

Angular Constraints on Planar Frameworks

Sean Dewar, Georg Grasegger, Anthony Nixon, Zvi Rosen,
William Sims, Meera Sitharam, David Urizar

March 24, 2024

Abstract

Consider a collection of points and the sets of slopes or directions of the lines between pairs of points. It is known that the algebraic matroid on this set of elements is the well studied 2-dimensional rigidity matroid. This article analyzes a construction on top of the set of slopes given by an angle constraint system of incidences and angles. In this setting we provide a matricial rigidity formulation of the problem for colored graphs, an algebro-geometric reformulation, precise necessary conditions and a combinatorial characterization of the generic behaviour for a special case.

1 Introduction

Consider a collection of points $p = p_1, \dots, p_n \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and the set $d_{ij} = \|p_i - p_j\|^2$ of pairwise squared distances between them. For generic points p_i , (e.g. with algebraically independent coordinates), the algebraic matroid on the set of distances d_{ij} was characterized by Pollaczek-Geiringer [PG27] and later rediscovered by Laman [Lam70]. This matroid, called the (generic 2-dimensional) *rigidity matroid*, is denoted \mathcal{R}_2 throughout this paper. Viewing the points and squared distances as vertices and edge lengths of a complete graph on a vertex set V , a set E of edges is independent in \mathcal{R}_2 if and only if it is $(2, 3)$ -sparse; that is, the subgraph induced by any non-empty $E' \subset E$ satisfies the inequality $|E'| \leq 2|V(E')| - 3$. The pair $(G = (V, E), p)$ is called a *bar-joint framework*.

A natural related question examines the sets of slopes or directions of the lines between pairs of points. In particular, the equations

$$m_{ij} = \frac{y_i - y_j}{x_i - x_j},$$

where $p_i = (x_i, y_i)$ for each i . Surprisingly, the algebraic matroid on this set of elements is precisely the rigidity matroid \mathcal{R}_2 . This was proved by Whiteley [Whi87, Proposition AB.14] using an analysis of the rigidity matrix. It was reproved later by Martin using techniques from algebraic geometry [Mar03].

In this paper, we examine a construction on top of the slope matroid, given by an angle constraint system. Instead of fixing slopes of edges, we fix the angles, i.e. slope differences, between chosen pairs of edges. Consider the example in Figure 1. Noting that for any subset of m edges, fixing $m - 1$ pairwise angles determines all pairwise angles, such an angle constraint system partitions the edges into sets such that the pairwise slope differences are fixed within each set.




Figure 1: K_4 is dependent in \mathcal{R}_2 , i. e. the distance / slope of one of the pairs of points (vertices) is dependent on the distances / slopes of the remaining pairs, however, the shown set of angles is independent.

An analogous scenario for distances was studied in [SST22], where the pairwise differences between edge lengths are fixed within each set. They showed a matroidal characterization by showing that independence for this scenario is closely related to independence in \mathcal{R}_2 [SST22, Theorems 4.1 and 4.2]. In fact, their result holds for dimensions $d > 2$.

The corresponding matroid governing angles or slope differences appears to be a more stubborn object to characterize. In this paper, we approach this problem from algebro-geometric and combinatorial perspectives. Our main results include [Theorem 2.8](#) which gives a matrix-based characterization of angle rigidity, [Corollary 3.5](#) and [Theorem 3.7](#) which provide algebraic matroidal re-formulations and [Theorem 5.4](#) which derives a complete combinatorial characterization in a rich special case.

1.1 Previous work on angles

The idea of placing angular constraints on frameworks has been primarily discussed in two bodies of literature. In the rigidity theory literature, especially the work of Walter Whiteley, angle constraints are considered in the context of direction and length constraints. More recently, various engineering groups have studied this problem as part of multi-agent formation control.

First, we summarize the rigidity theory results. In [SW99], Servatius and Whiteley explored the combination of direction constraints and length constraints, called *direction-length frameworks*. In that paper, they prove some initial results on angles, including the necessary sparsity bound $|A| \leq 2|V(E)| - 4$, as well as the fact that this sparsity condition is not sufficient to guarantee independence. Polygon constraints are cited as one demonstration of the failure of sufficiency, but they add that even if polygons are accounted for, the sparsity bound is not sufficient.

In a subsequent paper [EWM⁺03], Whiteley and co-authors stated further results on angle arrangements. They introduced the *first-order angle matrix* as an analogue to the traditional rigidity matrix. They conjectured that there is no polynomial-time algorithm to check independence of angle arrangements. They also described Henneberg-type moves to extend angle arrangements: the 0-extension adds one new vertex v to a graph as well as two angle constraints both centered at vertex v . The 1-extension adds a vertex v , deletes one angle constraint, and adds three new angle constraints. The theorems are stated there unproven, with reference made to an unpublished article entitled “Constraining plane geometric configurations in CAD: Angle”.

They conclude that these two types of extensions were insufficient to construct all angle-rigid arrangements, since they do not produce vertices of degree 5.

In the 2006 doctoral thesis of Zhou [Zho06], the author considers the problem of angle constraints. A rigorous proof of the validity of 0-extensions (which the author calls “gradual construction”) is presented, as are some necessary combinatorial conditions for rigidity. Other studies of angles have been made but usually with some fundamental twist, e.g. considering circle arrangements with constrained angles of intersection as in [SW04].

The multi-agent formation literature is differentiated from the rigidity literature both in its goals and its mathematical approach. In particular, they often feature practical results that can be used to guide multiple agents toward a desired formation based on angle information. The mathematical tools tend to come from control theory and analysis. For example, the 2015 paper [ZZ15] begins from the 2-d rigidity-theoretic work and generalizes to higher dimensions. Then they use Lyapunov methods to define a control law that can stabilize bearing-rigid formations. Other recent papers [JZLW19, CCL21] stay focused on the 2-d setting, but further explore the control law and how perturbed formations stabilize under a control law. Given the different objectives and toolkit, we leave further integration of the literature for future work.

1.2 Analogous cases in the literature

At first glance, the angle matroid appears to be a special case of the point-line incidence structures studied by Jackson and Owen in [JO16]. In that article, the authors characterize structures with two types of objects—points and lines—and three types of relations:

- (i) angles between pairs of lines;
- (ii) perpendicular distance from a point to a line;
- (iii) distance from point to point.

When these quantities are taken to be generic, they prove that the resulting matroid is the Dilworth truncation of a direct sum of two count matroids. If the point-line relations are set to a perpendicular distance of 0, then what remains is a condition that a point lies on a particular line. The angle matroid would then emerge as the matroid for specifically the first two types of relations: line-line and point-line. The problem is that removing the genericity of the point-line distances means that the characterization of the matroid in [JO16] no longer holds. Perhaps the strongest statement we could make without further specialized analysis is that the angle matroid is the image of the Jackson-Owen matroid under a weak map of matroids. This is not a very strong condition at all.

Another seemingly similar setup is that of frameworks with coordinated edge motions, studied by Schulze, Serocold and Theran in [SST22]. In their setting, subcollections of edges are assigned to “coordinated classes.” In addition to the standard rigid motions, the edges of each color are allowed to change length (additively) by the same fixed amount while still being considered equivalent. They characterize the resulting matroid (in the $d = 2$ case) as the matroid union of the rigidity matroid \mathcal{R}_2 with the transversal matroid whose bases take one element from each of the coordinated classes. As we see in Section 6, we argue that the matroid here takes a very similar form. Much like the edge lengths change in coordinated fashion, the directions of a fixed set of edges move in concert if they are connected by a chain of angle constraints. Indeed, if the points in \mathbb{R}^2 are instead considered as numbers in the complex plane, then rotation of the points can be encoded as multiplication of all edge directions by a complex number of unit

norm. However, as noted in Section 5.3 of their paper, “the rigidity analysis of such coordinated frameworks seems more complex than the one considered in this paper.” Indeed, their proof methods do not seem to extend to our scenario.

1.3 Mathematical setting

We model our frameworks using an ordered pair (G, p) , where $G = (V, E)$ is a (simple) graph $G = (V, E)$ and $p : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ (known as a *realization* of G) is an injective map. Each edge vw corresponds to the unique line containing the points p_v and p_w . The set of such realizations is denoted by $R^G \subset (\mathbb{R}^2)^V$, which we note is a connected Zariski open subset. We define a *substructure* of (G, p) to be any pair (G', p') , where $G' = (V', E')$ is a subgraph of G and p' is the restriction of p to V' .

Let A be a set of distinct unordered pairs of edges of G . We define any triple (G, A, p) to be a *line-angle incidence structure*. Define the map

$$\theta_A : R^G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^A, p = (p_v)_{v \in V} \mapsto \left(\arccos \left(\frac{(p_a - p_b) \cdot (p_c - p_d)}{\|p_a - p_b\| \|p_c - p_d\|} \right) \right)_{\{ab, cd\} \in A}.$$

We say that the map θ_A is the *angle map* of G . Any two line-angle incidence structures (G, A, p) and (G, A, q) are said to be *equivalent* if $\theta_A(p) = \theta_A(q)$. Any such pair of line-angle incidence structures are said to be *similar* if there exists a linear isometry T , a vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and a scalar $\lambda > 0$ such that $q_v = \lambda T(p_v) + z$ for each $v \in V$; the affine map $x \mapsto \lambda T(x) + z$ is called a *similarity*.

For simplicity later, we now give an alternative definition of line-angle incidence structures that is in fact equivalent. We first note that if the angle between lines ab and cd is fixed and the angle between lines cd and ef is fixed, then the angle between lines ab and ef is also fixed. It follows that it only matters whether two lines lie in the same connected component of the graph (E, A) . Because of this, we can define a line-angle incidence structure to instead be a triple (G, c, p) , where $c : E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is an edge coloring. We assume for simplicity that the image of c is the first n positive integers (although this condition is relaxed for any substructures), and we define $|c|$ to be the size of the image of c (i. e. the amount of different colors). Any positive integer is said to be a *color* of (G, c) if it lies in the image of c , and the subgraph with edges of color i is denoted by $G_i = (V, E_i)$. A line-angle incidence structure is said to be *monochromatic* if $|c| = 1$.

We now say that two line-angle incidence structures (G, c, p) and (G, c, q) are equivalent if for each pair of edges ab, cd where $c(ab) = c(cd)$, we have

$$\arccos \left(\frac{(p_a - p_b) \cdot (p_c - p_d)}{\|p_a - p_b\| \|p_c - p_d\|} \right) = \arccos \left(\frac{(q_a - q_b) \cdot (q_c - q_d)}{\|q_a - q_b\| \|q_c - q_d\|} \right).$$

We still say that (G, c, p) and (G, c, q) are similar if there is a similarity mapping from p to q .

