

GRAPH MAGNITUDE HOMOLOGY VIA ALGEBRAIC MORSE THEORY

YUZHOU GU

ABSTRACT. We compute magnitude homology of various graphs using algebraic Morse theory. Specifically, we (1) give an alternative proof that trees are diagonal, (2) identify a new class of diagonal graphs, (3) prove that the icosahedral graph is diagonal, and (4) compute the magnitude homology of cycles. These results answer several questions of Hepworth and Willerton [HW17].

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Background	1
1.2. Our results	2
1.3. Organization of the paper	3
1.4. Acknowledgements	3
2. Preliminaries	3
2.1. Magnitude homology	3
2.2. Algebraic Morse theory	4
3. Description of matchings	5
4. Computations	9
4.1. Warmup: Trees	9
4.2. A new class of diagonal graphs	10
4.3. Icosahedral graph	11
4.4. Odd cycles	15
4.5. Even cycles	16
Appendix A. Magnitude homology is stronger than magnitude	20
Appendix B. Geodetic ptolemaic graphs	22
References	24

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Background.** The magnitude of a finite metric space is a cardinality-like invariant defined and first studied by Leinster [Lei13]. It is a special case of a general theory of magnitude of an enriched category, and has found applications in areas like biodiversity (e.g., Leinster and Cobbold [LC12]).

A finite graph¹ naturally gives rise to a finite metric space, and therefore has magnitude associated with it. The magnitude of a graph can be represented as a

¹In this paper, we consider only finite simple undirected graphs. We often also assume that a graph is connected.

power series with integer coefficients. Leinster [Lei17] studied magnitude of graphs and proved many interesting properties, such as multiplicativity with respect to Cartesian products, inclusion-exclusion formula under certain conditions, and invariance under Whitney twists with adjacent gluing points.

Magnitude admits a categorification, called magnitude homology, in the sense that a coefficient of the power series is the Euler characteristic of corresponding homology groups. Magnitude homology is defined for graphs by Hepworth and Willerton [HW17] and for enriched categories by Leinster and Shulman [LS17]. Hepworth and Willerton proved that magnitude homology admits properties that categorify properties of magnitude. A Künneth theorem categorifies multiplicativity, and a Mayer-Vietoris theorem categorifies inclusion-exclusion formula.² They also proved a theorem which essentially computes the magnitude homology of joins of graphs.

Using these theorems, Hepworth and Willerton are able to compute magnitude homology of many graphs, including trees, complete multipartite graphs, and so on. On the other hand, it turns out magnitude homology of graphs can be difficult to compute, even for very simple graphs. Based on computer computations of the first homology groups, Hepworth and Willerton made explicit conjectures for cycle graphs and the icosahedral graph.

Algebraic Morse theory, developed independently by Jöllenbeck [Jöl05] and by Sköldberg [Skö06], is a useful combinatorial tool for homology computations. Many successful computations have been done using algebraic Morse theory, such as cohomology of certain nilpotent Lie algebras by Sköldberg, and Hochschild homology of certain algebras by Jöllenbeck.

1.2. Our results. In this paper, we use algebraic Morse theory to compute magnitude homology of various graphs.

1.2.1. *Trees.* Hepworth and Willerton proved that trees are diagonal ([HW17], Corollary 31). Their proof relies on a Mayer-Vietoris theorem, which can take some effort to prove. As a warmup for more complicated computations, we give another proof of this fact using algebraic Morse theory (Proposition 4.1).

1.2.2. *A new class of diagonal graphs.* Hepworth and Willerton proved that joins of graphs are diagonal ([HW17], Theorem 37). We define a new class of graphs, named pawful graphs (Definition 4.2), which strictly contains the class of joins, and prove that pawful graphs are diagonal (Theorem 4.4).

1.2.3. *Icosahedral graph.* Based on computer computations, Hepworth and Willerton [HW17] conjectured that the icosahedral graph is diagonal. We prove this using algebraic Morse theory (Theorem 4.5).

1.2.4. *Cycles.* Based on computer computations, Hepworth and Willerton [HW17] made conjectures about ranks of magnitude homology groups of cycles. We prove their conjectures by computing using algebraic Morse theory (Theorem 4.6 for odd cycles and Theorem 4.8 for even cycles).

²We should note that it is still open whether magnitude homology is invariant under Whitney twists with adjacent gluing points.

1.2.5. *Magnitude homology is stronger than magnitude.* Hepworth and Willerton [HW17] asked whether there exist graphs with the same magnitude but different magnitude homology. In Appendix A, we answer the question in the affirmative by giving explicit examples.

1.2.6. *Geodetic ptolemaic graphs.* Slightly generalizing the proof of Proposition 4.1, we prove that graphs that are both geodetic and ptolemaic are diagonal. However, this does not give new diagonal graphs, because a graph is both geodetic and ptolemaic if and only if it is a block graph, whose diagonality follows from Mayer-Vietoris. We study geodetic ptolemaic graphs in Appendix B.

1.3. **Organization of the paper.** The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall basic definitions and results about magnitude homology and algebraic Morse theory. In Section 3 we study special kinds of matchings, and prove several results that can simplify proofs of correctness of matchings. In Section 4 we carry out the computations and prove the main results. In Appendix A we give examples of graphs with the same magnitude but different magnitude homology. In Appendix B we prove using algebraic Morse theory that graphs that are both geodetic and ptolemaic are diagonal, and explain why this does not give a new class of diagonal graphs.

1.4. **Acknowledgements.** The author is partially supported by Jacobs Family Presidential Fellowship during the preparation of this paper. The author would like to thank Richard Hepworth, Yury Polyanskiy, and Simon Willerton for helpful discussions.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we review necessary definitions and results regarding magnitude homology and algebraic Morse theory. We do not state them in full generality, but in a generality that suffices for our purposes.

2.1. **Magnitude homology.** This part follows Hepworth and Willerton [HW17]. Let G be a finite simple undirected connected graph. For a sequence of vertices (x_0, \dots, x_k) , let

$$\ell(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k-1} d(x_i, x_{i+1}).$$

Definition 2.1 (Magnitude homology). The magnitude chain complex $\text{MC}_{*,*}(G)$ is defined as

$$\text{MC}_{k,l}(G) = \mathbb{Z}\{(x_0, \dots, x_k) \in V(G)^{k+1} : x_i \neq x_{i+1} \forall i, \ell(x_0, \dots, x_k) = l\}$$

with differential $\partial : \text{MC}_{*,*}(G) \rightarrow \text{MC}_{*-1,*}(G)$ defined by

$$\partial(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k-1} (-1)^i \partial_i(x_0, \dots, x_k)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_i(x_0, \dots, x_k) \\ &= \begin{cases} (x_0, \dots, \hat{x}_i, \dots, x_k) & \text{if } \ell(x_0, \dots, \hat{x}_i, \dots, x_k) = \ell(x_0, \dots, x_k), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The magnitude homology $\text{MH}_{*,*}(G)$ is defined as

$$\text{MH}_{k,l}(G) = H_k(\text{MC}_{*,l}(G)).$$

Hepworth and Willerton proved many interesting properties of magnitude homology. In this paper, we perform computations starting from the magnitude chain complex, so we do not need most of the properties.

We recall the following definition.

Definition 2.2 (Diagonal graphs). A diagonal graph is a graph whose magnitude homology is diagonal, i.e., $\text{MH}_{k,l}(G) \neq 0$ only if $k = l$.

Diagonal graphs are interesting because their magnitude homology is completely determined by magnitude ([HW17], Proposition 34). In contrast, graphs in general can have the same magnitude but different magnitude homology, as shown in Appendix A.

Hepworth and Willerton proved that trees are diagonal (op. cit., Corollary 31) and that joins of (non-empty) graphs are diagonal (op. cit., Theorem 37). Recall that the join $G \star H$ of two graphs G and H has vertex set $V(G \star H) = V(G) \amalg V(H)$ and edge set $E(G \star H) = E(G) \amalg E(H) \amalg (V(G) \times V(H))$.

2.2. Algebraic Morse theory. This part follows Sköldbberg [Skö06] and Lampret and Vavpetič [LV16]. Fix a commutative ring R . (We use $R = \mathbb{Z}$ throughout this paper.) Let C_* be a chain complex of R -modules

$$\cdots \rightarrow C_{k+1} \xrightarrow{\partial_{k+1}} C_k \xrightarrow{\partial_k} C_{k-1} \rightarrow \cdots$$

Assume that for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have a direct sum decomposition $C_k = \bigoplus_{i \in I_k} C_{k,i}$ where I_k is the index set. For our purpose, we assume that I_k is finite and each $C_{k,i}$ is isomorphic to R . For $i \in I_k$ and $j \in I_{k-1}$, let $\partial_{k,i,j}$ denote the composition

$$C_{k,i} \hookrightarrow C_k \xrightarrow{\partial_k} C_{k-1} \twoheadrightarrow C_{k-1,j},$$

where the first map is the obvious inclusion, and the third map is the obvious projection. We assume that each $\partial_{k,i,j}$ is either 0 or an isomorphism. Define Γ_{C_*} to be the directed graph with vertex set $\coprod_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} I_k$ and edge set

$$\coprod_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \{(i, j) : i \in I_k, j \in I_{k-1}, \partial_{k,i,j} \neq 0\}.$$

Definition 2.3 (Morse matching). Let M be a (not necessarily perfect) matching of Γ_{C_*} . Let $\Gamma_{C_*}^M$ denote the graph Γ_{C_*} with edges in M having reversed direction. Then M is called a Morse matching if $\Gamma_{C_*}^M$ is acyclic.

Remark 2.4. If there exists a cycle in $\Gamma_{C_*}^M$, then it must be of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} a_1 & \rightarrow & a_2 & \rightarrow & \cdots & \rightarrow & a_p & \rightarrow & a_{p+1} = a_1 \\ \downarrow & \nearrow & \downarrow & \nearrow & \downarrow & \nearrow & \downarrow & \nearrow & \\ b_1 & & b_2 & & \cdots & & b_p & & \end{array}$$

where $a_i \in I_k, b_i \in I_{k-1}$ for all i , for some fixed k . (Vertex b_i and a_{i+1} are matched.)

Given a Morse matching M , we can find a smaller chain complex homotopy equivalent to C_* . Let I_k° denote the set of vertices in I_k unmatched in M . We

define a chain complex C_*° with $C_k^\circ = \bigoplus_{i \in I_k^\circ} C_{k,i}$. Let us describe the differential $\partial^\circ : C_*^\circ \rightarrow C_{*-1}^\circ$. For $u \in I_k^\circ$, $v \in I_{k-1}^\circ$, let $\Gamma_{u,v}^M$ denote the set of paths

$$\gamma = (u = v_1 \rightarrow v_2 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow v_{2r} = v)$$

in $\Gamma_{C_*^M}^M$ with $v_{2i-1} \in I_k$, $v_{2i} \in I_{k-1}$ for all i . For such a path, we define $\partial_\gamma^\circ : C_{k,u} \rightarrow C_{k-1,v}$ as

$$\partial_\gamma^\circ = (-1)^{r-1} \partial_{k,v_{2r-1},v_{2r}} \partial_{k,v_{2r-1},v_{2r-2}}^{-1} \cdots \partial_{k,v_3,v_4} \partial_{k,v_3,v_2}^{-1} \partial_{k,v_1,v_2}.$$

Then the differential ∂° restricted on $C_{k,u}$, $u \in I_k^\circ$ is defined as

$$\partial^\circ|_{C_{k,u}} = \sum_{v \in I_{k-1}^\circ, \gamma \in \Gamma_{u,v}^M} \partial_\gamma^\circ.$$

This determines the differential $\partial^\circ : C_*^\circ \rightarrow C_{*-1}^\circ$. It turns out that $(C_*^\circ, \partial^\circ)$ is a chain complex, and furthermore, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2.5. *The chain complex $(C_*^\circ, \partial^\circ)$ is homotopy equivalent to (C_*, ∂) .*

3. DESCRIPTION OF MATCHINGS

Morse matchings are useful for simplifying a chain complex. However, it can sometimes be cumbersome to describe a Morse matching and to prove its correctness. In this section we study special kinds of Morse matchings for magnitude chain complexes that are easier to deal with.

