

# Cancellation of a critical pair in discrete Morse theory and its effect on (co)boundary operators

Anupam Mondal <sup>a</sup>, Sajal Mukherjee <sup>b</sup>, and Pritam Chandra Pramanik <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a,b,c</sup>Institute for Advancing Intelligence (IAI), TCG CREST, Kolkata – 700091, West Bengal, India

<sup>a,b</sup>Academy of Scientific & Innovative Research (AcSIR), Ghaziabad – 201002, Uttar Pradesh, India

<sup>c</sup>Department of Mathematics, National Institute of Technology (NIT) Durgapur, Durgapur – 713209, West Bengal, India

{anupam.mondal, sajal.mukherjee, pritam.pramanik.80}@tcgcrest.org

## Abstract

Discrete Morse theory helps us compute the homology groups of simplicial complexes in an efficient manner. A “good” gradient vector field reduces the number of critical simplices, simplifying the homology calculations by reducing them to the computation of homology groups of a simpler chain complex. This homology computation hinges on an efficient enumeration of gradient trajectories. The technique of cancelling pairs of critical simplices reduces the number of critical simplices, though it also perturbs the gradient trajectories. In this article, we demonstrate that (the matrix of) a certain modified boundary operator of interest can be derived from the corresponding original boundary operator through a sequence of elementary row operations. Thus, it eliminates the need of enumeration of the new gradient trajectories. We also obtain a similar result for coboundary operators.

**Keywords:** discrete Morse theory, gradient vector field, Morse complex, chain complex, homology, boundary operator.

*MSC 2020:* 57Q70 (primary), 05E45, 55U15.

## 1 Introduction

Discrete Morse theory, introduced by Forman [6], serves as a combinatorial counterpart to (smooth) Morse theory (see also [4, 8, 12, 13, 17]). Over time, it has proven to be highly valuable across various areas of theoretical and applied mathematics, as well as in computer science. At the core of this theory is the concept of a *discrete Morse function* defined on a finite simplicial complex (or, a regular CW complex). This function helps us obtain a more efficient cell decomposition for the complex by reducing the number of simplices (or, cells) while preserving its homotopy-type.

In practice, rather than working directly with discrete Morse functions, we often use an equivalent and more practical notion, namely, (discrete) *gradient vector fields*. The homotopy-type of the complex is completely determined by only simplices that are *critical* with respect

to the assigned gradient vector field. Thus we are required to start with a gradient vector field that admits a low number of critical simplices. An *optimal gradient vector field* is one that minimizes the number of critical simplices. However, finding such an optimal gradient vector field is an NP-hard problem, even for two-dimensional complexes [5, 11, 14].

Furthermore, discrete Morse theory offers efficient methods for computing topological invariants such as homology groups [15], Betti numbers, etc. We remark that these computations are dependent on the choice of gradient vector field that admits a low number of critical simplices, as well as one that allows an efficient (weighted) enumeration of important combinatorial objects, viz., *gradient trajectories*. The task of computing homology gets reduced to the computation of (discrete) *Morse homology groups*, which are homology groups of a relatively simpler chain complex, known as *Morse complex*.

The technique of *cancelling a pair of critical simplices* [6, 8] allows us to augment a given gradient vector field to a more efficient one. We note that cancellation of critical pairs perturbs the set of critical simplices, as well as (some of) the gradient trajectories. Therefore, to compute the Morse homology groups with respect to the improved gradient vector field obtained after cancellation, we are required to enumerate all possible gradient trajectories with respect to the new gradient vector field. However, in this article, we provide an explicit formula for the modified boundary operators (with respect to the improved gradient vector field), in terms of the boundary operators with respect to the gradient vector field before cancellation.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\Delta$  be a  $d$ -dimensional simplicial complex with an assigned gradient vector field  $\mathcal{V}$ . Let  $(\sigma_0^{(k)}, \tau_0^{(k-1)})$  be a cancellable critical pair, for some  $k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ , and  $\mathcal{W}$  be the gradient vector field obtained by cancelling  $(\sigma_0^{(k)}, \tau_0^{(k-1)})$  from  $\mathcal{V}$ . Let  $\partial_q^{\mathcal{V}} : C_q^{\mathcal{V}}(\Delta) \rightarrow C_{q-1}^{\mathcal{V}}(\Delta)$  and  $\partial_q^{\mathcal{W}} : C_q^{\mathcal{W}}(\Delta) \rightarrow C_{q-1}^{\mathcal{W}}(\Delta)$  be the  $q$ -th boundary maps of the Morse complexes corresponding to  $\mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathcal{W}$ , respectively. Then the following hold.*