2 Angle rigidity

In this section we develop the general theory of angle-rigid frameworks. We do so by reformulating each line-angle incidence structure as a bar-joint framework with a specific edge-coloring.

2.1 The angle-rigidity matrix

For every point $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, x^\perp denotes the point formed by applying a 90° anti-clockwise rotation to x . As a short-hand, we use the notation p^\perp for the realization formed by rotating p by 90° anti-clockwise. By differentiating the angle constraints we observe that a map $u : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ is an infinitesimal angle-preserving deformation of (G, c, p) (now referred to as an *infinitesimal flex*) if and only if for every pair of edges ab, cd with $c(ab) = c(cd)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{[(p_a - p_b) \cdot (p_c - p_d)](p_a - p_b) - [(p_a - p_b) \cdot (p_a - p_b)](p_c - p_d)}{\|p_a - p_b\|^2} \right) \cdot (u_a - u_b) \\ & + \left(\frac{[(p_a - p_b) \cdot (p_c - p_d)](p_c - p_d) - [(p_c - p_d) \cdot (p_c - p_d)](p_a - p_b)}{\|p_c - p_d\|^2} \right) \cdot (u_c - u_d) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

It can also be seen that

$$\begin{aligned} & [(p_a - p_b) \cdot (p_c - p_d)](p_a - p_b) - (p_a - p_b) \cdot (p_a - p_b)(p_c - p_d) \cdot (p_a - p_b) = 0, \\ & ((p_a - p_b) \cdot (p_c - p_d)(p_c - p_d) - (p_c - p_d) \cdot (p_c - p_d)(p_a - p_b)) \cdot (p_c - p_d) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

so we can simplify the infinitesimal flex constraint condition to obtain

$$\left(\frac{(p_a - p_b)^\perp}{\|p_a - p_b\|^2} \right) \cdot (u_a - u_b) - \left(\frac{(p_c - p_d)^\perp}{\|p_c - p_d\|^2} \right) \cdot (u_c - u_d) = 0. \quad (1)$$

We say that an infinitesimal flex is *trivial* if it is a restriction of an infinitesimal similarity to the points $\{p_v : v \in V\}$. It can be easily checked that eq. (1) holds for any choice of vertices a, b, c, d with $a \neq b$ and $c \neq d$ when u is a trivial infinitesimal flex. The set of trivial infinitesimal flexes forms a linear subspace of the linear space of infinitesimal flexes. Since similarities are formed from translations, rotations and scalings, the following result is immediate.

Lemma 2.1. *Let (G, c, p) be a line-angle incidence structure. If there exist vertices $v, w \in V$ where $p_v \neq p_w$, then the following vectors form a basis of the trivial infinitesimal flexes of (G, c, p) :*

$$u^{(1,0)} = ((1,0))_{v \in V}, \quad u^{(0,1)} = ((0,1))_{v \in V}, \quad u^p = (p_v)_{v \in V}, \quad u^{p^\perp} = (p_v^\perp)_{v \in V}.$$

Lemma 2.2. *Let (G, c, p) be a line-angle incidence structure. Let $u \in (\mathbb{R}^2)^V$. Then u is an infinitesimal flex of (G, c, p) if and only if for each color i of (G, c) , there exists $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$ so that for each $vw \in E$ with $c(vw) = i$,*

$$(p_v - p_w)^\perp \cdot (u_v - u_w) = \lambda_i \|p_v - p_w\|^2.$$

Proof. For each color i choose an edge $v_i w_i \in E_i$. We now set

$$\lambda_i := \frac{(p_{v_i} - p_{w_i})^\perp \cdot (u_{v_i} - u_{w_i})}{\|p_{v_i} - p_{w_i}\|^2}.$$

The result follows by inspection of the constraint system given in eq. (1). \square

We define the *angle-rigidity matrix* to be the $|E| \times (2|V| + |c|)$ matrix

$$R(G, c, p) := [R(G, p) \quad M(G, c, p)],$$

where $M(G, c, p)$ is the $|E| \times |c|$ matrix with entries

$$M(G, c, p)_{vw, i} := \begin{cases} -\|p_v - p_w\|^2, & \text{if } c(vw) = i, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By [Lemma 2.2](#), a map $u: V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ is an infinitesimal flex of (G, c, p) if and only if there exists $\lambda: \{1, \dots, |c|\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $(u, \lambda) \in \ker R(G, c, p)$. From this we can immediately deduce the following lemma.

Lemma 2.3. *Let (G, c, p) be a line-angle incidence structure. If there exist vertices $v, w \in V$ where $p_v \neq p_w$, then the following vectors are contained in the kernel of $R(G, c, p)$:*

$$(u^{(1,0)}, \mathbf{0}), \quad (u^{(0,1)}, \mathbf{0}), \quad (u^{p^\perp}, \mathbf{0}), \quad (u^p, \mathbf{1}), \quad (2)$$

where each of the u vectors is defined as in [Lemma 2.1](#), and $\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}: \{1, \dots, |c|\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are the constant maps $i \mapsto 0$ and $i \mapsto 1$ respectively.

Remark 2.4. It follows from [Lemma 2.3](#) that for (G, c, p) with vertices $v, w \in V$ such that $p_v \neq p_w$, the rank of the matrix $R(G, c, p)$ is the same as the rank of the matrix formed by deleting the columns corresponding to the vertices v and w .

Example 2.5. Let us consider the triangle graph where all edges have the same color and the same graph where there are edges in two colors (see [Figure 2](#)).




Figure 2: Colored triangles (K_3, c) and (K_3, c') .

Then $R(K_3, c, p)$ and $R(K_3, c', p)$ are given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_1 - x_2 & y_1 - y_2 & x_2 - x_1 & y_2 - y_1 & 0 & 0 & -(x_1 - x_2)^2 - (y_1 - y_2)^2 \\ x_1 - x_3 & y_1 - y_3 & 0 & 0 & x_3 - x_1 & y_3 - y_1 & -(x_1 - x_3)^2 - (y_1 - y_3)^2 \\ 0 & 0 & x_2 - x_3 & y_2 - y_3 & x_3 - x_2 & y_3 - y_2 & -(x_2 - x_3)^2 - (y_2 - y_3)^2 \end{pmatrix}, \text{ and}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_1 - x_2 & y_1 - y_2 & x_2 - x_1 & y_2 - y_1 & 0 & 0 & -(x_1 - x_2)^2 - (y_1 - y_2)^2 & 0 \\ x_1 - x_3 & y_1 - y_3 & 0 & 0 & x_3 - x_1 & y_3 - y_1 & -(x_1 - x_3)^2 - (y_1 - y_3)^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & x_2 - x_3 & y_2 - y_3 & x_3 - x_2 & y_3 - y_2 & 0 & -(x_2 - x_3)^2 - (y_2 - y_3)^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

respectively.

2.2 Infinitesimally angle-rigid frameworks

In this section we define rigidity properties for line-angle incidence structures and colored graphs.

Definition 2.6. Let (G, c, p) be a line-angle incidence structure. We define three types of angle-rigidity in analogy with standard notions of rigidity, see for example, [\[GSS93, Whi96\]](#):




Figure 3: A line-angle incidence structure with two different realizations.

- (i) (G, c, p) is *locally angle-rigid* if all motions of the graph are trivial (obtained by translation, rotation, scaling, and reflection).
- (ii) (G, c, p) is *globally angle-rigid* if all embeddings of (G, c) are equivalent to p up to trivial motions.
- (iii) (G, c, p) is *infinitesimally angle-rigid* if the null space of the angle-rigidity matrix is precisely the space of trivial infinitesimal flexes.

We furthermore say that (G, c, p) is *minimally locally/infinitesimally rigid* if, in addition to being locally/infinitesimally rigid, deleting any edge (and adjusting the coloring accordingly) produces a line-angle incidence structure that is not locally/infinitesimally rigid.

Proposition 2.7. *For a fixed line-angle incidence structure (G, c, p) , both infinitesimal and global angle-rigidity imply local angle-rigidity. No other implication among the notions of angle-rigidity holds.*

Proof. We proceed step by step.

- (Infinitesimal \implies Local) To prove the contrapositive, any local motion is a parameterized curve in the configuration space whose tangent is an infinitesimal motion.
- (Global \implies Local) By definition.
- (Infinitesimal $\not\Rightarrow$ Global, Local $\not\Rightarrow$ Global) We present the following line-angle incidence structure which is infinitesimally angle-rigid (thus locally angle-rigid) but not globally angle-rigid.

The graph $G = K_4$, the color map is given by the edges $\{(12), (14), (23), (34)\}$ having color c_1 , and $\{(13), (24)\}$ with color c_2 , and the embedding is given by

$$p_1 = (0, 0), \quad p_2 = (1, 0), \quad p_3 = \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\right), \quad p_4 = \left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{2}}{2}, \frac{1 + \sqrt{2}}{2\sqrt{3}}\right).$$

Computing the angle-rigidity matrix explicitly demonstrates that (G, c, p) is infinitesimally rigid. However, there is another realization (Figure 3) with the same angles:

$$p_1 = (0, 0), \quad p_2 = (1, 0), \quad p_3 = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\right), \quad p_4 = \left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{2}}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{2} - 1}{2\sqrt{3}}\right).$$

Direct computation of the orbits of each of these frameworks shows that they are dissimilar. Note that our definition of similarity considers two angles to be the same as long as the pairs of defining lines intersect in the same set of four angles.

These realizations were obtained by computing the defining system of polynomial equations, and solving explicitly for the vertex coordinates after fixing some angles.

- (Global $\not\Rightarrow$ Infinitesimal, Local $\not\Rightarrow$ Infinitesimal) We present a line-angle incidence structure which is globally angle-rigid (thus locally angle-rigid) but not infinitesimally angle-rigid. Here as well $G = K_4$. This time, the edges $\{(12), (13), (14), (23)\}$ have color c_1 and $\{(24), (34)\}$ have c_2 . The embedding into \mathbb{R}^2 (Figure 4) is given by

$$p_1 = (0, 0), \quad p_2 = (1, 0), \quad p_3 = (2, 1), \quad p_4 = (0, 1).$$




Figure 4: An infinitesimal vertical motion of a globally angle-rigid line-angle incidence structure.

Plugging these values into the angle-rigidity matrix, you see that the null space has something extra. This corresponds to the infinitesimal vertical motion of p_4 . This implies that the line-angle incidence structure is *not* infinitesimally rigid.