Strictly speaking, the magnitude chain complex is not a single chain complex, but one chain complex for each l . Nevertheless, we treat these chain complexes uniformly. By a Morse matching of $\text{MC}_{*,*}(G)$, we mean a Morse matching of $\text{MC}_{*,l}(G)$ for each l .

The index set we use is

$$I_{k,l}(G) = \{(x_0, \dots, x_k) \in V(G)^{k+1}, x_i \neq x_{i+1} \forall i, \ell(x_0, \dots, x_k) = l\}.$$

In the following, by ‘‘a sequence (x_0, \dots, x_k) ’’ we mean a sequence $(x_0, \dots, x_k) \in I_{k,l}(G)$.

First we introduce the notion of matching states.

Notation 3.1 (Matching state). Fix a (not necessarily Morse) matching of $\text{MC}_{*,*}(G)$. The matching state of a sequence (x_0, \dots, x_k) is one of the following:

- (1) unmatched, if it is not matched to another sequence;
- (2) $\text{insert}(i, v)$, if it is matched to the sequence $(x_0, \dots, x_i, v, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_k)$;
- (3) $\text{delete}(i)$, if it is matched to the sequence $(x_0, \dots, \hat{x}_i, \dots, x_k)$.

In this paper, all the matchings we construct satisfy the property that (roughly speaking) the matching state of a matched sequence is determined by a prefix of it. Therefore we make the following definition.

Definition 3.2 (Prefix matching). A prefix matching of $\text{MC}_{*,*}(G)$ is a matching satisfying the following properties.

- (1) If (x_0, \dots, x_k) has matching state $\text{insert}(i, v)$, then any sequence of the form $(x_0, \dots, x_{i+1}, y_{i+2}, \dots, y_{k'})$ has matching state $\text{insert}(i, v)$.
- (2) If (x_0, \dots, x_k) has matching state $\text{delete}(i)$, then any sequence of the form $(x_0, \dots, x_{i+1}, y_{i+2}, \dots, y_{k'})$ has matching state $\text{delete}(i)$.

In other words, for a sequence (x_0, \dots, x_k) , the prefix (x_0, \dots, x_{i+1}) determines whether the sequence has matching state $\text{insert}(i, v)$, $\text{delete}(i)$, or neither.

In order to make it easy to check the correctness of the description of a prefix matching, we make the following definition.

Definition 3.3 (Matching rule). A matching rule is a function F that maps a finite sequence (x_0, \dots, x_k) of vertices to one of the following symbols:

- (1) ϵ , meaning “idle”;
- (2) $\iota(v)$ for some $v \in V(G)$, meaning $\text{insert}(*, v)$.
- (3) δ , meaning $\text{delete}(*)$;

Let M be a prefix matching. We say M is the prefix matching generated by F if for any sequence (x_0, \dots, x_k) with unmatched prefix (x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) , the matching state of (x_0, \dots, x_k) is

- (1) $\text{insert}(k-1, v)$ if and only if $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \iota(v)$;
- (2) $\text{delete}(k-1)$ if and only if $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \delta$.

Note that there does not always exist a prefix matching generated by F , because we have not put any restrictions on F .

We say a matching rule is valid if it satisfies the following properties.

- (1) If $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \iota(v)$, then $d(x_{k-1}, v) + d(v, x_k) = d(x_{k-1}, x_k)$, $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, v) = \epsilon$ and $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, v, x_k) = \delta$.
- (2) If $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \delta$, then $d(x_{k-2}, x_{k-1}) + d(x_{k-1}, x_k) = d(x_{k-2}, x_k)$, and $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-2}, x_k) = \iota(x_{k-1})$.

Remark 3.4. It is easy to see that in the definition of matching rules, value of $F(x_0, \dots, x_k)$ is meaningful only when (x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) is unmatched. So we can assume that $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \epsilon$ if (x_0, \dots, x_j) is matched for some $j < k$.

For simplicity, when we describe a matching rule, we usually omit sequences on which its value is ϵ . However, we never omit any sequences on which the value is δ or $\iota(*)$.

Lemma 3.5. *If F is a valid matching rule, then there exists a prefix matching generated by F .*

Proof. Fix a sequence (x_0, \dots, x_k) . Let j be the smallest number such that $F(x_0, \dots, x_j) \neq \epsilon$. If such j does not exist, then (x_0, \dots, x_k) is unmatched.

If $F(x_0, \dots, x_j) = \iota(v)$, then (x_0, \dots, x_k) is matched to $(x_0, \dots, x_{j-1}, v, x_j, \dots, x_k)$. By valid property (1) in Definition 3.3, we have $F(x_0, \dots, x_{j-1}, v) = \epsilon$ and $F(x_0, \dots, x_{j-1}, v, x_j) = \delta$, so $(x_0, \dots, x_{j-1}, v, x_j, \dots, x_k)$ is matched to (x_0, \dots, x_k) .

If $F(x_0, \dots, x_j) = \delta$, then (x_0, \dots, x_k) is matched to $(x_0, \dots, x_{j-2}, x_j, \dots, x_k)$. By valid property (2) in Definition 3.3, we have $F(x_0, \dots, x_{j-2}, x_j) = \iota(x_{j-1})$, so $(x_0, \dots, x_{j-2}, x_j, \dots, x_k)$ is matched to (x_0, \dots, x_k) .

Therefore under the matching rule, every sequence is matched to at most one other sequence. So this gives a valid prefix matching. \square

With Lemma 3.5, we can verify that a matching rule generates a prefix matching. In order to apply to algebraic Morse theory, we would like to know when a matching rule generates a Morse matching. It turns out that this problem is not easy.

Example 3.6. There exist prefix matchings that are not Morse matchings. Consider the graph in Figure 1 and the following matching rule.





FIGURE 1. Example graph for a non-Morse matching


- (1) $F(1, 4) = \iota(2)$, $F(1, 2, 4) = \delta$;
- (2) $F(1, 5) = \iota(3)$, $F(1, 3, 5) = \delta$;
- (3) $F(1, 2, 6) = \iota(5)$, $F(1, 2, 5, 6) = \delta$;
- (4) $F(1, 3, 6) = \iota(4)$, $F(1, 3, 4, 6) = \delta$.

One can verify that this is a valid matching rule, and therefore generates a prefix matching. However, this is not a Morse matching, because we have the following zig-zag cycle.



Nevertheless, there are some general facts that can simplify Morse-ness proofs.

Lemma 3.7. *Fix a prefix matching M . Suppose in the graph $\Gamma_{MC^{*,*}}^M(G)$, there is a directed cycle*



(Recall Remark 2.4.)

Say a_i transforms into b_i by $\text{delete}(d_i)$, and b_i transforms into a_{i+1} by $\text{insert}(c_i, u_i)$.³ Then we have $d_{i+1} \neq c_i + 1$, $d_{i+1} \leq c_i + 2$, and $d_i \leq c_i + 1$.

(Because this is a cycle, all indices are mod p . That is, $a_{p+i} = a_i$, $b_{p+i} = b_i$, $c_{p+i} = c_i$, $d_{p+i} = d_i$.)

Proof. Write $a_i = (a_{i,0}, \dots, a_{i,k})$ and $b_i = (b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,k-1})$.

(1) $d_{i+1} \neq c_i + 1$. If $d_{i+1} = c_i + 1$, then $b_i = b_{i+1}$, which cannot happen because there is at most one direct edge between two sequences in $\Gamma_{MC^{*,*}}^M(G)$.

(2) $d_{i+1} \leq c_i + 2$. If $d_{i+1} \geq c_i + 3$, then $(b_{i+1,0}, \dots, b_{i+1,c_i+2}) = (a_{i+1,0}, \dots, a_{i+1,c_i+2})$. Because of the edge $b_i \rightarrow a_{i+1}$, we know a_{i+1} has matching state $\text{delete}(c_i + 1)$. By definition of prefix matchings, sequence b_{i+1} also has matching state $\text{delete}(c_i + 1)$. Then there cannot be an edge $b_{i+1} \rightarrow a_{i+2}$. Contradiction.

(3) $d_i \leq c_i + 1$. If $d_i \geq c_i + 2$, then $(b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,c_i+1}) = (a_{i,0}, \dots, a_{i,c_i+1})$. Because of the edge $b_i \rightarrow a_{i+1}$, we know b_i has matching state $\text{insert}(c_i, u_i)$. By definition of prefix matchings, sequence a_i also has matching state $\text{insert}(c_i, u_i)$. Then there cannot be an edge $b_{i-1} \rightarrow a_i$. Contradiction. \square

³We abuse notation from matching states. Note that a_i has matching state $\text{delete}(c_{i-1} + 1)$ and b_i has matching state $\text{insert}(c_i, u_i)$.

Some of the matchings we construct are for proving that a graph is diagonal. Therefore we make the following definition.

Definition 3.8 (Diagonal matching rule). Let F be a valid matching rule. We say F is a diagonal matching rule if for any sequence (x_0, \dots, x_k) with unmatched prefix (x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) and $d(x_{k-1}, x_k) \geq 2$, we have $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) \neq \epsilon$.

Lemma 3.9. *Let F be a diagonal matching rule and M be the prefix matching generated by F . If (x_0, \dots, x_k) is unmatched, then $d(x_i, x_{i+1}) = 1$ for all i . If $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \iota(v)$, then we have $d(x_{k-1}, v) = 1$.*

Proof. The second assertion follows from the first by valid property (1) in Definition 3.3. So we only need to prove the first assertion. Suppose (x_0, \dots, x_k) is unmatched and $d(x_j, x_{j+1}) \geq 2$ for some $j < k$. Because it is unmatched, the prefix (x_0, \dots, x_j) is unmatched. Then by definition of diagonal matchings, $F(x_0, \dots, x_{j+1}) \neq \epsilon$. Contradiction. \square

Corollary 3.10. *Let F be a diagonal matching rule and M be the prefix matching generated by F . If M is a Morse matching, then the graph G is diagonal.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.9, all unmatched sequences have $\ell(x_0, \dots, x_k) = k$. So $I_{k,l}^\circ$ is nonempty only when $k = l$ and therefore $\text{MC}_{k,l}^\circ(G)$ is nontrivial only when $k = l$. By Theorem 2.5, magnitude homology $\text{MH}_{*,*}(G)$ is homology of $\text{MC}_{*,*}^\circ(G)$ with certain differentials. So $\text{MH}_{k,l}(G)$ is nontrivial only when $k = l$. \square

Lemma 3.11. *Work in the setting of Lemma 3.7 and assume in addition that M is generated by a diagonal matching rule F . Then $d_i = c_i + 1$ for all i .*

Proof. For a sequence x_0, \dots, x_k , let $\rho(x_0, \dots, x_k)$ denote the largest integer j such that $\ell(x_0, \dots, x_j) = j$.

By Lemma 3.7, we have $d_i \leq c_i + 1$. Because we can delete a_{i,d_i} from a_i , we have $d(a_{i,d_i-1}, a_{i,d_i+1}) \geq 2$. So $\rho(b_i) \leq d_i - 1$. By Lemma 3.9, the prefix $(b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,\rho(b_i)+1})$ is matched. By definition of prefix matchings, sequence b_i has the same matching state as its prefix $(b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,\rho(b_i)+1})$. So we must have $c_i \leq \rho(b_i)$. Combining these, we get $c_i = \rho(b_i) = d_i - 1$. \square

Lemma 3.12. *Work in the setting of Lemma 3.7 and assume in addition that $d_i = c_i + 1$ and $d(a_{i+1,c_i}, a_{i+1,c_i+1}) = 1$ for all i . Then $d(a_{i,d_i-1}, a_{i,d_i}) = 1$ for all i .*

Proof. For a sequence (x_0, \dots, x_k) , define $\tau(x_0, \dots, x_k)$ be the sequence

$$(\ell(x_0, x_1), \ell(x_0, x_1, x_2), \dots, \ell(x_0, \dots, x_k)).$$

Because $d_i = c_i + 1$ and $d(a_{i+1,c_i}, a_{i+1,c_i+1}) = 1$, we have $\tau(a_{i+1}) \leq \tau(a_i)$ (where \leq is lexicographical order), and equality holds if and only if $d(a_{i,d_i-1}, a_{i,d_i}) = 1$. Because $\tau(a_1) \geq \dots \geq \tau(a_p) \geq \tau(a_{p+1}) = \tau(a_1)$, we see all inequality signs are equalities, and therefore $d(a_{i,d_i-1}, a_{i,d_i}) = 1$ for all i . \square

Corollary 3.13. *Work in the setting of Lemma 3.7 and assume in addition that M is generated by a diagonal matching rule F . Then $d(a_{i,d_i-1}, a_{i,d_i}) = 1$ for all i .*

Proof. By Lemma 3.9, Lemma 3.11, and Lemma 3.12. \square

4. COMPUTATIONS

In this section we perform the computations. Each computation is in roughly four steps.

