

# Collapses, products and LC manifolds

Bruno Benedetti\*

benedetti@math.tu-berlin.de

November 24, 2009

## Abstract

Durhuus and Jonsson (1995) introduced the class of “locally constructible” (LC) triangulated manifolds and showed that all the LC 2- and 3-manifolds are spheres. We show here that for each  $d > 3$  some LC  $d$ -manifolds are not spheres. We prove this result by studying how to collapse products of manifolds with exactly one facet removed.

## 1 Introduction

*Collapses* are a classical notion in Combinatorial Topology, originally introduced in the Thirties by Whitehead [14], extensively studied in the Sixties by Bing, Cohen, Lickorish and Zeeman among others, yet also at the center of recent works such as [1] and [8].

Given a polytopal (or a regular CW) complex, a collapse is a move that cancels some faces and yields a smaller complex which is topologically a strong deformation retract of the starting one. Any complex that is collapsible (i.e. transformable into a point via a sequence of collapses) is thus also contractible. Conversely, every shellable contractible complex is collapsible. In particular, all trees and all two-dimensional balls are collapsible.

That said, not all contractible complexes are collapsible: A famous two-dimensional counterexample is given by Zeeman’s dunce hat [15]. Due to the work of Cohen [7], however, a complex  $C$  is contractible if and only if some collapsible complex  $D$  collapses also onto  $C$ . In fact, one can construct a collapsible triangulated 3-ball with 12 vertices that collapses onto a copy of the dunce hat [3]. Cohen’s result is obtained by taking *products*: Zeeman [15] first noticed that the product of the dunce hat with a segment  $\mathbb{I}$  is collapsible and asked whether the same holds for any contractible 2-complex. (The question, known as “Zeeman’s conjecture”, is still open.) Cohen [7, Corollaries 3 & 4] [10] showed that the product of any contractible  $d$ -complex  $C$  with the  $q$ -dimensional cube  $\mathbb{I}^q$  is collapsible, provided  $q \geq \max(2d, 5)$ . At the same time,  $C \times \mathbb{I}^q$  collapses onto  $C$  for each  $q$  (cf. Corollary 2.2).

It was first discovered by Bing [5] that some 3-balls are not collapsible. For each  $d \geq 3$ , Lickorish [12] proved that also some  $d$ -balls of the form  $S - \Delta$  (with  $S$  a  $d$ -sphere and  $\Delta$  a facet of  $S$ ) are not collapsible. Bing’s and Lickorish’s claim were recently strengthened by the author and Ziegler [4, Thm. 2.19], who showed that for each  $d \geq 3$  certain  $d$ -balls of the form  $S - \Delta$  do

---

\*Inst. Mathematics, MA 6-2, TU Berlin, Germany. Supported by DFG via the Berlin Mathematical School.

not even collapse onto any  $(d - 2)$ -dimensional subcomplex of  $S$ . These three results were all obtained via knot theory. In fact, a 3-ball may contain arbitrarily complicated three-edge-knots in its 1-skeleton. Depending on how complicated the knot is, one can draw sharp conclusions on the collapsibility of the 3-ball and of its successive suspensions.

In the Nineties, two quantum physicists, Durhuus and Jonsson [9], introduced the term “*LC  $d$ -manifold*” to describe a manifold that can be obtained from a tree of  $d$ -polytopes by repeatedly identifying two combinatorially equivalent adjacent  $(d - 1)$ -faces in the boundary ( $d \geq 2$ ). Plenty of spheres satisfy this bizarre requirement: In fact, all shellable and all constructible  $d$ -spheres are LC (cf. [4]). At the same time, simplicial LC  $d$ -manifolds are only exponentially many when counted with respect to the number of facets, while arbitrary (simplicial)  $d$ -manifolds are much more numerous [2, Chapter 2].

Durhuus and Jonsson noticed that the class of LC  $d$ -manifolds coincides with the class of all  $d$ -spheres for  $d = 2$ . But what about higher dimensions? For  $d = 3$ , they were able to prove one of the two inclusions, namely, that all LC 3-manifolds are spheres [9, Theorem 2]. (Their proof works by case enumeration and does not extend to higher dimensions.) The other inclusion does not hold: For each  $d \geq 3$ , some  $d$ -spheres are not LC, as established in [4]. The examples of non-LC spheres are given by simplicial 3-spheres with a three-edge-knot in their 1-skeleton (provided the knot is sufficiently complicated!) and by their successive suspensions.