Any configuration of the framework has a representative with $p_1 = (0, 0)$, $p_2 = (1, 0)$ up to the group action. Take any embedding realizing (G, c) with the same angles. Then, it has a curve of representatives keeping p_1 and p_2 constant. The angles between (12), (13), and (23) would then determine the location of 3 to be (2, 1). Then p_4 must be on the y -axis based on the angle (12) – (14); it must also be on the black circle so that the angle $\angle 243$ is fixed. The circle and line intersect in only one point, so the graph is globally angle-rigid. \square

Theorem 2.8. *Let (G, c, p) be a line-angle incidence structure with $|V| \geq 2$. Then (G, c, p) is infinitesimally angle-rigid if and only if $\text{rank } R(G, c, p) = 2|V| + |c| - 4$.*

Proof. The matrix $R(G, c, p)$ is formed from $R(G, c, p^\perp)$ by applying a column reordering and multiplying some columns by -1 , hence $\text{rank } R(G, c, p) = \text{rank } R(G, c, p^\perp)$. The result now follows from Lemma 2.3. \square

We fix coker M to be the cokernel (also known as the left kernel or left null space) of the matrix M . We say that (G, c, p) is *independent* if $\text{coker } R(G, c, p) = \{0\}$. An element of $\text{coker } R(G, c, p)$ is called an *equilibrium stress* of $R(G, c, p)$. Hence, (G, c, p) is independent if and only if it has no non-zero equilibrium stresses. The structure of $R(G, c, p)$ implies that

$\omega \in \mathbb{R}^E$ is an equilibrium stress of (G, c, p) if and only if it is an equilibrium stress of (G, p) and for every color i we have

$$\sum_{vw \in E_i} \omega_{vw} \|p_v - p_w\|^2 = 0.$$

Corollary 2.9. *Let (G, c, p) be a line-angle incidence structure and fix a color i . Let ω be an equilibrium stress of the bar-joint framework (G_i, p) , and define the vector $\tilde{\omega} \in \mathbb{R}^E$ by putting $\tilde{\omega}_{vw} = \omega_{vw}$ for all $vw \in E_i$ and $\tilde{\omega}_{vw} = 0$ otherwise. Then $\tilde{\omega}$ is an equilibrium stress of $R(G, c, p)$. Hence, if (G, c, p) is independent then each bar-joint framework (G_j, p) is also independent for each color j .*

Proof. As ω is an equilibrium stress of (G_i, p) , we have that

$$\sum_{vw \in E_i} \omega_{vw} \|p_v - p_w\|^2 = 0;$$

see [Con82]. We now note that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\omega}^T R(G, c, p) &= \left(\tilde{\omega}^T R(G, p) \quad \sum_{vw \in E_1} -\omega_{vw} \|p_v - p_w\|^2 \quad \dots \quad \sum_{vw \in E_{|c|}} -\omega_{vw} \|p_v - p_w\|^2 \right) \\ &= \left(\omega^T R(G_i, p) \quad 0 \quad \dots \quad 0 \quad - \sum_{vw \in E_i} \omega_{vw} \|p_v - p_w\|^2 \quad 0 \quad \dots \quad 0 \right) \end{aligned}$$

and so $\tilde{\omega}$ lies in the cokernel of $R(G, c, p)$. \square

Corollary 2.10. *Let (G, c, p) be a monochromatic line-angle incidence structure. Then (G, c, p) is infinitesimally angle-rigid (respectively, independent) if and only if the bar-joint framework (G, p) is infinitesimally rigid (respectively, independent).*

Proof. It follows from Corollary 2.9 that $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^E$ is an equilibrium stress of (G, c, p) if and only if it is an equilibrium stress of $R(G, c, p)$. Hence, $\text{rank } R(G, c, p) = \text{rank } R(G, p)$ as required. \square

2.3 Angle-rigid graphs

Figure 4 gives an example of a locally angle-rigid (in fact, globally angle-rigid) graph which is not infinitesimally angle-rigid, however it relies on a very specific geometric coincidence. In particular, the tangent line to the unique circle containing points 2, 3 and 4 contains the edge (14). This coincidence leads us to define an angle-version of the rigidity-theoretic concept of generic rigidity.

Definition 2.11. The colored graph (G, c) is said to be (minimally) angle-rigid if there exists a non-empty Zariski open subset $S \subset \mathbb{R}^{2|V|}$ such that for all $p \in S$ the associated line-angle incidence structure (G, c, p) is (minimally) locally angle-rigid.

It follows, using Proposition 2.7, that our Zariski open subset S can be chosen such that each $p \in S$ is associated to an infinitesimally angle-rigid line-angle incidence structure (G, c, p) .

Proposition 2.12. *Suppose there exists an embedding p such that (G, c, p) is (minimally) infinitesimally angle-rigid. Then the colored graph (G, c) is (minimally) angle-rigid.*

Proof. If the rank of $R(G, c, p)$ is $2|V| + |c| - 4$, then there is a nonzero $(2|V| + |c| - 4)$ -minor determinant. As a function of the parameters p , this minor is a polynomial function not identically equal to zero. Thus, taking the ideal of all non-zero $(2|V| + |c| - 4)$ -minor determinants yields a nonzero ideal defining a Zariski-closed subset of parameter space. The line-angle incidence structure (G, c, p) is (minimally) infinitesimally rigid for any p in the complement of that subset. \square

3 Algebraic matroid formulation

In this section we define the angle matroid and show basic properties of it. We give an alternative approach to the previous section that is based on an algebraic matroid formulation of this matroid. That is we consider angles as elements in a field extension $\mathbb{C}(x_i, y_i)_{i \in [n]}/\mathbb{C}$. These elements define an algebraic matroid, which is a combinatorial structure characterized by which subsets of elements have nontrivial polynomial relations over the ground field. Throughout this section we fix \mathbb{K} to be any field containing \mathbb{C} . As we show later in the section, the specific choice of \mathbb{K} is actually irrelevant.

Definition 3.1. The angle matroid \mathcal{A} (over \mathbb{K}) is the algebraic matroid on the elements

$$a_{(ij)(kl)} = \frac{(x_i - x_j)(y_k - y_l)}{(y_i - y_j)(x_k - x_l)}.$$

in the function field $\mathbb{K}(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n)$, where x and y are transcendentals called *coordinates*. Each $a_{(ij)(kl)}$ is called an *angle*.

The justification of this definition of angle is the following change of coordinates inspired by [CGG⁺18]. Begin with the vertex space $\mathbb{C}^2 = \{(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})\}$. Then apply a linear invertible change of coordinates

$$x = \tilde{x} + i\tilde{y}, \quad y = \tilde{x} - i\tilde{y}. \quad (3)$$

The image of \mathbb{R}^2 under this linear map is pairs of complex conjugate numbers. Now when the original values of (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) are real, the point $[x_2 - x_1 : y_2 - y_1] \in \mathbb{P}^1$ gives a pair of complex conjugate numbers $[re^{i\theta} : re^{-i\theta}]$, where θ describes the angle from the positive x -axis to the point $(\tilde{x}_2 - \tilde{x}_1, \tilde{y}_2 - \tilde{y}_1)$. Scaling does not affect the point in \mathbb{P}^1 so this is $[e^{i\theta} : e^{-i\theta}]$ which uniquely specifies a real number θ in $[0, \pi)$. Note that this approach cannot distinguish between θ and $\theta + \pi$.

Given a pair of edges of the form $[e^{i\theta} : e^{-i\theta}]$ and $[e^{i\tau} : e^{-i\tau}]$, we would want a formula to incorporate the angle between them, that is $\theta - \tau$, in the same form, i. e. $[e^{i(\theta-\tau)} : e^{-i(\theta-\tau)}]$. This can be accomplished algebraically by sending

$$([a_1 : b_1], [a_2 : b_2]) \mapsto [a_1 b_2 : a_2 b_1].$$

Note that the exceptional locus where the map is not well-defined involves $a_i = 0, b_i \neq 0$ or vice versa for both $i = 1$ and 2 , so it does not correspond to any real arrangement. Since neither coordinate is zero for real configurations, we can rescale to

$$\left[\frac{a_1 b_2}{a_2 b_1} : 1 \right] = \left[\frac{(x_i - x_j)(y_k - y_l)}{(x_k - x_l)(y_i - y_j)} : 1 \right].$$

So it suffices to take this coordinate on the affine patch of \mathbb{P}^1 that we need.

Remark 3.2. The angles can also be defined in terms of the slope matroid defined by [Mar03]. Here Martin defines, for each vertex pair i, j , the equation

$$m_{ij} = \frac{(y_i - y_j)}{(x_i - x_j)}.$$

There, no complex coordinate change is used; instead, he defines slopes in the traditional geometric sense. Still, using that formula, we have:

$$a_{(ij)(kl)} = m_{kl}/m_{ij},$$

where m_{ij} and m_{kl} are elements in the function field $\mathbb{K}(m_{ij})/\mathcal{S}(G)$, where $\mathcal{S}(G)$ is the *slope variety* defined in [Mar03].

Definition 3.3. Given a set of angles $A = \{a_{(\alpha_1\beta_1)(\gamma_1\delta_1)}, \dots, a_{(\alpha_k\beta_k)(\gamma_k\delta_k)}\}$, we can define the sets

$$\begin{aligned} V(A) &:= \{\text{indices appearing in any subscript, e. g. } \alpha_i \text{ or } \beta_i\}, \\ E(A) &:= \{\text{pairs of indices appearing in any subscript, e. g. } (\alpha_i, \beta_i) \text{ or } (\gamma_i, \delta_i)\}, \text{ and} \\ P(A) &:= \{\text{a full subscript of some angle, a pair of pairs, e. g. } (\alpha_i\beta_i)(\gamma_i\delta_i)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The set $V(A)$ is denoted the *vertex support* of A , and $E(A)$ is denoted the *edge support* of A . We can now associate two graphs to A : the graph $G_1(A) = (V(A), E(A))$ called the *direction graph* and $G_2(A) = (E(A), P(A))$ called the *angle graph*.

In this definition, we do not use the fact that there is a difference between $a_{(ij)(kl)}$ and $a_{(kl)(ij)}$ (and hence every edge of $G_2(A)$ could be allowed a direction). This ambiguity is justified by (i) and (ii) in the next proposition, which observes that the field extension generated by the set of angles is invariant under shuffling any given angle's index order.