(1) For  $q > k + 1$  or  $q < k - 1$ ,

$$\partial_q^{\mathcal{W}} = \partial_q^{\mathcal{V}}.$$

(2) If  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$  are the  $\mathcal{W}$ -critical  $k$ -simplices, and for any  $\mathcal{W}$ -critical  $(k + 1)$ -simplex  $\beta$ ,  $\partial_{k+1}^{\mathcal{V}}(\beta) = \sum_{j=0}^n b_j \sigma_j$ , then

$$\partial_{k+1}^{\mathcal{W}}(\beta) = \sum_{j=1}^n b_j \sigma_j.$$

(3) The operator  $\partial_{k-1}^{\mathcal{W}}$  is the restriction of  $\partial_{k-1}^{\mathcal{V}}$  to the subgroup  $C_{k-1}^{\mathcal{W}}(\Delta)$ , i.e.,

$$\partial_{k-1}^{\mathcal{W}} = \partial_{k-1}^{\mathcal{V}}|_{C_{k-1}^{\mathcal{W}}(\Delta)}.$$

(4) Let  $\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$  be the  $\mathcal{V}$ -critical  $k$ -simplices, and  $\tau_0, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_m$  be the  $\mathcal{V}$ -critical  $(k - 1)$ -simplices, and for all  $j \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ ,  $\partial_k^{\mathcal{V}}(\sigma_j) = \sum_{i=0}^m a_{ij} \tau_i$ . Then, for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,

$$\partial_k^{\mathcal{W}}(\sigma_j) = \sum_{i=1}^m (a_{ij} - a_{00} a_{0j} a_{i0}) \cdot \tau_i.$$

In other words, we may obtain (the matrix representation of)  $\partial_k^{\mathcal{W}}$  from  $\partial_k^{\mathcal{V}}$  by a sequence of elementary row (or, column) operations. Let the matrix  $B$  represent the boundary operator

$\partial_k^{\mathcal{V}}$ , with rows and columns indexed by  $0, 1, \dots, m$  ( $i$ -th row corresponds to  $\tau_i$ ) and  $0, 1, \dots, n$  ( $j$ -th column corresponds to  $\sigma_j$ ), respectively. We obtain a matrix  $B'$  from  $B$  as follows

$$B \xrightarrow[\text{for each } i \geq 1]{R_i - a_{i0} \cdot a_{00} \cdot R_0} B'.$$

Then  $\partial_k^{\mathcal{V}}$  is the submatrix of  $B'$ , obtained by deleting the 0-th row and the 0-th column.

We also provide an analogous explicit formula (in Theorem 3.6) for the modified coboundary operators. Finally in Appendix A, we include an example of change in a certain boundary operator, where the cancellation technique is applied twice.

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Basics of simplicial complex and simplicial (co)homology

**Definition 2.1** (Simplicial complex). An (abstract) *simplicial complex*  $\Delta$  is a (finite, nonempty) collection of finite sets with the property that if  $\sigma \in \Delta$  and  $\tau \subseteq \sigma$ , then  $\tau \in \Delta$ .

We note that the empty set is always in  $\Delta$ . If  $\sigma \in \Delta$ , then  $\sigma$  is called a *simplex* or a *face* of  $\Delta$ . The dimension of a simplex  $\sigma$ ,  $\dim(\sigma) = |\sigma| - 1$ . If  $\dim(\sigma) = d$ , we call  $\sigma$  a *d-dimensional simplex* (or simply, a *d-simplex*). We denote a  $d$ -simplex  $\sigma$  by  $\sigma^{(d)}$  whenever necessary. The dimension of a simplicial complex  $\Delta$ ,  $\dim(\Delta) = \max\{\dim(\sigma) : \sigma \in \Delta\}$ . The *vertex set* of a simplicial complex  $\Delta$ ,  $V(\Delta)$ , is the collection of all elements in all the faces (i.e.,  $V(\Delta) = \cup_{\sigma \in \Delta} \sigma$ ). The elements of  $V(\Delta)$  are called the *vertices* of the complex  $\Delta$ .

An *orientation* of a simplex is given by an ordering of its vertices, with two orderings defining the same orientation if and only if they differ by an even permutation. Let  $V(\Delta) = \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_\ell\}$ . We denote an oriented  $q$ -simplex  $\sigma$  consisting of the vertices  $x_{i_0}, x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_q}$ , with  $i_0 < i_1 < \dots < i_q$ , by  $[x_{i_0}, x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_q}]$ . In order to avoid notational complicacy, whenever necessary, we denote the oriented  $q$ -simplex  $[x_{i_0}, x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_q}]$  by  $\sigma$  as well.

**Definition 2.2** (Incidence number between simplices). Let  $\sigma^{(q)} = [x_0, x_1, \dots, x_q]$  and  $\tau^{(q-1)}$  be oriented simplices of a simplicial complex  $\Delta$ . Then the *Incidence number* between  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  is denoted by  $\langle \sigma, \tau \rangle$ , and defined by

$$\langle \sigma, \tau \rangle = \begin{cases} (-1)^i, & \text{if } \tau = [x_0, \dots, \widehat{x}_i, \dots, x_q], \\ 0, & \text{if } \tau \not\subseteq \sigma, \end{cases}$$

where  $[x_0, \dots, \widehat{x}_i, \dots, x_q]$  is the  $(q-1)$ -simplex obtained from  $\sigma$  after deleting  $x_i$ , with the induced orientation.

