}|_{U_1} \sim c_0|_{U_1}$.

On the other hand, K is not strongly collapsible, so we conclude that $\text{SD}(\text{id}, c_0, \varphi) = 1$.

Next, we will focus on the relation between the higher contiguity distance of simplicial maps and the higher homotopic distance of their geometric realisations.

Lemma 3.1. [14] *If contiguous simplicial maps agree on a subcomplex L , then they determine continuous maps which are homotopic relative to $|L|$.*

Proposition 3.10. *For simplicial maps $\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_n : K \rightarrow L$, we have*

$$D(|\varphi_1|, \dots, |\varphi_n|) \leq \text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n).$$

Proof. Let $\text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) = k$. Then there are subcomplexes K_0, K_1, \dots, K_k covering K such that $\varphi_i|_{K_j} \sim \varphi_{i-1}|_{K_j}$ for all $i = 2, \dots, n$ and $j = 0, \dots, k$. By Lemma 3.1, we have $|\varphi_i|_{|K_j|} \simeq |\varphi_{i-1}|_{|K_j|}$ for all $i = 2, \dots, n$ and $j = 0, \dots, k$. Moreover the union of the closed subsets $|K_0|, |K_1|, \dots, |K_n|$ cover $|K|$. \square

The following is an example for the strict case of the inequality of Proposition 3.10.

Example 3.4. *Consider the simplicial complex K given in Figure 3.4. Let $\tilde{i}_j : K \rightarrow K^n$ be the simplicial maps as defined in Theorem 3.4. By Example 3.3 in [9] $\text{scat}(K) = 1$ and by Theorem 3.4 we have $\text{SD}(\tilde{i}_1, \dots, \tilde{i}_n) = 1$. Since K is contractible, $0 = \text{cat}(|K|) = D(|\tilde{i}_1|, \dots, |\tilde{i}_n|)$. Hence we conclude that $D(|\tilde{i}_1|, \dots, |\tilde{i}_n|) < \text{SD}(\tilde{i}_1, \dots, \tilde{i}_n)$.*




Figure 3.3

4. BARYCENTRIC SUBDIVISION

For a given abstract simplicial complex K , recall that the (first) barycentric subdivision of K , denoted by $\text{sd}K$, is defined as follows.

The vertex set of $\text{sd}K$ is the set of simplices of K and the set $\{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_q\}$ determines a simplex in $\text{sd}K$ if $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_q$ are simplices of K satisfying $\sigma_1 \subset \dots \subset \sigma_q$.

Definition 4.1. [9] *For a simplicial map $\varphi : K \rightarrow K'$, the induced map on barycentric subdivisions $\text{sd}\varphi : \text{sd}(K) \rightarrow \text{sd}(K')$ is defined as*

$$(\text{sd}\varphi)(\{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_q\}) = \{\varphi(\sigma_1), \dots, \varphi(\sigma_q)\}.$$

Notice that $\text{sd}\varphi$ is a simplicial map.

Remark 4.1. [9] $\text{sd}(\varphi \circ \psi) = \text{sd}\varphi \circ \text{sd}\psi$ and $\text{sd}(\text{id}) = \text{id}$.

Proposition 4.1. [9] *For simplicial maps $\varphi, \psi : K \rightarrow L$, if φ and ψ are in the same contiguity class then $\text{sd}(\varphi)$ and $\text{sd}(\psi)$ are in the same contiguity class.*

Theorem 4.1. *For simplicial maps $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n : K \rightarrow K'$, $\text{SD}(\text{sd}(\varphi_1), \dots, \text{sd}(\varphi_n)) \leq \text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$.*

Proof. Assume that $\text{SD}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) = k$. There exist subcomplexes K_0, \dots, K_k covering K such that $\varphi_1|_{K_j} \sim \varphi_2|_{K_j} \sim \dots \sim \varphi_n|_{K_j}$ for all $j = 0, \dots, k$. Let consider the cover $\{\text{sd}(K_0), \text{sd}(K_1), \dots, \text{sd}(K_k)\}$ of $\text{sd}(K)$. By Proposition 4.1, if $\varphi_1|_{K_j} \sim \varphi_2|_{K_j} \sim \dots \sim \varphi_n|_{K_j}$, then $\text{sd}(\varphi_1|_{K_j}) \sim \text{sd}(\varphi_2|_{K_j}) \sim \dots \sim \text{sd}(\varphi_n|_{K_j})$.