Proposition 3.4. *The following properties are satisfied by angles and sets of angles A :*

- (i) $a_{(ij)(kl)} = a_{(ji)(kl)}$.
- (ii) $a_{(ij)(kl)} = (a_{(kl)(ij)})^{-1}$.
- (iii) *If $G_2(A)$ has a cycle, then A satisfies a nontrivial polynomial relation.*
- (iv) *If $G_2(A)$ is a tree and A satisfies a nontrivial polynomial relation, then so does every A' such that $E(A') = E(A)$.*
- (v) *If $G_2(A)$ is a forest with connected components A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k and A satisfies a nontrivial polynomial relation, then so does every forest A' whose connected components A'_1, \dots, A'_k have $E(A_k) = E(A'_k)$.*

Proof. (i) and (ii) fall directly out of the formula.

For (iii), take the edges of $E(A)$ labeled $(\alpha_1\beta_1), (\alpha_2\beta_2), \dots, (\alpha_k\beta_k)$. Observe that multiplying all the $a_{(\alpha_1\beta_1)(\alpha_2\beta_2)}, \dots, a_{(\alpha_k\beta_k)(\alpha_1\beta_1)}$ results in every linear factor $(x_{\alpha_i} - x_{\beta_i})$ and $(y_{\alpha_i} - y_{\beta_i})$ appearing once each in numerator and denominator.

For (iv), take any angle in $A \setminus A'$ and write it in terms of angles of A' using the fact that the product of a cycle equals one. Replacing each of those in the nontrivial relation $P(A) = 0$ yields a nontrivial rational function $Q(A') = 0$, and clearing denominators yields the result. This method also directly implies (v). \square

Part (iii) of Proposition 3.4 leads to the observation that, if we are solely interested in angle rigidity, we may assume that our angle sets are *acyclic*, in that the graph $G_2(A)$ has no cycles. In addition, part (iv) and (v) of Proposition 3.4 leads to the same observation made earlier which reframes the problem in terms of graphs with edge colorings.

Corollary 3.5. *The algebraic (in)dependence of an acyclic set of angles A is determined by the graph $G_1(A)$ together with a partition of $E(A)$ into colors based on the connected components of $G_2(A)$.*

It follows from Corollary 3.5 that every set of angles A generates a corresponding colored graph (G, c) by setting $G = G_1(A)$ and, given $G_2(A)$ has connected components C_1, \dots, C_k , fixing c to be the map where $c(e) = i$ if and only if $e \in C_i$. Similarly, every colored graph (G, c) generates an acyclic set of angles A so that each connected component of $G_2(A)$ is a star (a tree with a single vertex that is not a leaf). This observation allows us to freely change our choice of angles A to another set A' so long as the connected components of $G_2(A)$ and $G_2(A')$ share the same vertices. This can simplify computations, as is the case in the next lemma.

Lemma 3.6. *Let A be an acyclic set of angles where $G_2(A)$ is connected and let $f \in E(A)$. For every edge $e \in E(A)$, fix m_e to be the variable defined in Remark 3.2. Then $\mathbb{K}(A \cup \{m_f\}) = \mathbb{K}(m_e : e \in E(A))$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.4, A can be taken so that $G_2(A)$ is a star with central vertex f . Every $a_{ef} = m_e/m_f$, so for every $e \in E(A)$, $a_{ef}m_f = m_e$. \square

We conclude the section by showing that there is an equivalence between the angle matroid and the angle rigidity matroid.

Theorem 3.7. *An acyclic set of angles A in the algebraic matroid \mathcal{A} is independent and contains $2|V| - 4$ elements if and only if the corresponding colored graph (G, c) is minimally angle-rigid.*

Proof. For convenience, in this proof, we denote

$$X_{ij} = x_i - x_j, \quad Y_{ij} = y_i - y_j, \quad S_{ij} = X_{ij}Y_{ij}, \quad m_{ij} = X_{ij}Y_{ij}^{-1}, \text{ and}$$

$$a_{(ij)(kl)} = m_{ij}m_{kl}^{-1} = X_{ij}X_{kl}^{-1}Y_{ij}^{-1}Y_{kl}.$$

A set of elements in a field extension \mathbb{F}/\mathbb{K} of characteristic 0 is algebraically independent over \mathbb{F} if and only if the corresponding set of differentials is linearly independent in the module of differentials $\Omega_{\mathbb{F}/\mathbb{K}}$ [Eis13, Theorem 16.14]. We set $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{K}(x_1, y_1, \dots, x_n, y_n)$ with all x_i and y_i transcendental over \mathbb{K} ; note that \mathbb{F} contains all variables of interest. Now, we differentiate the defining equations of $a_{(ij)(kl)}$ and m_{ij} to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} da_{(ij)(kl)} &= d(m_{ij}m_{kl}^{-1}) = m_{kl}^{-1}dm_{ij} - m_{ij}m_{kl}^{-2}dm_{kl} = a_{(ij)(kl)}(m_{ij}^{-1}dm_{ij} - m_{kl}^{-1}dm_{kl}) \\ dm_{ij} &= d(X_{ij}Y_{ij}^{-1}) = \frac{dx_i - dx_j}{Y_{ij}} - \frac{X_{ij}(dy_i - dy_j)}{Y_{ij}^2} = \frac{1}{Y_{ij}^2} [Y_{ij}(dx_i - dx_j) - X_{ij}(dy_i - dy_j)]. \end{aligned}$$

Without affecting linear independence, we may rescale each $da_{(ij)(kl)}$ and instead consider the variables:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{(ij)(kl)} &:= \frac{S_{ij}S_{kl}}{a_{(ij)(kl)}} da_{(ij)(kl)} = S_{ij}S_{kl} (m_{ij}^{-1}dm_{ij} - m_{kl}^{-1}dm_{kl}) = S_{kl}Y_{ij}^2 dm_{ij} - S_{ij}Y_{kl}^2 dm_{kl} \\ &= S_{kl} [Y_{ij}(dx_i - dx_j) - X_{ij}(dy_i - dy_j)] - S_{ij} [Y_{kl}(dx_k - dx_l) - X_{kl}(dy_k - dy_l)]. \end{aligned}$$

The x_i, y_i variables are taken to be algebraically independent, so their differentials dx_i, dy_i are linearly independent. Thus we may take these as a basis of a field extension \mathbb{F}/\mathbb{K} , and encode the elements $\alpha_{(ij)(kl)} \in \Omega_{\mathbb{F}/\mathbb{K}}$ as rows of a $(2|V| - 4) \times 2|V|$ matrix $M(A)$. With this in mind, $M(A)$ is of the form below, where all unspecified entries are zero:

$$\alpha_{(ij)(kl)} \begin{pmatrix} dx_i & dy_i & \cdots & dx_j & dy_j & \cdots & dx_k & dy_k & \cdots & dx_l & dy_l \\ S_{kl}Y_{ij} & S_{kl}X_{ji} & & S_{kl}Y_{ji} & S_{kl}X_{ij} & & S_{ij}Y_{lk} & S_{ij}X_{kl} & & S_{ij}Y_{kl} & S_{ij}X_{lk} \end{pmatrix}.$$

With this setup, and the observation that the coefficients of the entries in $M(A)$ are all rational, we now have that the differentials $da_{(ij)(kl)}$ are linearly independent (and hence A is independent in the angle matroid \mathcal{A}) if and only if $M(A)$ has full rank for any choice of x_i, y_i variables which form an algebraically independent set over \mathbb{Q} .

Now fix a set $\{x_i, y_i : i \in V\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ which is algebraically independent over \mathbb{Q} , and fix $p : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ to be the realization where $p_i = (x_i, y_i)$ for each vertex $i \in V$. The matrix $M(A)$ can be decomposed into two matrices

$$M(A) = T_{G_2(A)} \cdot R(G, p^\perp),$$

where $R(G, p^\perp)$ is the rigidity matrix of the rotated framework (G, p^\perp) and $T_{G_2(A)}$ is a $(2|V| - 4) \times (2|V| + |c| - 4)$ block matrix described as follows. Each block corresponds to a star in $G_2(A)$. If the star has leaves ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_r and center f , then the corresponding block is:

$$\alpha_{\ell_i, f} \begin{pmatrix} m_{\ell_1} & \cdots & m_{\ell_r} & m_f \\ -S_f & & & S_{\ell_1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \alpha_{\ell_r, f} & & -S_f & S_{\ell_r} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since (G, c) was formed from A , every edge of G is in the subscript of some angle in A , and so the matrix $T_{G_2(A)}$ has rank $2|V| - 4$.

We now form one more matrix. Fix J to be the $(2|V| + |c| - 4) \times (2|V| - 4)$ matrix formed from $R(G, c, p^\perp)$ by replacing each entry $-(X_{ij}^2 + Y_{ij}^2)$ in the color column for the edge ij with S_{ij} . We observe that

$$T_{G_2(A)}J = \begin{pmatrix} T_{G_2(A)}R(G, p^\perp) & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} M(A) & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence, the left kernels of $M(A)$ and $T_{G_2(A)}J$ are the same.

We claim that the left nullity of $M(A)$ and J are equal. As $T_{G_2(A)}$ has rank $2|V| - 4$, the left nullity of $M(A)$ is at most the left nullity of J . Now choose ω in the left kernel of J . Then for each color i we have $\sum_{c(e)=i} \omega_e S_e = 0$. This is equivalent to the observation that for every star in $G_2(A)$ with star center f and leaves ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_r , we have

$$\omega_f = - \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\omega_{\ell_i}}{S_f} S_{\ell_i}. \quad (4)$$

Define the element $\nu \in \mathbb{K}^A$ where $\nu(a_{\ell_i, f}) = \omega_{\ell_i}/S_f$ for every angle $a_{\ell_i, f}$ where f is a star center in $G_2(A)$. It now follows from eq. (4) that $\nu^T T_{G_2(A)} = \omega$, hence

$$\nu^T T_{G_2(A)}J = \omega^T J = 0.$$

Since no element of the left kernel can be supported only on the star centers of $G_2(A)$, the map $\omega \mapsto \nu$ is injective and linear. Therefore, it follows that the left nullity of $M(A)$ is at most the left nullity of J . Hence, the left nullities of $M(A)$ and J are equal.

By manipulating rows and using the linear transform given in eq. (3), it is simple to show that J has the same rank as $R(G, c, p)$. Hence, $M(A)$ has full rank if and only if $R(G, c, p)$ has full rank and the result follows from Theorem 2.8. \square

4 A necessary condition for minimal angle-rigidity

In this section we prove necessary conditions for minimal angle-rigidity. First, using basic linear algebra and dimension counting techniques, one can derive the following Maxwell-type necessary condition. We omit the proof.

Lemma 4.1. *Let (G, c) be minimally angle-rigid. Then for each subgraph $H \subseteq G$, the following inequality holds:*

$$|E(H)| \leq 2|V(H)| + \chi(H) - 4,$$

where $\chi(H)$ is the number of colors among the edges of H .