The analogy with the aforementioned obstructions to collapsibility is not a coincidence: In fact, simplicial LC  $d$ -spheres can be characterized [4, Theorem 2.1] as the  $d$ -spheres that collapse onto a  $(d - 2)$ -complex after the removal of a facet. (It does not matter which facet you choose.) In the present paper, we extend such characterization to closed manifolds (not necessarily simplicial):

**Main Result 1.** *A  $d$ -manifold is LC if and only if after the removal of a facet it collapses onto a  $(d - 2)$ -complex.*

Thanks to the broader generality of Main Result 1, we can prove the following statement:

**Main Result 2.** *The product of LC manifolds is an LC manifold.*

The proof, which is elementary, can be outlined as follows: Suppose a manifold  $M$  (resp.  $M'$ ) minus a facet collapses onto a  $(\dim M - 2)$ -complex  $C$  (resp. a  $(\dim M' - 2)$ -complex  $C'$ ). We show (cf. Corollary 2.4) that the complex obtained by removing a facet from  $M \times M'$  collapses onto the complex  $(C \times M') \cup (M \times C')$ , which is  $(\dim M + \dim M' - 2)$ -dimensional.

As a corollary, we immediately obtain that some LC 4-manifolds are not spheres, but rather products of two LC 2-spheres. This enables us to solve Durhuus–Jonsson’s problem for all dimensions:

**Main Result 3.** *The class of LC 2-manifolds coincides with the class of all 2-spheres.*

*The class of LC 3-manifolds is strictly contained in the class of all 3-spheres.*

*For each  $d \geq 4$ , the class of LC  $d$ -manifolds and the class of all  $d$ -spheres are overlapping, but none of them is contained in the other.*

By the work of Zeeman (see e.g. [6]), for every positive integer  $d$ , every shellable or constructible  $d$ -manifold is a  $d$ -sphere. Thus, the properties of shellability and constructibility are obviously *not* inherited by products. All 2-spheres are LC, constructible and shellable; however, for each  $d \geq 3$ , all shellable  $d$ -spheres are constructible, all constructible  $d$ -spheres are LC, but some LC  $d$ -spheres are not constructible [4]. It is still unknown whether all constructible spheres are shellable.

## 1.1 Definitions

A *polytopal complex* is a finite, nonempty collection  $C$  of polytopes (called the *faces* of  $C$ ) in some Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^k$ , such that (1) if  $\sigma$  is a polytope in  $C$  then all the faces of  $\sigma$  are elements of  $C$  and (2) the intersection of any two polytopes of  $C$  is a face of both. If  $d$  is the largest dimension of a polytope of  $C$ , the polytopal complex  $C$  is called *d-complex*. An inclusion-maximal face of  $C$  is called *facet*. A *d-complex* is *simplicial* (resp. *cubical*) if all of its facets are simplices (resp. cubes). Given an *a-complex*  $A$  and a *b-complex*  $B$ , the *product*  $C = A \times B$  is an  $(a + b)$ -complex whose nonempty faces are the products  $P_\alpha \times P_\beta$ , where  $P_\alpha$  ranges over the nonempty polytopes of  $A$  and  $P_\beta$  ranges over the nonempty polytopes of  $B$ . In general, the product of two simplicial complexes is *not* a simplicial complex, while the product of two cubical complexes yields a cubical complex.