If we show that $\text{sd}(\varphi_i|_{K_j}) = \text{sd}(\varphi_i|_{\text{sd}(K_j)})$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 0, \dots, k$, then we are done. For $\{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_q\} \in \text{sd}(K_j)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sd}(\varphi_i|_{K_j})(\{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_q\}) &= \{\varphi_i|_{K_j}(\sigma_1), \dots, \varphi_i|_{K_j}(\sigma_q)\} \\ &= \{\varphi_i(\sigma_1), \dots, \varphi_i(\sigma_q)\} \\ &= \{\varphi_i|_{\text{sd}(K_j)}(\sigma_1), \dots, \varphi_i|_{\text{sd}(K_j)}(\sigma_q)\} \\ &= \text{sd}(\varphi_i|_{\text{sd}(K_j)}(\{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_q\})). \end{aligned}$$

where the first and the last equalities follow from the definition of the induced map on the barycentric subdivisions whereas the third equality comes from the fact that σ_s is a simplex in $\text{sd}(K_j)$ for $s = 1, \dots, q$.

Consequently, since the following holds

$$\text{sd}(\varphi_1|_{K_j}) \sim \dots \sim \text{sd}(\varphi_n|_{K_j}),$$

we obtain

$$\text{sd}(\varphi_1|_{\text{sd}(K_j)}) \sim \dots \sim \text{sd}(\varphi_n|_{\text{sd}(K_j)}).$$

for all $j = 0, \dots, k$.

□

The following is an example for the strict case of Theorem 4.1.

Example 4.1. Consider the abstract simplicial complex K as given in Figure 3.1. In Example 3.6 in [8], it is showed that $\text{scat}(K) = 2$ while $\text{scat}(\text{sd}K) = 1$. For a fixed vertex v_0 in K , consider the simplicial inclusion maps $i_1, i_2, i_3 : K \rightarrow K^3$ given by $i_1(v) = (v, v_0, v_0)$, $i_2(v) = (v_0, v, v_0)$ and $i_3(v) = (v_0, v_0, v)$. Hence, by Theorem 3.4, we have

$$1 = \text{SD}(\text{sd}i_1, \text{sd}i_2, \text{sd}i_3) < \text{SD}(i_1, i_2, i_3) = 2.$$

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to acknowledge that this paper is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for PhD degree at Bursa Technical University.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Alabay, A. Borat, E. Cihangirli, E. Dirican Erdal, Higher analogues of discrete topological complexity, arXiv: 2310.01333v1.
- [2] I. Basabe, J. Gonzalez, Y. Rudyak and D. Tamaki, Higher topological complexity and its symmetrization, Algebraic and Geometric Topology 14 (2014) 2103-2124.
- [3] A. Borat, T. Vergili, Higher homotopic distance, Topological Methods in Nonlinear Analysis, Vol 57 No 2 (2021) 525-534.
- [4] A. Borat, M. Pamuk, T. Vergili, Contiguity distance between simplicial maps, Turkish Journal of Mathematics, Vol 47 (2023), 664-677.
- [5] O. Cornea, G. Lupton, J. Oprea, D. Tanre, Lusternik-Schnirelmann category. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, Vol. 103, American Mathematical Society 2003.
- [6] M. Farber, Topological complexity of motion planning, Discrete and Computational Geometry 29 (2003), 211-221.
- [7] D. Fernandez-Ternero, E. Macias-Virgos, E. Minuz, J. A. Vilches, Discrete topological complexity, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 146 (2018), 4535-4548.
- [8] D. Fernandez-Ternero, E. Macias-Virgos, E. Minuz, J. A. Vilches, Simplicial Lusternik-Schbirelmann category, Publ. Mat. 63 (2019), 265-293.
- [9] D. Fernandez-Ternero, E. Macias-Virgos, J. A. Vilches, Lusternik-Schbirelmann category of simplicial complexes and finite spaces, Topology and its Applications, 194 (2015), 37-50.
- [10] J. Gonzalez, Simplicial Complexity: Piecewise Linear Motion Planning in Robotics, New York Journal of Mathematics 24 (2018), 279-292.
- [11] D. Kozlov, Combinatorial algebraic topology, Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics, Vol. 21, Springer, Berlin, 2008.
- [12] E. Macias-Virgos, D. Mosquera-Lois, Homotopic distance between maps, Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. Vol 172, Issue 1 (2022) 73-93.
- [13] Y. Rudyak, On higher analogs of topological complexity, Topology Appl. 157 (2010) 916-920. Erratum: Topology Appl. 157 (2010) 1118.
- [14] E. H. Spanier, Algebraic Topology, McGraw-Hill Boook Co., New York-Toronto, Ont.-London, 1966.

NILAY EKİZ YAZICI BURSA TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY, FACULTY OF ENGINEERING AND NATURAL SCIENCES, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BURSA, TURKIYE

Email address: nilay.ekiz@btu.edu.tr

AYŞE BORAT BURSA TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY, FACULTY OF ENGINEERING AND NATURAL SCIENCES, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BURSA, TURKIYE

Email address: ayse.borat@btu.edu.tr