We next compare the necessary condition described in Lemma 4.1 to two related combinatorial statements. Throughout the remainder of the section we fix $\mathcal{R}_2(V)$ to be the restriction of the rigidity matroid to the complete graph with vertex set V .

Proposition 4.2. *Let (G, c) be a colored graph with $G = (V, E)$. Consider the following three conditions:*

- (i) *There exists a set $F = \{e_1, \dots, e_{|c|}\}$ where $c(e_i) = i$ for each color i , and $(E \setminus F) + e_i$ is a basis of $\mathcal{R}_2(V)$ for each color i .*
- (ii) *For each color i , there exists a set $F_i = \{e_j\}_{j \neq i} \subseteq E$ where $c(e_j) = j$ for each j such that $E \setminus F_i$ is a basis of $\mathcal{R}_2(V)$.*
- (iii) *For each subgraph $H \subseteq G$, the following inequality holds:*

$$|E(H)| \leq 2|V(H)| + \chi(H) - 4,$$

where $\chi(H)$ is the number of colors among the edges of H .

Condition (i) implies (ii), which implies (iii). Condition (iii) does not imply (i) or (ii), and (ii) does not imply (i).

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii). For each i we simply set $F_i = F \setminus e_i$. The sets $F_1, \dots, F_{|c|}$ satisfy the desired conditions by the definition of the set F .

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii). Consider a subgraph $H \subseteq G$. Suppose, without loss of generality, that 1 is among the colors on the edges of H . Let $H_1 = H \cap (E \setminus F_1)$ and $H_2 = H \cap F_1$. As $E \setminus F_1$ is a basis in \mathcal{R}_2 , we have that $|E(H_1)| \leq 2|V(H_1)| - 3$. Since $|E(H_2)| \leq \chi(H) - 1$, this implies

$$|E(H)| = |E(H_1)| + |E(H_2)| \leq 2|V(H_1)| - 3 + (\chi(H) - 1) \leq 2|V(H)| + \chi(H) - 4.$$

(iii) $\not\Rightarrow$ (i) or (ii). Consider the left-hand graph in Figure 5. One may check directly that condition (iii) is satisfied. Condition (ii), on the other hand, is not satisfied: If (ii) held then there would be a red edge that could be omitted leaving behind a basis of $\mathcal{R}_2(V)$. However, removing either red edge leaves a K_4 in the graph. If condition (ii) fails, then condition (i) must also fail.

(ii) $\not\Rightarrow$ (i). Consider the right-hand graph in Figure 5. Condition (ii) is satisfied since $E \setminus (e_1 \cup e_2^*)$, $E \setminus (e_1 \cup e_3^*)$ and $E \setminus (e_2 \cup e_3^*)$ are bases of $\mathcal{R}_2(V)$. We claim that Condition (i) fails. Suppose such an $F = \{x, y, z\}$ exists. If F contains an edge not contained in one of the two copies of K_4 , say the edge x , then $(E \setminus F) + y = E \setminus \{x, z\}$ leaves some K_4 intact, which means it cannot be a basis of $\mathcal{R}_2(V)$. We conclude that every edge of F must be contained in some K_4 . If F has all three edges in the two K_4 's, one of the copies of K_4 must contain two edges while the other contains one, say x . This means that $(E \setminus F) + x$ contains all the edges of one of the copies of K_4 , so also fails to be a basis of $\mathcal{R}_2(V)$. \square




Figure 5: Counterexample graphs.

We now give a sharper result showing that property (ii) of Proposition 4.2 is necessary. To this end let (G, c) be a colored graph, and let $j \in c$ be a color. Denote by $T_{c,j}(G)$ the j -th transversal matroid, where the ground set is $E(G)$ and the bases are sets of $|c| - 1$ elements, where for each color $i \neq j$ there exists exactly one element e_i where $c(e_i) = i$. The next lemma, whose proof is simply unpacking the definitions, reformulates property (ii) of Proposition 4.2 in terms of transversal.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $G = (V, E)$ and let (G, c) be a colored graph. Then for each color i , the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *there exists a set $F_i = \{e_j\}_{j \neq i} \subseteq E$ where $c(e_j) = j$ for each j such that $E \setminus F_i$ is a basis of $\mathcal{R}_2(V)$;*
- (ii) *there exists a transversal $X \in T_{c,i}(G)$ and a minimally rigid graph H such that $G = H + X$ and $X \cap E(H) = \emptyset$.*

For the next result we apply the terminology and techniques developed in Section 3. For fields F and K , let $\text{td}[F : K]$ denote the transcendence degree of the field extension F/K .

Theorem 4.4. *If a colored graph (G, c) is minimally angle-rigid, then for each color j , there exists a transversal $X \in T_{c,j}(G)$ and a minimally rigid graph H such that $G = H + X$ and $X \cap E(H) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Fix A to be a set of angles constructed from (G, c) and choose any field \mathbb{K} containing \mathbb{C} . As was observed in Section 3, we may choose the set A so that the angle graph $G_2(A)$ is a union of stars. By Theorem 3.7, the set A is algebraically independent over \mathbb{K} and contains $2|V| - 4$

elements. We denote by D the full set of slopes m_{ij} (see [Remark 3.2](#)), by A_k the set of angles $a_{(ij)(kl)}$ where $c(ij) = k$ (and hence $c(kl) = k$), and by D_k the set of slopes m_{ij} where $c(ij) = k$. No slope is determined by the set of angles, since the full graph can always be rotated, so every element $m_{ij} \in D$ is algebraically independent over A . Fix an edge $\hat{e} \in E(A_1)$ (for simplicity). Consider the transcendental field extension $\mathbb{K}(A \cup \{m_{\hat{e}}\})/\mathbb{K}$. Then

$$\text{td}[\mathbb{K}(A \cup \{m_{\hat{e}}\}) : \mathbb{K}] = 2|V| - 3 = (2|V| - 4) + 1,$$

and $\mathbb{K}(A \cup \{m_{\hat{e}}\})$ is a subfield of $\mathbb{K}(D)$, so $\mathbb{K}(D)/\mathbb{K}(A \cup \{m_{\hat{e}}\})$ is an algebraic extension. Note that

$$\mathbb{K}(A \cup \{m_{\hat{e}}\}) = \mathbb{K}(A \setminus A_1)(A_1 \cup \{m_{\hat{e}}\}) = \mathbb{K}(A \setminus A_1)(D_1) = \mathbb{K}((A \setminus A_1) \cup D_1),$$

with the second equality following from [Lemma 3.6](#).

Now, we argue by induction. Let $B_1 = (A \setminus A_1) \cup D_1$. Fix $j \in \{1, \dots, |c| - 1\}$. Suppose that there exists a sequence of edges $e_1, \dots, e_j \in E$ so that $c(e_i) = i$ for each $i \leq j$, $e_1 = \hat{e}$ and, let B_1, \dots, B_j be defined inductively by

$$B_i = (B_{i-1} \setminus A_i) \cup (D_i \setminus \{m_{e_i}\}).$$

Then each set B_i is algebraically independent over \mathbb{K} with $\text{td}[\mathbb{K}(B_i) : \mathbb{K}] = 2|V| - 3$. We now construct a similar set B_{j+1} by carefully choosing $e_{j+1} \in E$ with $c(e_{j+1}) = j+1$. Choose an edge $e \in E$ with $c(e) = j+1$. Since $\text{td}[\mathbb{K}(B_j) : \mathbb{K}] = 2|V| - 3$, the slope m_e is algebraically dependent over $\mathbb{K}(B_j)$. Since B_j is algebraically independent over \mathbb{K} , $\text{td}[\mathbb{K}(B_j \setminus A_{j+1}) : \mathbb{K}] = |B_j| - |A_{j+1}|$. By [Lemma 3.6](#),

$$\mathbb{K}(B_j \cup \{m_e\}) = \mathbb{K}(B_j \setminus A_{j+1})(A_{j+1} \cup \{m_e\}) = \mathbb{K}(B_j \setminus A_{j+1})(D_{j+1}).$$

Further $\text{td}[\mathbb{K}(A_{j+1} \cup \{m_e\}) : \mathbb{K}(B_j \setminus A_{j+1})] = |A_{j+1}|$ as m_e is algebraically dependent over $\mathbb{K}(B_j)$ and $\text{td}[\mathbb{K}(B_j \setminus A_{j+1}) : \mathbb{K}] = |B_j| - |A_{j+1}|$. This implies that

$$\text{td}[\mathbb{K}(D_{j+1}) : \mathbb{K}(B_j \setminus A_{j+1})] = |D_{j+1}| - 1 = |A_{j+1}|;$$

so, there are $|D_{j+1}| - 1$ slopes in D_{j+1} that are algebraically independent over the field $\mathbb{K}(B_j \setminus A_{j+1})$. Hence, there exists an edge $e_{j+1} \in E$ so that the set

$$B_{j+1} = (B_j \setminus A_{j+1}) \cup (D_{j+1} \setminus \{m_{e_{j+1}}\})$$

satisfies $\text{td}[\mathbb{K}(B_{j+1}) : \mathbb{K}] = 2|V| - 3$.

We now have sets $B_1, \dots, B_{|c|}$ defined using edges $\{e_2, \dots, e_{|c|}\}$ with $c(e_i) = i$ for each i , where each set B_i satisfies $\text{td}[\mathbb{K}(B_i) : \mathbb{K}] = 2|V| - 3$. Importantly, the set

$$B_{|c|} = D_1 \cup (D_2 \setminus \{m_{e_2}\}) \cup \dots \cup (D_{|c|} \setminus \{m_{e_{|c|}}\})$$

satisfies $\text{td}[\mathbb{K}(B_{|c|}) : \mathbb{K}] = 2|V| - 3$. Since the algebraic matroid of D over \mathbb{K} is isomorphic to \mathcal{R}_2 (see [[Whi87](#), Proposition AB.14]), the corresponding set of edges $E \setminus \{e_2, \dots, e_{|c|}\}$ is a basis of $\mathcal{R}_2(V)$. The desired transversal set is now the set $X = \{e_2, \dots, e_{|c|}\}$. \square

The graph on the left of Figure 5 is not minimally angle-rigid (see Section 5 for more details). Hence, property (iii) of Proposition 4.2 (see Lemma 4.1) is a necessary but not sufficient condition for minimal angle-rigidity. The graph on the right of Figure 5 is minimally angle-rigid but does not satisfy property (i) of Proposition 4.2. Hence, property (i) of Proposition 4.2 is not a necessary condition for minimal angle-rigidity. We discuss the potential sufficiency of (ii) of Proposition 4.2 (see Theorem 4.4) in Section 6. However, we do have positive results in some specific cases. In Section 5 we use two simple extension operations to generate rigid line-angle incidence structures and show that (ii) of Proposition 4.2 is sufficient (and hence provide a combinatorial characterization) when there are only 2 color classes.