Let  $C$  be a *d-complex*. An *elementary collapse* is the simultaneous removal from  $C$  of a pair of faces  $(\sigma, \Sigma)$ , such that  $\sigma$  is a proper face of  $\Sigma$  and of no other face of  $C$ . (This is usually abbreviated as “ $\sigma$  is a free face of  $\Sigma$ ”; some complexes have no free faces.) We say the complex  $C$  *collapses onto* the complex  $D$ , and write  $C \searrow D$ , if  $C$  can be deformed onto  $D$  by a finite (nonempty) sequence of elementary collapses. Without loss of generality, we may assume that in this sequence the pairs  $((d - 1)\text{-face}, d\text{-face})$  are removed first; we may also assume that the pairs  $((d - 2)\text{-face}, (d - 1)\text{-face})$  are removed immediately afterwards; and so on. A *collapsible d-complex* is a *d-complex* that can be collapsed onto a single vertex. If  $C$  collapses onto  $D$ , then  $D$  is a strong deformation retract of  $C$ , so  $C$  and  $D$  have the same homotopy type. In particular, all collapsible complexes are contractible.

The *underlying space*  $|C|$  of a *d-complex*  $C$  is the union of all of its faces. A *d-sphere* is a *d-complex* whose underlying space is homeomorphic to  $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} : |\mathbf{x}| = 1\}$ . A *d-ball* is a *d-complex* with underlying space homeomorphic to  $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : |\mathbf{x}| \leq 1\}$ ; a *tree of d-polytopes* is a *d-ball* whose dual graph is a tree. With abuse of notation, we call *d-manifold* any *d-complex* whose underlying space is homeomorphic to a topological manifold (without boundary).

A *locally constructible (LC) d-manifold* is a *d-manifold* obtained from a tree of polytopes by repeatedly gluing together two combinatorially equivalent adjacent  $(d - 1)$ -faces of the boundary. “Adjacent” means here “sharing at least a  $(d - 2)$ -face” and represents a dynamic requirement: after each identification, new pairs of boundary facets might become adjacent and may be glued together. (The cell complexes consecutively formed during the gluing process might not be polytopal complexes; ignore this difficulty for the moment, or see [2] for details.)

## 2 Proof of the main results

In this section we prove Main Result 1, from which the other results follow easily. In fact, Main Result 2 is a direct consequence of Corollary 2.4; Main Result 3 follows by putting together Remark 2.7 and the results already mentioned in the Introduction.

Let us start by reproving a well-known fact on collapses and products.

**Proposition 2.1** (Cohen [7, p. 254], see also Welker [13, Theorem 2.6]). *Let  $A$  and  $B$  be two polytopal complexes. If  $A$  collapses onto a complex  $C_A$  then  $A \times B$  collapses onto  $C_A \times B$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $B_1, \dots, B_M$  be an ordered list of all the faces of  $B$ , ordered by weakly decreasing dimension. Let  $(\sigma_1^A, \Sigma_1^A)$  be the first pair of faces appearing in the collapse of  $A$  onto  $C_A$ . We

perform the  $M$  collapses  $(\sigma_1^A \times B_1, \Sigma_1^A \times B_1), \dots, (\sigma_1^A \times B_M, \Sigma_1^A \times B_M)$ , in this order. It is easy to check that each of the steps above is a legitimate collapse: When we remove  $\sigma_1^A \times B_i$  all the faces of the type  $\sigma_1^A \times \beta$  containing  $\sigma_1^A \times B_i$  have already been removed, because in the list  $B_1, \dots, B_M$  the face  $\beta$  appears before  $B_i$ . On the other hand,  $\sigma_1^A$  is a *free* face of  $\Sigma_1^A$ , thus no face of the type  $\alpha \times B_i$  may contain  $\sigma_1^A \times B_i$  other than  $\Sigma_1^A \times B_i$ .

Next, we consider the *second* pair of faces  $(\sigma_2^A, \Sigma_2^A)$  that appears in the collapse of  $A$  onto  $C_A$  and we repeat the procedure above, and so on: In the end, the only faces left are those of  $C_A \times B$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.2.** *If  $A$  is collapsible, then  $A \times B$  collapses onto a copy of  $B$ . If  $A$  and  $B$  are both collapsible, so is  $A \times B$ .*

Since the product of the dunce hat with a segment  $\mathbb{I}$  is collapsible [15], the converse of the second implication does not hold.

