

# ON 2-COMPLEXES EMBEDDABLE IN 4-SPACE, AND THE EXCLUDED MINORS OF THEIR UNDERLYING GRAPHS

AGELOS GEORGAKOPOULOS<sup>†</sup> AND MARTIN WINTER<sup>‡</sup>

**ABSTRACT.** We study the potentially undecidable problem of whether a given 2-dimensional CW complex can be embedded into  $\mathbb{R}^4$ . We provide operations that preserve embeddability, including joining and cloning of 2-cells, as well as  $\Delta Y$ -transformations. We also construct a CW complex for which  $Y\Delta$ -transformations do not preserve embeddability.

We use these results to study 4-flat graphs, *i.e.*, graphs that embed in  $\mathbb{R}^4$  after attaching any number of 2-cells to their cycles; a graph class that naturally generalizes planarity and linklessness. We verify several conjectures of van der Holst; in particular, we prove that each of the 78 graphs of the Heawood family is an excluded minor for the family of 4-flat graphs.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The study of planar graphs marks the starting point of both topological graph theory and graph minor theory. A variety of concepts have been introduced with the goal of capturing a higher-dimension analogue of planarity. Linkless graphs, for example, are defined by the existence of particular embeddings into 3-space, and can likewise be characterized by a short list of excluded minors [17]. In 2006 van der Holst introduced a natural 4-dimensional analogue [22]: a graph  $G$  is *4-flat* if every 2-dimensional regular CW complex having  $G$  as its 1-skeleton can be (piecewise linearly) embedded into  $\mathbb{R}^4$ . Van der Holst's work contains a number of results and plausible conjectures that paint the picture of 4-flat graphs as the most natural continuation from planar and linkless to 4-space. In particular, 4-flat graphs encompass planar and linkless graphs and appear to have the right behaviour in terms of forbidden minors and the Colin de Verdière graph invariant. They moreover allow natural generalisations to even higher dimensions.

The study of 4-flat graphs is intimately connected with the embedding problem  $2 \rightarrow 4$ , *i.e.*, deciding the embeddability of a 2-dimensional CW complex into  $\mathbb{R}^4$ . A fundamental homological obstruction to embeddability  $n \rightarrow 2n$ , the van Kampen obstruction, fails to be sufficient precisely for  $n = 2$  [8], and it is a prominent open question whether the decision problem  $2 \rightarrow 4$  is decidable [15]. As a consequence, seemingly simple questions about 4-flat graphs can be hard, since there is currently no way to decide whether a given graph is 4-flat.

In this paper we provide operations on 2-dimensional CW complexes that preserve embeddability into  $\mathbb{R}^4$ , and use them to make a number of conclusions about

---


2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 57Q35, 05C10, 05C83, 05C75.

*Key words and phrases.* CW complex, embedding problem, excluded minors, 4-flat graphs.

<sup>†</sup>Supported by EPSRC grants EP/V009044/1, EP/V048821/1, and EP/Y004302/1.

<sup>‡</sup>Supported by EPSRC grant EP/V009044/1.

Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom.



**Figure 1.** Three graphs from the Heawood family:  $K_7$ ,  $K_{3,3,1,1}$  and the Heawood graph. All three are not 4-flat.

4-flat graphs. We answer several conjectures of van der Holst regarding their excluded minors and on operations that preserve 4-flatness. Moreover, our tools allow us to give streamlined proofs for some known results.

**1.1. Background on 4-flat graphs.** We now recall some results of van der Holst [22]. The 4-flat graphs form a minor-closed graph family and are therefore, by the Robertson-Seymour Graph Minor theorem [18], characterized by a finite list of *excluded minors*, *i.e.*, graphs that are not 4-flat, but every proper minor of them is. The complete list of excluded minors is unknown, though there is a plausible candidate: the *Heawood family* consists of the 78 graphs built from  $K_7$  and  $K_{3,3,1,1}$  by repeated application of  $\Delta Y$ - and  $Y\Delta$ -transformations. The members of the Heawood family are collectively known as “Heawood graphs”, owing to the fact that *the* Heawood graph (Figure 1, right) is a member of this family. Van der Holst showed that the Heawood graphs are not 4-flat and proposed:

**Conjecture 1.1** ([22]). *Each of the 78 graphs of the Heawood family is an excluded minor for the class of 4-flat graphs. Even more, there are no further excluded minors.*<sup>1</sup>

This conjecture is natural, given the similarity of the Heawood family to the well-known Petersen family (that is, the family of excluded minors for linkless graphs): both are obtained from the Kuratowski graphs  $K_5$  and  $K_{3,3}$  by forming suspensions, and then  $\Delta Y$ - and  $Y\Delta$ -transformations.


Van der Holst proved that both  $K_7$  and  $K_{3,3,1,1}$  are excluded minors, though left this open for the other graphs of the Heawood family. We shall fill this gap with **Theorem 6.1**, proved in **Section 6**.

Van der Holst proposed a different approach for proving this, based on two further conjectures:

**Conjecture 1.2** ([22, Conjecture 1]). *Cloning an edge of a graph (*i.e.*, replacing it by two parallel edges) preserves 4-flatness.*

**Conjecture 1.3** ([22, Conjecture 2]).  *$\Delta Y$ - and  $Y\Delta$ -transformations of graphs preserve 4-flatness (*cf.* Figure 3).*

<sup>1</sup>The first statement of **Conjecture 1.1** can be found at the end of [22, §3]. The second statement is more implicit: it is conjectured that the graphs in the Heawood family are all excluded minors for the class of graphs with  $\mu \leq 5$  [22, §4], and that a graph has  $\mu \leq 5$  if and only if it is 4-flat ([22, Conjecture 3]). Combining the latter two conjectures yields the second statement.



**Figure 2.** Visualization of  $\Delta Y$ - and  $Y\Delta$ -transformations.

We will confirm [Conjecture 1.2](#) as well as the  $\Delta Y$ -part of [Conjecture 1.3](#). We also provide constructions for complexes and graphs that highlight the difficulties in proving the  $Y\Delta$ -part of the conjecture.

Another striking analogy to planar and linkless graphs might exist in connection to the Colin de Verdière graph invariant  $\mu(G)$  [[23](#)]: recall that a graph  $G$  is planar if and only if  $\mu(G) \leq 3$ , and is linkless if and only if  $\mu(G) \leq 4$ . Van der Holst conjectured:

**Conjecture 1.4** ([\[22, Conjecture 3\]](#)). *A graph  $G$  is 4-flat if and only if it has Colin de Verdière invariant  $\mu(G) \leq 5$ .*

We list some evidence in favor of this conjecture: all Heawood graphs have  $\mu = 6$ . It moreover holds that  $G$  is linkless if and only if the *suspension*  $G * K_1$ , obtained by adding a new dominating vertex, is a 4-flat graph. One direction of this was proven in [[22, Theorem 2](#)], and we prove the other direction in [Theorem 5.9](#). It follows that  $G * K_1$  is 4-flat if and only if  $\mu(G * K_1) \leq 5$ .

An alternative definition of 4-flat graphs based on “almost embeddings” as well as generalizations to even higher dimensions are introduced in [[24](#)]. Based on this the authors define a graph invariant  $\sigma(G)$  and show that it agrees with  $\mu(G)$  on linkless graphs, but disagrees at sufficiently large values. It is unknown whether  $\sigma(G) \leq 5$  is equivalent to being 4-flat. It is known that  $\sigma(G) \leq \mu(G)$  [[13](#)].

**1.2. Overview and results.** The results of this paper can be divided into results on general 2-dimensional CW complexes and result on 4-flat graphs.

[Section 3](#) explores operations on general 2-dimensional CW complexes, and especially on when those preserve embeddability into  $\mathbb{R}^4$ .

**Theorem.** *The class of 2-complexes embeddable into  $\mathbb{R}^4$  is closed under each of the following operations:*

- (i) *joining 2-cells at vertices and edges* ([Lemma 3.1](#)).
- (ii) *cloning 2-cells* ([Lemma 3.2](#)).
- (iii) *collapsing 2-cells* ([Lemma 3.9](#)).
- (iv) *cloning edges* ([Corollary 3.11](#)).

We also obtain further results on rerouting 2-cells ([Lemma 3.7](#)), stellifying cycles ([Lemma 3.15](#)) (including the important special case of  $\Delta Y$ -transformations; [Corollary 3.16](#)), and merging parallel edges ([Corollary 3.13](#)). These operations preserve embeddability only under additional assumptions and so the precise statements require more care.

As an application of these operations, we prove the following:

**Theorem 3.5.** *Suppose a 2-dimensional CW complex  $X$  has two vertices  $v, w$  such that each 2-cell  $c \subseteq X$  is incident to at least one of  $v, w$ . Then  $X$  can be embedded in  $\mathbb{R}^4$ .*

To appreciate the strength of [Theorem 3.5](#), we remark that it is non-trivial to prove that  $X$  is 4-embeddable even if its 1-skeleton has only a single vertex; see [\[5\]](#), where this statement is deduced from a difficult theorem of Stallings. Moreover, [Theorem 3.5](#) becomes false if we replace  $v, w$  by a triple of vertices; a counterexample is the triple cone over any non-planar graph, as was proven by Grünbaum [\[11\]](#).

The above tools will allow us to verify van der Holst’s [Conjecture 1.2](#) ([Corollary 3.12](#)) and the  $\Delta Y$ -part of [Conjecture 1.3](#) ([Corollary 3.18](#)) on 4-flat graphs.

[Section 4](#) explores the intricacies of the inverse operations – reverse stellification, and in particular,  $Y\Delta$ -transformations. We show that the  $Y\Delta$ -part of [Conjecture 1.3](#) is at the boundary of what can be true: stellification at cycles of length  $\ell \geq 4$  does not preserve 4-flatness ([Example 4.2](#)); and we construct an embeddable complex (based on the Freedman-Krushkal-Teichner complex [\[8\]](#)) having a  $Y\Delta$ -transformation which is not embeddable ([Section 4.1](#)).

From [Section 5](#) on we explore the implications of our results to the theory of 4-flat graphs and their full complexes. Combined with results from [Section 3](#), the following operations are shown to preserve 4-flatness:

**Theorem.** *The class of 4-flat graphs is closed under each of the following operations:*

- (i) *cloning edges* ([Corollary 3.12](#)).
- (ii)  *$\Delta Y$ -transformations* ([Corollary 3.18](#)).
- (iii)  *$k$ -clique sums for  $k \leq 3$*  ([Proposition 5.14](#)).

Other results obtained in [Section 5](#) include:

- we consider alternative notions of 4-flatness: instead of *every regular* complex on  $G$  being embeddable, we require that *every* (not necessarily regular) complex, or *every induced* complex (*i.e.*, 2-cells only along induced cycles) is embeddable. We show that, surprisingly, both modifications give rise to the same notion of 4-flatness, despite being seemingly stronger and weaker respectively ([Theorem 5.1](#)).
- we show that 4-flat graphs are “locally linkless” ([Lemma 5.7](#)).
- we show that a suspension  $G * K_1$  yields a 4-flat graph if and only if  $G$  is linkless ([Theorem 5.9](#)).
- we show that there is no simple inclusion relation between 4-flat and knotless graphs ([Section 5.5](#)).

Finally, in [Section 6](#), we verify the first statement of [Conjecture 1.1](#):

**Theorem 6.1.** *All graphs of the Heawood family are excluded minors for the class of 4-flat graphs.*

We emphasize that this is not a priori a finite problem: recall that there is no known algorithm for deciding whether a given 2-complex embeds into  $\mathbb{R}^4$ , and it might be that none exists. There is also no known algorithm for deciding whether a given graph is 4-flat.

The Graph Minor Theorem [\[18\]](#) says that every minor-closed class  $F$  of finite graphs is characterised by a finite set  $\text{Ex}(F)$  of excluded minors. However, the proof is inherently non-constructive, and it is often hopelessly difficult to determine  $\text{Ex}(F)$

given  $F$  even if the latter has a natural definition. Indeed, Fellows & Langston [6, Theorem 8] prove that there is no algorithm to compute the set of excluded minors of  $F$  even if we are given a Turing machine that accepts precisely the graphs in  $F$ .