- (1) Setup notions and describe the matching rule F .
- (2) Prove that F is valid, and sometimes that F is diagonal.
- (3) Prove that F generates a Morse matching.
- (4) Analyze unmatched sequences, and analyze differentials in $\text{MC}_{*,*}^\circ(G)$ if there are any.

Usually step (2) and step (4) are routine, and step (3) is the most difficult. Sometimes step (3) involves analyzing unmatched sequences.

4.1. Warmup: Trees. Hepworth and Willerton proved that trees are diagonal ([HW17], Corollary 31). Their proof relies on a Mayer-Vietoris theorem, which can take some effort to prove. As a warmup for more complicated computations, we give another proof of this fact using algebraic Morse theory.

Proposition 4.1. *Trees are diagonal.*

Proof. Let G be a tree. We define a function $\sigma : \{(u, v) \in V(G) \times V(G) : d(u, v) \geq 2\} \rightarrow V(G)$ that maps (u, v) to the unique vertex w with $d(u, w) = 1$ and $d(u, v) = d(u, w) + d(v, w)$. Existence and uniqueness follows from that G is a tree.

Let us describe the matching rule. Fix a sequence (x_0, \dots, x_k) with unmatched prefix (x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) .

- (1) If $k \geq 2$ and $x_{k-1} = \sigma(x_{k-2}, x_k)$, then $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \delta$.
- (2) If $k \geq 1$, $d(x_{k-1}, x_k) \geq 2$, and not $(k \geq 2 \wedge x_{k-1} = \sigma(x_{k-2}, x_k))$, then $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \iota(\sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k))$.

Let us prove that F is a valid matching rule. Fix a sequence (x_0, \dots, x_k) with unmatched prefix (x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) .

- (1) Suppose $k \geq 2$ and $x_{k-1} = \sigma(x_{k-2}, x_k)$. Clearly $d(x_{k-2}, x_k) \geq 2$. Also, if $k \geq 3$ and $x_{k-2} = \sigma(x_{k-3}, x_k)$, then $x_{k-2} = \sigma(x_{k-3}, x_{k-1})$ and $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) = \delta$, which is not true. So we have $\neg(k \geq 3 \wedge x_{k-2} = \sigma(x_{k-3}, x_k))$. So $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-2}, x_k) = \iota(\sigma(x_{k-2}, x_k)) = \iota(x_{k-1})$.
- (2) Suppose $k \geq 1$, $d(x_{k-1}, x_k) \geq 2$, and not $(k \geq 2 \wedge x_{k-1} = \sigma(x_{k-2}, x_k))$. Because $d(x_{k-1}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k)) = 1$, we have $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k)) \neq \iota(*)$. If $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k)) = \delta$, then $k \geq 2$ and $x_{k-1} = \sigma(x_{k-2}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k))$, and therefore $x_{k-1} = \sigma(x_{k-2}, x_k)$, which is not true. So $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k)) = \epsilon$ and thus $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k), x_k) = \delta$.

It is easy to see that F is a diagonal matching rule.

Let M be the prefix matching generated by F . Let us prove that M is a Morse matching. Work in the setting of Lemma 3.7. Suppose in $\Gamma_{\text{MC}_{*,*}^\circ(G)}^M$ there is a directed cycle $a_1 \rightarrow b_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow b_p \rightarrow a_{p+1} = a_1$. Define d_i, c_i, u_i accordingly.

By Corollary 3.13, we have $d(a_{1,d_1-1}, a_{1,d_1}) = 1$. Because of the edge $a_1 \rightarrow b_1$, we have $d(a_{1,d_1-1}, a_{1,d_1}) + d(a_{1,d_1}, a_{1,d_1+1}) = d(a_{1,d_1-1}, a_{1,d_1+1})$. So $a_{1,d_1} = \sigma(a_{1,d_1-1}, a_{1,d_1+1})$. Also, by the edge $b_1 \rightarrow a_2$, we have $a_{2,c_1+1} = \sigma(a_{2,c_1}, a_{2,c_1+2})$. By Lemma 3.11, we have $c_1 = d_1 - 1$. Also, we have $a_{1,j} = b_{1,j} = a_{2,j}$ for $j \leq d_1 - 1$, and $a_{1,j} = b_{1,j-1} = a_{2,j}$ for $j \geq d_1 + 1$. So $a_{2,d_1} = a_{1,d_1}$, and therefore $a_2 = a_1$. Then edges $a_1 \rightarrow b_1$ and $b_1 \rightarrow a_2$ cannot both exist in $\Gamma_{\text{MC}_{*,*}^\circ(G)}^M$. Contradiction. So M is a Morse matching.

By Corollary 3.10, the graph G is diagonal. Actually, the unmatched sequences are (v) for $v \in V(G)$ and $(u, v, u, \dots, u$ or $v)$ for (u, v) or $(v, u) \in E(G)$. Their homology classes form a basis of $\text{MH}_{*,*}(G)$. \square

In fact, the computation for trees can be directly applied to graphs that are both ptolemaic and geodetic. However, it turns out that this does not give previously-unknown diagonal graphs. See Appendix B.

4.2. A new class of diagonal graphs. Hepworth and Willerton proved that joins of graphs are diagonal ([HW17], Theorem 37). We give a new class of diagonal graphs, containing all joins.

Definition 4.2 (Pawful graphs). A pawful graph is a connected graph of diameter at most 2 satisfying the property that for any three vertices u, v, w with $d(u, v) = d(v, w) = 2$ and $d(u, w) = 1$, there exists a vertex x such that $d(x, u) = d(x, v) = d(x, w) = 1$.⁴

Example 4.3. Joins of graphs are pawful. Suppose we have a join $G \star H$ with G and H non-empty. Then $G \star H$ is connected and has diameter at most 2. If there are three vertices u, v, w with $d(u, v) = d(v, w) = 2$ and $d(u, w) = 1$, then u, v, w must be all in G or all in H , and we can take x to be an arbitrary vertex of the other side.

There exist pawful graphs that are not joins, e.g. the complement of C_n for $n \geq 6$. So the class of pawful graphs is strictly larger than the class of joins.

Theorem 4.4. *Pawful graphs are diagonal.*

Proof. Let G be a pawful graph. We choose a function $f : \{(u, v) \in V(G) \times V(G) : d(u, v) = 2\} \rightarrow V(G)$ that maps (u, v) to any vertex w with $d(u, w) = d(v, w) = 1$, and a function $g : \{(u, v, w) \in V(G)^{\times 3} : d(u, v) = d(v, w) = 2, d(u, w) = 1\} \rightarrow V(G)$ that maps (u, v, w) to any vertex x with $d(u, x) = d(v, x) = d(w, x) = 1$. Because G is pawful, such functions f and g exist.

Let us describe the matching rule. Fix a sequence (x_0, \dots, x_k) with unmatched prefix (x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) .

- (1) If $k = 1$ and $d(x_0, x_1) = 2$, then $F(x_0, x_1) = \iota(f(x_0, x_1))$.
- (2) If $k \geq 2$, $d(x_{k-1}, x_k) = 2$, and $d(x_{k-2}, x_k) = 1$, then $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \iota(x_{k-2})$.
- (3) If $k \geq 2$, $d(x_{k-1}, x_k) = 2$, and $d(x_{k-2}, x_k) = 2$, then $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \iota(g(x_{k-2}, x_k, x_{k-1}))$.
- (4) If $k = 2$, $d(x_0, x_2) = 2$ and $x_1 = f(x_0, x_2)$, then $F(x_0, x_1, x_2) = \delta$.
- (5) If $k \geq 3$, $d(x_{k-2}, x_k) = 2$, $d(x_{k-3}, x_k) = 1$, and $x_{k-3} = x_{k-1}$, then $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \delta$.
- (6) If $k \geq 3$, $d(x_{k-2}, x_k) = 2$, $d(x_{k-3}, x_k) = 2$, and $x_{k-1} = g(x_{k-3}, x_k, x_{k-2})$, then $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \delta$.

Let us prove that F is a valid matching rule. Note that F is a diagonal matching rule.⁵

⁴They are so named because the subgraph induced by vertices u, v, w, x is a paw.

⁵Strictly speaking, we perform induction on ℓ and prove at the same time that F is valid and diagonal up to sequences with $\ell(x_0, \dots, x_k) \leq \ell$. For simplicity, we use the fact that F is diagonal during the proof that F is valid. Because we are doing induction, this is not circular argument.

- (1) Suppose $k = 1$ and $d(x_0, x_1) = 2$. Then $d(x_0, f(x_0, x_1)) = 1$, so $F(x_0, f(x_0, x_1)) = \epsilon$. Then we have $F(x_0, f(x_0, x_1), x_1) = \delta$ by rule (4).
- (2) Suppose $k \geq 2$, $d(x_{k-1}, x_k) = 2$, and $d(x_{k-2}, x_k) = 1$. We have $d(x_{k-2}, x_{k-2}) = 0$, so $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, x_{k-2}) \neq \delta$. Because (x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) is unmatched, we have $d(x_{k-2}, x_{k-1}) = 1$. So $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, x_{k-2}) \neq \iota(*)$ and therefore $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, x_{k-2}) = \epsilon$. Then we have $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, x_{k-2}, x_k) = \delta$ by rule (5).
- (3) Suppose $k \geq 2$, $d(x_{k-1}, x_k) = 2$, and $d(x_{k-2}, x_k) = 2$. We have $d(x_{k-2}, g(x_{k-2}, x_k, x_{k-1})) = d(x_{k-1}, g(x_{k-2}, x_k, x_{k-1})) = 1$, so $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, g(x_{k-2}, x_k, x_{k-1})) = \epsilon$. Then we have $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, g(x_{k-2}, x_k, x_{k-1}), x_k) = \epsilon$ by rule (6).
- (4) Suppose $k = 2$, $d(x_0, x_2) = 2$ and $x_1 = f(x_0, x_2)$. Then $F(x_0, x_2) = \iota(x_1)$ by rule (1).
- (5) Suppose $k \geq 3$, $d(x_{k-2}, x_k) = 2$, $d(x_{k-3}, x_k) = 1$, and $x_{k-3} = x_{k-1}$. Then $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-2}, x_k) = \iota(x_{k-1})$ by rule (2).
- (6) Suppose $k \geq 3$, $d(x_{k-2}, x_k) = 2$, $d(x_{k-3}, x_k) = 2$, and $x_{k-1} = g(x_{k-3}, x_k, x_{k-2})$. Then $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-2}, x_k) = \iota(x_{k-1})$ by rule (3).

Let M be the prefix matching generated by F . Let us prove that M is a Morse matching. Work in the setting of Lemma 3.7. Suppose in $\Gamma_{\text{MC}^{*,*}(G)}^M$ there is a directed cycle $a_1 \rightarrow b_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow b_p \rightarrow a_{p+1} = a_1$, Define d_i, c_i, u_i accordingly. By rotating, we can assume WLOG that c_1 is the smallest c_i among all i 's.

By Lemma 3.7, we have $d_2 \leq c_1 + 2$ and $d_2 \neq c_1 + 1$. So $d_2 = c_1 + 2$ and therefore $c_2 = c_1 + 1$ by Lemma 3.11. By definition of F , we have $d(a_{3,c_1}, a_{3,c_1+2}) \leq 1$. Actually, for all $i \geq 3$, if $d_i = c_1 + 2$, then $d(a_{i+1,c_1}, a_{i+1,c_1+2}) \leq 1$ by definition of F ; if $d_i \neq c_1 + 2$, then $d(a_{i+1,c_1}, a_{i+1,c_1+2}) = d(a_{i,c_1}, a_{i,c_1+2}) \leq 1$. (We know that $a_{i,c_1} = a_{i+1,c_1}$ because $d_i = c_i + 1 \geq c_1 + 1$.) So we have $d(a_{i,c_1}, a_{i,c_1+2}) \leq 1$ for all $i \geq 3$.