Now, consider a 1-sphere  $S$  consisting of four edges. The 2-complex  $S \times S$  is a cubical torus; after the removal of a facet, it collapses onto the union of a meridian and a parallel of the torus. (Topologically, a punctured torus retracts to a bouquet of two circles.) This can be generalized as follows:

**Proposition 2.3.** *Let  $A$  and  $B$  be two polytopal complexes. Let  $\Delta_A$  (resp.  $\Delta_B$ ) be a facet of  $A$  (resp.  $B$ ). If  $A - \Delta_A$  collapses onto some complex  $C_A$  and if  $B - \Delta_B$  collapses onto some complex  $C_B$  then  $(A \times B) - (\Delta_A \times \Delta_B)$  collapses onto  $(A \times C_B) \cup (C_A \times B)$ .*

*Proof.* We start by forming three ordered lists of pairs of faces. Let  $(\sigma_1, \Sigma_1), \dots, (\sigma_U, \Sigma_U)$  be the list of the removed pairs of faces in the collapse of  $A$  minus  $\Delta_A$  onto  $C_A$ . (We assume that higher dimensional faces are collapsed first.) Analogously, let  $(\gamma_1, \Gamma_1), \dots, (\gamma_V, \Gamma_V)$  be the list of all the removed pairs in the collapse of  $B$  minus  $\Delta_B$  onto  $C_B$ . Let then  $B_1, \dots, B_W$  be the list of all the faces of  $B$  that are not in  $C_B$ , ordered by weakly decreasing dimension.

The desired collapsing sequence for  $(A \times B) - (\Delta_A \times \Delta_B)$  consists of  $U + 1$  distinct phases:

PHASE 0: We remove from  $(A \times B) - (\Delta_A \times \Delta_B)$  the  $V$  pairs of faces  $(\Delta_A \times \gamma_1, \Delta_A \times \Gamma_1), (\Delta_A \times \gamma_2, \Delta_A \times \Gamma_2), \dots, (\Delta_A \times \gamma_V, \Delta_A \times \Gamma_V)$ , in this order. Analogously to the proof of Proposition 2.1, one sees that all these removals are elementary collapses. They wipe away the “ $\Delta_A$ -layer” of  $A \times B$ , but not entirely: The faces  $\alpha \times \beta$  with  $\beta$  in  $C_B$  are still present. What we have written is in fact a collapse of  $(A \times B) - (\Delta_A \times \Delta_B)$  onto the complex  $((A - \Delta_A) \times B) \cup (\Delta_A \times C_B)$ .

PHASE 1: We take the first pair  $(\sigma_1, \Sigma_1)$  in the first list and we perform the  $W$  elementary collapses  $(\sigma_1 \times B_1, \Sigma_1 \times B_1), \dots, (\sigma_1 \times B_W, \Sigma_1 \times B_W)$ . This way we remove (with the exception of  $\Sigma_1 \times C_B$ ) the  $\Sigma_1$ -layer of  $A \times B$ , where  $\Sigma_1$  is the first facet of  $A$  to be collapsed away in  $A - \Delta_A \searrow C_A$ .

$\vdots$

PHASE  $j$ : We consider  $(\sigma_j, \Sigma_j)$  and proceed as in Phase 1, performing  $W$  collapses to remove (with the exception of  $\Sigma_j \times C_B$ ) the  $\Sigma_j$ -layer of  $A \times B$ .

$\vdots$

PHASE  $U$ : We consider  $(\sigma_U, \Sigma_U)$  and proceed as in Phase 1, performing  $W$  collapses to remove (with the exception of  $\Sigma_U \times C_B$ ) the  $\Sigma_U$ -layer of  $A \times B$ .

Eventually, the only faces of  $A \times B$  left are the polytopes of  $A \times C_B \cup C_A \times B$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.4.** *Given  $s$  polytopal complexes  $A_1, \dots, A_s$ , suppose that each  $A_i$  after the removal of a facet collapses onto some lower-dimensional complex  $C_i$ . Then the complex  $A_1 \times \dots \times A_s$  after the removal of a facet collapses onto*

$$(C_1 \times A_2 \times \dots \times A_s) \cup (A_1 \times C_2 \times A_3 \times \dots \times A_s) \cup \dots \cup (A_1 \times \dots \times A_{s-1} \times C_s).$$