This theoretical difficulty is hard to overcome even for specific classes  $F$  of interest: there are more than 16 thousand excluded minors for embeddability into the torus [9], and more than 68 billion excluded minors for  $Y\Delta Y$ -reducible graphs [27]. On the other hand, some natural classes  $F$  have a small  $\text{Ex}(F)$  that we know exactly; these include outerplanar, series-parallel, planar, and linkless graphs [17]. Thus naturally defined minor-closed families  $F$  for which we can find  $\text{Ex}(F)$  exactly are rare. The best next candidate for such a class might be the class of 4-flat graphs, due to [Conjecture 1.1](#).

## 2. BASIC TERMINOLOGY AND EXAMPLES

**2.1. Graphs, complexes and embeddings.** Throughout this paper  $G$  denotes a finite graph or *multi-graph*, i.e. we allow loops and parallel edges. We consider graphs as 1-dimensional CW complexes, i.e., as topological spaces with 0-cells (the vertices) and 1-cells (the edges).

We write  $X$  to denote a *2-dimensional CW complex* (or just *2-complex* for short). A 2-complex over  $G$  is obtained by attaching homeomorphs of the disk  $\mathbb{D}^2$ —called *2-cells*—along closed walks in  $G$ . Each 2-cell  $c \subset X$  is determined by its *attachment map*  $\partial c: \partial\mathbb{D}^2 \rightarrow G$ . If a 2-cell  $c$  is attached along a cycle, i.e., a closed walk without self-intersections, and the attachment map is injective, then  $c$  is said to be *regular*. We say that  $X$  is *regular*, if each of its 2-cells is. Given a complex  $X$ , the underlying graph, called the *1-skeleton* of  $X$ , is denoted by  $G_X$ . Given a cell  $c \subseteq X$ , we write  $X - c$  for the subcomplex with this cell removed (but its boundary  $\partial c$  left intact).

All subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , all embeddings into  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and all homeomorphisms between such sets, are assumed to be piecewise linear (PL). We follow the terminology of [19] for piecewise linear topology. Recall that if  $Y$  is a PL-set then for each point  $y \in Y$  and for each sufficiently small ball (or star-shaped neighborhood)  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , the intersection  $B \cap Y$  coincides with the cone over  $\partial B \cap Y$  with apex at  $y$ . Each neighborhood  $B$  with this property is called a *link neighborhood* of  $y$ , and  $\partial B \cap Y$  is a *link* of  $Y$  at  $y$ .

All embeddings in this paper are, if not stated otherwise, into  $\mathbb{R}^4$ . Given an embedding  $\phi: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$ , we write  $X^\phi$  instead of  $\phi(X)$  to denote the image of  $\phi$ . A complex  $X$  is *embeddable* (or *4-embeddable*) if there exists an embedding  $\phi: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$ . Note that all 2-complexes embed in  $\mathbb{R}^5$ , though not necessarily in  $\mathbb{R}^4$ . The classical example for a non-embeddable 2-complex is the triple cone over  $K_5$  [11]. Let  $\mathcal{K}_n$  be the complex obtained from the complete graph  $K_n$  by attaching a 2-cell along each triangle. Then  $\mathcal{K}_7$  provides another example of a non-embeddable 2-complex ([14, Theorem 5.1.1]). Removing a single 2-cell  $\Delta$  from  $\mathcal{K}_7$  yields a complex  $\mathcal{K}_7 - \Delta$  that is however embeddable, and we will frequently use it as an example:

**Example 2.1** ( $\mathcal{K}_7 - \Delta$ ). We have  $\mathcal{K}_4 \simeq \mathbb{S}^2$  and  $\mathcal{K}_3 \simeq \mathbb{S}^1$ . The join of two spheres is a sphere:  $\mathcal{K}_3 \star \mathcal{K}_4 \simeq \mathbb{S}^1 \star \mathbb{S}^2 \simeq \mathbb{S}^4$  [12, p. 9]. Since  $\mathcal{K}_7 - \Delta \subset \mathcal{K}_3 \star \mathcal{K}_4$  (the missing 2-cell  $\Delta$  corresponds precisely to the missing “filling” of  $K_3$ ), this provides an embedding of  $\mathcal{K}_7 - \Delta$  into  $\mathbb{S}^4$ .

Moreover, we can add back in the missing 2-cell and obtain an “almost embedding” of  $\mathcal{K}_7$  with only a single intersection between two 2-cells with disjoint boundary as follows:

**Example 2.2.** Starting from the construction  $X := K_3 \star \mathcal{K}_4$  of [Example 2.1](#), pick a point  $x$  in the interior of some 2-face of  $\mathcal{K}_4 \subset X$ , and note that the cone  $C_x$  over the circle  $K_3 \subset X$  with apex at  $x$  lies entirely within  $X$ . Moreover,  $C_x$  is homeomorphic to a disc filling  $K_3$ . By the definition of join [[12](#), p. 9],  $x$  is the only intersection of  $C_x$  with the rest of  $\mathcal{K}_7 - \Delta \subset X$ .

**2.2. Full complexes and 4-flat graphs.** Throughout the text we use the following definition for 4-flat graphs:

**Definition 2.3** (full complex, 4-flat graph).

- (i) The *full complex*  $X(G)$  of  $G$  is the CW complex obtained by attaching a 2-cell along each cycle of  $G$ .
- (ii) A graph is *4-flat* if its full complex is embeddable.

The full complex is clearly a regular complex. Since every regular 2-complex with 1-skeleton  $G$  is a subcomplex of  $X(G)$ , this is equivalent to the definition given in the introduction.

Some relevant examples of graphs that are not 4-flat follow from previous discussions: since  $\mathcal{K}_7$  is not embeddable,  $K_7$  is not 4-flat. Since the triple cone over  $K_5$  is not embeddable,  $K_5 * \overline{K}_3$  is not 4-flat (here  $\overline{K}_3$  denotes the complement graph of  $K_3$ , and  $*$  denotes the graph join operation). Since  $K_7$  is known to be an excluded minor,  $K_7 - e$  ( $K_7$  with an edge removed) is 4-flat.

**2.3. Contraction.** Given an embeddable 2-complex  $X$  and a cell  $c \subseteq X$  with injective attachment map, it is known that the quotient complex  $X/c$  is embeddable as well. To see this, choose a small neighborhood  $B$  of  $c^\phi$  and replace its interior with a cone over  $\partial B \cap X^\phi$ . This argument is made precise by the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.4.** *If  $X$  is embeddable and  $c \subseteq X$  is collapsible<sup>2</sup> (e.g. when  $c$  is a cell of  $X$ ) then  $X/c$  is embeddable too.*

The proof requires the theory of regular neighborhoods, see e.g. [[19](#), Chapter 3].

*Proof (sketch).* Fix a triangulation of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with simplicial subcomplexes that triangulate  $X^\phi$  and  $c^\phi$  respectively (which exists by [[19](#), Addendum 2.12]). Let  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a regular neighborhood of  $c^\phi$  with respect to this triangulation (e.g. as defined in [[19](#), Chapter 3]). Since  $c^\phi$  is collapsible,  $B$  is a ball (by [[19](#), Corollary 3.27]). Then there exists a homeomorphism  $\psi: B \rightarrow K$  to a convex set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $C$  be the cone over  $\psi(\partial B \cap X^\phi) \subset \partial K$  with apex at some interior point of  $K$ . Remove  $X^\phi \cap B$  and replace it with  $\psi^{-1}(C)$ . This yields an embedding of  $X/c$ .  $\square$


### 3. OPERATIONS THAT PRESERVE EMBEDDABILITY

In this section we study operations on general (2-dimensional) CW complexes and circumstances under which they preserve embeddability. The eventual goal is to develop a set of flexible tools to build and modify full complexes of 4-flat graphs, but this will also lead to new results and conjectures for general 2-complexes.

<sup>2</sup>We will refrain from recalling the definition of collapsible complex, as we will only need the trivial special case where  $c$  is a regular 2-cell or an edge with distinct end-vertices in a complex.

In order to be concise, we will often not distinguish an attachment map  $\partial c: \partial\mathbb{D}^2 \rightarrow G_X$  from its image, considering  $\partial c$  as both a parametrized curve and a subset of  $X$ , with the understanding that  $\partial c$  is injective when we do so.

**3.1. Joining 2-cells.** Let  $c_1, c_2 \subseteq X$  be two distinct 2-cells and  $\gamma \subset \partial c_1 \cap \partial c_2$  a common path (potentially of length zero) in their boundaries. *Joining*  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  along  $\gamma$  means to replace  $c_1, c_2$  by a new 2-cell  $c$  whose attachment map is a concatenation of  $\partial c_1 - \gamma$  and  $\partial c_2 - \gamma$ .



**Figure 3.** Joining 2-cells across a path  $\gamma$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $X$  be an embeddable 2-complex, and  $c_1, c_2$  two of its 2-cells. Then the 2-complex obtained by joining  $c_1, c_2$  along a path  $\gamma$  of length  $\ell \leq 1$  (i.e., at a vertex or edge) is embeddable too.*

*Proof.* Fix an embedding  $\phi: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$ . Choose an end-vertex  $x$  of  $\gamma^\phi$ , and a link neighborhood  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^4$  of  $x$ . The idea is to delete  $B \cap c_1^\phi$  and  $B \cap c_2^\phi$ , to fill the resulting holes with suitable “patches” that join the 2-cells into a single one and, in case  $\ell = 1$ , to contract  $\gamma^\phi \setminus B$  onto the other end-vertex of  $\gamma$ . To define the patches, let  $\rho_i := \partial B \cap c_i^\phi$  be the paths in the link that correspond to the original 2-cells. We distinguish two cases according to the length  $\ell$  of  $\gamma$ .

*Case  $\ell = 0$ :* There exists a square  $[0, 1]^2 \simeq Q \subseteq \partial B$  with two opposite edges attached along  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$  respectively, disjoint from the rest of the link, and mapped into  $\mathbb{R}^4$  non-injectively only where required by the boundary conditions. Let  $C_1, C_2 \subset B$  be cones over the other two edges of  $Q$  with apex at  $x$ . The union  $Q \cup C_1 \cup C_2$  then patches the hole and joins the 2-cells across  $\gamma$  (note that  $\gamma^\phi = x$ ).

*Case  $\ell = 1$ :* Since  $x$  is an end-vertex of  $\gamma$ , the link at  $x$  contains a unique point  $y := \partial B \cap \gamma^\phi$  corresponding to  $\gamma$ . There also exists a (filled in) triangle  $\Delta \subseteq \partial B$  with a vertex mapped to  $y$  and its two adjacent edges attached along  $\rho_1 \cup \rho_2$ , disjoint from the rest of the link, and mapped into  $\mathbb{R}^4$  non-injective only where required by the boundary conditions. Let  $C \subset B$  be the cone over the third edge of  $\Delta$  with its apex at  $x$ . The union  $\Delta \cup C$  patches the hole and joins the 2-cells across the small initial segment  $B \cap \gamma^\phi$  of  $\gamma^\phi$ . Finally, we contract  $\gamma^\phi \setminus B$  onto the other end-vertex of  $\gamma$  to finalize the joining.  $\square$

Joining along a path of length two is no longer guaranteed to preserve embeddability. An example of this failure will be given in the next section ([Example 3.4](#)).

**3.2. Cloning 2-cells.** Given a 2-cell  $c$  of a 2-complex  $X$ , *cloning*  $c$  means attaching to  $X$  a new 2-cell  $c'$  with with the same boundary  $\partial c' = \partial c$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *Cloning 2-cells preserves embeddability.*

*Proof.* Let  $\phi: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$  be an embedding, and  $\mathcal{T}$  a triangulation of  $c^\phi$  such that each 2-cell of  $\mathcal{T}$  coincides with the convex hull of a triple of points.

If  $\mathcal{T}$  consists of a single triangle  $\Delta$  then a clone of  $c$  can be embedded as follows: let  $\sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^4$  be a 3-dimensional simplex with  $\sigma \cap X^\phi = \partial\sigma \cap X^\phi = \Delta$ . Then  $\partial\sigma - \Delta$  is an embedding of the clone  $c'$ .