5 Extension moves for angle-rigid graphs

Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, a 0 -extension creates a new graph G' which is obtained from G by adding one new vertex w and 2 new edges both incident to w . A 1 -extension creates a new graph G' by deleting an edge xy from E and adding a new vertex w and 3 new edges all incident to w including the edges wx, wy .

We generalize these operations to the colored case to form a new colored graph (G', c') from (G, c) . In the 0 -extension case the only constraint is that the two new edges use colors from the color set of the original graph. For the 1 -extension the three new edges use colors from the color set of the original graph but we need an extra constraint. Specifically, we say that a 1 -extension is *color-preserving* if either $c'(wx) = c(xy)$ or $c'(wy) = c(xy)$.

Lemma 5.1. *Let (G', c') be formed from (G, c) by a 0 -extension. Then (G, c) is independent if and only if (G', c') is independent.*

Proof. Let w be the new vertex in G' that is adjacent to $x, y \in V$. Choose a generic realization p' of G' and define p to be the realization of G with $p_v = p'_v$ for all $v \in V$. Let A be the 2×2 non-singular matrix with rows $(p_w - p_x)^T$ and $(p_w - p_y)^T$ and O be the $|E| \times 2$ all zeroes matrix. Then there exists a $2 \times (2|V| + |c|)$ matrix B so that

$$R(G', c', p') = \begin{pmatrix} O & R(G, c, p) \\ A & B \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence, $\text{rank } R(G', c', p') = \text{rank } R(G, c, p) + 2$ as required. \square

The same holds for color-preserving 1 -extensions.

Lemma 5.2. *Let (G', c') be formed from (G, c) by a color-preserving 1 -extension. If (G, c) is independent then (G', c') is independent.*

Proof. Suppose (G', c') is formed from (G, c) by a 1 -extension that removes an edge xy , adds a new vertex w and adds the edges wx, wy, wz for some other vertex z . Further suppose that $c'(wx) = c(xy)$. Choose a generic realization p of (G, c) and define for each $t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ the realization p^t of (G', c') where $p_v^t = p_v$ for all $v \in V$ and $p_w^t = tp_x + (1-t)p_y$.

Define M_t' to be the matrix formed from $R(G', c', p^t)$ by adding $(1-t)/t$ times row wy to row wx . The only rows with non-zero entries in the w columns are row wy (with $p_w^t - p_y^t$) and row wz (with $p_w^t - p_z^t$); this is because in row wx and column w we have

$$(p_w^t - p_x^t) + ((1-t)/t)(p_w^t - p_y^t) = (1-t)(p_y - p_x) + (1-t)(p_x - p_y) = 0.$$

Now define M_t to be the matrix formed from M'_t by deleting rows wy and wz and the columns corresponding to w , and then multiplying row wx by $(1-t)^{-1}$. As $p_w^t - p_y^t$ and $p_w^t - p_z^t$ are linearly independent, we have $\text{rank } M_t = \text{rank}(G', c', p^t) - 2$.

Suppose $c'(wx) = c'(wy) = c(xy)$. The row wx of M_t is of the form

$$\left(\overbrace{p_x - p_y}^x \quad \dots \quad \overbrace{p_y - p_x}^y \quad \dots \quad \overbrace{-\|p_x - p_y\|^2}^{c(xy)} \right).$$

Hence, $M_t = R(G, c, p)$ for all values of t , and so $\text{rank } R(G', c', p^{1/2}) = \text{rank } R(G, c, p) + 2$ as required. Now suppose $c'(wx) \neq c'(wy)$. The row wx of M_t is of the form

$$\left(\overbrace{(1-t)(p_x - p_y)}^x \quad \dots \quad \overbrace{(1-t)(p_y - p_x)}^y \quad \dots \quad \overbrace{-(1-t)\|p_x - p_y\|^2}^{c(xy)} \quad \overbrace{-t\|p_x - p_y\|^2}^{c'(wy)} \right).$$

We now note that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} M_t = R(G, c, p)$, hence for sufficiently small t we have $\text{rank } R(G', c', p^t) = \text{rank } R(G, c, p) + 2$ as required. \square

These two lemmas allow us to build families of graphs that are independent (or rigid) for any number of colors. We next show that in the special case when $|c| = 2$ they are enough to derive a complete characterization. To this end we need the following basic lemma.

Lemma 5.3. *Let (K_4, c) be a colored graph with $|c| \geq 2$. Then there exists an independent line-angle incidence structure (K_4, c, p) .*

Proof. There are 5 non-isomorphic bichromatic graphs (K_4, c) , see Figure 6, which we can easily check are independent by choosing random realizations.




Figure 6: The 5 non-isomorphic bichromatic colorings of K_4 .

Suppose the result holds for any coloring of K_4 with at least 2 and at most $k \geq 2$ colors, and suppose (K_4, c) is a colored graph with $|c| = k + 1$. Let c' be the k -coloring of K_4 formed by setting every edge of color $k + 1$ to be of color k . The result now follows as (K_4, c') is independent and $\text{rank } R(K_4, c', p) \leq \text{rank } R(K_4, c, p)$ for any realization p of K_4 . \square

For the next result, we use the following terminology. If $G = (V, E)$ is a graph and E is a circuit in the rigidity matroid \mathcal{R}_2 then we say that G is an \mathcal{R}_2 -circuit.

Theorem 5.4. *Let (G, c) be a colored graph with $|c| = 2$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *There exists a generic line-angle incidence structure (G, c, p) that is minimally infinitesimally angle-rigid.*
- (ii) *$|E| = 2|V| - 2$, and G contains a unique \mathcal{R}_2 -circuit that contains edges of both colors.*
- (iii) *(G, c) can be constructed from a bichromatic copy of K_4 by a sequence of 0-extensions and color-preserving 1-extensions.*

In the proof, we need the following: Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and, for $X \subset V$, let $i_G(X)$ denote the number of edges in the subgraph of G induced by X . We say that G is *Laman* if $i_G(X) \leq 2|X| - 3$ for all X with $|X| \geq 2$ and $i_G(V) = 2|V| - 3$. Also $X \subset V$ is *critical* if $i_G(X) = 2|X| - 3$. We also use $d(X, Y)$ to denote the number of edges in G of the form xy with $x \in X, y \in Y$ for disjoint sets $X, Y \subset V$.

Recall that [PG27, Lam70] showed that G is minimally rigid (as a generic bar-joint framework) in the plane if and only if G is Laman. Hence, all \mathcal{R}_2 -circuits are rigid. It is now immediate that condition (ii) implies that G is rigid as a bar-joint framework. An elementary property of such rigid graphs is that they are 2-edge-connected and any 2-edge-separation has one component of size 1 (i. e. the separation simply separates a degree 2 vertex from the rest of the graph). The condition is also checkable efficiently by the well-known pebble game algorithm [JH97].

Lemma 5.5 ([PG27, Lam70]). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a Laman graph and let $v \in V$ be a vertex of degree 3 in G . Then there exists a pair $\{x, y\} \subset N(v)$ such that $G - v + xy$ is a Laman graph.*

It is convenient to introduce the terms *0-reduction* and *color-preserving 1-reduction* for the colored graph operations that ‘undo’ a 0-extension and a color preserving 1-extension respectively.

Proof of Theorem 5.4. (i) \Rightarrow (ii): This follows from Theorem 4.4.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii): Let \mathcal{C} be the set of all colored graphs that satisfy (ii). It suffices to show that any colored graph with at least 5 vertices in \mathcal{C} can be reduced to another graph in \mathcal{C} by a 0-reduction or color-preserving 1-reduction. Choose any colored graph $(G, c) \in \mathcal{C}$ with $|V| \geq 5$. Since $|E| = 2|V| - 2$, G has a vertex of degree less than 4 and since G contains a unique \mathcal{R}_2 -circuit it has no vertex of degree less than 2. If (G, c) has a vertex v of degree 2 then we can apply a 0-reduction to that vertex. (Note that if $G - v$ was monochromatic then it would contain an \mathcal{R}_2 -circuit which violates condition (ii) and this circuit would also be contained in G .) Hence, we may assume that the minimum degree in G is 3.

Since $|E| = 2|V| - 2$ and the minimum degree is 3, G contains at least 4 vertices of degree 3. Let C be the unique \mathcal{R}_2 -circuit and suppose that there is a vertex v with degree 3 that is not in C . If v has three neighbors in C , then for any $e \in C$, $(C - e) \cup v$ fails the Laman count; this would imply it contains a circuit C' distinct from C , contrary to assumption. Thus, v has at most two neighbors in C . Delete from G an edge e of C (not incident to both of the two neighbors) and we have a minimally rigid graph. Hence, by Lemma 5.5 there is a 1-reduction on v to a smaller minimally rigid graph with any color on the new edge. Moreover the vertex set of $C - e$ is a critical set so the new edge has at most one end-vertex in C . We can now re-add e (with its color) to get the same unique \mathcal{R}_2 -circuit.

Note that if $C = K_4$ then not all the vertices of degree 3 can be in C (since G is connected). Hence, we may apply the above argument and assume from here that C is not isomorphic to K_4 and that all degree 3 vertices are in C . We now apply a very similar argument. Since $|V(C)| \geq 5$, we may delete xy from $C - v$ such that $|\{x, y\} \cap N(v)| \leq 1$. Then $G - xy$ is a minimally rigid graph and Lemma 5.5 implies there exists a 1-reduction deleting v in $G - xy$, and adding ab (with color prescribed by the color-preserving reduction) for some $a, b \in N(v)$, that results in a smaller minimally rigid graph. Now add xy back with its original color to obtain G' . The graph G' contains a unique \mathcal{R}_2 -circuit C' .

It remains to show that C' contains edges of both colors. If the 3 edges incident to v have the same color this is trivial so without loss we may suppose v is incident to two blue edges av, bv

and one red edge cv . The conclusion is also trivial if either ac or bc is added in the 1-reduction. Hence, we may suppose that ab is added, this forces us to color ab blue. The conclusion fails if and only if ac was the unique red edge of (G, c) . However, there are at least 4 vertices of degree 3 in C . So we may choose $u \neq v$ in C of degree 3 and repeat the argument. Clearly, at the final step, there is more than one red edge in (G, c) so we are now done.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i): This follows from [Lemmas 5.1 to 5.3](#). \square

We expect that it may be possible to use similar techniques (though at least one additional operation is certainly needed) to resolve the case when $|c| = 3$. However, in general, different techniques seem to be needed. The two color case has a nice application for bar-and-joint frameworks.