*In particular, if  $\dim C_i = \dim A_i - 2$  for each  $i$ , then  $A_1 \times \dots \times A_s$  minus a facet collapses onto a complex of dimension  $\dim A_1 + \dots + \dim A_s - 2$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from Proposition 2.3, by induction on  $s$ . □

**Remark 2.5.** Prop. 2.1, Prop. 2.3 and Cor. 2.4 can be extended to the generality of finite regular CW complexes (see e.g. Björner [6, p. 1860] for the definition). The situation is different for Main Result 1. In fact, let  $P$  be the 2-complex obtained from a finely triangulated 2-sphere by identifying two vertices that are sufficiently far apart. This “pseudo-manifold”  $P$  is not simply connected and it cannot be LC, yet it becomes collapsible after the removal of any triangle. That said, there exists a version of Main Result 1 for manifolds with boundary: The condition equivalent to local constructibility reads, “ $M$  minus a facet collapses onto the union of a  $(d-2)$ -complex with  $\partial M$ ”.

***Proof of Main Result 1.***

Let  $M$  be a  $d$ -manifold that can be locally constructed starting with some tree of  $d$ -polytopes  $P$ . Let  $T$  be the dual graph of  $P$ . Let  $K^T$  be the subcomplex of  $M$  given by all the  $(d-1)$ -faces that are not perforated by  $T$ . Note that  $P$  can be recovered by cutting  $M$  open along  $K^T$ . Each facet  $\sigma$  of  $K^T$  corresponds to *two* facets  $\sigma', \sigma''$  of  $\partial P$ . (In some sense, the boundary of  $P$  is a “double copy” of  $K$ .) We claim that:

- (i) for each facet  $\Delta$  of  $M$ , the  $d$ -complex  $M - \Delta$  collapses onto the  $(d-1)$ -complex  $K^T$ ;
- (ii) from the local construction of  $M$  one can read off a collapse of  $K^T$ , which removes all of the  $(d-1)$ -faces of  $K^T$ .

Item (i) follows directly from the definition of  $K^T$ : Just collapse  $M - \Delta$  along  $T$ . Item (ii) can be shown as follows: Each gluing of adjacent  $(d-1)$ -faces  $\sigma'$  and  $\sigma''$  which share a  $(d-2)$ -face  $F$  can be naturally associated with the elementary collapse that removes  $\sigma$ , together with its free face  $F$ . This proves the claim. In particular, for each facet  $\Delta$  of  $M$ , the  $d$ -complex  $M - \Delta$  collapses onto some  $(d-2)$ -complex.

Conversely, suppose that for *some* facet  $\Delta$  of  $M$  we have:

- (A) a list of elementary collapses of the type  $((d-1)$ -face,  $d$ -face) which transforms  $M - \Delta$  into some  $(d-1)$ -complex  $K$ ;
- (B) a list of elementary collapses of the type  $((d-2)$ -face,  $(d-1)$ -face) which collapses  $K$  onto some  $(d-2)$ -complex.

The collapse described in (A) acts along some spanning tree  $T$  of the dual graph of  $M$ . Thus  $K$  is the complex of the  $(d-1)$ -faces of  $M$  not hit by  $T$ . Since  $M$  is a manifold, cutting  $M$  open alongside  $K$  one obtains a manifold with boundary whose dual graph is  $T$ . Therefore, this manifold with boundary is a tree of  $d$ -polytopes; let us call it  $P$ . We are going to show how to obtain  $M$  from  $P$  via gluings of adjacent boundary facets.

Let us label by  $1, 2, \dots, t$  the facets of  $K$  that appear in the list (B) above (in the same order). Each facet of  $K$  corresponds to *two* facets of  $\partial P$ , so let us label by  $i'$  and  $i''$  the two boundary facets of  $P$  corresponding to  $i$ . Now we start with the tree of polytope  $P$  and perform the gluings

$i' \equiv i''$ , in this order. It is not difficult to check that either  $i'$  and  $i''$  are adjacent, or (recursively) they have become adjacent after we glued together some  $j'$  and  $j''$ , with  $j < i$ . The crucial idea is that  $i'$  and  $i''$  share the  $(d-1)$ -face  $F_i$  that was removed together with  $i$  in the  $i$ -th elementary collapse of the list (B). So  $M$  is LC and we are done.  $\square$