For an integer  $q$ , let  $S_q(\Delta)$  be the set of all  $q$ -dimensional simplices of  $\Delta$ , and  $C_q(\Delta)$  be the free abelian group generated by  $S_q(\Delta)$ . So if  $|S_q(\Delta)| = m$ , then  $C_q(\Delta) \cong \mathbb{Z}^m$ . If  $\dim(\Delta) = d$ , for  $q < 0$  or  $q > d$ , then  $C_q(\Delta) = \{0\}$ . We define the homomorphisms  $\partial_q : C_q(\Delta) \rightarrow C_{q-1}(\Delta)$  and  $\delta_q : C_{q-1}(\Delta) \rightarrow C_q(\Delta)$  by linearly extending the following maps.

$$\partial_q(\sigma) = \sum_{\tau \in S_{q-1}(\Delta)} \langle \sigma, \tau \rangle \cdot \tau, \text{ and } \delta_q(\alpha) = \sum_{\beta \in S_q(\Delta)} \langle \beta, \alpha \rangle \cdot \beta,$$

where  $\sigma \in S_q$  and  $\alpha \in S_{q-1}$ .

So if,  $\dim(\Delta) = d$  we have two chain complexes,

$$\begin{aligned} \dots \rightarrow \{0\} \xrightarrow{\partial_{d+1}} C_d(\Delta) \xrightarrow{\partial_d} C_{d-1}(\Delta) \xrightarrow{\partial_{d-1}} \dots \xrightarrow{\partial_1} C_0(\Delta) \xrightarrow{\partial_0} \{0\} \rightarrow \dots \\ \dots \rightarrow \{0\} \xrightarrow{\delta_0} C_0(\Delta) \xrightarrow{\delta_1} C_1(\Delta) \xrightarrow{\delta_2} \dots \xrightarrow{\delta_d} C_d(\Delta) \xrightarrow{\delta_{d+1}} \{0\} \rightarrow \dots \end{aligned}$$

The first one is the *simplicial chain complex* and the second one is the *simplicial cochain complex* of  $\Delta$ . For  $q \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\partial_q$  is called the *q-th boundary map* of the simplicial chain complex and  $\delta_q$  is called the *q-th coboundary map* of the simplicial cochain complex of  $\Delta$ . The quotient groups  $H_q(\Delta) = \text{Ker}(\partial_q)/\text{Im}(\partial_{q+1})$  and  $H^q(\Delta) = \text{Ker}(\delta_{q+1})/\text{Im}(\delta_q)$  are the *q-th homology* and *cohomology group* of  $\Delta$ , respectively.

For further reading on the topics introduced in this subsection, we refer to *Elements of Algebraic Topology* [16] by Munkres.

## 2.2 Basics of discrete Morse theory

First, we introduce the notion of gradient vector field and some related concepts following [6, 7, 8].

**Definition 2.3** (Discrete vector field). A discrete vector field  $\mathcal{V}$  on a simplicial complex  $\Delta$  is a collection of ordered pairs of simplices of the form  $(\alpha, \beta)$ , such that

- (i)  $\alpha \subsetneq \beta$ ,
- (ii)  $\dim(\beta) = \dim(\alpha) + 1$ ,
- (iii) each simplex of  $\Delta$  is in *at most* one pair of  $\mathcal{V}$ .

If the simplex  $\alpha^{(q-1)}$  is paired off with the simplex  $\beta^{(q)}$  in  $\mathcal{V}$  (i.e.,  $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{V}$ ), then we diagrammatically represent the pair as  $\alpha \rightsquigarrow \beta$  (or  $\beta \leftarrow \alpha$ ).

**Definition 2.4** ( $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory). Given a discrete vector field  $\mathcal{V}$  on a complex  $\Delta$ , a  $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory from a  $q$ -simplex, say  $\beta_0$ , to a  $q$ -simplex, say  $\beta_r$ , (or, alternatively, to a  $(q-1)$ -simplex  $\alpha_{r+1}$ ) is a sequence of simplices

$$\beta_0^{(q)}, \alpha_1^{(q-1)}, \beta_1^{(q)}, \dots, \alpha_r^{(q-1)}, \beta_r^{(q)} \text{ (or, } \beta_0^{(q)}, \alpha_1^{(q-1)}, \beta_1^{(q)}, \dots, \alpha_r^{(q-1)}, \beta_r^{(q)}, \alpha_{r+1}^{(q-1)})$$

such that for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ , the pair  $(\alpha_i, \beta_i) \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $(\alpha_i \neq) \alpha_{i+1} \subsetneq \beta_i$ , and  $\alpha_1 \subsetneq \beta_0$ .

We represent such a  $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory  $P$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P : \beta_0^{(q)} \rightarrow \alpha_1^{(q-1)} \rightsquigarrow \beta_1^{(q)} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \alpha_r^{(q-1)} \rightsquigarrow \beta_r^{(q)} \\ \text{(or, } P : \beta_0^{(q)} \rightarrow \alpha_1^{(q-1)} \rightsquigarrow \beta_1^{(q)} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \alpha_r^{(q-1)} \rightsquigarrow \beta_r^{(q)} \rightarrow \alpha_{r+1}^{(q-1)}) \end{aligned}$$

(here “ $\rightarrow$ ” represents set inclusion). Such a trajectory is said to be a *nontrivial closed  $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory* if  $r > 0$  and  $\beta_r = \beta_0$ .