For all i , if $d(a_{i,c_1}, a_{i,c_1+2}) \leq 1$, then $d_i \neq c_1 + 1$ and therefore $c_i \neq c_1$. So $c_i \neq c_1$ for all $i \geq 3$. However, we know that $c_{p+1} = c_1$. Contradiction. So M is a Morse matching.

By Corollary 3.10, the graph G is diagonal. \square

4.3. Icosahedral graph. Hepworth and Willerton [HW17] did computer computations and conjectured that the icosahedral graph is diagonal. We prove this using algebraic Morse theory.

Theorem 4.5. *The icosahedral graph is diagonal.*

Proof. Let G be the icosahedral graph. We fix an embedding of G as the skeleton of an icosahedron in a three dimensional Euclidean space. See Figure 2. Vertices 2, 7, 8 are in the back and invisible, and the other vertices are in the front and visible.

We choose a function $f : V(G) \rightarrow V(G)$ that maps a vertex u to any vertex v with $d(u, v) = 1$. We define two functions $g_L, g_R : \{(u, v) \in V(G) \times V(G) : d(u, v) = 2\} \rightarrow V(G)$ as follows. Rotate (without reflection) the icosahedron so that u is at the position of vertex 10 in Figure 2, and v is at the position of vertex 5. Then $g_L(u, v)$ is the vertex at the position of vertex 1, and $g_R(u, v)$ is the vertex at the position of vertex 6. It is easy to see that we have $d(u, g_L(u, v)) = d(v, g_L(u, v)) = d(u, g_R(u, v)) = d(v, g_R(u, v)) = 1$, $g_L(u, v) \neq g_R(u, v)$, and $g_L(u, v) = g_R(v, u)$.

We define a function $\xi : \{(u, v, w) \in V(G)^{\times 3} : d(u, v) = 1, d(v, w) = 2\} \rightarrow V(G)$ that maps (u, v, w) to the $x \in \{g_L(v, w), g_R(v, w)\}$ with smaller $d(x, u)$. (If there is tie, choose any.) Note that when $d(u, w) \neq 3$, there is no tie, and




FIGURE 2. Icosahedral graph

$d(u, \xi(u, v, w)) \leq 1$. We define a function $\zeta : \{(u, v, w, x) \in V(G)^{\times 4} : d(u, v) = 1, d(w, x) = 2, d(v, x) = 3, u \neq w\}$ that maps (u, v, w, x) to the unique vertex $y \in \{g_L(w, x), g_R(w, x)\}$ with smaller $d(y, u)$. By checking all possible relative positions one can verify that ζ is well-defined.

Let us describe the matching rule. Fix a sequence (x_0, \dots, x_k) with unmatched prefix (x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) .

- (1) If $k = 1$ and $d(x_0, x_1) = 3$, then $F(x_0, x_1) = \iota(f(x_0))$.
- (2) If $k \geq 2$ and $d(x_{k-1}, x_k) = 3$, then $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \iota(x_{k-2})$.
- (3) If $k = 1$ and $d(x_0, x_1) = 2$, then $F(x_0, x_1) = \iota(g_L(x_0, x_1))$.
- (4) If $k \geq 2$, $d(x_{k-1}, x_k) = 2$, $d(x_{k-2}, x_k) \neq 3$, then $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \iota(\xi(x_{k-2}, x_{k-1}, x_k))$.
- (5) If $k = 2$, $d(x_1, x_2) = 2$, $d(x_0, x_2) = 3$, $x_1 \neq f(x_0)$, then $F(x_0, x_1, x_2) = \iota(g_L(x_1, x_2))$.
- (6) If $k \geq 3$, $d(x_{k-1}, x_k) = 2$, $d(x_{k-2}, x_k) = 3$, $x_{k-1} \neq x_{k-3}$, then $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \iota(\zeta(x_{k-3}, x_{k-2}, x_{k-1}, x_k))$.
- (7) If $k = 2$, $d(x_0, x_2) = 3$, and $x_1 = f(x_0)$, then $F(x_0, x_1, x_2) = \delta$.
- (8) If $k \geq 3$, $d(x_{k-2}, x_k) = 3$, and $x_{k-3} = x_{k-1}$, then $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \delta$.
- (9) If $k = 2$, $d(x_0, x_2) = 2$, and $x_1 = g_L(x_0, x_2)$, then $F(x_0, x_1, x_2) = \delta$.
- (10) If $k \geq 3$, $d(x_{k-2}, x_k) = 2$, $d(x_{k-3}, x_k) \neq 3$, and $x_{k-1} = \xi(x_{k-3}, x_{k-2}, x_k)$, then $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \delta$.
- (11) If $k = 3$, $d(x_1, x_3) = 2$, $d(x_0, x_3) = 3$, $x_1 \neq f(x_0)$, and $x_2 = g_L(x_1, x_3)$, then $F(x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3) = \delta$.
- (12) If $k \geq 4$, $d(x_{k-2}, x_k) = 2$, $d(x_{k-3}, x_k) = 3$, $x_{k-4} \neq x_{k-2}$, and $x_{k-1} = \zeta(x_{k-4}, x_{k-3}, x_{k-2}, x_k)$, then $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \delta$.

Let us prove that F is a valid matching rule. Note that F is a diagonal matching rule.⁶

⁶Strictly speaking, we perform induction on ℓ and prove at the same time that F is valid and diagonal up to sequences with $\ell(x_0, \dots, x_k) \leq \ell$. For simplicity, we use the fact that F is diagonal

- (1) Suppose $k = 1$ and $d(x_0, x_1) = 3$. Then $d(x_0, f(x_0)) = 1$, so $F(x_0, f(x_0)) = \epsilon$ and $F(x_0, f(x_0), x_1) = \delta$ by rule (7).
- (2) Suppose $k \geq 2$ and $d(x_{k-1}, x_k) = 3$. Because (x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) is unmatched, we have $d(x_{k-2}, x_{k-1}) = 1$. So $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, x_{k-2}) \neq \iota(*)$, and thus $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, x_{k-2}) = \epsilon$. Therefore $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, x_{k-2}, x_k) = \delta$ by rule (8).
- (3) Suppose $k = 1$ and $d(x_0, x_1) = 2$. Then $d(x_0, g_L(x_0, x_1)) = 1$, so $F(x_0, g_L(x_0, x_1)) = \epsilon$ and $F(x_0, g_L(x_0, x_1), x_1) = \delta$ by rule (9).
- (4) Suppose $k \geq 2$, $d(x_{k-1}, x_k) = 2$, and $d(x_{k-2}, x_k) \neq 3$. Because $d(x_{k-1}, \xi(x_{k-2}, x_{k-1}, x_k)) = 1$, we have $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, \xi(x_{k-2}, x_{k-1}, x_k)) \neq \iota(*)$. Because $d(x_{k-2}, \xi(x_{k-2}, x_{k-1}, x_k)) \leq 1$, we have $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, \xi(x_{k-2}, x_{k-1}, x_k)) \neq \delta$. So $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, \xi(x_{k-2}, x_{k-1}, x_k)) = \epsilon$ and therefore $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, \xi(x_{k-2}, x_{k-1}, x_k), x_k) = \delta$ by rule (10).
- (5) Suppose $k = 2$, $d(x_1, x_2) = 2$, $d(x_0, x_2) = 3$, and $x_1 \neq f(x_0)$. Because $d(x_1, g_L(x_1, x_2)) = 1$, we have $F(x_0, x_1, g_L(x_1, x_2)) \neq \iota(*)$. Because $x_1 = g_R(x_0, g_L(x_1, x_2))$, we have $F(x_0, x_1, g_L(x_1, x_2)) \neq \delta$. So $F(x_0, x_1, g_L(x_1, x_2)) = \epsilon$ and thus $F(x_0, x_1, g_L(x_1, x_2), x_2) = \delta$ by rule (11).
- (6) Suppose $k \geq 3$, $d(x_{k-1}, x_k) = 2$, $d(x_{k-2}, x_k) = 3$, and $x_{k-1} \neq x_{k-3}$. Because (x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) is unmatched, we have $d(x_{k-3}, x_{k-2}) = d(x_{k-2}, x_{k-1}) = 1$. Write $u = \zeta(x_{k-3}, x_{k-2}, x_{k-1}, x_k)$. Because $d(x_{k-1}, u) = 1$, we have $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, u) \neq \iota(*)$. By analyzing all four cases of x_{k-3} , we can see that $d(x_{k-3}, u) \neq 3$, and $\xi(x_{k-3}, x_{k-2}, u) \neq x_{k-1}$. So $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-2}, u) = \iota(\xi(x_{k-3}, x_{k-2}, u)) \neq \iota(x_{k-1})$ by rule (4), and $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, u) \neq \delta$. So $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, u) = \epsilon$, and thus $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, u, x_k) = \delta$ by rule (12).
- (7) Suppose $k = 2$, $d(x_0, x_2) = 3$, and $x_1 = f(x_0)$. Then $F(x_0, x_2) = \iota(x_1)$ by rule (1).
- (8) Suppose $k \geq 3$, $d(x_{k-2}, x_k) = 3$, and $x_{k-3} = x_{k-1}$. Then $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-2}, x_k) = \iota(x_{k-1})$ by rule (2).
- (9) Suppose $k = 2$, $d(x_0, x_2) = 2$, and $x_1 = g_L(x_0, x_2)$. Then $F(x_0, x_2) = \iota(x_1)$ by rule (3).
- (10) Suppose $k \geq 3$, $d(x_{k-2}, x_k) = 2$, $d(x_{k-3}, x_k) \neq 3$, and $x_{k-1} = \xi(x_{k-3}, x_{k-2}, x_k)$. Then $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-2}, x_k) = \iota(x_{k-1})$ by rule (4).
- (11) Suppose $k = 3$, $d(x_1, x_3) = 2$, $d(x_0, x_3) = 3$, $x_1 \neq f(x_0)$, and $x_2 = g_L(x_1, x_3)$. Then $F(x_0, x_1, x_3) = \iota(x_2)$ by rule (5).
- (12) Suppose $k \geq 4$, $d(x_{k-2}, x_k) = 2$, $d(x_{k-3}, x_k) = 3$, $x_{k-4} \neq x_{k-2}$, and $x_{k-1} = \zeta(x_{k-4}, x_{k-3}, x_{k-2}, x_k)$. Then $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-2}, x_k) = \iota(x_{k-1})$ by rule (6).

Let M be the prefix matching generated by F . Let us prove that M is a Morse matching. Work in the setting of Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 3.11. Suppose in $\Gamma_{\text{MC}^{*,*}}^M(\mathcal{G})$ there is a directed cycle $a_1 \rightarrow b_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow b_p \rightarrow a_{p+1} = a_1$. Define d_i, c_i, u_i accordingly. By rotating, we can assume WLOG that c_1 is the smallest c_i among all i 's. By Corollary 3.13, we have $d_i = c_i + 1$ for all i . Let us do a case analysis depending on which rule the edge $b_1 \rightarrow a_2$ uses.

Case (1). The edge $b_1 \rightarrow a_2$ uses rule (1). Then $d(a_2, d_1, a_2, d_1+1) = 2$. By Lemma 3.7, we have $d_2 = d_1 + 1$. By Corollary 3.13, we have $d(a_2, d_2-1, a_2, d_2) = 1$. Contradiction.

during the proof that F is valid. In proof of validity of rule (6), we also use validity of rule (10). Because we are doing induction, this is not circular argument.

Case (2). The edge $b_1 \rightarrow a_2$ uses rule (2). Then $d(a_{2,d_1}, a_{2,d_1+1}) = 2$. By Lemma 3.7, we have $d_2 = d_1 + 1$. By Corollary 3.13, we have $d(a_{2,d_2-1}, a_{2,d_2}) = 1$. Contradiction.

Case (3). The edge $b_1 \rightarrow a_2$ uses rule (3). There are two sub-cases.

Sub-case (3.1). There does not exist i such that $d_i = 3$. Then by Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 3.11, and that $d_i \geq 1$ for all i , we have $d_1 = 1, d_2 = 2, d_3 = 1, d_4 = 2, \dots$. By checking all possible relative positions of $(a_{1,0}, a_{1,1}, a_{1,2}, a_{1,3})$, we see that a cycle is not formed.⁷

Sub-case (3.2). There exist i such that $d_i = 3$. Take the smallest such i . By Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 3.11, there exists i' with $d_{i'} = 2$. Then by Corollary 3.13, for all j , we have $d(a_{j,0}, a_{j,1}) = d(a_{j,1}, a_{j,2}) = d(a_{j,2}, a_{j,3}) = 1$.