**Example 2.6.** Let  $C$  be the boundary of the three-dimensional cube  $\mathbb{I}^3$ . The removal of a square from  $C$  yields a collapsible 2-complex. The product  $C \times C$  is a cubical 4-manifold homeomorphic to  $S^2 \times S^2$  (and not homeomorphic to  $S^4$ ). By Proposition 2.3, the 4-complex obtained by removing a facet from  $C \times C$  collapses onto a 2-complex. By Main Result 1,  $C \times C$  is LC. Note that the second homotopy group of  $C \times C$  is nonzero; on the other hand, as observed by Durhuus and Jonsson [9] [2, Lemma 1.6.3], every LC  $d$ -manifold is simply connected.

**Remark 2.7.** The previous example can be generalized by taking the product of the boundary of the 3-cube  $\mathbb{I}^3$  with the boundary of the  $(d-1)$ -cube  $\mathbb{I}^{d-1}$  ( $d \geq 4$ ). As a result, one obtains a cubical  $d$ -manifold that is homeomorphic to  $S^2 \times S^{d-2}$  and not homeomorphic to  $S^d$ . This  $d$ -manifold is LC by Prop. 2.3 (because the boundary of a  $(d-1)$ -cube is shellable and in particular LC).

Of course, many LC manifolds of the type  $S^i \times S^j$  will be LC, if  $i$  and  $j$  are integers greater than one. On the contrary, all  $d$ -manifolds homeomorphic to  $S^1 \times S^{d-1}$  cannot be LC, because they are not simply connected.

## References

- [1] J. A. BARMAN AND E. G. MINIAN, *Simple homotopy types and finite spaces*, Adv. in Math., 218 (2008), 87–104.
- [2] B. BENEDETTI, *On locally constructible manifolds*. PhD thesis, TU Berlin, 2009.
- [3] B. BENEDETTI AND F. H. LUTZ, *The dunce hat and a non-extendably collapsible 3-ball*, in preparation.
- [4] B. BENEDETTI AND G. M. ZIEGLER, *On locally constructible spheres and balls*, preprint, 2009. Available online at [arXiv:0902.0436v3](https://arxiv.org/abs/0902.0436v3).
- [5] R. H. BING, *Some aspects of the topology of 3-manifolds related to the Poincaré conjecture*, in Lectures on Modern Mathematics, T. Saaty, ed., vol. II, Wiley, 1964, 93–128.
- [6] A. BJÖRNER, *Topological methods*, in Handbook of Combinatorics, R. Graham, M. Grötschel, and L. Lovász, eds., vol. II, Amsterdam, 1995, Elsevier, 1819–1872.
- [7] M. M. COHEN, *Dimension estimates in collapsing  $X \times I^q$* , Topology, 14 (1975), 253–256.
- [8] K. CROWLEY, *Simplicial collapsibility, discrete Morse theory, and the geometry of nonpositively curved simplicial complexes*, Geom. Dedicata, 133 (2008), 33–50.
- [9] B. DURHUUS AND T. JONSSON, *Remarks on the entropy of 3-manifolds*, Nucl. Phys. B, 445 (1995), 182–192.
- [10] M. FREEDMAN, *The topology of four-dimensional manifolds*, J. Diff. Geom., 17 (1982), 357–453.
- [11] C. HOG-ANGELONI, W. METZLER AND A. SIERADSKI eds., *Two-dimensional homotopy and combinatorial group theory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.
- [12] W. B. R. LICKORISH, *Unshellable triangulations of spheres*, Europ. J. Combinatorics, 12 (1991), 527–530.
- [13] V. WELKER, *Constructions preserving evasiveness and collapsibility*, Discr. Math., 207 (1999), 243–255.
- [14] J. H. C. WHITEHEAD, *Simplicial spaces, nuclei and  $m$ -groups*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc., 45 (1939), 243–327.
- [15] E. C. ZEEMAN, *On the dunce hat*, Topology, 2 (1963), 341–358.