**Definition 2.5** (co- $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory). A *co- $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory* from a  $q$ -simplex, say  $\beta_0$ , to a  $q$ -simplex, say  $\beta_r$ , (or, alternatively to a  $(q+1)$ -simplex  $\tau_{r+1}$ ) is a sequence of simplices

$$\beta_0^{(q)}, \tau_1^{(q+1)}, \beta_1^{(q)}, \dots, \tau_r^{(q+1)}, \beta_r^{(q)} \quad (\text{or, } \beta_0^{(q)}, \tau_1^{(q+1)}, \beta_1^{(q)}, \dots, \tau_r^{(q+1)}, \beta_r^{(q)}, \tau_{r+1}^{(q+1)})$$

such that for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ , the pair  $(\beta_i, \tau_i) \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $(\beta_i \neq) \beta_{i-1} \subsetneq \tau_i$ , and  $\beta_r \subsetneq \tau_{r+1}$ .

We represent such a co- $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory  $Q$  as follows:

$$Q : \beta_0^{(q)} \leftarrow \tau_1^{(q+1)} \leftarrow \beta_1^{(q)} \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow \tau_r^{(q+1)} \leftarrow \beta_r^{(q)}$$

$$(\text{or, } Q : \beta_0^{(q)} \leftarrow \tau_1^{(q+1)} \leftarrow \beta_1^{(q)} \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow \tau_r^{(q+1)} \leftarrow \beta_r^{(q)} \leftarrow \tau_{r+1}^{(q+1)}).$$

Such a trajectory is said to be a *nontrivial closed co- $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory* if  $r > 0$  and  $\beta_r = \beta_0$ .

When  $P : \beta_0^{(q)} \rightarrow \alpha_1^{(q-1)} \rightsquigarrow \beta_1^{(q)} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \alpha_r^{(q-1)} \rightsquigarrow \beta_r^{(q)}$  is a  $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory, the *weight* of  $P$  is defined by

$$w_{\mathcal{V}}(P) = \prod_{i=1}^r (-\langle \beta_{i-1}, \alpha_i \rangle \langle \beta_i, \alpha_i \rangle).$$

Similarly, when  $P : \beta_0^{(q)} \rightarrow \alpha_1^{(q-1)} \rightsquigarrow \beta_1^{(q)} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \alpha_r^{(q-1)} \rightsquigarrow \beta_r^{(q)} \rightarrow \alpha_{r+1}^{(q-1)}$ ,

$$w_{\mathcal{V}}(P) = \left( \prod_{i=1}^r (-\langle \beta_{i-1}, \alpha_i \rangle \langle \beta_i, \alpha_i \rangle) \right) \cdot \langle \beta_r, \alpha_{r+1} \rangle.$$

Abusing the notation, we drop the parameter  $\mathcal{V}$  from  $w_{\mathcal{V}}(P)$  for the sake of simplicity; it should be understood from the context.

When  $Q : \beta_0^{(q)} \leftarrow \tau_1^{(q+1)} \leftarrow \beta_1^{(q)} \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow \tau_r^{(q+1)} \leftarrow \beta_r^{(q)}$  is a co- $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory, the *weight* of  $Q$  is defined by

$$w(Q) = \prod_{i=1}^r (-\langle \tau_i, \beta_{i-1} \rangle \langle \tau_i, \beta_i \rangle)$$

Similarly, when  $Q : \beta_0^{(q)} \leftarrow \tau_1^{(q+1)} \leftarrow \beta_1^{(q)} \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow \tau_r^{(q+1)} \leftarrow \beta_r^{(q)} \leftarrow \tau_{r+1}^{(q+1)}$ ,

$$w(Q) = \left( \prod_{i=1}^r (-\langle \tau_i, \beta_{i-1} \rangle \langle \tau_i, \beta_i \rangle) \right) \cdot \langle \tau_{r+1}, \beta_r \rangle.$$

The (co-)trajectory  $P$  is said to be *trivial* if  $r = 0$ . In this case,  $w(P)$  is defined to be 1. We note that, the weight of any (co-)trajectory is either 1 or  $-1$ .

We observe that, for a given discrete vector field  $\mathcal{V}$  on a simplicial complex  $\Delta$ , there exists no nontrivial closed  $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory if and only if there exists no nontrivial closed co- $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory.

**Definition 2.6** (Gradient vector field). A *gradient vector field* on a complex  $\Delta$  is a discrete vector field  $\mathcal{V}$  on  $\Delta$  which does not admit nontrivial closed  $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectories (equivalently, nontrivial closed co- $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectories).

We remark that a gradient vector field is also referred to as an *acyclic matching* in literature [4]. We may also call a  $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory a *gradient trajectory*, when  $\mathcal{V}$  is a gradient vector field.