By checking all possible relative positions of $(a_{i,0}, \dots, a_{i,4})$, we see that $d(a_{i+1,3}, a_{i+1,0}) \leq 2$. So $d(a_{j,3}, a_{j,0}) \leq 2$ for all $j \geq i + 1$.

Take the smallest $i' \geq i + 1$ such that $d_{i'} = 2$. By checking all possible relative positions of $(a_{i',0}, \dots, a_{i',3})$, we see that $d(a_{i'+1,2}, a_{i'+1,0}) \leq 1$. So $d(a_{j,2}, a_{j,0}) \leq 1$ for all $j \geq i' + 1$.

Take the smallest $i'' \geq i' + 1$ such that $d_{i''} = 1$. There exist such i'' because $d_{1+np} = d_1 = 1$ for all n . However, because $d(a_{i'',2}, a_{i'',0}) = 1$, such i'' cannot exist. Contradiction.

Case (4). The edge $b_1 \rightarrow a_2$ uses rule (4). There are two sub-cases.

Sub-case (4.1). $d(a_{2,d_1}, a_{2,d_1-2}) = 0$. Let i be the smallest integer ≥ 2 such that $d_i = d_1$. Note that $d(a_{2,d_1}, a_{2,d_1+1}) = 1$.

For $2 \leq j < i$, if $d_j \neq d_1 + 1$, then $d(a_{j+1,d_1}, a_{j+1,d_1+1}) = d(a_{j,d_1}, a_{j,d_1+1}) = 1$; if $d_j = d_1 + 1$, then $d(a_{j,d_1}, a_{j,d_1+1}) = 1$ by Corollary 3.13. So $d(a_{i,d_1}, a_{i,d_1+1}) = 1$ by induction. It is also clear that $d(a_{i,d_1}, a_{i,d_1-2}) = 0$.

So $d(b_{i,d_1-1}, b_{i,d_1}) = d(a_{i,d_1-1}, a_{i,d_1+1}) = 2$. Also, $d(b_{i,d_1}, b_{i,d_1-2}) = d(a_{i,d_1+1}, a_{i,d_1-2}) = d(a_{i,d_1+1}, a_{i,d_1}) = 1$. So rule (4) applies to $(b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,d_1})$, and $F(b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,d_1}) = \iota(b_{i,d_1-2})$. This means $a_i = a_{i+1}$, and edges $a_i \rightarrow b_i$ and $b_i \rightarrow a_{i+1}$ cannot both exist in $\Gamma_{MC^{*,*}}^M(G)$. Contradiction.

Sub-case (4.2). $d(a_{2,d_1}, a_{2,d_1-2}) = 1$. Let i be the smallest integer ≥ 2 such that $d_i = d_1$. By the same reason as sub-case (4.1), we have $d(a_{i,d_1}, a_{i,d_1+1}) = 1$, and $d(a_{i,d_1}, a_{i,d_1-2}) = 1$. So $d(b_{i,d_1-1}, b_{i,d_1}) = d(a_{i,d_1-1}, a_{i,d_1+1}) = 2$. Also, $d(b_{i,d_1}, b_{i,d_1-2}) = d(a_{i,d_1+1}, a_{i,d_1-2}) \leq d(a_{i,d_1+1}, a_{i,d_1}) + d(a_{i,d_1}, a_{i,d_1-2}) = 2$. So rule (4) applies to $(b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,d_1})$.

If $a_{i+1,d_1} = a_{i,d_1}$, then $a_{i+1} = a_i$, and edges $a_i \rightarrow b_i$ and $b_i \rightarrow a_{i+1}$ cannot both exist in $\Gamma_{MC^{*,*}}^M(G)$. So $a_{i+1,d_1} \neq a_{i,d_1}$. Then by rule (4) and properties of ξ , we have $d(a_{i+1,d_1}, a_{i+1,d_1-2}) < d(a_{i,d_1}, a_{i,d_1-2}) = 1$. We can rotate a_i to a_1 and reduce to Sub-case (4.1).

Case (5). The edge $b_1 \rightarrow a_2$ uses rule (5). Let i be the smallest integer ≥ 2 such that $d_i = d_1$.

If $a_{i,d_i+1} = a_{2,d_i+1}$, then $(a_{2,0}, \dots, a_{2,d_i+1}) = (a_{i,0}, \dots, a_{i,d_i+1})$. So $(b_{1,0}, \dots, b_{1,d_i}) = (b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,d_i})$, and by the edge $b_1 \rightarrow a_2$, we have $(a_{i+1,0}, \dots, a_{i+1,d_i+1}) = (a_{2,0}, \dots, a_{2,d_i+1})$. Then $a_i = a_{i+1}$, and edges $a_i \rightarrow b_i$ and $b_i \rightarrow a_{i+1}$ cannot both exist in $\Gamma_{MC^{*,*}}^M(G)$. Contradiction.

So $a_{i,d_i+1} \neq a_{2,d_i+1}$. This means $d(b_{i,d_i}, b_{i,d_i-2}) \neq 3$. We can rotate a_i to a_1 and reduce to Case (4).

⁷There are only a few possible relative positions. Same for the other checks.

Case (6). The edge $b_1 \rightarrow a_2$ uses rule (6). Let i be the smallest integer ≥ 2 such that $d_i = d_1$. By the same reason as Case (5), we have $a_{i,d_i+1} \neq a_{2,d_i+1}$ and $d(b_{i,d_i}, b_{i,d_i-2}) \neq 3$. We can rotate a_i to a_1 and reduce to Case (4).

So all cases lead to contradiction. Therefore M is a Morse matching.

By Corollary 3.10, the icosahedral graph is diagonal. \square

4.4. Odd cycles. Hepworth and Willerton [HW17] computed the first magnitude homology groups of small cycles using computer program, and made conjectures for magnitude homology groups of cycles in general. We prove their conjectures using algebraic Morse theory. We compute for odd cycles in this section, and for even cycles in the next section. It turns out that magnitude homology of odd cycles has more complicated description but easier computation.

Theorem 4.6. *Fix an integer $m \geq 2$. The magnitude homology of C_{2m+1} is described as follows.*

- (1) All groups $\text{MH}_{k,l}(C_{2m+1})$ are torsion-free.
- (2) Define a function $T : \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ as
 - (a) $T(k, l) = 0$ if $k < 0$ or $l < 0$;
 - (b) $T(0, 0) = 2m + 1$, $T(1, 1) = 4m + 2$;
 - (c) $T(k, l) = T(k - 1, l - 1) + 2T(k - 2, l - (m + 1))$ for $(k, l) \neq (0, 0)$ and $(1, 1)$.

Then $\text{rank MH}_{k,l}(C_{2m+1}) = T(k, l)$ for all k and l .

Proof. Label the vertices of $G = C_{2m+1}$ as $\{1, \dots, 2m+1\}$ such that i is adjacent to $i+1$ for all i , and $2m+1$ adjacent to 1 . We define signed distance $\Delta : V(G) \times V(G) \rightarrow \{-m, \dots, m\}$ such that $\Delta(u, v)$ is the unique number in $\{-m, \dots, m\}$ in the same modulo- $(2m+1)$ equivalence class as $v - u$. Define $\text{sgn} : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ that maps positive integers to 1 , negative integers to -1 , and 0 to 0 . It is easy to see that $|\Delta(u, v)| = d(u, v)$ and $\Delta(u, v) = -\Delta(v, u)$. We also have $d(u, v) + d(v, w) = d(u, w)$ if and only if $|\Delta(u, v)| + |\Delta(v, w)| \leq m$ and $\text{sgn}(\Delta(u, v)) = \text{sgn}(\Delta(v, w))$.

Define a function $\sigma : \{(u, v) \in V(G) \times V(G) : d(u, v) \geq 2\} \rightarrow V(G)$ that maps (u, v) to the unique vertex w with $d(u, w) = 1$ and $d(u, w) + d(w, v) = d(u, v)$. For three vertices (u, v, w) , let $\chi(u, v, w)$ denote the proposition $\text{sgn}(\Delta(u, v)) = \text{sgn}(\Delta(v, w)) \wedge d(u, v) = 1 \wedge d(v, w) = m$.

Let us describe the matching rule. Fix a sequence (x_0, \dots, x_k) with unmatched prefix (x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) .

- (1) If $k \geq 2$ and $x_{k-1} = \sigma(x_{k-2}, x_k)$, then $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \delta$.
- (2) If $k \geq 1$, $d(x_{k-1}, x_k) \geq 2$, not $(k \geq 2 \wedge x_{k-1} = \sigma(x_{k-2}, x_k))$, and not $(k \geq 2 \wedge \chi(x_{k-2}, x_{k-1}, x_k))$, then $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \iota(\sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k))$.

Let us prove that F is a valid matching rule.

- (1) Suppose $k \geq 2$ and $x_{k-1} = \sigma(x_{k-2}, x_k)$. Clearly $d(x_{k-2}, x_k) \geq 2$. If $k \geq 3$ and $x_{k-2} = \sigma(x_{k-3}, x_k)$, then $x_{k-2} = \sigma(x_{k-3}, x_{k-1})$, and $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) = \delta$, which is not true. So we have $\neg(k \geq 3 \wedge x_{k-2} = \sigma(x_{k-3}, x_k))$. If $k \geq 3$ and $\chi(x_{k-3}, x_{k-2}, x_k)$, then $x_{k-2} = \sigma(x_{k-3}, x_{k-1})$, and $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) = \delta$, which is not true. So $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-2}, x_k) = \iota(\sigma(x_{k-2}, x_k)) = \iota(x_{k-1})$.
- (2) Suppose $k \geq 1$, $d(x_{k-1}, x_k) \geq 2$, not $(k \geq 2 \wedge x_{k-1} = \sigma(x_{k-2}, x_k))$, and not $(k \geq 2 \wedge \chi(x_{k-2}, x_{k-1}, x_k))$. Because $d(x_{k-1}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k)) = 1$, we have $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k)) \neq \iota(*)$. If $k \geq 2$ and $x_{k-1} = \sigma(x_{k-2}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k))$, then either $x_{k-1} = \sigma(x_{k-2}, x_k)$, or $(k \geq 2 \wedge \chi(x_{k-2}, x_{k-1}, x_k))$,

neither of which is true. So we have $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k)) = \epsilon$ and $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k), x_k) = \delta$.

The unmatched sequences are described as follows.

- (1) (v) is unmatched for any vertex v .
- (2) (u, v) is unmatched for $d(u, v) = 1$.
- (3) If (x_0, \dots, x_k) is unmatched with $k \geq 1$ and $d(x_{k-1}, x_k) = 1$, then (x_0, \dots, x_k, v) is unmatched, where $d(x_k, v) = m$ and $\text{sgn}(\Delta(x_{k-1}, x_k)) = \text{sgn}(\Delta(x_k, v))$.
- (4) If (x_0, \dots, x_k) is unmatched with $k \geq 1$ and $d(x_{k-1}, x_k) = m$, then (x_0, \dots, x_k, v) is unmatched, where $d(x_k, v) = 1$ and $\text{sgn}(\Delta(x_{k-1}, x_k)) = \text{sgn}(\Delta(x_k, v))$.
- (5) If (x_0, \dots, x_k) is unmatched with $k \geq 1$, then (x_0, \dots, x_k, v) is unmatched, where $d(x_k, v) = 1$ and $\text{sgn}(\Delta(x_{k-1}, x_k)) \neq \text{sgn}(\Delta(x_k, v))$.

Note that no unmatched sequences have outgoing edges in $\Gamma_{\text{MC}_{*,*}}(G)$.

Let M be the prefix matching generated by F . Let us prove that M is a Morse matching. Work in the setting of Lemma 3.7. Suppose in $\Gamma_{\text{MC}_{*,*}}^M(G)$ there is a directed cycle $a_1 \rightarrow b_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow b_p \rightarrow a_{p+1} = a_1$. Define d_i, c_i, u_i accordingly. Although F is not a diagonal matching rule, it satisfies some good properties that a diagonal matching rule has. We prove the following analogue of Lemma 3.11.