If  $\mathcal{T}$  contains more than one triangle then let  $G$  be the 1-skeleton of  $\mathcal{T}$  and let  $G'$  be the subgraph induced by  $V(G) \setminus \partial c^\phi$ . Let  $F$  be a spanning forest of  $G'$  and, for each connected component  $\tau \subseteq F$ , choose an edge  $e_\tau \in E(G)$  that connects  $\tau$  to a boundary vertex  $v_\tau \in \partial c^\phi$ . Now clone each triangle of  $\mathcal{T}$  as above, and join the clones along their shared edges that are not in  $F$  using Lemma 3.1. Observe that  $\text{int}(c^\phi) \setminus F$  is an open disk and that the above process created a clone of it. Thus, contracting each connected component  $\tau \subseteq F$  onto the corresponding boundary vertex  $v_\tau \in \partial c^\phi$  turns these disks into embeddings of the 2-cell  $c$  and a clone  $c'$ .  $\square$

Let us point out some subtleties of this result. First, the proof of Lemma 3.2 makes significant use of the PL structure and it is not clear how to translate it to, say, the topological category. Second, to embed the clone our construction modifies the initial 2-cell, and it is not clear whether this can be avoided:

**Question 3.3.** *Let  $X$  be an embedded 2-complex, and  $c$  one of its 2-cells. Can a clone of  $c$  always be embedded without modifying the original embedding of  $X$ ?*

For a smooth embedding one can always embed a clone in the normal bundle of a 2-cell without modifying the original. In contrast, there are topological embeddings of disks that cannot be completed to embeddings of spheres [3, 4], which shows that in the topological category cloning 2-cells will require modification (see also the discussion in [26]). We are not aware of an answer in the PL category.

Cloning is a powerful tool when combined with other operations on 2-cells such as joining: one can first clone the involved 2-cells and then perform the other operation on the clones. We will make use of this idea many times. For example, we will now use it to show that joining 2-cells along a path of length two is not guaranteed to preserve embeddability:

**Example 3.4.** Recall that  $\mathcal{K}_7 - \Delta$  is embeddable (Example 2.1). We label its vertices as  $x_1, \dots, x_7$ , so that  $x_1x_2x_3$  is the missing 2-cell. Clone the 2-cells  $x_1x_2x_4$  and  $x_2x_3x_4$ , and join the clones along the shared edge  $x_2x_4$ . This creates a 2-cell  $c$  bounded by  $x_1x_2x_3x_4$ , and preserves embeddability. However, joining  $c$  and a clone of the 2-cell bounded by  $x_3x_4x_1$  along the shared 2-path  $x_3x_4x_1$  introduces a new 2-cell bounded by  $x_1x_2x_3$ . We thereby created the missing triangle, and thus the non-embeddable complex  $\mathcal{K}_7$ .

**3.3. Application: complexes with few dominating vertices.** De la Harpe [5] asked whether every 2-complex with a single vertex embeds in  $\mathbb{R}^4$ , and an answer was found involving a difficult theorem of Stallings. The following result strengthens this. Its elementary proof was inspired by a discussion with T. Tâm Nguyễn-Phan.

**Theorem 3.5.** *If there are two vertices  $v, w \in X$  so that each 2-cell  $c \subseteq X$  is incident to at least one of them, then  $X$  can be embedded in  $\mathbb{R}^4$ .*

*Proof.* Assume first that all 2-cells are incident to the vertex  $v \in X$ . Fix an embedding  $\phi$  of the 1-skeleton  $G_X$  into  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times \{0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ . Let  $C_G \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}_+$  be a cone over  $G_X^\phi$ . For each vertex  $u$  and edge  $e$  of  $G$ , let  $C_u, C_e \subseteq C_G$  denote the subcone over

$u$  and  $e$  respectively. Then  $C_G$  is a 2-complex with each  $C_u, u \in V(G)$  an edge of  $C_G$ , and each  $C_e, e \in E(G)$  a 2-cell. To embed a 2-cell  $c \subseteq X$ , we clone all 2-cells  $C_e, e \subset \partial c$  and join the clones along the edges  $C_u, u \in \partial c \setminus v$  using [Lemma 3.1](#). This results in a single 2-cell  $\tilde{c}$  with boundary  $\partial\tilde{c} = \partial c \cup C_v$ . Having constructed  $\tilde{c}$  for all 2-cells  $c \subseteq X$ , we contract the edge  $C_v$  onto  $v$ . This results in an embedding of  $X$ .

If each 2-cell is incident to one of the two vertices  $v, w \in X$ , we proceed as above, except that we also embed a second cone  $C'_G$  into  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}_-$ . We use  $C_G$  to construct the 2-cells that contain  $v$  as above, and then use  $C'_G$  to construct the remaining 2-cells, which contain  $w$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.6.** If every 2-cell is incident to one of three vertices, then embeddability is no longer guaranteed. A counterexample is the triple-cone over  $K_5$  [\[11\]](#).

**3.4. Rerouting 2-cells.** Let  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \subseteq G$  be *parallel* paths, that is, with the same end-vertices. By *rerouting* a 2-cell  $c$  with  $\gamma_1 \subset \partial c$  from  $\gamma_1$  to  $\gamma_2$  we mean replacing  $c$  by a 2-cell  $c'$  attached along  $(\partial c - \gamma_1) \cup \gamma_2$  instead.

**Lemma 3.7.** *If  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  are parallel paths and  $\gamma_1$  is of length  $\leq 1$  (i.e., it is a vertex or edge), then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *Rerouting a 2-cell from  $\gamma_1$  to  $\gamma_2$  yields an embeddable complex.*
- (ii) *Attaching a 2-cell along  $\gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2$  yields an embeddable complex.*

*Proof.* We start with the implication (i)  $\implies$  (ii). Easily, attaching a new 2-cell  $\tilde{c}$  along  $\partial\tilde{c} = \gamma_1$  (if  $\gamma_1$  is an edge then this means  $\partial\tilde{c}$  traverses  $\gamma_1$  twice, once in each direction) preserves embeddability. Since rerouting from  $\gamma_1$  to  $\gamma_2$  preserved embeddability, we can reroute a part of  $\partial\tilde{c}$  attached along  $\gamma_1$  to traverse  $\gamma_2$  instead to create a 2-cell along  $\gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2$ .

To prove (ii)  $\implies$  (i), let  $\tilde{c}$  be a 2-cell attached along  $\partial c = \gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2$ . To reroute a 2-cell  $c$  from  $\gamma_1$  to  $\gamma_2$ , clone  $\tilde{c}$  using [Lemma 3.2](#), and join the clone with  $c$  at  $\gamma_1$ . Since  $\gamma_1$  is of length  $\leq 1$ , this preserves embeddability by [Lemma 3.1](#).  $\square$

We remark that rerouting from a path of length two, even with a 2-cell along  $\gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2$ , is *not* guaranteed to preserve embeddability:

**Example 3.8.** In  $\mathcal{K}_7 - \Delta$ , with the notation of [Example 3.4](#), clone the 2-cells  $x_1x_2x_4$  and  $x_2x_3x_4$ , and join the clones at the shared edge  $x_2x_4$ . This creates a 2-cell  $c$  along  $x_1x_2x_3x_4$  and preserves embeddability. The paths  $\gamma_1 = x_1x_4x_3$  and  $\gamma_2 = x_1x_2x_3$  now satisfy [Lemma 3.7](#) (ii) (as  $c$  is attached along  $\gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2$ ). However, cloning the 2-cell along  $x_1x_3x_4$  and rerouting the clone from  $\gamma_1$  to  $\gamma_2$  yields a 2-cell along  $x_1x_2x_3$ . We thereby recreated the missing triangle and thus the non-embeddable complex  $\mathcal{K}_7$ .

**3.5. Collapsing 2-cells.** Given a 2-cell  $c \subseteq X$ , fix a decomposition  $\partial c = \gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2$  into parallel paths, as well as a homeomorphism  $f: \gamma_1 \rightarrow \gamma_2$  that fixes end points. *Collapsing* a 2-cell  $c$  is the operation of deleting  $c$  and identifying the paths  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  along the homeomorphism  $f$ .

Collapsing can be interpreted as an extreme form of rerouting: we reroute every 2-cell from  $\gamma_1$  to  $\gamma_2$ , even cells that are attached to only a part of  $\gamma_1$ . In contrast to rerouting single 2-cells, where embeddability is preserved only in few special cases, collapsing is always possible:

**Lemma 3.9.** *Collapsing 2-cells preserves embeddability.*

*Proof.* Let  $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \gamma_1$  be an enumeration of the vertices of  $\gamma_1$  and let  $e_i \subset \gamma_1$  be the edge between  $v_i$  and  $v_{i+1}$ . We subdivide  $c$  into a “chain of 2-cells”  $c_2, \dots, c_{n-1} \subseteq c$  by introducing new edges  $\tilde{e}_i \subset c$  that connect  $v_i$  and  $f(v_i)$ . Then  $\partial c_i = e_i \cup \tilde{e}_i \cup f(e_i) \cup \tilde{e}_{i-1}$ . If we contract all  $\tilde{e}_i$  then we have  $\partial c_i = e_i \cup f(e_i)$ . Using [Lemma 3.7 \(ii\)](#)  $\implies$  [\(i\)](#) we can reroute all 2-cells attached along  $e_i$  to  $f(e_i)$ . Finally, we delete  $c$  including all  $e_i$ .  $\square$

For later use we also introduce collapsing cylinders: given a graph  $H$ , collapsing a cylinder  $H \times [0, 1] \subseteq X$  means deleting it and identifying  $H \times \{0\}$  with  $H \times \{1\}$  in the obvious way.

**Corollary 3.10.** *Collapsing cylinders preserves embeddability.*

*Proof.* For each vertex  $v \in H$  contract  $v \times [0, 1]$ . This turns  $H \times [0, 1]$  into a number of 2-cells  $c_e$  indexed by edges  $e \subseteq H$  and bounded by  $\partial c_e = (e \times \{0\}) \cup (e \times \{1\})$ . Subsequently collapse each 2-cell  $c_e$  onto  $e \times \{0\} \subset \partial c_e$ .  $\square$

**3.6. Cloning and merging edges.** We now define an edge-cloning operation, which comes in two variants, one for graphs, and one for 2-complexes. By *cloning* an edge  $e \subseteq G$  of a graph we mean adding a new edge  $e'$  parallel to  $e$ . In a 2-complex  $X$ , *cloning*  $e$  clones  $e$  in  $G_X$ , and additionally adds the following new 2-cells:

- (i) a new 2-cell  $\tilde{c}$  with boundary  $e \cup e'$ , and
- (ii) for each 2-cell  $c \subseteq X$  incident with  $e$ , another 2-cell  $c'$  with the same attachment map as  $c$  except that it traverses  $e'$  instead of  $e$ .

**Corollary 3.11.** *Cloning an edge  $e$  of a 2-complex preserves embeddability.*

*Proof.* Fix an embedding  $\phi: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$ . First, embed a disk  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^4$  with  $D \cap X^\phi = \partial D \cap X^\phi = e^\phi$ . We can now interpret  $\partial D - e^\phi$  as an embedding of  $e'$  and  $D$  as an embedding of a 2-cell  $\tilde{c}$  with  $\partial \tilde{c} = e \cup e'$ . For each 2-cell  $c$  incident with  $e$ , we do the following: we clone  $c$ , and reroute the clone from  $e$  to  $e'$ . This preserves embeddability by [Lemmas 3.2](#) and [3.7](#).  $\square$

We can now confirm van der Holst’s [Conjecture 1.2](#) on 4-flat graphs:

**Corollary 3.12.** *Cloning an edge  $e$  of a graph preserves 4-flatness.*


*Proof.* Let  $G'$  be the graph obtained from  $G$  by cloning the edge  $e$ . Let  $X'$  be the complex obtained from  $X(G)$  by cloning the edge  $e$ . Observe that  $X(G') = X'$ . The claim then follows from [Corollary 3.11](#).  $\square$

We now consider the reverse operation of cloning: by *merging* a pair of parallel edges  $e_1, e_2 \subseteq X$  we mean to identify them in the obvious way.

**Corollary 3.13.** *Given an embeddable 2-complex  $X$  with parallel edges  $e_1, e_2 \subset X$ , the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *The complex  $X'$  obtained by merging  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  is embeddable.*
- (ii) *The complex  $X''$  obtained by attaching a 2-cell along  $e_1 \cup e_2$  is embeddable.*

*Proof.* Let  $e$  denote the edge of  $X'$  resulting from merging. Then the complex obtained from  $X'$  by cloning  $e$  contains  $X''$  as a subcomplex. Therefore [\(i\)](#)  $\implies$  [\(ii\)](#) follows from [Corollary 3.11](#). Conversely,  $X'$  is obtained from  $X''$  by collapsing the 2-cell along  $e_1 \cup e_2$ , onto  $e_1$  say. Therefore [\(ii\)](#)  $\implies$  [\(i\)](#) follows from [Lemma 3.9](#).  $\square$



**Figure 4.** Visualization of stellification of a 5-cycle in a 2-complex. The highlighted paths show how an attachment map  $\partial c$  gets modified in the process.