Let  $P : \eta_0, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_r$  be a gradient trajectory (or, a sequence of simplices in general). For  $(0 \leq) i < j (\leq r)$ , we denote the (sub)sequence of simplices from  $\eta_i$  to  $\eta_j$  by  $\eta_i P \eta_j$ , i.e.,

$$\eta_i P \eta_j : \eta_i, \eta_{(i+1)}, \dots, \eta_j.$$

Now, suppose

$$P_1 : \eta_0, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i, \dots, \eta_r, \text{ and } P_2 : \eta'_0, \eta'_1, \dots, \eta'_j, \dots, \eta'_s$$

are two gradient trajectories, such that  $\eta_i = \eta'_j$ . For  $\ell \leq i$  and  $t \geq j$ , we denote the concatenation of  $\eta_\ell P_1 \eta_i$  and  $\eta'_j P_2 \eta'_t$  by  $\eta_\ell P_1 \eta_i P_2 \eta'_t$  (or,  $\eta_\ell P_1 \eta'_j P_2 \eta'_t$ ), i.e.,

$$\eta_\ell P_1 \eta_i P_2 \eta'_t : \eta_\ell, \eta_{\ell+1}, \dots, \eta_i (= \eta'_j), \eta'_{j+1}, \dots, \eta'_t.$$

We use similar intuitive notation, e.g.,  $\eta_\ell P_1 \eta_j P_2 \eta'_t P_3 \eta''_u$  (defined associatively), for three or more trajectories or sequences.

**Definition 2.7** (Critical simplex). Let  $\mathcal{V}$  be a gradient vector field on a complex  $\Delta$ . A nonempty simplex  $\sigma$  is said to be a  $\mathcal{V}$ -critical simplex (or, a *critical simplex*, when the gradient vector field is clear from the context) if one of the following holds:

- (i)  $\sigma$  does not appear in any pair of  $\mathcal{V}$ , or
- (ii)  $\sigma$  is a 0-simplex and  $(\emptyset, \sigma) \in \mathcal{V}$ .

Also,  $\text{Crit}_q^{\mathcal{V}}(\Delta)$  is the set of all  $q$ -dimensional  $\mathcal{V}$ -critical simplices.

The following important theorem presents a method for reducing the number of critical simplices in a given gradient vector field on a simplicial complex.

**Theorem 2.8** (Cancellation of a pair of critical simplices, [6, 8]). *Suppose  $\mathcal{V}$  is a gradient vector field on a  $d$ -dimensional simplicial complex  $\Delta$ , such that  $\sigma^{(k)}$  and  $\tau^{(k-1)}$  are critical, for some  $k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ . If there is a unique  $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory from  $\sigma^{(k)}$  to  $\tau^{(k-1)}$  (we call such a pair  $(\sigma^{(k)}, \tau^{(k-1)})$  a ‘cancellable critical pair’), then there is a gradient vector field  $\mathcal{W}$  on  $\Delta$  such that the critical simplices with respect to  $\mathcal{W}$  remain the same, except that  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  are no longer critical. Moreover,  $\mathcal{W}$  is same as  $\mathcal{V}$  except along the unique  $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory from  $\sigma$  to  $\tau$ .*

A sketch of a proof is as follows. Let the unique  $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory  $P$  from  $\sigma$  to  $\tau$  be

$$P : (\sigma^{(k)} =) \beta_0^{(k)}, \alpha_1^{(k-1)}, \beta_1^{(k)}, \dots, \alpha_r^{(k-1)}, \beta_r^{(k)}, \alpha_{r+1}^{(k-1)} (= \tau^{(k-1)}).$$

We get  $\mathcal{W}$  from  $\mathcal{V}$  by removing  $(\alpha_i, \beta_i)$ , for  $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ , and adding  $(\alpha_{i+1}, \beta_i)$ , for  $i \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{W} = (\mathcal{V} \setminus \{(\alpha_i, \beta_i) : i \in \{1, \dots, r\}\}) \sqcup \{(\alpha_{i+1}, \beta_i) : i \in \{0, \dots, r\}\}$$

( $\sqcup$  denotes the union of disjoint sets).

In other words we have the following diagram:

$$P : (\sigma^{(k)} =) \beta_0^{(k)} \rightarrow \alpha_1^{(k-1)} \rightsquigarrow \beta_1^{(k)} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \alpha_r^{(k-1)} \rightsquigarrow \beta_r^{(k)} \rightarrow \alpha_{r+1}^{(k-1)} (= \tau^{(k-1)}).$$

We obtain  $\mathcal{W}$  from  $\mathcal{V}$  by flipping the arrows, with ‘ $\rightarrow$ ’ becoming ‘ $\leftarrow$ ’ and ‘ $\rightsquigarrow$ ’ becoming ‘ $\leftarrow$ ’, as follows.

$$(\sigma^{(k)} =) \beta_0^{(k)} \leftarrow \alpha_1^{(k-1)} \leftarrow \beta_1^{(k)} \leftarrow \cdots \leftarrow \alpha_r^{(k-1)} \leftarrow \beta_r^{(k)} \leftarrow \alpha_{r+1}^{(k-1)} (= \tau^{(k-1)}).$$

The uniqueness of the  $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory from  $\sigma$  to  $\tau$  guarantees that  $\mathcal{W}$  is also a gradient vector field on  $\Delta$ . This also implies that  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  are not critical with respect to  $\mathcal{W}$ , while the criticality of all other simplices remains unchanged.