Lemma 4.7. *We have $d_i = c_i + 1$ for all i .*

Proof. Suppose $(b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,d_i})$ is unmatched. Then $c_i \geq d_i$, $(a_{i+1,0}, \dots, a_{i+1,d_i}) = (b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,d_i})$, and $(a_{i+1,0}, \dots, a_{i+1,d_i+1})$ is unmatched (by valid property (1) in Definition 3.3). Because an unmatched sequence has no outgoing edges, we have $d_{i+1} \geq d_i + 1$ and $(b_{i+1,0}, \dots, b_{i+1,d_i}) = (b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,d_i})$.

Suppose for some $j \geq i + 1$, we have $(b_{j,0}, \dots, b_{j,d_i}) = (b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,d_i})$. By the same reasoning, we have $d_{j+1} \geq d_i + 1$, and $(b_{j+1,0}, \dots, b_{j+1,d_i}) = (b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,d_i})$. Applying induction, we see that $d_j \geq d_i + 1$ for all $j \geq i + 1$. This means $d_{i+p} \geq d_i + 1$, which cannot be true.

So $(b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,d_i})$ is matched. By definition of prefix matchings, the matching state of $(b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,d_i})$ is the same as that of b_i , which is $\text{insert}(c_i, u_i)$. In particular, $c_i + 1 \leq d_i$. By Lemma 3.7, we have $d_i \leq c_i + 1$. So $d_i = c_i + 1$. \square

Now we return to the proof that M is a Morse matching. By Lemma 4.7 and Lemma 3.12, we have $d(a_{1,d_1-1}, a_{1,d_1}) = 1$. Because of the edge $a_1 \rightarrow b_1$, we have $d(a_{1,d_1-1}, a_{1,d_1}) + d(a_{1,d_1}, a_{1,d_1+1}) = d(a_{1,d_1-1}, a_{1,d_1+1})$. So $a_{1,d_1} = \sigma(a_{1,d_1-1}, a_{1,d_1+1})$. Also, by the edge $b_1 \rightarrow a_2$, we have $a_{2,c_1+1} = \sigma(a_{2,c_1}, a_{2,c_1+2})$. By Lemma 4.7, we have $c_1 = d_1 - 1$. Also, we have $a_{1,j} = b_{1,j} = a_{2,j}$ for $j \leq d_1 - 1$, and $a_{1,j} = b_{1,j-1} = a_{2,j}$ for $j \geq d_1 + 1$. So $a_{2,d_1} = a_{1,d_1}$, and therefore $a_2 = a_1$. Then edges $a_1 \rightarrow b_1$ and $b_1 \rightarrow a_2$ cannot both exist in $\Gamma_{\text{MC}_{*,*}}^M(G)$. Contradiction. So M is a Morse matching.

Because no unmatched sequences have any outgoing edges, all differentials $\partial^\circ : \text{MC}_{k,l}^\circ(G) \rightarrow \text{MC}_{k-1,l}^\circ(G)$ are zeros. Therefore the homology classes of unmatched sequences form a basis of $\text{MH}_{*,*}(G)$. It is not hard to see that $\text{rank MH}_{*,*}(G)$ is as described in the theorem statement. \square

4.5. Even cycles.

Theorem 4.8. *Fix an integer $m \geq 3$. The magnitude homology of C_{2m} is described as follows.*

- (1) All groups $\text{MH}_{k,l}(C_{2m})$ are torsion-free.

- (2) Define a function $T : \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ as
- (a) $T(k, l) = 0$ if $k < 0$ or $l < 0$;
 - (b) $T(0, 0) = 2m$, $T(1, 1) = 4m$;
 - (c) $T(k, l) = \max\{T(k-1, l-1), T(k-2, l-m)\}$ for $(k, l) \neq (0, 0)$ and $(1, 1)$.

Then $\text{rank MH}_{k,l}(C_{2m}) = T(k, l)$ for all k and l .

Proof. Label the vertices of $G = C_{2m}$ as $\{1, \dots, 2m\}$ such that i is adjacent to $i+1$ for all i , and $2m$ adjacent to 1 . We define a signed distance $\Delta : V(G) \times V(G) \rightarrow \{-m+1, \dots, m\}$ such that $\Delta(u, v)$ is the unique number in $\{-m+1, \dots, m\}$ in the same modulo- $(2m)$ equivalence class as $v - u$. Define $\text{sgn} : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ that maps positive integers to 1 , negative integers to -1 , and 0 to 0 .

Define a function $\sigma : \{(u, v) \in V(G) \times V(G) : d(u, v) \geq 2\}$ that maps (u, v) to the unique vertex w with $d(u, w) = 1$ and $\text{sgn}(\Delta(u, w)) = \text{sgn}(\Delta(u, v))$. Note that when $d(u, v) \leq m-1$, $\sigma(u, v)$ is the unique vertex w with $d(u, w) = 1$ and $d(u, w) + d(w, v) = d(u, v)$. For three vertices (u, v, w) , let $\chi(u, v, w)$ denote the proposition $\Delta(u, v) = -1 \wedge \Delta(v, w) = -m+1$.

Let us describe the matching rule. Fix a sequence (x_0, \dots, x_k) with unmatched prefix (x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) .

- (1) If $k \geq 2$ and $x_{k-1} = \sigma(x_{k-2}, x_k)$, then $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \delta$.
- (2) If $k \geq 3$, $\Delta(x_{k-3}, x_{k-2}) = 1$, and $\chi(x_{k-2}, x_{k-1}, x_k)$, then $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \delta$.
- (3) If $k \geq 1$, $d(x_{k-1}, x_k) \geq 2$, not $(k \geq 2 \wedge x_{k-1} = \sigma(x_{k-2}, x_k))$, not $(k \geq 2 \wedge \chi(x_{k-2}, x_{k-1}, x_k))$, and not $(k \geq 2 \wedge \chi(x_{k-1}, x_{k-2}, x_k))$, then $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \iota(\sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k))$.
- (4) If $k \geq 2$ and $\chi(x_{k-1}, x_{k-2}, x_k)$, then $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \iota(x_{k-2})$.

Let us prove that F is a valid matching rule.

- (1) Suppose $k \geq 2$ and $x_{k-1} = \sigma(x_{k-2}, x_k)$. Clearly $d(x_{k-2}, x_k) \geq 2$. If $k \geq 3$ and $x_{k-2} = \sigma(x_{k-3}, x_k)$, then $x_{k-2} = \sigma(x_{k-3}, x_{k-1})$ and $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) = \delta$, which is not true. So we have $\neg(x \geq 3 \wedge x_{k-2} = \sigma(x_{k-3}, x_k))$. If $k \geq 3$ and $\chi(x_{k-3}, x_{k-2}, x_k)$, then $x_{k-2} = \sigma(x_{k-3}, x_{k-1})$ and $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) = \delta$, which is not true. So we have $\neg(k \geq 4 \wedge \chi(x_{k-3}, x_{k-2}, x_k))$. If $k \geq 3$ and $\chi(x_{k-2}, x_{k-3}, x_k)$, then $x_{k-2} = \sigma(x_{k-3}, x_{k-1})$ and $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) = \delta$, which is not true. So $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-2}, x_k) = \iota(\sigma(x_{k-2}, x_k)) = \iota(x_{k-1})$ by rule (3).
- (2) Suppose $k \geq 3$, $\Delta(x_{k-3}, x_{k-2}) = 1$, and $\chi(x_{k-2}, x_{k-1}, x_k)$. Then $x_{k-3} = x_{k-1}$, and $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-2}, x_k) = \iota(x_{k-3}) = \iota(x_{k-1})$ by rule (4).
- (3) Suppose $k \geq 1$, $d(x_{k-1}, x_k) \geq 2$, not $(k \geq 2 \wedge x_{k-1} = \sigma(x_{k-2}, x_k))$, not $(k \geq 2 \wedge \chi(x_{k-2}, x_{k-1}, x_k))$, and not $(k \geq 2 \wedge \chi(x_{k-1}, x_{k-2}, x_k))$. Because $d(x_{k-1}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k)) = 1$, we have $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k)) \neq \iota(*)$. If $k \geq 2$ and $x_{k-1} = \sigma(x_{k-2}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k))$, then there are three possibilities.
 - (a) $x_{k-1} = \sigma(x_{k-2}, x_k)$;
 - (b) $\chi(x_{k-1}, x_{k-2}, x_k)$;
 - (c) $\chi(x_{k-2}, x_{k-1}, x_k)$.
None of these can be true. So we have $\neg(k \geq 2 \wedge x_{k-1} = \sigma(x_{k-2}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k)))$. Because $m \geq 3$, rule (2) does not apply to the sequence $(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k))$. So $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k)) \neq \delta$. Therefore $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k)) = \epsilon$ and thus $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k), x_k) = \delta$ by rule (1).
- (4) Suppose $k \geq 2$ and $\chi(x_{k-1}, x_{k-2}, x_k)$. Because $d(x_{k-2}, x_{k-1}) = 1$, we have $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, x_{k-2}) \neq \iota(*)$. Clearly $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, x_{k-2}) \neq \delta$.

So $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, x_{k-2}) = \epsilon$. Because $\chi(x_{k-1}, x_{k-2}, x_k)$ is true, we have $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, x_{k-2}, x_k) = \delta$ by rule (2).

We say a sequence (x_0, \dots, x_k) is special if k is even (can be zero), and $\chi(x_{2i}, x_{2i+1}, x_{2i+2})$ holds for all i . The unmatched sequences are described as follows.

- (1) A special sequence is unmatched.
- (2) If (x_0, \dots, x_k) is a special sequence, then (x_0, \dots, x_k, v) is unmatched, where $d(x_k, v) = 1$.
- (3) If (x_0, \dots, x_k) is unmatched with $d(x_{k-1}, x_k) = 1$, then (x_0, \dots, x_k, v) is unmatched, where $d(x_k, v) = 1$ and $\text{sgn}(\Delta(x_{k-1}, x_k)) \neq \text{sgn}(\Delta(x_k, v))$.

For a sequence (x_0, \dots, x_k) define $\rho(x_0, \dots, x_k)$ to be the largest integer j such that (x_0, \dots, x_j) is a special sequence.

Let M be the prefix matching generated by F . Let us prove that M is a Morse matching. Work in the setting of Lemma 3.7. Suppose in $\Gamma_{\text{MC}^{*,*}(G)}^M$ there is a directed cycle $a_1 \rightarrow b_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow b_p \rightarrow a_{p+1} = a_1$. Define d_i, c_i, u_i accordingly.

Lemma 4.9. *We have $d_i \geq \rho(a_i) + 1$ for all i .*

Proof. Because special sequences are unmatched, we have $c_i \geq \rho(b_i)$ and $\rho(a_{i+1}) = \rho(b_i)$ for all i . If $d_i \leq \rho(a_i)$ for some i , then $\rho(a_{i+1}) = \rho(b_i) = 2\lfloor \frac{d_i-1}{2} \rfloor$. If $d_i \geq \rho(a_i) + 1$, then $\rho(a_{i+1}) = \rho(b_i) \geq \rho(a_i)$.

Suppose $d_1 \leq \rho(a_1)$, and that d_1 is the smallest among all $d_i \leq \rho(a_i)$. Then $\rho(a_2) = 2\lfloor \frac{d_1-1}{2} \rfloor$ is the smallest among all $\rho(a_i)$'s. So $d_i \geq 2\lfloor \frac{d_1-1}{2} \rfloor + 1$ for all i . There are two cases depending on parity of d_1 .

Case 1: d_1 is odd. Because $(a_{1,0}, \dots, a_{1,d_1+1})$ is a special sequence, it is easy to check that the conditions of rule (3) holds for $(b_{1,0}, \dots, b_{1,d_1})$. So $c_1 = d_1 - 1$, $F(b_{1,0}, \dots, b_{1,d_1}) = \iota(\sigma(b_{1,d_1-1}, b_{1,d_1}))$, and $\Delta(a_{2,d_1-1}, a_{2,d_1}) = 1$.

Let us prove by induction that $(a_{i,0}, \dots, a_{i,d_1}) = (a_{2,0}, \dots, a_{2,d_1})$ for all $i \geq 2$. The case $i = 2$ is trivial. Suppose $(a_{i,0}, \dots, a_{i,d_1}) = (a_{2,0}, \dots, a_{2,d_1})$. Because d_1 is odd, we have $d_i \geq d_1$.