**3.7. Stellifying cycles and  $\Delta Y$ -transformations.** **Corollary 3.13** states that, from the point of view of embeddability, “collapsing a 2-cycle” is the same as filling it by a 2-cell. In this section we investigate whether statements of this sort can be extended to longer cycles.

Given a cycle  $C \subseteq G$  of length  $\ell \geq 3$ , the operation of *stellifying*  $C$  consists in replacing  $C$  by a star (see **Figure 4**). More precisely, let  $C$  have vertices  $v_1, \dots, v_\ell$  and edges  $e_{ij} = v_i v_j$ ; to stellify  $C$  we remove the edges  $e_{ij}$  and then add a new vertex  $w$  as well as the edges  $e_i := w v_i$ . If  $C \subseteq G_X$  is part of a 2-complex, then *stellifying* additionally reroutes every 2-cell that traverses  $e_{ij}$  to run along  $e_i \cup e_j$  instead.

Let  $G_\circ$  be a graph containing a cycle  $C$ , and let  $G_\star$  be the graph obtained by stellifying  $C$  in  $G_\circ$ . Similarly, let  $X_\circ$  be a 2-complex with 1-skeleton  $G_\circ$  that contains no 2-cell bounded by  $C$ , and let  $X_\star$  be the complex obtained by stellifying  $C$  in  $X_\circ$ . Finally, let  $X_\bullet$  be the complex obtained from  $X_\circ$  by attaching a 2-cell injectively along  $C$ .

Generalizing **Corollary 3.13** to longer cycles turns out to be non-trivial. The following conjecture goes in this direction:

**Conjecture 3.14.** *If  $X_\circ$  is embeddable, then the following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $X_\star$  is embeddable.
- (ii)  $X_\bullet$  is embeddable.

**Lemma 3.15.** *The implication (ii)  $\implies$  (i) of **Conjecture 3.14** holds.*

*Proof.* Let  $c \subseteq X_\bullet$  be the 2-cell with  $\partial c = C$ . We subdivide  $c$  by adding a vertex  $w$  in its interior as well as edges  $e_i$  connecting  $w$  to  $v_i$ . Let  $c_i \subset c$  be the sub-cell with  $\partial c_i = e_i \cup e_{ij} \cup e_j$ . Stellifying  $C$  is then achieved by collapsing each  $c_i$  onto  $e_i \cup e_j$ . This preserves embeddability by **Lemma 3.9**.  $\square$

So far we are unable to prove the other direction (i)  $\implies$  (ii). We also emphasize an important difference to the 2-cycle version (**Corollary 3.13**): in **Conjecture 3.14** we need to assume the embeddability of  $X_\circ$ , as otherwise the direction (i)  $\implies$  (ii) is not true. An example of this failure is given in **Section 4.1**. For a potential counterexample to **Conjecture 3.14** see **Question 7.2**.

A particularly common instance of stellification is  $\ell = 3$ , in which case the operation is known as a  $\Delta Y$ -transformation. Using this terminology, **Lemma 3.15** reads

**Corollary 3.16.** *Applying a  $\Delta Y$ -transformation on a 2-complex preserves embeddability.*

We next work towards van der Holst's [Conjecture 1.3](#) for 4-flat graphs. Suppose now that the cycle  $C$  in the definition of  $G_\circ$  is a triangle, and let us use the notation  $G_\Delta$  and  $G_Y$  (and  $X_\Delta$  and  $X_Y$  accordingly) instead of  $G_\circ$  and  $G_\star$  to emphasize this. We make the following observation, which follows from the definitions:

**Observation 3.17.** If  $X_\Delta := X(G_\Delta)$ , then  $X_Y = X(G_Y)$ .

This statement is more subtle than one may think at first sight. Indeed, the analogous statement is incorrect for  $|C| \geq 4$ : while in  $X(G_\star)$  there is a 2-cell that traverses  $e_1 \cup e_3$ , there is no such 2-cell in  $X_\star$ .

The  $\Delta Y$ -part of van der Holst's [Conjecture 1.3](#) follows immediately:

**Corollary 3.18.** *Performing a  $\Delta Y$ -transformation on a graph preserves 4-flatness.*

*Proof.* Set  $X_\Delta := X(G_\Delta)$ . By [Observation 3.17](#) we have  $X_Y = X(G_Y)$ . The claim then follows from [Corollary 3.16](#).  $\square$

**Observation 3.19.**

- (i) By cloning all edges of the cycle  $C$  we create a second cycle  $C'$  on the same vertex set. Stellifying this new cycle has the net effect of adding to  $G$  a suspension vertex over  $C$  while also preserving the original cycle.
- (ii) Since both cloning edges and  $\Delta Y$ -transformations preserve 4-flatness, (i) implies that adding a suspension vertex over a triangle in  $G$  preserves 4-flatness. We prove a strengthening of this in [Proposition 5.14](#).
- (iii) Adding a cone over a cycle and then deleting all but two of the cone edges has the net effect of adding a chord to the cycle. Any chord can be created in this way.
- (iv) We can now deduce that stellifying a cycle of length  $\ell \geq 4$  does not preserve 4-flatness: via cloning edges and stellifying 4-cycles one can reconstruct the missing edge in the 4-flat graph  $K_7 - e$ , thereby turning it into  $K_7$ , which is not 4-flat.

Consider the following generalized stellification operation: stellifying a subgraph  $H \subseteq G$  means to delete its edges and to add a new suspension vertex over it (and note that with the help of doubling edges, deleting the edges of  $H$  does not make any difference for 4-flatness). Following the reasoning of [Observation 3.19](#) (iii) and (iv), stellifying a non-complete subgraph cannot preserve 4-flatness. Likewise, stellifying  $K_5$  cannot preserve 4-flatness either, because we can use it to turn  $K_5$  into a triple suspension over  $K_5$ , which is not 4-flat. This motivates the following question:

**Question 3.20.** *Does stellifying a  $K_4$  preserve 4-flatness?*

#### 4. REVERSE STELLIFICATION AND $Y\Delta$ -TRANSFORMATIONS


In [Section 3.7](#) we explored the conditions under which the embeddability of  $X_\circ$  implies the embeddability of  $X_\star$ , as well as analogous questions for 4-flatness. In this section we ask about the opposite direction: if  $X_\star$  embeds, must  $X_\circ$  embed to? This includes the  $Y\Delta$ -part of van der Holst's [Conjecture 1.3](#):

**Conjecture 4.1.** *Performing a  $Y\Delta$ -transformation on a graph preserves 4-flatness.*

This conjecture remains open. We do however present evidence that its statement is at the boundary of what can be true:

- (i) an analogous statement is not true for cycles of length  $\ell \geq 4$ : even if  $G_\star$  is 4-flat,  $G_\circ$  might not be (see [Example 4.2](#) below).
- (ii) an analogous statement is not true for embeddability of general 2-complexes: even if  $X_Y$  is embeddable,  $X_\Delta$  might not be ([Section 4.1](#)).

**Example 4.2.**  $G_\circ := K_7$  is not 4-flat. However, stellifying any of its 4-cycles results in a 4-flat graph  $G_\star$ . To see this, we make use of the fact that the double suspension of a planar graph is 4-flat (we prove this in [Theorem 5.9](#) in the next section). Since we can delete two vertices of  $G_\star$  and obtain a planar graph (see [Figure 5](#)),  $G_\star$  is contained in such a double suspension. In conclusion, reverse stellification at a 4-cycle does not always preserve 4-flatness.



**Figure 5.** Starting from  $K_7$  we first stellify a 4-cycle, then we delete two vertices to obtain a planar graph.

**4.1. A  $Y\Delta$ -transformation that does not preserve embeddability.** The following construction is based on the Freedman-Krushkal-Teichner (FKT) complex  $X_{\text{FKT}}$  [8]. One of the main characteristics of the FKT complex is that it does *not* embed into  $\mathbb{R}^4$ , despite its van Kampen obstruction being zero.

We shall describe two 2-complexes,  $X_\Delta$  and  $X_Y$ , the latter being the  $\Delta Y$ -transformation of the former. We will show that  $X_Y$  is embeddable, while  $X_\Delta$  is not (by proving that any potential embedding of it can be turned into an embedding of the FKT complex).

We briefly recall the FKT complex and then modify it to obtain  $X_\Delta$ .

4.1.1. *The Freedman-Krushkal-Teichner complex.* The complex is built as follows:

- (1) start from two copies of  $K_7$ , say,  $K_7$  with vertices  $x_1, \dots, x_7$ , and  $\tilde{K}_7$  with vertices  $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_7$ .
- (2) attach a 2-cell  $c_{ijk}$  to each 3-cycle  $x_i x_j x_k$  of  $K_7$ , except  $x_4 x_5 x_6$ . And analogously, attach a 2-cell  $\tilde{c}_{ijk}$  to each 3-cycle  $\tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}_j \tilde{x}_k$  of  $\tilde{K}_7$ , except  $\tilde{x}_4 \tilde{x}_5 \tilde{x}_6$ .
- (3) add an edge  $e_6$  between  $x_6$  and  $\tilde{x}_6$ .
- (4) attach a 2-cell  $c^*$  along the closed walk  $\partial c^*$  given by

$$(4.1) \quad x_6 x_5 x_4 x_6 \tilde{x}_6 \tilde{x}_5 \tilde{x}_4 \tilde{x}_6 x_6 x_4 x_5 x_6 \tilde{x}_6 \tilde{x}_4 \tilde{x}_5 \tilde{x}_6 x_6.$$

The contrived attachment map  $\partial c^*$  is chosen specifically to force the emergence of a Borromean-ring-like structure in every potential embedding of the complex (details can be found in the original work of Freedman, Krushkal and Teichner [8], or with more explanations in [1]). The relevant property of  $X_{\text{FKT}}$  for our purposes is the following (see [8, Section 3.2]): no embedding of  $X_{\text{FKT}} - c^*$  can be extended to a mapping of  $X_{\text{FKT}}$  into  $\mathbb{R}^4$ , which means that we are allowing self-intersections of  $c^*$ , but still no intersections between  $c^*$  and other parts of  $X_{\text{FKT}}$ .

4.1.2. *The complexes  $X_\Delta$  and  $X_Y$ .* We modify  $X_{\text{FKT}}$  to obtain the complex  $X_\Delta$  as follows:

- (1) identify  $c_{123}$  and  $\tilde{c}_{123}$  in an interior point; call the resulting point  $w$ .
- (2) identify  $c^*$  and  $c_{123}$  in an interior point; call the resulting point  $v$ .
- (3) identify  $c^*$  and  $\tilde{c}_{123}$  in an interior point; call the resulting point  $\tilde{v}$ .

These three identifications do not respect the CW complex structure, which needs to be restored using suitable subdivisions. We choose subdivisions which in particular contain the following edges:

- (4) an edge  $e_{123} \subset \text{int}(c_{123})$  from  $v$  to  $w$ .
- (5) an edge  $\tilde{e}_{123} \subset \text{int}(\tilde{c}_{123})$  from  $\tilde{v}$  to  $w$ .
- (6) an edge  $e^* \subset \text{int}(c^*)$  from  $v$  to  $\tilde{v}$ .

The edges  $e_{123}$ ,  $\tilde{e}_{123}$  and  $e^*$  form the triangle  $\Delta$  on which we later perform the  $\Delta Y$ -transformation. The complex obtained by this  $\Delta Y$ -transformation is  $X_Y$ .

4.1.3. *Non-embeddability of  $X_\Delta$ .* In [8, Section 3.2] the authors prove that an embedding of  $X_{\text{FKT}} - c^*$  cannot be extended to a mapping of  $X_{\text{FKT}}$  into  $\mathbb{R}^4$ , in particular, allowing for self-intersections of  $c^*$  (a fact that we will make use of). By construction, an embedding of  $X_\Delta$  defines a mapping of  $X_{\text{FKT}}$  into  $\mathbb{R}^4$  in which  $c_{123}$ ,  $\tilde{c}_{123}$  and  $c^*$  have pairwise intersections at  $v, \tilde{v}$  and  $w$  respectively, but that is an embedding otherwise. We show that we can get rid of these intersections, creating self-intersections at most for  $c^*$ , and in this way, turning an embedding of  $X_\Delta$  into a mapping of  $X_{\text{FKT}}$  that is known to not exist.