The following allows us to apply the technique above to cancel several pairs of critical simplices simultaneously.

**Theorem 2.9.** [10] *Let  $\mathcal{V}$  be a gradient vector field on a complex  $\Delta$  such that, for  $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ , there is a unique  $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory  $P_i$  from a critical  $k_i$ -simplex  $\sigma_i$  to the critical  $(k_i - 1)$ -simplex  $\tau_i$ . If there is no nonidentity permutation  $\pi$  of  $t$  elements such that there is a  $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory from  $\sigma_i$  to  $\tau_{\pi(i)}$ , for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ , then reversing all the  $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectories  $P_i$  (to cancel the critical pair  $\tau_i$  and  $\sigma_i$ ) would still produce a gradient vector field on  $\Delta$ .*

Here we remark that Benedetti, Lutz, et al. proposed a methodology for searching optimal discrete gradient vector fields with a random heuristic [1, 2, 3]. This approach turned out to be successful, even in some cases with a large input size.

## 2.3 Morse complex and co-Morse complex

For a given gradient vector field  $\mathcal{V}$  on a simplicial complex  $\Delta$ , this section introduces two chain complexes: the (discrete) Morse complex and the co-Morse complex. The Morse complex is homotopy equivalent to the simplicial chain complex, while the co-Morse complex is homotopy equivalent to the simplicial co-chain complex of  $\Delta$ . Consequently, their homology and cohomology groups are identical. Both of these chain complexes are generated by the  $\mathcal{V}$ -critical simplices of  $\Delta$ . It simplifies the computation of homology and cohomology compared to the original chain and co-chain complexes. We remark that the Morse complex is also referred to as *combinatorial Thom–Smale Complex* in literature [9].

Let  $C_q^\mathcal{V}(\Delta)$  be the free abelian group generated by  $\text{Crit}_q^\mathcal{V}(\Delta)$ . We define homomorphisms,  $\partial_q^\mathcal{V} : C_q^\mathcal{V}(\Delta) \rightarrow C_{q-1}^\mathcal{V}(\Delta)$  and  $\delta_q^\mathcal{V} : C_{q-1}^\mathcal{V}(\Delta) \rightarrow C_q^\mathcal{V}(\Delta)$  by linearly extending the following maps.

$$\partial_q^\mathcal{V}(\beta) = \sum_{\alpha \in \text{Crit}_{q-1}^\mathcal{V}(\Delta)} \left( \sum_{\substack{P:P \text{ is a} \\ \mathcal{V}\text{-traj. from} \\ \beta \text{ to } \alpha}} w(P) \right) \cdot \alpha, \quad \delta_q^\mathcal{V}(\sigma) = \sum_{\tau \in \text{Crit}_q^\mathcal{V}(\Delta)} \left( \sum_{\substack{Q:Q \text{ is a} \\ \text{co-}\mathcal{V}\text{-traj. from} \\ \sigma \text{ to } \tau}} w(Q) \right) \cdot \tau,$$

where  $\beta \in \text{Crit}_q^\mathcal{V}(\Delta)$  and  $\sigma \in \text{Crit}_{q-1}^\mathcal{V}(\Delta)$ .

**Lemma 2.10.** [7, 9] *for all  $q \in \mathbb{N}$ , (i)  $\partial_{q-1}^\mathcal{V} \circ \partial_q^\mathcal{V} = 0$ , (ii)  $\delta_q^\mathcal{V} \circ \delta_{q-1}^\mathcal{V} = 0$ .*

Lemma 2.10 lets us define the *Morse Complex*,

$$\cdots \rightarrow \{0\} \xrightarrow{\partial_{d+1}^{\mathcal{V}}} C_d^{\mathcal{V}}(\Delta) \xrightarrow{\partial_d^{\mathcal{V}}} C_{d-1}^{\mathcal{V}}(\Delta) \xrightarrow{\partial_{d-1}^{\mathcal{V}}} \cdots \rightarrow C_1^{\mathcal{V}}(\Delta) \xrightarrow{\partial_1^{\mathcal{V}}} C_0^{\mathcal{V}}(\Delta) \xrightarrow{\partial_0^{\mathcal{V}}} \{0\} \rightarrow \cdots,$$

and the *co-Morse Complex*,

$$\cdots \rightarrow \{0\} \xrightarrow{\delta_0^{\mathcal{V}}} C_0^{\mathcal{V}}(\Delta) \xrightarrow{\delta_1^{\mathcal{V}}} C_1^{\mathcal{V}}(\Delta) \xrightarrow{\delta_2^{\mathcal{V}}} \cdots \rightarrow C_{d-1}^{\mathcal{V}}(\Delta) \xrightarrow{\delta_d^{\mathcal{V}}} C_d^{\mathcal{V}}(\Delta) \xrightarrow{\delta_{d+1}^{\mathcal{V}}} \{0\} \rightarrow \cdots.$$