Corollary 5.6. *Let (G, p) be a generic framework in \mathbb{R}^2 such that G is an \mathcal{R}_2 -circuit. Let ω be an equilibrium stress of (G, p) . Then, for a non-empty $F \subseteq E$, we have*

$$\sum_{vw \in F} \omega_{vw} \|p_v - p_w\|^2 = 0$$

if and only if $F = E$.

Proof. Choose any proper subset $F \subset E$. Define c to be the coloring of G , where $c(e) = 1$ if $e \in F$ and $c(e) = 2$ if $e \in E \setminus F$. By [Theorem 5.4](#), (G, c, p) is minimally infinitesimally rigid. Hence, $\sum_{vw \in F} \omega_{vw} \|p_v - p_w\|^2 \neq 0$ as required. \square

5.1 Computational results

[Theorem 5.4](#) gives a tool to construct all 2-colored graphs (G, c) that are minimally angle-rigid. On the other hand, we can test a given (G, c) for angle-rigidity by [Proposition 2.12](#) using a random realization p . In the case when (G, c, p) is infinitesimally angle-rigid we know (G, c) is also angle-rigid. However, if (G, c, p) is not infinitesimally angle-rigid, then it could be that our choice of random realization was not “generic enough” to obtain the maximal rank. Using these two tools we can analyze the angle-rigid colored graphs computationally. Up to a certain (rather low) number of vertices we get a full picture.

Let G be a graph with $|E| = 2|V| - 2$. We say that G is *2-color-rigid* if there is a color map c with $|c| = 2$ such that (G, c) is minimally angle-rigid. For $|V| = 5$ we have two 2-color-rigid graphs (G_1 and G_2 from [Figure 7](#)). G_1 admits 45 different 2-color maps such that (G_1, c) is angle-rigid. Note that we only count non-isomorphic ones. G_2 has 26 such maps. Hence, in total there are 71 non-isomorphic colored graphs¹ (G, c) with $|c| = 2$ that are minimally angle-rigid (see last column in [Table 1](#)).

We have seen in [Figure 6](#) that K_4 has 5 possible color maps in two colors which give a rigid structure. We have computed the number of such color maps for all graphs up to 7 vertices. In [Table 2](#) we show the minimum and maximum number of color maps obtained by graphs with less than 8 vertices.

Similarly to 2-color-rigid graphs we can take more general *k-color-rigid* graphs which have $|E| = 2|V| + k - 4$ and a k -color map c that gives a minimally angle-rigid structure. Note that, computations are done using [Proposition 2.12](#), hence, they use random realizations and might therefore yield false negatives. [Table 3](#) shows how many k -color-rigid graphs there are with few vertices.

¹Here we say two colored graphs (G, c) and (G', c') are isomorphic if there exists a graph isomorphism $\phi : G \rightarrow G'$ so that $c = c' \circ \phi$.

$ V $	graphs	2-color-rigid	2-colored angle-rigid
4	1	1	5
5	2	2	71
6	12	12	2227
7	97	91	99148
8	1113	1003	
9	17117	14870	

Table 1: Graphs with $|E| = 2|V| - 2$ and minimum degree 2 in the second column and the number of 2-color-rigid graphs in column three. The last column shows the number of non-isomorphic colored graphs (G, c) with $|c| = 2$ for the respective number of vertices which are minimally angle-rigid.




Figure 7: Two graphs with 5 vertices that are 2-color-rigid.

6 Conjecture, strategies, and partial results

Experimental data so far, as well as various heuristic arguments, argue in favor of the conjecture that the matroid takes the form specified by the second property in [Proposition 4.2](#). We can formalize the condition in terms of transversal matroids.

Conjecture 6.1. *A colored graph (G, c) is minimally angle-rigid if and only if for each color j , there exists a transversal edge set $X \in T_{c,j}(G)$ and a minimally rigid graph H such that $G = H \cup X$ and $X \cap E(H) = \emptyset$.*

The “only if” part of the statement is covered by [Theorem 4.4](#). For convenience, we refer to the second clause of this conjecture as the “transversal property.” [Conjecture 6.1](#) has been stubbornly resilient to various attempts at resolving it. For the benefit of other researchers studying this problem, we describe three approaches we have tried, including partial results that they produced, and the obstacles that must be overcome if they will work.

6.1 A color-swap move

Perhaps the most popular proof of the Laman-Pollaczek-Geiringer (LPG) theorem is by way of the Henneberg moves. First, show that both 0- and 1-extensions preserve rigidity of frameworks. Then show that any framework satisfying the LPG hypotheses can be obtained from K_3 by a sequence of Henneberg moves.

An analogous method to prove the “if” direction of [Conjecture 6.1](#) extending the proof of [Theorem 5.4](#) could involve the introduction of a color-swap move on colored graphs.

$ V $	minimum 2-color maps	maximum 2-color maps
4	5	5
5	26	45
6	67	304
7	46	2047

Table 2: For all 2-color-rigid graphs we count the number of possible 2-color maps. The minimum and maximum of these numbers for a given $|V|$ is shown in the table.

$ V $	2-color-rigid	3-color-rigid	4-color-rigid
4	1	-	-
5	2	1	1
6	12	8	5
7	91	80	59
8	1003	1168	
9	14870		

Table 3: Number of k -color-rigid graphs with $k \leq 6$ and less than 10 vertices.

Definition 6.2. Let (G, c) be a colored graph with colors $\{1, \dots, k\}$. For any pair of colors i, j with $c(e) = i$, denote

$$(G, c(e : i \rightarrow j)) = (G, c'), \text{ where } c'(x) = \begin{cases} c(x) & x \neq e, \\ j & x = e. \end{cases}$$

If both (G, c) and $(G, c(e : i \rightarrow j))$ have the transversal property, we say that the color-swap is *tp-preserving*.

Suppose $G = (V, E)$, $|V| = n$ and c has k colors. Consider the colored graph (K_n, c') , where c' agrees with c on E and assigns a unique color to every remaining edge in K_n . With this set up, (G, c) is angle-rigid if and only if (K_n, c') is angle-rigid, and (G, c) has the transversal property if and only if (K_n, c') has the transversal property. The strategy for proving [Conjecture 6.1](#) would now be to begin with (K_n, c') satisfying the transversal property. Then prove that:

- (i) there exists a sequence of tp-preserving color-swap moves from (K_n, χ) , a colored complete graph with χ with $|\chi| = \binom{n}{2} - 2n + 3$ that is monochromatic on a Laman subgraph, to (K_n, c') ; and
- (ii) each tp-preserving color-swap also preserves angle-rigidity or -flexibility of a colored graph.

This would then imply that (K_n, c') must also be angle-rigid.

Arguing by way of contradiction. A potentially easier approach to color-swaps would be to use proof by contradiction together with weak induction. Assume again that we are working with (K_n, c') . If colors are listed from most edges to least, the sequence $(c^{-1}(1), c^{-1}(2), \dots, c^{-1}(N))$ is a partition of $\binom{n}{2}$ into $N = \binom{n}{2} - (2n - 4)$ nonempty parts. The resulting list can be ordered by the dominance ordering $(a_1, \dots, a_N) \leq (b_1, \dots, b_N)$ if $\sum_{i=1}^k a_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^k b_i$ for all k . The maximal

element is the partition $(2n - 3, 1, \dots, 1)$. In this base case, the transversal property implies angle-rigidity (as a monochromatic graph).

Now suppose that (K_n, c') is flexible but satisfies the transversal property. If we can find a color-swap move that moves up the dominance ordering preserving both flexibility and the transversal property, then we arrive at a contradiction. This means we need to move any edge from its color to any color of greater or equal size.

Showing that these moves exist could come out of analysis of the structure of the rigidity matrix. Given what we know about various submatrices, when can we say that switching two entries preserves deficient rank of the matrix (i.e. flexibility of the framework) as well as a collection of submatrices of full rank (i.e. the transversal property)?

One partial result for color swaps based on analyzing the rigidity matrix is given in the following proposition.

Proposition 6.3. *Let (G, c) be a colored graph with $n \geq 4$ vertices, $2n - 4 + k$ edges and $k \geq 3$ colors, and let $e = xy$ be an edge of color k . Define two other graphs as follows.*

- (i) *Let $(G, c(e : k \rightarrow k - 1))$ denote the colored graph obtained by switching edge e to color $k - 1$.*
- (ii) *Let $(G - e, c')$ denote the colored graph obtained from changing every edge of color k to be of color $k - 1$ and deleting edge e and color k .*

If any one of (G, c) , $(G, c(e : k \rightarrow k - 1))$, and $(G - e, c')$ is not angle-rigid, then the other two are both angle-rigid or both are not angle-rigid.

Proof. Fix $c^* = c(e : k \mapsto k - 1)$. Choose two vertices $a, b \in V \setminus \{x, y\}$. Choose a generic realization p of (G, c) . For each matrix $R(G, c, p)$, $R(G, c^*, p)$ and $R(G - e, c', p)$, we define the square matrices $S(G, c, p)$, $S(G, c^*, p)$ and $S(G - e, c', p)$ respectively by deleting the columns corresponding to the vertices a and b . It follows from [Remark 2.4](#) that each of these new matrices has nonzero determinant if and only if the original matrices have full rank (which is equivalent to infinitesimal angle-rigidity by [Theorem 2.8](#)).