**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $\phi_1, \phi_2: \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$  be PL maps, potentially non-injective, with a single intersection  $x := \phi_1 \cap \phi_2$ , and injective in a neighborhood  $B$  of  $x$ . Then the intersection can be removed by modifying the  $\phi_i$  in this neighborhood of  $x$ . If  $\phi_i$  was injective to begin with, then it is still injective after the modification.*

*Proof.* Delete  $(\phi_1 \cup \phi_2) \cap B$  and replace it by a copy of the exterior  $(\phi_1 \cup \phi_2) \setminus B$  via inversion on the 3-sphere  $\partial B$ . This replaces the disk  $\phi_i \cap B$  by an image of the disk  $\phi_i \setminus B$ , keeping  $\phi_i$  a map of the 2-sphere, and injective if  $\phi_i$  was injective outside of  $B$ . Since there are no intersections of  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  outside of  $B$ , this removed the intersection.  $\square$

Observe that the subcomplex  $\sigma$  induced on the vertices  $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_7 \in X_\Delta$  has 2-cells along each triangle (like a 3-simplex) and thus forms a 2-sphere. Analogously, the subcomplex  $\tilde{\sigma}$  on  $\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2, \tilde{x}_3, \tilde{x}_7$  forms a 2-sphere. In  $X_\Delta$  these 2-spheres intersect exactly once in  $w = c_{123} \cap \tilde{c}_{123}$ . In the embedding this intersection can then be removed using [Lemma 4.3](#).

Next, we observe that the boundary curve  $\partial c^*$  can be filled in by a (self-intersecting) disk disjoint from  $\sigma$ : use  $\tilde{\sigma} - \tilde{c}_{123}$  to fill in the parts  $\tilde{x}_6 \tilde{x}_5 \tilde{x}_4$  and  $\tilde{x}_6 \tilde{x}_4 \tilde{x}_5$ ; the rest can be filled in by a ‘‘collapsed disk’’ (see [Figure 6](#)). Together with the embedding of  $c^*$  this is a mapping (but not an embedding) of a 2-sphere. We now use [Lemma 4.3](#) to get rid of the unique intersection of  $c^*$  and  $c_{123}$  at  $v$ , potentially creating self-intersections of  $c^*$ . Analogously, we can get rid of the single intersection between  $c^*$  and  $\tilde{c}_{123}$  at  $\tilde{v}$ .

Thus we have obtained a mapping of  $X_{\text{FKT}}$  into  $\mathbb{R}^4$ , having self-intersections only of  $c^*$  and being an embedding otherwise. This is a contradiction.




**Figure 6.** Visualization of a disk attached along  $\partial c^*$  as constructed in [Section 4.1.3](#). Note that  $\partial c^*$  is non-injective but is depicted in an injective way to assist the visualization. The curve passes through a single vertex in the regions marked in gray.

4.1.4. *Embeddability of  $X_Y$ .* Recall that the complex  $\mathcal{K}_7$  is obtained from the complete graph  $K_7$  by attaching a 2-cell along each triangle. Let  $x_1, \dots, x_7$  be its vertices and let  $c_{ijk}$  denote the 2-cell attached along  $x_i x_j x_k$ . Recall further that while  $\mathcal{K}_7$  does not embed, there exists a mapping  $\phi: \mathcal{K}_7 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$  that is injective except for a single intersection between, say,  $c_{123}$  and  $c_{456}$  ([Example 2.2](#)). Define the complex  $\mathcal{K}_7^*$  from  $\mathcal{K}_7$  by identifying  $c_{123}$  and  $c_{456}$  in an interior point. We denote the point of intersection by  $y := c_{123} \cap c_{456}$  and subdivide the intersecting 2-cells by edges of the form  $yx_i$  to restore the CW complex structure. We continue to denote the subdivided 2-cells by  $c_{123}$  and  $c_{456}$  respectively. We can now view  $\phi$  as an embedding of  $\mathcal{K}_7^*$ . Observe that the link at  $y^\phi$  consists of two linked cycles. We now modify  $\mathcal{K}_7^*$  into  $X_Y$  by a series of operations that preserve embeddability (*cf.* [Section 3](#)).

Choose a 4-ball  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^4$  that intersects  $(\mathcal{K}_7^*)^\phi$  only in  $y$ . By inversion on  $\partial B$  we embed a copy  $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_7^*$  that shares with  $\mathcal{K}_7^*$  only the vertex  $y$ . We denote its vertices by  $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_7$  and its 2-cells by  $\tilde{c}_{ijk}$  respectively. Observe that the link at  $y^\phi$  now consists of four cycles that belong to two linked pairs but are otherwise unlinked.


Embed a disk  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^4$  with a path in its boundary  $\partial D$  attached along  $x_6 y x_6$ . The opposite path  $\partial D \setminus (x_6 y x_6)^\phi$  we now consider as an embedding of an edge  $e_6 = x_6 \tilde{x}_6$  and  $D$  as a 2-cell attached along  $yx_6 \cup y\tilde{x}_6 \cup e_6$ . After these additions, the link at  $y^\phi$  now looks as shown in [Figure 7](#).



**Figure 7.** The link at  $y^\phi$  at a stage during the construction of  $X_Y$ . The point labelled  $x_i$  (resp.  $\tilde{x}_i$ ) is the vertex of the link that corresponds to the edge  $yx_i$  (resp.  $y\tilde{x}_i$ ) in the complex.


By cloning relevant 2-cells incident to  $y$  (*cf.* [Lemma 3.2](#)) and joining the clones suitably at shared edges (*cf.* [Lemma 3.1](#)) we create an embedding of a (subdivided) 2-cell attached along the path  $\partial c^*$  (see also [\(4.1\)](#)) that intersects  $c_{123}$  and  $\tilde{c}_{123}$  only in  $y$ . [Figure 8](#) visualizes the modification to the link at  $y^\phi$ .

It remains to turn  $y$  into a vertex of degree three (the center of the  $Y$  in  $X_Y$ ). As before, we attach suitable disks  $D_1, D_2, D_3 \subset \mathbb{R}^4$  to the complex to modify the link



**Figure 8.** The link of  $y^\phi$  after cloning (top) and then joining (bottom) certain 2-cells. The three cycles form Borromean rings.

as shown in [Figure 9](#) (top). We then collapse  $D_i$  onto edges that we denote as  $yz_i$  (see [Figure 9](#) bottom). The  $z_i$  form the neighbors of  $y$  in  $X_Y$ . We eventually adjust the subdivisions of the 2-cells so that  $y$  is indeed of degree three. This completes the construction of  $X_Y$  and its embedding.



**Figure 9.** Modification to the link of  $y^\phi$  during the last step of the construction. Link vertices of degree two can be removed by modifying the subdivision of 2-cells adjacent to  $y$ .

## 5. RESULTS ON 4-FLAT GRAPHS

In [Section 3](#) we developed sufficient machinery to already verify van der Holst's [Conjecture 1.2](#) as well as the  $\Delta Y$ -part of [Conjecture 1.3](#). In this section we explore further consequences of our results for the theory of 4-flat graphs.

**5.1. Variants of full complexes.** Recall that the *full complex*  $X(G)$  of a graph  $G$  has 1-skeleton  $G$  and a 2-cell attached along each cycle of  $G$ . Consider the following variants:

- (i)  $X_{\text{ind}}(G)$  has a 2-cell attached along each *induced* cycle of  $G$ .
- (ii)  $X_{\text{reg}}(G)$  has a 2-cell attached along each cycle of  $G$  (this is just  $X(G)$ ).

(iii)  $X_{\text{full}}(G)$  has a 2-cell attached along each *closed walk* in  $G$ .

The notion of 4-flatness discussed so far is defined by the embeddability of  $X_{\text{reg}}(G)$ . It is natural to consider analogous notions of 4-flatness defined using  $X_{\text{ind}}(G)$  and  $X_{\text{full}}(G)$  respectively. We show that they are equivalent:

**Theorem 5.1.** *The following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $X_{\text{ind}}(G)$  is embeddable.
- (ii) every regular complex on  $G$  is embeddable (or equivalently,  $X_{\text{reg}}(G)$  is).
- (iii) every finite (potentially non-regular) complex on  $G$  is embeddable (or equivalently, every finite subcomplex of  $X_{\text{full}}(G)$  is embeddable).<sup>3</sup>

*Proof.* The implications (iii)  $\implies$  (ii)  $\implies$  (i) are obvious. Let us first verify (i)  $\implies$  (ii).

Every cycle  $C \subseteq G$  can be written as a homology sum  $C_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus C_r$  where each  $C_i$  is an induced cycle of  $G$ . Indeed, this is easy to prove by induction on the length of  $C$ , by using a chord  $e$  of  $C$  to write  $C$  as a sum of two shorter cycles containing  $e$  as long as  $C$  is not induced. A 2-cell attached along  $C$  can be constructed by cloning 2-cells attached along the  $C_i$  and joining the clones along shared edges. Since cloning and joining along edges preserves embeddability (cf. Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2), this proves (i)  $\implies$  (ii).

Finally, we verify (ii)  $\implies$  (iii). A 2-cell with constant attachment map as well as a 2-cell attached along a single edge (traversing it twice in opposite directions) can always be added to a complex while preserving embeddability. Any other walk  $\gamma$  in  $G$  can be written as the concatenation of cycles and double-traversals of edges; call them  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r$ . A 2-cell attached along  $\gamma$  can be constructed by cloning 2-cells attached along the  $\gamma_i$  and then joining the clones at the concatenation vertices. Using Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 again, the implication (ii)  $\implies$  (iii) follows.  $\square$

Since  $X_{\text{ind}}(G)$ ,  $X_{\text{reg}}(G)$  and  $X_{\text{full}}(G)$  are equivalent from the point of view of embeddability, we will continue to write  $X(G)$  to denote any of them and choose the interpretation most convenient for the situation. For example,  $X_{\text{ind}}(G)$  is most convenient to establish embeddability since it has the fewest 2-cells:

**Example 5.2.** Since all induced cycles of  $K_7 - e$  are triangles we find  $X_{\text{ind}}(K_7 - e)$  as a subcomplex of  $K_7 - \Delta$ . Since  $K_7 - \Delta$  is embeddable (see Example 2.1), this gives a short proof that  $K_7 - e$  is indeed 4-flat.

We present another argument based on Schlegel diagrams of polytopes:

**Example 5.3.**  $K_6$  is the 1-skeleton of the 5-dimensional simplex. Its 2-dimensional faces form exactly the 2-cells of  $X_{\text{ind}}(K_6)$ . The Schlegel diagram of the simplex is a 3-dimensional complex embedded in  $\mathbb{R}^4$  that contains  $X_{\text{ind}}(K_6)$  as a subcomplex. We conclude that  $K_6$  is 4-flat.

Analogously, consider gluing two 5-dimensional simplices at a 4-dimensional face. The resulting polytope has  $K_7 - e$  as its 1-skeleton (the missing edge connected the

<sup>3</sup>Note that  $X_{\text{full}}(G)$  is infinite unless  $G$  is just a vertex. Therefore,  $X_{\text{full}}(G)$  cannot be embeddable itself – when endowed with the CW topology – because it is not metrizable, except in degenerate cases. Indeed,  $X_{\text{full}}(G)$  contains the infinite star as a topological subspace. For this reason we consider only finite subcomplexes of  $X_{\text{full}}(G)$  here. Alternatively, one can endow  $X_{\text{full}}(G)$  with a rougher, metrizable, topology, and require that  $X_{\text{full}}(G)$  be embeddable in item (iii). The details go beyond the scope of this paper however, and we refer the interested reader to [2].

vertices opposite to the glued faces) and each 2-dimensional face corresponds to a 2-cell in  $X_{\text{ind}}(K_7 - e)$ . Following the argument above, we conclude that  $K_7 - e$  is 4-flat.