The map  $\partial_q^{\mathcal{V}}$  is called the  $q$ -th boundary map of the Morse complex and  $\delta_q^{\mathcal{V}}$  is called the  $q$ -th coboundary map of the co-Morse complex. By Lemma 2.10,  $\text{Im}(\partial_{q+1}^{\mathcal{V}})$  is a subgroup of  $\text{Ker}(\partial_q^{\mathcal{V}})$  and  $\text{Im}(\delta_q^{\mathcal{V}})$  is a subgroup of  $\text{Ker}(\delta_{q+1}^{\mathcal{V}})$ . The quotient groups  $H_q^{\mathcal{V}}(\Delta) = \text{Ker}(\partial_q^{\mathcal{V}})/\text{Im}(\partial_{q+1}^{\mathcal{V}})$  and  $H^{\mathcal{V},q}(\Delta) = \text{Ker}(\delta_{q+1}^{\mathcal{V}})/\text{Im}(\delta_q^{\mathcal{V}})$  are called the  $q$ -th *Morse homology group* and  $q$ -th *Morse cohomology group* of  $\Delta$ , respectively.

**Theorem 2.11.** [6, 7, 9] *Let  $\Delta$  be a simplicial complex, and  $\mathcal{V}$  be a gradient vector field defined on it. Then for any  $q \in \mathbb{N}$ , (i)  $H_q(\Delta)$  and  $H_q^{\mathcal{V}}(\Delta)$  are isomorphic, and (ii)  $H^q(\Delta)$  and  $H^{\mathcal{V},q}(\Delta)$  are isomorphic.*

### 3 Proof of the main theorem

Let  $\Delta$  be a  $d$ -dimensional simplicial complex, and  $\mathcal{V}$  be a gradient vector field defined on  $\Delta$  such that, for some  $k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ ,  $(\sigma_0^{(k)}, \tau_0^{(k-1)})$  is a cancellable critical pair. Let  $\mathcal{W}$  be the gradient vector field obtained by cancelling  $(\sigma_0^{(k)}, \tau_0^{(k-1)})$  from  $\mathcal{V}$ . Let  $\partial_q^{\mathcal{V}} : C_q^{\mathcal{V}} \rightarrow C_{q-1}^{\mathcal{V}}$  and  $\partial_q^{\mathcal{W}} : C_q^{\mathcal{W}} \rightarrow C_{q-1}^{\mathcal{W}}$  be the  $q$ -th boundary maps of the Morse complex of  $\Delta$  corresponding to the gradient vector fields  $\mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathcal{W}$ , respectively. Note that, when  $q \notin \{k, k-1\}$ ,  $\text{Crit}_q^{\mathcal{W}}(\Delta) = \text{Crit}_q^{\mathcal{V}}(\Delta)$ , and thus  $C_q^{\mathcal{W}}(\Delta) = C_q^{\mathcal{V}}(\Delta)$ .

$$\cdots \longrightarrow C_{k+2}^{\mathcal{V}}(\Delta) \xrightarrow{\partial_{k+2}^{\mathcal{V}}} C_{k+1}^{\mathcal{V}}(\Delta) \xrightarrow{\partial_{k+1}^{\mathcal{V}}} C_k^{\mathcal{V}}(\Delta) \xrightarrow{\partial_k^{\mathcal{V}}} C_{k-1}^{\mathcal{V}}(\Delta) \xrightarrow{\partial_{k-1}^{\mathcal{V}}} C_{k-2}^{\mathcal{V}}(\Delta) \xrightarrow{\partial_{k-2}^{\mathcal{V}}} \cdots$$

The image of any  $\mathcal{W}$ -critical  $q$ -simplex, under the map  $\partial_q^{\mathcal{W}}$ , depends only on the  $\mathcal{W}$ -trajectories from that simplex to the  $\mathcal{W}$ -critical  $(q-1)$ -simplices. Theorem 2.8 implies that, when  $q \neq k$ , the  $\mathcal{W}$ -trajectories and the  $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectories from a  $\mathcal{W}$ -critical  $q$ -simplex to a  $\mathcal{W}$ -critical  $(q-1)$ -simplex are identical. This implies, when  $q \neq k$ , for any  $\mathcal{W}$ -critical  $q$ -simplex  $\sigma$  and for any  $\mathcal{W}$ -critical  $(q-1)$ -simplex  $\tau$ , the coefficient of  $\tau$  in  $\partial_q^{\mathcal{W}}(\sigma)$  is the same as the coefficient of  $\tau$  in  $\partial_q^{\mathcal{V}}(\sigma)$ . So, the following can be deduced.