Fix r_e to be the row vector of $R(G, p)$ corresponding to the edge e with the four coordinates corresponding to a, b removed, and for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ fix $\mathbf{0}_m$ to be the all zeroes $1 \times m$ vector. Given the top row is indexed by the edge e and the last two columns are indexed by the colors $k - 1, k$ respectively, there exists matrices A, B, C, D (each with $|E| - 1$ columns and with $2n - 4, k, 1$ and 1 rows respectively) so that

$$\begin{aligned} S(G, c, p) &= \begin{pmatrix} r_e & \mathbf{0}_k & 0 & -\|p_x - p_y\|^2 \\ A & B & C & D \end{pmatrix} \\ S(G, c^*, p) &= \begin{pmatrix} r_e & \mathbf{0}_k & -\|p_x - p_y\|^2 & 0 \\ A & B & C & D \end{pmatrix} \\ S(G - e, c', p) &= \begin{pmatrix} A & B & C + D \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the multilinearity of the determinant and the Laplace expansion, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \det S(G, c, p) &= \det \begin{pmatrix} r_e & \mathbf{0}_k & 0 & 0 \\ A & B & C & D \end{pmatrix} + \det \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{2n-4} & \mathbf{0}_k & 0 & -\|p_x - p_y\|^2 \\ A & B & C & D \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \det \begin{pmatrix} r_e & \mathbf{0}_k & 0 & 0 \\ A & B & C & D \end{pmatrix} + (-1)^k \|p_x - p_y\|^2 \det \begin{pmatrix} A & B & C \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\det S(G, c^*, p) = \det \begin{pmatrix} r_e & \mathbf{0}_k & 0 & 0 \\ A & B & C & D \end{pmatrix} - (-1)^k \|p_x - p_y\|^2 \det \begin{pmatrix} A & B & D \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since C and D are column vectors, it follows from the multilinearity of the determinant that

$$\begin{aligned} \det S(G, c, p) &= \det S(G, c^*, p) + (-1)^k \|p_x - p_y\|^2 \left(\det \begin{pmatrix} A & B & C \end{pmatrix} + \det \begin{pmatrix} A & B & D \end{pmatrix} \right) \\ &= \det S(G, c^*, p) + (-1)^k \|p_x - p_y\|^2 \det S(G - e, c', p). \end{aligned}$$

Fixing any one of the determinants above to be zero now yields the result. \square

In general, we do not have the guarantee that one of these line-angle incidence structures is not angle-rigid, so this proposition is not as strong as we need.

6.2 The picture variety and partitioning vertices

In [Mar03], Martin uses the following strategy to demonstrate that $(2, 3)$ -tight graphs are independent in the ‘‘slope matroid’’ i.e. the algebraic matroid on the set of slopes in a generic realization of n points in the plane. The argument begins by considering the set of ‘‘pictures’’ of points and lines described by a graph G as an algebraic variety inside $\prod_{v \in V(G)} \mathbb{P}^2 \times \prod_{e \in E(G)} \mathbb{P}^{2^V}$. This variety is cut out by the set of $2r$ equations $p_v \in \ell_e$ if $v \in e$. However, this variety can be decomposed into *cellules*, each indexed by a partition which tells us which subsets of points are forced to coincide. Every irreducible component of the picture variety is a cellule.

Suppose that $G = (V, E)$ has $|V| = n$ and $|E| = 2n - 3$. When all points are distinct, the lines corresponding to edges are completely determined; thus, the corresponding part (called the *discrete cellule*) of the variety has dimension $2n$. On the other hand, when all points coincide, each line can be chosen independently from a \mathbb{P}^1 ; thus the corresponding cellule (called the *indiscrete cellule*) has dimension $r + 2 = (2n - 3) + 2 = 2n - 1$ (two degrees of freedom for choosing the unique point). Indeed, for all partitions of the points into coincident groupings, the dimension of the corresponding cellule can be shown to be less than $2n$.

The geometric argument concludes as follows: The variety of pictures must be locally of dimension $2n$ based on the number of defining equations. This implies that the indiscrete cellule must be in the Zariski closure of the discrete cellule. In fact, the closure of the discrete cellule is the unique irreducible component of the variety. Projecting to only the edge coordinates, this indicates that the slopes achievable in honest arrangements are dense in $\prod_{e \in E(G)} (\mathbb{P}^2)^V$, thus they are algebraically independent.

Since our colored graphs include $2n - 4 + |c|$ edges, the indiscrete cellule is not in the closure of the discrete cellule. However, we may be able to pinpoint partitions of the vertices which allow free designation of many of the angles, but which are still in the closure of the discrete cellule. For this, we rely on [Mar03, Theorem 6.2] which states that the cellule corresponding to a fixed partition \mathcal{A} is in the closure of the discrete cellule if no rigidity circuit is collapsed by \mathcal{A} . By studying the maps from each of these subvarieties to angle-space, we may be able to prove that the map from the discrete cellule is dominant.

6.3 Pseudo-Euclidean space

As alluded to in the introduction, the angle-rigidity matrix $R(G, c, p)$ appears similar to the *coordinated rigidity matrix* defined in [SST22]. The only differences between the two matrices

are: (i) coordinated rigidity allows for edges with no color, and (ii) the coordinated rigidity matrix replaces every entry of the form $-\|p_v - p_w\|^2$ with a 1 entry. These small changes makes a large difference in the available techniques however; when an edge is significantly smaller than all other edges, any equilibrium stress (i. e., element of the left kernel of the coordinated rigidity matrix) supported by the coordinated framework must be in some sense “large on the edge”, however this causes issues when summing over the 0/1 columns of the coordinated rigidity matrix. We do not have access to this tool however, since the entries of $M(G, c, p)$ scale with respect to p .

One possible method to get around this issue is to replace the standard metric stemming from the quadratic form $(x, y) \mapsto x^2 + y^2$ to the degenerate quadratic form $(x, y) \mapsto x^2 - y^2$. The space \mathbb{R}^2 with the latter quadratic form is often referred to as *pseudo-Euclidean space*. It is well known in rigidity theory that an infinitesimal motion in Euclidean space gives rise to a corresponding infinitesimal motion in any pseudo-Euclidean space of the same dimension, and moreover the converse holds too. In other words a framework is infinitesimally rigid in Euclidean space if and only if the same framework is infinitesimally rigid in pseudo-Euclidean space [NW18].

In such a pseudo-Euclidean space we can have unusually small distances arising from light directions, and it may be possible to utilize this notion to repeat the argument of [SST22], mentioned above, to specially chosen configurations.

Acknowledgements

This project originated from the Fields Institute Thematic Program on Geometric Constraint Systems, Framework Rigidity, and Distance Geometry and benefited from time at the Fields Institute Focus Program on Geometric Constraint Systems. The authors are grateful to the Fields Institute for their hospitality and financial support. S.D. was supported by the Heilbronn Institute for Mathematical Research. G.G. was partially supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF): 10.55776/P31888. A.N. was partially supported by EPSRC grant EP/X036723/1.

References

- [CCL21] Liangming Chen, Ming Cao, and Chuanjiang Li. Angle rigidity and its usage to stabilize multiagent formations in 2-d. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 66(8):3667–3681, 2021. doi:10.1109/TAC.2020.3025539.
- [CGG⁺18] Jose Capco, Matteo Gallet, Georg Grasegger, Christoph Koutschan, Niels Lubbes, and Josef Schicho. The number of realizations of a Laman graph. *SIAM Journal on Applied Algebra and Geometry*, 2(1):94–125, 2018. doi:10.1137/17M1118312.
- [Con82] Robert Connelly. Rigidity and energy. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, pages 11–33, 1982. doi:10.1007/BF01404753.
- [Eis13] David Eisenbud. *Commutative algebra: with a view toward algebraic geometry*, volume 150. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013. doi:10.1007/978-1-4612-5350-1.

- [EWM⁺03] Tolga Eren, Walter Whiteley, A. Stephen Morse, Peter N. Belhumeur, and Brian D.O. Anderson. Sensor and network topologies of formations with direction, bearing, and angle information between agents. In *42nd IEEE International Conference on Decision and Control (IEEE Cat. No. 03CH37475)*, volume 3, pages 3064–3069. IEEE, 2003. doi:10.1109/CDC.2003.1273093.
- [GSS93] Jack Graver, Brigitte Servatius, and Herman Servatius. *Combinatorial rigidity*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1993. doi:10.1090/gsm/002.
- [JH97] Donald J. Jacobs and Bruce Hendrickson. An algorithm for two-dimensional rigidity percolation: The pebble game. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 137(2):346–365, 1997. doi:10.1006/jcph.1997.5809.
- [JO16] Bill Jackson and John Owen. A characterisation of the generic rigidity of 2-dimensional point–line frameworks. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 119:96–121, 2016. doi:10.1016/j.jctb.2015.12.007.
- [JZLW19] Gangshan Jing, Guofeng Zhang, Heung Wing Joseph Lee, and Long Wang. Angle-based shape determination theory of planar graphs with application to formation stabilization. *Automatica*, 105:117–129, 2019. doi:10.1016/j.automatica.2019.03.026.
- [Lam70] Gerard Laman. On graphs and rigidity of plane skeletal structures. *Journal of Engineering mathematics*, 4(4):331–340, 1970. doi:10.1007/BF01534980.
- [Mar03] Jeremy Martin. Geometry of graph varieties. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 355(10):4151–4169, 2003. doi:10.1090/S0002-9947-03-03321-X.
- [NW18] Anthony Nixon and Walter Whiteley. Change of metrics in rigidity theory. In Meera Sitharam, Audrey St. John, and Jessica Sidman, editors, *Handbook of Geometric Constraint Systems Principles, Discrete Mathematics and Its Applications*. CRC Press, 2018. doi:10.1201/9781315121116.
- [PG27] Hilda Pollaczek-Geiringer. Über die Gliederung ebener Fachwerke. *ZAMM-Journal of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics/Zeitschrift für Angewandte Mathematik und Mechanik*, 7(1):58–72, 1927. doi:10.1002/zamm.19270070107.
- [SST22] Bernd Schulze, Hattie Serocold, and Louis Theran. Frameworks with coordinated edge motions. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 36(4):2602–2618, 2022. doi:10.1137/20M1377539.
- [SW99] Brigitte Servatius and Walter Whiteley. Constraining plane configurations in computer-aided design: Combinatorics of directions and lengths. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 12(1):136–153, 1999. doi:10.1137/S0895480196307342.
- [SW04] Franco Saliola and Walter Whiteley. Constraining plane configurations in CAD: circles, lines, and angles in the plane. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 18(2):246–271, 2004. doi:10.1137/S0895480100374138.
- [Whi87] Walter Whiteley. Parallel redrawings, 1987. Preprint. doi:10.13140/RG.2.2.13701.91365.

- [Whi96] Walter Whiteley. Some matroids from discrete applied geometry. In J. E. Bonin, J. G. Oxley, and B. Servatius, editors, *Matroid theory*, number 197 in Contemporary Mathematics, pages 171–311. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996. doi:[10.1090/conm/197/02540](https://doi.org/10.1090/conm/197/02540).
- [Zho06] Yong Zhou. *Combinatorial decomposition, generic independence and algebraic complexity of geometric constraints systems: applications in biology and engineering*. PhD thesis, University of Florida, 2006.
- [ZZ15] Shiyu Zhao and Daniel Zelazo. Bearing rigidity and almost global bearing-only formation stabilization. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 61(5):1255–1268, 2015. doi:[10.1109/TAC.2015.2459191](https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2015.2459191).