**5.2. Sliced embeddings.** We say that an embedding of a 2-complex  $X$  is *sliced*, if it embeds the 1-skeleton  $G_X$  into the 3-dimensional subspace  $\Pi := \mathbb{R}^3 \times \{0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ . A number of 4-flat variants can be defined based on such embeddings. First, we note the following:

**Lemma 5.4.** *Every embeddable 2-complex has a sliced embedding.*

*Proof.* For a generic embedding  $\phi: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$  the projection  $\pi: \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \Pi$  is injective on the embedded skeleton  $G_X^\phi$ . Let  $H := \pi(G_X^\phi) \subset \Pi$  be the image of the projection. Choose a triangulation  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $\Pi$  that contains  $H$  as a subcomplex. For each simplex  $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}$ , let  $\hat{\sigma} := \pi^{-1}(\sigma) = \sigma \times \mathbb{R}$  be the cylinder over  $\sigma$ . We define a homeomorphism  $f: \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$  as follows: for a vertex  $v \in \mathcal{T}$ , either  $v \notin H$  and  $f$  fixes the ray  $\hat{v}$ , or  $v \in H$  and  $f$  translates the ray  $\hat{v}$  by moving the point  $\pi^{-1}(v) \cap X^\phi$  to  $v$ . Then extend  $f$  linearly to all cylinders  $\hat{\sigma}$ . The image  $f(X^\phi)$  is a sliced embedding of  $X$ .  $\square$

This suggests to consider the following subtypes of sliced embeddings:

- (i) a *+sliced embedding* embeds each 2-cell into the halfspace  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}_+$ .
- (ii) a  *$\pm$ -sliced embedding* embeds each 2-cell into one of the halfspaces  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}_-$ .

It turns out that graphs for which  $X(G)$  has a  $+$ -sliced embedding are exactly the linkless graphs: recall that a graph  $G$  is *linkless* if there is an embedding  $\phi: G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  so that any two disjoint cycles of  $G$  are mapped to unlinked closed curves.

**Theorem 5.5.** *The following are equivalent for every graph  $G$ :*

- (i)  $X(G)$  has a  $+$ -sliced embedding.
- (ii)  $G$  is linkless.

*Proof.* We start with the proof of (ii)  $\implies$  (i), which is essentially due to van der Holst [22, Theorem 2], but we include it here for completeness and for its elegance. If  $G$  is linkless, then it is known that it has a *flat* embedding  $\phi: G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  [17], that is, for each 2-cell  $c \subseteq X_{\text{reg}}(G)$  —which is attached along a cycle in  $G$ — there exists an embedded disk  $D_c: c \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  with  $D_c \cap G^\phi = \partial D_c \cap G^\phi = \partial c$ . We choose distinct numbers  $a_c > 0$ , one for each 2-cell  $c \subseteq X_{\text{reg}}(G)$ . We now extend  $\phi$  to embed the 2-cell  $c$  into  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}_+$  by the following map:

$$c \ni x \mapsto \phi(x) := \begin{pmatrix} D_c(x) \\ a_c \text{dist}(D_c(x), G^\phi) \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}_+$$

where  $\text{dist}(D_c(x), G^\phi)$  is the distance of  $D_c(x)$  to the closest point in  $G^\phi$ . It remains to show that this is an embedding. Clearly,  $\phi$  is an embedding on  $G$  with any single 2-cell. If two embedded 2-cells  $c_1^\phi$  and  $c_2^\phi$  were to intersect in points  $\phi(x_1) = \phi(x_2)$ , where  $x_i \in c_i$ , then comparing the  $\phi(x_i)$  component-wise yields

$$a_{c_1} \text{dist}(D_{c_1}(x_1), G^\phi) = a_{c_2} \text{dist}(D_{c_2}(x_2), G^\phi) = a_{c_2} \text{dist}(D_{c_1}(x_1), G^\phi),$$

and hence  $a_{c_1} = a_{c_2}$ , implying  $c_1 = c_2$ , which is a contradiction.

For the implication (i)  $\implies$  (ii), note first that if  $G$  is not linkless, then each embedding in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  contains two disjoint cycles of non-zero linking number (by definition it contains two linked cycles, but the non-zero linking number follows from

the excluded-minor characterization of linkless graphs and the fact that such a pair of cycles exists for each excluded minor; see [20] or [24, Theorem 36]). Secondly, a pair of disjoint closed curves in  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times \{0\}$  of non-zero linking number cannot be filled in by disjoint disks in  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}_+$  (see e.g. [21, Lemma 2]). These two facts combined prove (i)  $\implies$  (ii).  $\square$

In contrast, graphs  $G$  for which  $X(G)$  has a  $\pm$ -sliced embeddings seem to be a much larger class. While we suspect that not every embeddable 2-complex (or full complex of a 4-flat graph) has a  $\pm$ -sliced embedding, we do not know of any examples.

**Question 5.6.**

- (i) Does every embeddable 2-complex have a  $\pm$ -sliced embedding?
- (ii) If  $G$  is 4-flat, must its full complex  $X(G)$  have a  $\pm$ -sliced embedding?

**5.3. 4-flat and linkless graphs.** We say that a graph  $G$  is *locally linkless*, if the neighborhood  $N_G(x)$  of each vertex  $x \in G$  is a linkless graph.

**Lemma 5.7.** *4-flat graphs are locally linkless.*

*Proof.* Fix an embedding  $\phi: X(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$ . For a vertex  $x$  of  $G$ , let  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^4$  be a link neighborhood of  $x^\phi$ . Note that  $X(G)$  contains a cone  $C$  over  $N_G(x)$  with apex at  $x$ . Then the closure of  $C^\phi \setminus B$  is a cylinder of the form  $N_G(x) \times [0, 1]$ . Collapsing this cylinder onto  $C \cap \partial B$  preserves embeddability by [Corollary 3.10](#). This results in an embedding of  $X(G)$  for which  $N_G(x)$  is embedded into  $\partial B$ , and each 2-cell non-incident with  $x$  is embedded outside of  $B$ . In particular, it yields a  $+$ -sliced embedding of  $X(N_G(x))$ . Thus  $N_G(x)$  is linkless by [Theorem 5.5](#).  $\square$

Using [Lemma 5.7](#) we obtain a short argument for the following well-known fact:

**Corollary 5.8.**  *$K_7$  and  $K_{3,3,1,1}$  are not 4-flat.*

*Proof.* The neighborhood of a vertex in  $K_7$  is  $K_6$ . The neighborhood of a dominating vertex in  $K_{3,3,1,1}$  is  $K_{3,3,1}$ . But the graphs  $K_6$  and  $K_{3,3,1}$  are not linkless [17].  $\square$

**5.4. 4-flatness and suspensions.** Given graphs  $G$  and  $H$ , we let  $G * H$  denote the graph join of  $G$  and  $H$ , i.e., the graph obtained from the disjoint union  $G \cup H$  by adding the edges of a complete bipartite graph between the vertices of  $G$  and the vertices of  $H$ . For example,  $G * K_1$  is a single suspension of  $G$ , and  $G * K_n$  is an  $n$ -fold (iterated) suspension.

**Theorem 5.9.** *The following hold for every graph  $G$ :*

- (i)  $G * K_1$  is 4-flat if and only if  $G$  is linkless.
- (ii)  $G * K_2$  is 4-flat if and only if  $G$  is planar.
- (iii)  $G * K_3$  is 4-flat if and only if  $G$  is outerplanar.

*Proof.* A graph is outerplanar if and only if its suspension is planar; and a graph is planar if and only if its suspension is linkless [23]. It therefore suffices to prove (i).

Let  $x$  be the suspension vertex of  $G * K_1$ . If  $G * K_1$  is 4-flat, then linklessness of  $G$  follows from [Lemma 5.7](#) and the fact that  $G \simeq N_{G * K_1}(x)$ . For the converse, observe that  $X_{\text{ind}}(G * K_1)$  is obtained from  $X_{\text{ind}}(G)$  by adding a cone over  $G$ . If  $G$  is linkless, then by [Theorem 5.5](#) there exists a  $+$ -sliced embedding  $\phi: X_{\text{ind}}(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}_+$ . We can extend  $\phi$  to an embedding of  $X_{\text{ind}}(G * K_1)$  by embedding the cone over  $G$  into  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}_-$ . Thus  $G * K_1$  is 4-flat.  $\square$

The join operation can be used to define potentially interesting intermediate classes between outerplanar, planar and linkless graphs. Let  $\overline{G}$  denote the complement of  $G$ :

**Example 5.10.**  $G * \overline{K}_2$  is 4-flat for some linkless graphs (e.g.  $G = K_5$  gives  $G * \overline{K}_2 = K_7 - e$ ), but not for others (e.g.  $G = K_{3,1,1,1}$  gives  $G * \overline{K}_2 = K_{3,3,1,1}$ ). Likewise,  $G * \overline{K}_3$  is 4-flat for some planar graphs (e.g.  $G = K_4$  gives  $G * \overline{K}_3 = K_7 - \Delta$ ), but not for others (e.g.  $G = K_{3,1,1}$  gives  $G * \overline{K}_3 = K_{3,3,1,1}$ ).

**Problem 5.11.** Given a graph  $H$ , describe the class of graphs  $G$  for which  $G * H$  is 4-flat.

**5.5. 4-flat and knotless graphs.** A graph  $G$  is *knotless*, if it has an embedding  $\phi: G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  for which each cycle  $C \subseteq G$  is embedded as the trivial knot. A graph that has no such embedding is called *intrinsically knotted*. The knotless graphs are often considered as another natural continuation from planar and linkless graphs, and one could ask about their relation to 4-flat graphs. The following two examples demonstrate that these two classes are generally unrelated:

**Example 5.12.** While the  $\Delta Y$ -family of  $K_{3,3,1,1}$  consists entirely of intrinsically knotted graphs, seven out of the 20 members of the  $\Delta Y$ -family of  $K_7$  are in fact linkless [10, Table 1]. Yet, being Heawood graphs, none of them is 4-flat. Thus, there are graphs that are knotless but not 4-flat.

**Example 5.13.** There exists a linkless graph  $G$  whose suspension  $G * K_1$  is not knotless [7]. However, by [Theorem 5.9](#) (i),  $G * K_1$  is 4-flat. Thus there are graphs that are 4-flat but not knotless.

**5.6. Clique sums of 4-flat graphs.** Given two graphs  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  both of which contain a  $k$ -clique  $K_k$ , a *k-clique sum*  $G_1 *_k G_2$  is a graph obtained by “gluing”  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  by identifying a  $K_k$  subgraph of  $G_1$  with one of  $G_2$ .

**Proposition 5.14.** *The class of 4-flat graphs is closed under 3-clique sums.*

*Proof.* Let  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  be two 4-flat graphs with 3-cliques  $\Delta_i \subseteq G_i$  and embeddings  $\phi_i: X(G_i) \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^4$ . Let  $c_i \subseteq X(G_i)$  be the 2-cell with  $\partial c_i = \Delta_i$  and  $x_i \in \text{int}(c_i)$  an interior point at which  $\phi$  is *locally flat*, that is, given a link neighborhood  $B_i \subset \mathbb{R}^4$  of  $x_i^{\phi_i}$ , the link  $\partial B_i \cap c_i^{\phi_i}$  is unknotted in  $\partial B_i$ . There is then a homeomorphism  $(\partial B_1, \partial B_1 \cap c_1^{\phi_1}) \simeq (\partial B_2, \partial B_2 \cap c_2^{\phi_2})$ . We identify  $\mathbb{S}^4 \setminus B_1$  and  $\mathbb{S}^4 \setminus B_2$  and their embedded complexes  $(X(G_i), \phi_i)$  along this homeomorphism, which yields a new  $\mathbb{S}^4$  with an embedded complex  $X'$ . This new complex  $X'$  contains a cylinder with boundary  $\Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2$ . We collapse this cylinder (thereby identifying  $\Delta_1$  and  $\Delta_2$ ), which preserves embeddability by [Corollary 3.10](#). The resulting complex  $X''$  has 1-skeleton  $G_1 *_3 G_2$ . Since each induced cycle of  $G_1 *_3 G_2$  is contained in either  $G_1$  or  $G_2$ , we find  $X_{\text{ind}}(G_1 *_3 G_2)$  as a sub-complex of  $X''$ . Thus  $G_1 *_3 G_2$  is 4-flat by [Theorem 5.1](#).  $\square$

It follows easily that  $k$ -clique sums for  $k < 3$  also preserve 4-flatness. For example, each 2-clique can be turned into a 3-clique by cloning and subdividing edges, which preserves 4-flatness by [Corollary 3.12](#).

**Question 5.15.** *Do 4-clique sums preserve 4-flatness?*

This question generalizes [Question 3.20](#): observe that adding a suspension over a complete subgraph  $K_4$  is the same as a 4-clique sum with  $K_5$ .