Suppose $d_i = d_1$. Because $\Delta(a_{i,d_1-1}, a_{i,d_1}) = 1$ and $d(a_{i,d_1-1}, a_{i,d_1}) + d(a_{i,d_1}, a_{i,d_1+1}) = d(a_{i,d_1-1}, a_{i,d_1+1})$, we have $a_{i,d_1} = \sigma(a_{i,d_1-1}, a_{i,d_1+1})$. Because $(a_{i,0}, \dots, a_{i,d_1-1}) = (a_{1,0}, \dots, a_{1,d_1-1})$ is a special sequence, we can verify that the conditions of rule (3) hold for $(b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,d_1})$. So $c_i = d_i - 1$ and $F(b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,d_1}) = \iota(\sigma(b_{1,d_1-1}, b_{1,d_1}))$. This implies $a_{i+1} = a_i$, and edges $a_i \rightarrow b_i$ and $b_i \rightarrow a_{i+1}$ cannot both exist in $\Gamma_{\text{MC}^{*,*}(G)}^M$. Contradiction.

So $d_i > d_1$. By Lemma 3.7, we have $c_i \geq d_i - 1 \geq d_1$ and $(a_{i+1,0}, \dots, a_{i+1,d_1}) = (a_{i,0}, \dots, a_{i,d_1})$. This completes the induction step.

So $(a_{i,0}, \dots, a_{i,d_1}) = (a_{2,0}, \dots, a_{2,d_1})$ for all $i \geq 2$. However, this cannot be true for $i = p + 1$ because $a_{1,d_1} \neq a_{2,d_1}$. Contradiction.

Case 2: d_1 is even. Because $\Delta(a_{1,d_1-1}, a_{1,d_1}) = -m + 1$ and $d(a_{1,d_1-1}, a_{1,d_1}) + d(a_{1,d_1}, a_{1,d_1+1}) = d(a_{1,d_1-1}, a_{1,d_1+1})$, we know that $d(a_{1,d_1-1}, a_{1,d_1+1}) = m$. Because $(a_{1,0}, \dots, a_{1,d_1})$ is a special sequence, it is easy to check that the conditions of rule (3) holds for $(b_{1,0}, \dots, b_{1,d_1})$. So $c_1 = d_1 - 1$, $F(b_{1,0}, \dots, b_{1,d_1}) = \iota(\sigma(b_{1,d_1-1}, b_{1,d_1}))$, and $\Delta(a_{2,d_1-1}, a_{2,d_1}) = 1$. (Note that $a_{2,d_1} = a_{2,d_1-2}$.)

Let us prove by induction that $(a_{i,0}, \dots, a_{i,d_1}) = (a_{2,0}, \dots, a_{2,d_1})$ for all $i \geq 2$. The case $i = 2$ is trivial. Suppose $(a_{i,0}, \dots, a_{i,d_1}) = (a_{2,0}, \dots, a_{2,d_1})$. Because d_1 is odd, we have $d_i \geq d_1 - 1$. Because $a_{i,d_1} = a_{i,d_1-2}$, we have $d_i \neq d_1 - 1$. By the same reason as Case 1, we have $d_i \neq d_1$. So $d_i > d_1$. By Lemma 3.7, we have

$c_i \geq d_i - 1 \geq d_1$ and $(a_{i+1,0}, \dots, a_{i+1,d_1}) = (a_{i,0}, \dots, a_{i,d_1})$. This completes the induction step.

So $(a_{i,0}, \dots, a_{i,d_1}) = (a_{2,0}, \dots, a_{2,d_1})$ for all $i \geq 2$. However, this cannot be true for $i = p + 1$ because $a_{1,d_1} \neq a_{2,d_1}$. Contradiction.

So both Case 1 and Case 2 lead to contradiction. \square

Lemma 4.10. *We have $d_i = c_i + 1$ for all i .*

Proof. The proof mimics that of Lemma 4.7. Suppose $(b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,d_i})$ is unmatched. Then $c_i \geq d_i$, $(a_{i+1,0}, \dots, a_{i+1,d_i}) = (b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,d_i})$, and $(a_{i+1,0}, \dots, a_{i+1,d_i+1})$ is unmatched (by valid property (1) in Definition 3.3). By Lemma 4.9, we have $d_{i+1} \geq \rho(a_{i+1}) + 1$. By analyzing unmatched sequences we can see that $d_{i+1} \geq d_i + 1$, and $(b_{i+1,0}, \dots, b_{i+1,d_i}) = (b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,d_i})$.

Suppose for some $j \geq i + 1$, we have $(b_{j,0}, \dots, b_{j,d_i}) = (b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,d_i})$. By the same reasoning, we have $d_{j+1} \geq d_i + 1$, and $(b_{j+1,0}, \dots, b_{j+1,d_i}) = (b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,d_i})$. Applying induction, we see that $d_j \geq d_i + 1$ for all $j \geq i + 1$. This means $d_{i+p} \geq d_i + 1$, which cannot be true.

So $(b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,d_i})$ is matched. By definition of prefix matchings, the matching state of $(b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,d_i})$ is the same as that of b_i , which is $\text{insert}(c_i, u_i)$. In particular, $c_i + 1 \leq d_i$. By Lemma 3.7, we have $d_i \leq c_i + 1$. So $d_i = c_i + 1$. \square

Now we return to the proof that M is a Morse matching. By rotating, we can WLOG assume that c_1 is the smallest c_i among all i 's. By Lemma 4.10 and Lemma 3.12, we have $d(a_{i,d_i-1}, a_{i,d_i}) = 1$ for all i .

By Lemma 3.7, we have $d_2 \leq c_1 + 2$ and $d_2 \neq c_1 + 1$. So $d_2 = c_1 + 2 = d_1 + 1$ and therefore $c_2 = d_1$ by Lemma 4.10. By definition of F , we have $d(a_{2,d_1-1}, a_{2,d_1}) = d(a_{3,d_2-1}, a_{3,d_2}) = 1$. Because $d_2 = d_1 + 1$, we have $d(a_{3,d_1-1}, a_{3,d_1}) = 1$.

Let us prove by induction that $(a_{i,0}, \dots, a_{i,d_1}) = (a_{3,0}, \dots, a_{3,d_1})$ and $d(a_{i,d_1}, a_{i,d_1+1}) = 1$ for all $i \geq 3$. The case $i = 3$ is trivial. Suppose $(a_{i,0}, \dots, a_{i,d_1}) = (a_{3,0}, \dots, a_{3,d_1})$ and $d(a_{i,d_1}, a_{i,d_1+1}) = 1$. By assumption, $d_i \geq d_1$.

Suppose $d_i = d_1$. Because $d(a_{i,d_1-1}, a_{i,d_1}) = d(a_{i,d_1}, a_{i,d_1+1}) = 1$ and $d(a_{i,d_1-1}, a_{i,d_1}) + d(a_{i,d_1}, a_{i,d_1+1}) = d(a_{i,d_1-1}, a_{i,d_1+1})$, we have $a_{i,d_1} = \sigma(a_{i,d_1-1}, a_{i,d_1+1})$. By Lemma 4.10, $c_i = d_i - 1$. Because $d(a_{i,d_1-1}, a_{i,d_1+1}) = 2 < m$, rule (4) does not apply to $(b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,d_1})$. So rule (3) must apply to $(b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,d_1})$. This means $F(b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,d_1}) = \iota(\sigma(b_{i,d_1-1}, b_{i,d_1})) = \iota(a_{i,d_1})$. This implies $a_{i+1} = a_i$, and edges $a_i \rightarrow b_i$ and $b_i \rightarrow a_{i+1}$ cannot both exist in $\Gamma_{\text{MC}^*,*(G)}^M$. Contradiction.

So $d_i > d_1$. By Lemma 3.7, we have $c_i \geq d_i - 1 \geq d_1$ and $(a_{i+1,0}, \dots, a_{i+1,d_i}) = (a_{3,0}, \dots, a_{3,d_i})$. If $d_i = d_1 + 1$, then by Lemma 4.10, $c_i = d_1$, and we have $d(a_{i+1,d_1}, a_{i+1,d_1+1}) = 1$ by definition of F . If $d_i \geq d_1 + 2$, then $c_i \geq d_i - 1 \geq d_1 + 1$ and $d(a_{i+1,d_1}, a_{i+1,d_1+1}) = d(a_{i,d_1}, a_{i,d_1+1}) = 1$. So in either case the induction step is completed.

So $(a_{i,0}, \dots, a_{i,d_1}) = (a_{3,0}, \dots, a_{3,d_1})$ for all $i \geq 3$. However, this cannot be true for $i = p + 1$ because $a_{1,d_1} \neq a_{2,d_1} = a_{3,d_1}$. Contradiction. So M is a Morse matching.

Let us analyze the differentials. Note that all sequences (x_0, \dots, x_k) in $I_{k,l}^\circ$ have $\rho(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \frac{2(l-k)}{m-2}$. Because $\rho(x_0, \dots, x_k)$ must be an even number, we have $I_{k,l}^\circ = \emptyset$ if $(m-2) \nmid (l-k)$. So when $m \neq 3$, there do not exist k and l such that $I_{k,l}^\circ$ and $I_{k-1,l}^\circ$ are both nonempty.

Now suppose $m = 3$. For all sequences (x_0, \dots, x_k) in $I_{k,l}^\circ$, we have

$$\Delta(x_0, x_k) \in \{3(l-k) + w : w \in \{-1, 0, 1\}\} \pmod{6}.$$

Let $A_{k,l}$ denote the set $\{3(l-k) + w : w \in \{-1, 0, 1\}\} \pmod{6}$. Then $A_{k,l}$ and $A_{k-1,l}$ are disjoint. On the other hand, if there is a zig-zag path $\gamma \in \Gamma_{x,y}^M$ for two sequences (x_0, \dots, x_k) and (y_0, \dots, y_{k-1}) , then we must have $x_0 = y_0$ and $x_k = y_{k-1}$, and therefore $\Delta(x_0, x_k) = \Delta(y_0, y_{k-1})$. So $\Gamma_{x,y}^M = \emptyset$ for $x \in I_{k,l}^\circ$ and $y \in I_{k-1,l}^\circ$.

So all differentials $\partial^\circ : \text{MC}_{k,l}^\circ(G) \rightarrow \text{MC}_{k-1,l}^\circ(G)$ are zeros. Therefore the homology classes of unmatched sequences form a basis of $\text{MH}_{*,*}(G)$. It is not hard to see that $\text{rank MH}_{*,*}(G)$ is as described in the theorem statement. \square

APPENDIX A. MAGNITUDE HOMOLOGY IS STRONGER THAN MAGNITUDE

Hepworth and Willerton [HW17] asked whether there exist graphs with the same magnitude but different magnitude homology. In this appendix we answer the question in the affirmative by giving explicit examples. For computing magnitude homology, we use Sage and Python program `rational_graph_homology_arxiv.py` written by Simon Willerton and James Cranch, which can be found in the arXiv version of [HW17].

We follow notations of Leinster [Lei17]. Let G be a finite simple undirected connected graph. Its magnitude $\#G$ is an element of $\mathbb{Z}[[q]] \cap \mathbb{Q}(q)$, i.e., it is both a power series with coefficients in \mathbb{Z} , and a rational function.

The following lemma is useful for proving two vertex-transitive graphs have the same magnitude.

Lemma A.1 (Speyer, in Leinster [Lei17]). *Let G be a vertex-transitive graph and $a \in V(G)$ be a fixed vertex. The magnitude of G is given by*

$$\#G = \frac{|V(G)|}{\sum_{x \in V(G)} q^{d(a,x)}}.$$

The first example we give is the 4×4 rook graph and the Shrikhande graph. The 4×4 rook graph is the Cayley graph on $\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$ with generators $\{(0, x), (x, 0) : x = 1, 2, 3\}$. The Shrikhande graph is the Cayley graph on $\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$ with generators $\{\pm(0, 1), \pm(1, 0), \pm(1, 1)\}$.