Note that 5-clique sums do *not* preserve 4-flatness: starting from three disjoint copies of  $K_6$  (which is 4-flat) we can use 5-clique sums to glue them at  $K_5$ -subgraphs to obtain  $K_5 * \bar{K}_3$ . The full complex of this graph contains the triple cone over  $K_5$ , which is not embeddable.

## 6. HEAWOOD GRAPHS ARE EXCLUDED MINORS

Van der Holst conjectured that the Heawood graphs are exactly the excluded minors for the class of 4-flat graphs ([Conjecture 1.1](#)). Comparing with the analogous result of Robertson, Seymour & Thomas for linkless graphs [[17](#)], proving [Conjecture 1.1](#) seems very hard and out of reach of our techniques.

The first step towards this conjecture is to confirm that each of the 78 Heawood graphs is indeed an excluded minor, and we do so with the following theorem. The difficulty in proving this is not only due to the large number of graphs that need to be checked; more importantly, as mentioned in the introduction, there is no known algorithm for checking whether a given graph is 4-flat.

**Theorem 6.1.** *Each graph of the Heawood family is an excluded minor for the class of 4-flat graphs.*

We will offer two proofs. The first proof relies on computer help, enumerating all minors of all Heawood graphs and checking them one by one ([Section 6.1](#)). Our second proof first uses results from [Section 5](#) to reduce the case analysis to merely five Heawood graphs.

The general procedure for both proofs is as follows: given a Heawood graph  $G$ , we step through its minors  $H$  (whereby it suffices to consider minors of the form  $G - e$  and  $G/e$ ) and show that each one is 4-flat. We do so by finding two vertices  $v, w \in V(H)$  for which  $H' := H - \{v, w\}$  is planar. This shows that  $H$  is a subgraph of  $H' * K_2$  and therefore 4-flat by [Theorem 5.9 \(ii\)](#).

Note that this approach for detecting 4-flat graphs was not guaranteed to succeed a priori: there are 4-flat graphs that are not contained in the double suspension of a planar graph (*e.g.* the disjoint union of two  $K_6$ ). Computationally we found that this works at least for the minors of Heawood graphs. The following question remains:

**Question 6.2.** *If  $G$  is an excluded minor for the class of 4-flat graphs and  $H$  is a minor of  $G$ , then are there two vertices  $v, w \in V(H)$  so that  $H - \{v, w\}$  is planar?*

**6.1. Proof by computer.** Our code for both enumerating all Heawood graphs and performing the exhaustive case analysis can be found in [Appendix A](#). The output of the program confirms [Theorem 6.1](#).

**6.2. Proof by hand.** In [Section 3](#) we proved that 4-flat graphs are closed under cloning edges ([Corollary 3.12](#)) and  $\Delta Y$ -transformations ([Corollary 3.18](#)). This constitutes an affirmative answer to van der Holst's conjecture [Conjecture 1.2](#) and part of [Conjecture 1.3](#). Assuming the truth of both conjectures, van der Holst showed that all Heawood graphs are indeed excluded minors for the class of 4-flat graphs [[22](#), Lemma 1]. However, since we only verified the  $\Delta Y$ -part of [Conjecture 1.3](#) we cannot draw this conclusion yet. Our results do however sufficiently reduce the work that remains to be done, so as to allow for a proof by hand.

The following lemma is used to reduce the case analysis to only a handful of graphs:

**Lemma 6.3.** *Let  $G$  be an excluded minor for the class of 4-flat graphs and let  $H$  be a graph obtained from  $G$  by a  $\Delta Y$ -transformation. Then either  $H$  is 4-flat, or  $H$  is itself an excluded minor for the class of 4-flat graphs.*

*Proof.* It suffices to show that either  $H$  is 4-flat, or every proper minor  $H'$  of  $H$  is 4-flat. Since the class of 4-flat graphs is minor-closed, it suffices to consider the cases  $H' = H - e$  and  $H' = H/e$  for some edge  $e \in E(H)$ .


Let  $x, y, z \in V(H)$  be the vertices of the triangle  $\Delta \subset G$  on which we performed the  $\Delta Y$ -transformation, and let  $v$  be the resulting vertex of degree three in  $H$ . There are two cases to be considered.

*Case 1:*  $e$  does not contain  $v$ . Then  $e$  is also an edge of  $G$ , and  $\Delta$  is also a triangle in  $G' := G - e$  resp.  $G' := G/e$ , and  $H'$  is obtained from  $G'$  by a  $\Delta Y$ -transformation on  $\Delta$ . Since  $G$  is an excluded minor,  $G'$  is 4-flat, and so  $H'$  is 4-flat too by [Corollary 3.18](#).

*Case 2:*  $e$  does contain  $v$ . We assume without loss of generality that  $e = vx$ . Then  $H/e$  coincides with  $G - yz$ , which is 4-flat. Similarly,  $H - e$  is obtained from  $G - \{xy, xz\}$  by subdividing the edge  $yz$ , which again is 4-flat.  $\square$

By [Lemma 6.3](#), to prove [Theorem 6.1](#) it suffices to consider the Heawood graphs that are not  $\Delta Y$ -transformations of other Heawood graphs. If those are shown to be excluded minors for the class of 4-flat graphs, then it follows that all Heawood graphs are excluded minors (using van der Holst's result that all Heawood graphs are not 4-flat).

Note that these are exactly the Heawood graphs of minimum degree  $\geq 4$ , because we cannot perform a  $Y\Delta$ -transformation on them. Computer code for listing these Heawood graphs can be found in [Appendix A.3](#). This list consists of  $K_7$  and  $K_{3,3,1,1}$  (which are known to be excluded minors; [[22](#), Lemma 2]) and five other graphs shown in [Figure 10](#). We call them the *remaining Heawood graphs*.



**Figure 10.** The five remaining Heawood graphs. The edges are colored solely for visualization. The name  $(v, e)$  indicates that the graph has  $v$  vertices and  $e$  edges, with a sub-index to resolve ambiguities.

In the following subsections we treat the remaining Heawood graphs one by one. For each of these graphs  $H$ , and each  $e \in E(H)$ , we will prove that both  $H - e$  and  $H/e$  can be made planar by deleting two vertices; as mentioned above, this implies that  $H - e$  and  $H/e$  are 4-flat. Our graphs have many automorphisms, and this will help us reduce the number of cases by considering only one edge  $e$  from each orbit of the automorphism group of  $H$ .

6.2.1. *The case (9, 21)*. There are at most four orbits of edges under the automorphisms of the graph, as colored in Figure 11 (a). The bottom half is the square of a hexagon, which has a planar embedding  $D$  as shown in Figure 11 (b).




Figure 11. Proving that all proper minors of  $(9, 21)$  are 4-flat.

If a red or green edge is deleted, then two of the faces are joined into a 4-gonal face  $F$ , which has two opposite vertices  $x, y$  in its boundary. Embed the top vertex  $u$  that sends edges to  $x, y$  inside  $F$ , and delete the two remaining top vertices.

Similarly, if a grey edge  $ux$  is deleted, we embed  $u$  with its one remaining grey edge inside a face of  $D$ , and delete the two remaining top vertices.

If a black edge  $uv$  is deleted, remove two bottom vertices to obtain a graph embeddable as in Figure 11 (c).

If a grey edge  $ux$  is contracted, we are in an easier situation than the previous one: we can delete the resulting vertex along with one more bottom vertex to obtain a subgraph of the previous case.


If a black edge  $uv$  is contracted, delete it along with the remaining top vertex to obtain  $D$ .

Finally, if a red or green edge  $xy$  is contracted, delete it along with a bottom vertex  $z$  such that  $x, y, z$  are consecutive along the green cycle. We are left with the top triangle, a triangle of  $D$ , and a perfect matching joining these triangles. This graph is a triangular prism, hence planar.

6.2.2. *The case (11, 22)*. There are five orbits of edges as colored in Figure 12 (a). Let  $u, v$  denote the top vertices.

A different drawing, with five crossings of edges, is shown in Figure 12 (b). If the blue  $xy$  or grey  $zv$  edge is deleted, we remove vertices  $t, b$  leaving no crossings. If the black edge  $uv$  is deleted, we remove vertices  $a, x$ . Notice that if vertices  $u, v$  are deleted, then only one crossing remains, namely the one marked with a purple  $\times$  symbol. Moreover, if one of the red  $cd$  or green  $yd$  edges are deleted, then we can reroute the edge  $xy$  to avoid any crossing. Thus if a red or green (or blue) edge is deleted, we can delete  $u, v$  to obtain a planar graph.


If a red or green edge  $e$  is contracted, we remove the resulting vertex as well as the third vertex forming a red-green triangle with  $e$ . Since all crossings of Figure 12 (b) involve edges incident with the bottom triangle, this results in a planar graph. If the black  $uv$  or grey  $vz$  edge is contracted, we remove the resulting vertex as well as the remaining vertex among  $u, v, z$ . Then only the crossing marked with a  $\times$  symbol remains, and we can re-route the  $xy$  edge to avoid it. Finally, if the blue



**Figure 12.** Proving that all proper minors of  $(11, 22)$  are 4-flat.

$bc$  edge is contracted, we remove the resulting vertex along with  $t$ , and draw the resulting graph as in [Figure 12 \(c\)](#).

6.2.3. *The case  $(10, 21)$ .* There are four orbits of edges as colored in [Figure 13 \(a\)](#). The bottom part has a drawing with only one crossing as shown in [Figure 13 \(b\)](#).



**Figure 13.** Proving that all proper minors of  $(10, 21)$  are 4-flat.


If we delete a green edge, then the aforementioned crossing disappears, and so we obtain a planar subgraph after removing  $u, v$ .

Similarly, if a black or grey edge is contracted, then by removing it along with one more vertex we can obtain the subgraph of [Figure 13 \(b\)](#) where one of the vertices involved in the crossing is removed.

Consider now the subgraph obtained by removing  $a, b$ , as drawn in [Figure 13 \(c\)](#). There is just one crossing, between the black edge and a green edge. Thus if the green edge  $ab$  is contracted, we can delete it along with one of the vertices involved in said crossing to obtain a planar subgraph. If the black edge is deleted, then we remove  $a, b$ . If a red edge is contracted, assume it is one incident with  $a$ , and remove it along with  $b$ ; again the crossing of [Figure 13 \(b\)](#) thereby disappears.

For the remaining two cases, remove  $x, b$  and consider the drawing of the resulting subgraph in [Figure 13 \(d\)](#). If a grey edge is deleted, the unique crossing disappears. Finally, if a red edge is deleted, assume it is  $zy$ , and embed  $v$  at a midpoint of where  $zy$  used to lie.

6.2.4. *The case  $(9, 22)_1$ .* Let  $u, v$  denote the top vertices, and note that  $G - \{u, v\}$  is a subdivision of  $K_5$ .



**Figure 14.** Proving that all proper minors of  $(9, 22)_1$  are 4-flat.

If one of the four red edges shown in [Figure 14](#) (a) is contracted, then by deleting the contracted vertex as well as its red neighbour we are left with a subgraph of the double suspension of a 4-cycle, which is planar.

If an edge  $ux$  of  $u$  is deleted, we consider two subcases: a) if  $x$  is the top vertex  $x_0$ , we delete the two bottom vertices. The result is a planar graph shown in [Figure 14](#) (b).

b) if not, then we may assume that  $x$  is one of  $x_1, x_2$  because of the symmetry. In this case we delete  $x_0$ , as well as  $z$ . The result is a planar graph shown in [Figure 14](#) (c) or (d), depending on which of  $x_1, x_2$  is  $x$ .

If an edge  $ux$  of  $u$  is contracted, then we remove  $v$  and the contracted vertex. We are left with a proper minor of  $K_5$ , hence a planar graph.

By symmetry, if an edge of  $v$  is deleted or contracted we are happy.

In all other cases, we remove  $u, v$ . We are left with a subdivision of  $K_5$ , where the red edges are the ones arising from a subdivision. Thus if we delete any edge, or contract an edge that is not red, we obtain a planar graph.


6.2.5. *The case  $(9, 22)_2$ .* There are seven orbits of edges as colored in [Figure 15](#) (a). We embed  $G - u$  with four crossings as in [Figure 15](#) (b). If we delete an edge  $e$  not incident with  $u$ , then we remove  $u$  as well as one more vertex to obtain a planar subgraph as follows:

- if  $e = ay$  (red), we remove  $c$ ;
- if  $e = xb$  (green), we remove  $c$ ;
- if  $e = xc$  (black), we remove  $y$ ;
- if  $e = cy$  (pink), we remove  $x$ ;
- if  $e = cd$  (blue), we remove  $x$ .