FIGURE 3. Left: 4×4 rook graph; Right: Shrikhande graph

Proposition A.2. *The 4×4 rook graph and the Shrikhande graph have the same magnitude but different magnitude homology.*

Proof. Let $R_{4,4}$ denote the 4×4 rook graph and let Shr denote the Shrikhande graph. Because $R_{4,4}$ and Shr are both Cayley graphs, they are both vertex transitive. So Lemma A.1 applies. Simple calculation shows that for a fixed vertex in $R_{4,4}$, there are 6 vertices with distance 1 and 9 vertices with distance 2. The same holds for Shr. Therefore

$$\#R_{4,4} = \#\text{Shr} = \frac{16}{1 + 6q + 9q^2}.$$

On the other hand, computer computation shows that $\text{rank MH}_{3,4}(R_{4,4}) = 0$ while $\text{rank MH}_{3,4}(\text{Shr}) \neq 0$ (Table 1 and Table 2). Therefore $R_{4,4}$ and Shr have different magnitude homology. \square

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	16						
1		96					
2			432				
3				1728			
4					6480		
5						23328	
6							81648

TABLE 1. Magnitude homology of the 4×4 rook graph

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	16						
1		96					
2			432				
3				1728			
4				144	6624		
5					1632	24960	
6						11824	93472

TABLE 2. Magnitude homology of the Shrikhande graph

Another example is the dodecahedral graph and the Desargues graph.




FIGURE 4. Left: dodecahedral graph; Right: Desargues graph

Proposition A.3. *The dodecahedral graph and the Desargues graph have the same magnitude but different magnitude homology.*

Proof. Let Dod denote the dodecahedral graph and let Des denote the Desargues graph. It is not hard to see that both Dod and Des are vertex-transitive graphs, and therefore Lemma A.1 applies. For a fixed vertex in Dod , there are 3 vertices with distance 1, 6 vertices with distance 2, 6 vertices with distance 3, 3 vertices with distance 4 and 1 vertex with distance 5. The same holds for Des . So we have

$$\#\text{Dod} = \#\text{Des} = \frac{20}{1 + 3q + 6q^2 + 6q^3 + 3q^4 + q^5}.$$

On the other hand, computer computation shows $\text{rank MH}_{2,4}(\text{Dod}) \neq 0$ while $\text{rank MH}_{2,4}(\text{Des}) = 0$ (Table 3 and Table 4). Therefore Dod and Des have different magnitude homology. \square

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
0	20								
1		60							
2			60						
3			120	60					
4			60	360	60				
5				380	600	60			
6				60	1320	840	60		
7					1020	3240	1080	60	
8					180	4620	6120	1320	60

TABLE 3. Magnitude homology of the dodecahedral graph

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
0	20								
1		60							
2			60						
3			120	60					
4				300	60				
5				20	240	60			
6					660	240	60		
7						1380	240	60	
8						300	900	240	60

TABLE 4. Magnitude homology of the Desargues graph

APPENDIX B. GEODETIC PTOLEMAIC GRAPHS

In this appendix, we prove that graphs that are both ptolemaic and geodetic are diagonal using algebraic Morse theory. Recall that a graph is ptolemaic if for every four vertices (x, y, z, w) , we have Ptolemy's inequality

$$d(x, y)d(z, w) + d(y, z)d(x, w) \geq d(x, z)d(y, w),$$

and a graph is geodetic if there is only one shortest path between any two vertices. Here we use an equivalent characterization of ptolemaic graphs.

Proposition B.1. *Let G be a graph. The following are equivalent.*

- (1) G is ptolemaic.
- (2) For every four vertices (x, y, z, w) with $y \neq z$, $d(x, y) + d(y, z) = d(x, z)$ and $d(y, z) + d(z, w) = d(y, w)$, we have $d(x, y) + d(y, z) + d(z, w) = d(x, w)$.
- (3) For every four vertices (x, y, z, w) with $d(x, y) + d(y, z) = d(x, z)$, $d(y, z) + d(z, w) = d(y, w)$, and $d(x, y) = d(y, z) = 1$, we have $d(x, y) + d(y, z) + d(z, w) = d(x, w)$.
- (4) G is chordal and distance-hereditary. (Recall that a graph is chordal if it does not contain an induced cycle of length at least 4, and a graph is distance-hereditary if every induced path is a shortest path.)

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2): Suppose G is ptolemaic and we have four vertices (x, y, z, w) with $y \neq z$, $d(x, y) + d(y, z) = d(x, z)$ and $d(y, z) + d(z, w) = d(y, w)$. Expanding and simplifying Ptolemy's inequality, we get $d(x, w) \geq d(x, y) + d(y, z) + d(z, w)$. (This step uses $d(y, z) \neq 0$.) By triangle inequality, we have $d(x, w) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, z) + d(z, w)$. So $d(x, w) = d(x, y) + d(y, z) + d(z, w)$.

(2) \Rightarrow (3): Obvious.

(3) \Rightarrow (4): Let us first prove a lemma.

Lemma B.2. *Let G be a graph satisfying (3). Let $k \geq 1$ and (x_0, \dots, x_k) be a sequence of vertices with $d(x_i, x_{i+1}) = 1$ and $d(x_i, x_{i+2}) = 2$ for all i . Then $d(x_0, x_k) = k$.*

Proof. Let us prove by induction.

Induction base $k = 1$ and $k = 2$ are trivial.

Assume $k \geq 3$ and that the result holds for $k' = 2, 3, \dots, k - 1$. Then we know $d(x_1, x_k) = k - 1$ and $d(x_2, x_k) = k - 2$ by induction hypothesis. Applying (3) to (x_0, x_1, x_2, x_k) , we get $d(x_0, x_k) = k$. This completes the induction step. \square

Now we return to the proof of (3) \Rightarrow (4). Suppose G is not chordal and there is an induced cycle $(x_0, \dots, x_k, x_{k+1} = x_0)$ with $k \geq 3$. Because this an induced cycle, we have $d(x_i, x_{i+2}) = 2$ for all i . By Lemma B.2, $d(x_0, x_{k+1}) = k + 1$. Contradiction. So G is chordal. That G is distance-hereditary is immediate from Lemma B.2.

(4) \Leftrightarrow (1): Proved by Howorka [How81]. \square

Remark B.3. (3) is the characterization we use. (2) is a notion used in Leinster and Shulman [LS17]. That (2) implies chordal is essentially known in op. cit., Example 7.17.

Theorem B.4. *A geodetic ptolemaic graph is diagonal.*

Proof. Let G be a geodetic ptolemaic graph. We define a function $\sigma : \{(u, v) \in V(G) \times V(G) : d(u, v) \geq 2\} \rightarrow V(G)$ that maps (u, v) to the unique vertex w with $d(u, w) = 1$ and $d(u, v) = d(u, w) + d(v, w)$. Existence and uniqueness follows from that G is geodetic.

Let us describe the matching rule. Fix a sequence (x_0, \dots, x_k) with unmatched prefix (x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) .

- (1) If $k \geq 2$ and $x_{k-1} = \sigma(x_{k-2}, x_k)$, then $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \delta$.
- (2) If $k \geq 1$, $d(x_{k-1}, x_k) \geq 2$, and not $(k \geq 2 \wedge x_{k-1} = \sigma(x_{k-2}, x_k))$, then $F(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \iota(\sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k))$.

Let us prove that F is a valid matching rule. Fix a sequence (x_0, \dots, x_k) with unmatched prefix (x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) .

- (1) Suppose $k \geq 2$ and $x_{k-1} = \sigma(x_{k-2}, x_k)$. Clearly $d(x_{k-2}, x_k) \geq 2$. Also, if $k \geq 3$ and $x_{k-2} = \sigma(x_{k-3}, x_k)$, then $x_{k-2} = \sigma(x_{k-3}, x_{k-1})$ and $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) = \delta$, which is not true. So we have $\neg(k \geq 3 \wedge x_{k-2} = \sigma(x_{k-3}, x_k))$. So $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-2}, x_k) = \iota(\sigma(x_{k-2}, x_k)) = \iota(x_{k-1})$.
- (2) Suppose $k \geq 1$, $d(x_{k-1}, x_k) \geq 2$, and not $(k \geq 2 \wedge x_{k-1} = \sigma(x_{k-2}, x_k))$. Because $d(x_{k-1}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k)) = 1$, we have $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k)) \neq \iota(*)$. If $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k)) = \delta$, then $k \geq 2$ and $x_{k-1} = \sigma(x_{k-2}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k))$. Applying ptolemaic characterization (3) to $(x_{k-2}, x_{k-1}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k), x_k)$, we get $x_{k-1} = \sigma(x_{k-2}, x_k)$, which is not true. So $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k)) = \epsilon$ and thus $F(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, \sigma(x_{k-1}, x_k), x_k) = \delta$.

It is easy to see that F is a diagonal matching rule.

Let M be the prefix matching generated by F . Let us prove that M is a Morse matching. Work in the setting of Lemma 3.7. Suppose in $\Gamma_{MC_{*,*}}^M(G)$ there is a directed cycle $a_1 \rightarrow b_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow b_p \rightarrow a_{p+1} = a_1$. Define d_i, c_i, u_i accordingly.

By Corollary 3.13, we have $d(a_{1,d_1-1}, a_{1,d_1}) = 1$. Because of the edge $a_1 \rightarrow b_1$, we have $d(a_{1,d_1-1}, a_{1,d_1}) + d(a_{1,d_1}, a_{1,d_1+1}) = d(a_{1,d_1-1}, a_{1,d_1+1})$. So $a_{1,d_1} = \sigma(a_{1,d_1-1}, a_{1,d_1+1})$. Also, by the edge $b_1 \rightarrow a_2$, we have $a_{2,c_1+1} = \sigma(a_{2,c_1}, a_{2,c_1+2})$. By Lemma 3.11, we have $c_1 = d_1 - 1$. Also, we have $a_{1,j} = b_{1,j} = a_{2,j}$ for $j \leq d_1 - 1$, and $a_{1,j} = b_{1,j-1} = a_{2,j}$ for $j \geq d_1 + 1$. So $a_{2,d_1} = a_{1,d_1}$, and therefore $a_2 = a_1$. Then edges $a_1 \rightarrow b_1$ and $b_1 \rightarrow a_2$ cannot both exist in $\Gamma_{MC_{*,*}}^M(G)$. Contradiction. So M is a Morse matching.

By Corollary 3.10, the graph G is diagonal. \square

It may sound like that Theorem B.4 gives new diagonal graphs. However, by Kay and Chartrand [KC65], a graph that is both ptolemaic and weakly geodetic (a notion weaker than geodetic) is a block graph. Recall that a block graph is a graph whose every biconnected component is a clique. Every (connected) block graph can be constructed by the following process.

- (1) A single vertex is a block graph.
- (2) Suppose $Y = X \cup K$, where X is a block graph, K is a clique, and $X \cap K$ is a single vertex. Then Y is a block graph.

So the diagonality of block graphs follows from Meyer-Vietoris (Hepworth and Willerton [HW17] Theorem 29). In other words, Theorem B.4 is a known result. Nevertheless, the proof using algebraic Morse theory is new and might be of interest.

REFERENCES

- [How81] E. Howorka. A characterization of ptolemaic graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 5(3):323–331, 1981.
- [HW17] R. Hepworth and S. Willerton. Categorifying the magnitude of a graph. *Homology, Homotopy and Applications*, 19(2):31–60, 2017.
- [Jöl05] M. Jöllenbeck. *Algebraic discrete Morse theory and applications to commutative algebra*. PhD thesis, Philipps-Universität Marburg, 2005.
- [KC65] D. C. Kay and G. Chartrand. A characterization of certain ptolemaic graphs. *Canad. J. Math*, 17:342–346, 1965.
- [LC12] T. Leinster and C. A. Cobbold. Measuring diversity: the importance of species similarity. *Ecology*, 93(3):477–489, 2012.
- [Lei13] T. Leinster. The magnitude of metric spaces. *Documenta Mathematica*, 18:857–905, 2013.

- [Lei17] T. Leinster. The magnitude of a graph. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, page 118, 2017.
- [LS17] T. Leinster and M. Shulman. Magnitude homology of enriched categories and metric spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.00802*, 2017.
- [LV16] L. Lampret and A. Vavpetič. (Co)homology of lie algebras via algebraic Morse theory. *Journal of Algebra*, 463:254–277, 2016.
- [Skö06] E. Sköldberg. Morse theory from an algebraic viewpoint. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 358(1):115–129, 2006.