If we delete an edge incident with  $u$ , say  $e = uw$  (respectively,  $e = uz$ ), then we remove vertices  $c, b$ , and embed the remaining graph as in [Figure 15](#) (c), putting  $u$  inside face  $F_1$  (resp.  $F_2$ ).

If we contract an edge  $f$ , then we remove the contracted vertex and proceed as follows:

- if  $f = ab$  (red), we can remove  $u$  as [Figure 15](#) (b) becomes planar;
- if  $f = xy$  (green), we remove  $u$  and obtain a subgraph of the above case  $e = xc$ ;
- if  $f = cb$  (pink), or  $f = xc$  (black), we remove  $u$  and obtain a subgraph of the above case  $e = xb$ ;



**Figure 15.** Proving that all proper minors of  $(9, 21)_2$  are 4-flat.

- if  $f = cd$  (blue), we remove  $x$ , and notice that the remaining subgraph is induced by  $u$  and a tree, and is therefore planar;
- if  $f = uy$  (grey), or  $f = uc$  (orange), we remove  $b$ ;

## 7. FURTHER OPEN QUESTIONS

The study of 4-flatness comes with a number of difficulties and subtleties inherited from the embedding problem  $2 \rightarrow 4$ . The standard homological obstruction, the van Kampen obstruction [25], is not strong enough to reliably decide embeddability of 2-complexes in  $\mathbb{R}^4$ , yet already the simplest example for this failure (the Freedman-Krushkal-Teichner complex  $X_{\text{FKT}}$ , see Section 4.1) is rather complex. Yet, for all known graphs  $G$  that are not 4-flat, their full complex  $X(G)$  has non-zero van Kampen obstruction.

**Question 7.1.** *Is it the case that a graph  $G$  is 4-flat if and only if its full complex  $X(G)$  has zero van Kampen obstruction?*

Note that an analogous phenomenon actually happens for linkless graphs: even though there are non-trivial links with vanishing linking number, an embedding of an intrinsically linked graph will always have a link with non-zero linking number.

Moreover, if the answer to Question 7.1 is affirmative, this would confirm Conjecture 1.3 since both  $\Delta Y$ - and  $Y\Delta$ -transformations preserve the vanishing of the van Kampen obstruction.

During our research we identified a number of 2-complexes whose embeddability seems likewise out of reach of standard techniques, in particular, cannot be decided by the van Kampen obstruction.

Consider the complex  $\mathcal{J}_{3,n}$  with 1-skeleton  $K_3 * K_n$  (i.e.,  $K_3 \cup K_{3,n} \cup K_n$ ) in which we attach a 2-cell along  $abcd$  for every four-tuple of vertices  $a, b, c, d$  with  $a, b \in K_3$  and  $c, d \in K_n$ . For  $n \leq 4$  the complex can be obtained from  $\mathcal{K}_7 - \Delta$  by cloning and joining 2-cells, hence can be embedded following Example 2.1, Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2. This does not apply for  $n \geq 5$ .

**Question 7.2.** *For which  $n \geq 5$  does  $\mathcal{J}_{3,n}$  embed in  $\mathbb{R}^4$ ?*

Note that any two 2-cells of  $\mathcal{J}_{3,n}$  intersect, hence the van Kampen obstruction is zero and gives no information about embeddability. The more interesting outcome would be that  $\mathcal{J}_{3,n}$  does not embed. Some consequences are:

- (i) this complex would replace the  $X_{\text{FKT}}$  complex as the simplest known example of a non-embeddable complex with vanishing van Kampen obstruction.

- (ii) the  $\Delta Y$ -transformation at  $K_3 \subset \mathcal{J}_{3,n}$  results in a complex in which every 2-cell passes through a fixed vertex. The  $\Delta Y$ -transformation is therefore embeddable by [Theorem 3.5](#). Thus  $\mathcal{J}_{3,n}$  could replace and greatly simplify the construction of [Section 4.1](#).

If  $\mathcal{J}_{3,n}$  turns out to be embeddable for all  $n \geq 5$ , a number of modifications are possible that are still of interest:

- (i) adding a 2-cell along  $K_3 \subset \mathcal{J}_{3,n}$ . If this makes a difference (*i.e.*,  $\mathcal{J}_{3,n}$  is embeddable, but  $\mathcal{J}_{3,n} + \Delta$  is not), then  $\mathcal{J}_{3,n}$  would be a counterexample to [Conjecture 3.14](#).
- (ii) adding a cone over  $K_5 \subset \mathcal{J}_{3,5}$ . Then, performing a  $\Delta Y$ -transformation at  $K_3 \subset \mathcal{J}_{3,n}$  results in a complex in which every 2-cell passes through one of *two* vertices. This still guarantees embeddability by [Theorem 3.5](#).

For both modifications the van Kampen obstruction remains zero.

Yet another family of relatively simple complexes with unknown embeddability are constructed as follows: let  $\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}$  be the complex with 1-skeleton  $K_{2n-1}$  and a 2-cell attached along each cycle of length  $n$  (alternatively, each cycle of length  $\geq n$ ). Like before, any two cycles intersect and the van Kampen obstruction vanishes. Also, once again,  $\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}$  is embeddable for  $n \leq 4$  as it can be constructed from  $\mathcal{K}_7 - \Delta$  using our embeddability preserving operations. The following question remains:

**Question 7.3.** *For which  $n \geq 5$  does  $\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}$  embed in  $\mathbb{R}^4$ ?*

**Acknowledgements.** We thank T. Tâm Nguyễn-Phan for her valuable input and the many discussions about this project.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] G. Avramidi and T. Phan. Fungible obstructions to embedding 2-complexes. *arXiv:2105.10984*, 2021.
- [2] J. Brazas. Making CW-complexes metrizable. MathOverflow. URL: <https://mathoverflow.net/questions/118833/making-cw-complexes-metrizable> (version: 2024-06-28).
- [3] R. Daverman. On the scarcity of tame disks in certain mild cells. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 1(79):63–77, 1973.
- [4] R. J. Daverman. On the absence of tame disks in certain wild cells. In *Geometric Topology: Proceedings of the Geometric Topology Conference held at Park City, Utah, February 19–22, 1974*, pages 142–155. Springer, 2006.
- [5] P. de la Harpe. When does a CW-complex of dimension 2 embed in  $\mathbb{R}^4$ ? MathOverflow. URL: <https://mathoverflow.net/q/19618> (version: 2010-03-28).
- [6] M. R. Fellows and M. A. Langston. On Search, Decision and the Efficiency of Polynomial-Time Algorithms. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 49:769–779, 1994.
- [7] J. Foisy. A newly recognized intrinsically knotted graph. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 43(3):199–209, 2003.
- [8] M. H. Freedman, V. S. Krushkal, and P. Teichner. Van Kampen’s embedding obstruction is incomplete for 2-complexes in  $\mathbb{R}^4$ . *Mathematical Research Letters*, 1(2):167–176, 1994.
- [9] A. Gagarin, W. Myrvold, and J. Chambers. Forbidden minors and subdivisions for toroidal graphs with no  $K_{3,3}$ ’s. *Elec. Notes Discrete Math.*, 22:151–156, 2005.
- [10] N. Goldberg, T. W. Mattman, and R. Naimi. Many, many more intrinsically knotted graphs. *Algebraic & Geometric Topology*, 14(3):1801–1823, 2014.
- [11] B. Grünbaum. Imbeddings of simplicial complexes. *Comment. Math. Helv*, 44(1):502–513, 1969.
- [12] A. Hatcher. *Algebraic Topology*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2002.

- [13] V. Kaluža and M. Tancer. Even maps, the Colin de Verdiere number and representations of graphs. *Combinatorica*, 42(Suppl 2):1317–1345, 2022.
- [14] J. Matoušek, A. Björner, G. M. Ziegler, et al. *Using the Borsuk-Ulam theorem: lectures on topological methods in combinatorics and geometry*, volume 2003. Springer, 2003.
- [15] J. Matoušek, M. Tancer, and U. Wagner. Hardness of embedding simplicial complexes in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 13(2):259–295, 2010.
- [16] M. Pierce. Ytygraphtransforms. <https://github.com/mikepierce/YTYGraphTransforms>, 2024.
- [17] N. Robertson, P. Seymour, and R. Thomas. Sachs’ linkless embedding conjecture. *J. Combin. Theory (Series B)*, 64:185–227, 1995.
- [18] N. Robertson and P. D. Seymour. Graph Minors. XX. Wagner’s conjecture. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 92(2):325–357, 2004.
- [19] C. P. Rourke and B. J. Sanderson. *Introduction to piecewise-linear topology*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [20] H. Sachs. On a spatial analogue of Kuratowski’s theorem on planar graphs—an open problem. In *Graph Theory: Proceedings of a Conference held in Łagów, Poland, February 10–13, 1981*, pages 230–241. Springer, 2006.
- [21] A. Skopenkov. A short exposition of salman Parsa’s theorems on intrinsic linking and non-realizability. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 65:584–585, 2021.
- [22] H. van der Holst. Graphs and obstructions in four dimensions. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 96(3):388–404, 2006.
- [23] H. Van der Holst, L. Lovász, A. Schrijver, et al. The Colin de Verdiere graph parameter. *Graph Theory and Computational Biology (Balatonlelle, 1996)*, 7:29–85, 1999.
- [24] H. van der Holst and R. Pendavingh. On a graph property generalizing planarity and flatness. *Comb.*, 29(3):337–361, 2009.
- [25] E. R. Van Kampen. Komplexe in euklidischen räumen. In *Abhandlungen aus dem Mathematischen Seminar der Universität Hamburg*, volume 9, pages 72–78. Springer, 1933.
- [26] M. Winter. Given a 2-disc embedded in  $\mathbb{R}^4$ , can I fit another 2-disc with the same boundary? MathOverflow. URL:<https://mathoverflow.net/q/406829> (version: 2021-10-22).
- [27] Y. Yu. More Forbidden Minors for Wye-Delta-Wye Reducibility. *Electronic J. Comb.*, 13:R7, 2006.

## APPENDIX A. COMPUTER CODE

We use the Mathematica package `YTYGraphTransforms.m` by Mike Pierce [16] to enumerate the graphs in the  $\Delta Y$ -family with given generators.

**A.1. Enumerating Heawood graphs.** The list of Heawood graphs can be generated as follows:

```
Heawood = WyeTriangleWyeFamily[{
  CompleteGraph[7],
  CompleteGraph[{3, 3, 1, 1}]
}];
Length@Heawood (* output: 78 *)
```

**A.2. Verifying Theorem 6.1.** The following code can be used to verify that each minor of a Heawood graph is 4-flat. The code iterates through all Heawood graphs  $G$  and all minors of the form  $H \in \{G - e, G/e\}$ . It then checks for each pair of vertices  $v, w \in V(H)$  whether  $H - \{v, w\}$  is planar. If one such pair is found, then  $H$  is 4-flat by Theorem 5.9.

```
counterexampleFound = False;
Do[ (* for all Heawood graphs G *)
  minors = Join[
    DeleteDuplicates[
      Table[EdgeDelete[G,e], {e, EdgeList[G]}],
      IsomorphicGraphQ],
    DeleteDuplicates[
      Table[EdgeContract[G,e], {e, EdgeList[G]}],
      IsomorphicGraphQ]
  ];
  Do[ (* for all minors H of G *)
    vertexPairFound = False;
    Do[ (* for each pair of vertices in H *)
      If[PlanarGraphQ[VertexDelete[H, pair]],
        vertexPairFound = True;
        Break[];
      ],,
      {pair, Subsets[VertexList[H], {2}]}
    ]
    If[!vertexPairFound,
      counterexampleFound = True;
      Print["Counterexample found!"];
      (* <-- this code is never reached *)
    ];,
    {H, minors}
  ];,
  {G, Heawood}
];
If[!counterexampleFound,
  Print["No counterexample found!"] (* <-- this code is reached *)
];
(* output: No counterexample found! *)
```

A.3. **The “remaining Heawood graphs”.** The seven remaining Heawood graphs (in the sense of [Section 6](#), including  $K_7$  and  $K_{3,3,1,1}$ ) can be listed as follows:

```
remaining = Select[Heawood, Min@VertexDegree[#] > 3 &];  
Length@remaining (* output: 7 *)
```