1. For  $q > k+1$  or  $q < k-1$ ,

$$\partial_q^{\mathcal{W}} = \partial_q^{\mathcal{V}}.$$

2. If  $\text{Crit}_k^{\mathcal{W}}(\Delta) = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n\}$  and for any  $\beta \in \text{Crit}_{k+1}^{\mathcal{W}}(\Delta)$ ,  $\partial_{k+1}^{\mathcal{V}}(\beta) = \sum_{j=0}^n b_j \sigma_j$ , then,

$$\partial_{k+1}^{\mathcal{W}}(\beta) = \sum_{j=1}^n b_j \sigma_j.$$








Figure 1:  $P$  is a  $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory (red) that starts from  $\sigma_0$ , follows along  $P_0$  (black) to  $\beta_s$  and then leaves  $P_0$  to reach  $\tau_i$ .

- (3) Any  $\mathcal{W}$ -trajectory from  $\sigma_j$  to  $\sigma_0$  first meets  $P_0$  at some  $(k-1)$ -simplex  $\alpha_t$ , where  $t \in \{1, \dots, r+1\}$  (see Figure 2), and follows along  $\overline{P_0}$  to  $\sigma_0$ . It is not possible for such a trajectory to leave  $\overline{P_0}$  after  $\alpha_t$ , otherwise it would give rise to a nontrivial closed  $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory, violating the *acyclicity* of the gradient vector field  $\mathcal{V}$ .




Figure 2:  $P$  is a  $\mathcal{W}$ -trajectory (red) from  $\sigma_j$  to  $\sigma_0$ , which meets  $P_0$  (black) at  $\alpha_t$ , then follows along  $\overline{P_0}$  to  $\sigma_0$ .

- (4) Any  $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory from  $\sigma_j$  to  $\tau_i$ , which involves some simplices from  $P_0$  has the following property. After starting from  $\sigma_j$ , it meets  $P_0$  at some  $(k-1)$ -simplex  $\alpha_t$ , where  $t \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ , then follows along  $P_0$  to some  $k$ -simplex  $\beta_s$ , with  $t \leq s \leq r$ , and then leaves  $P_0$  and ends at  $\tau_i$  (see Figure 3). Thus,  $P$  contains only the simplices  $\beta_t, \dots, \beta_s$  and  $\alpha_t, \dots, \alpha_s$  from  $P_0$ .




Figure 3:  $P$  (red) is a  $\mathcal{V}$ -trafejory from  $\sigma_j$  to  $\tau_i$  that meets  $P_0$  (black) at  $\alpha_t$ , follows along  $P_0$  to  $\beta_s$  and then leaves the trajectory  $P_0$  to reach  $\tau_i$ .

- (5) Any  $\mathcal{W}$ -trajectory from  $\sigma_j$  to  $\tau_i$ , which involves some simplices from  $P_0$  has the following property. After starting from  $\sigma_j$ , it meets  $P_0$  at some  $(k-1)$ -simplex  $\alpha_t$ , where  $t \in \{1, \dots, r+1\}$  then follows along  $\overline{P_0}$  to some  $k$ -simplex  $\beta_s$ , with  $0 \leq s < t$ , and then leaves  $P_0$  and ends at  $\tau_i$  (see Figure 4). Thus,  $P$  contains only the simplices  $\beta_s, \beta_{s+1}, \dots, \beta_{t-1}$  and  $\alpha_{s+1}, \alpha_{s+2}, \dots, \alpha_t$  from  $P_0$ .




Figure 4:  $P$  (red) is a  $\mathcal{W}$ -trajectory from  $\sigma_j$  to  $\tau_i$  that meets  $P_0$  (black) at  $\alpha_t$ , follows along  $\overline{P_0}$  to  $\beta_s$  and then leaves the trajectory  $P_0$  to reach  $\tau_i$ .

**Lemma 3.3.** For any  $\sigma_j \in \text{Crit}_k^{\mathcal{W}}(\Delta)$ ,

$$\sum_{\substack{P: P \text{ is a} \\ \mathcal{W}\text{-traj. from} \\ \sigma_j \text{ to } \sigma_0}} w(P) = -w(P_0) \cdot \sum_{\substack{P: P \text{ is a} \\ \mathcal{V}\text{-traj. from} \\ \sigma_j \text{ to } \tau_0}} w(P).$$

*Proof.* Any  $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory  $P$  from  $\sigma_j$  to  $\tau_0$  first meets  $P_0$  at some  $(k-1)$ -simplex, say  $\alpha_t$ , for some  $t \in \{1, \dots, r+1\}$ , and then follows along  $P_0$  to  $\tau_0$ . In this case,  $\sigma_j P \alpha_t \overline{P_0} \sigma_0$  is a  $\mathcal{W}$ -trajectory from  $\sigma_j$  to  $\sigma_0$  (see Figure 5). This gives a one-to-one correspondence between the  $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectories from  $\sigma_j$  to  $\tau_0$  and the  $\mathcal{W}$ -trajectories from  $\sigma_j$  to  $\sigma_0$ . Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} & w(\sigma_j P \alpha_t \overline{P_0} \sigma_0) \\ &= w(\sigma_j P \alpha_t) \cdot (-\langle \beta_{t-1}, \alpha_t \rangle) \cdot w(\beta_{t-1} \overline{P_0} \sigma_0) \\ &= w(\sigma_j P \alpha_t) \cdot (-\langle \beta_{t-1}, \alpha_t \rangle) \cdot w(\sigma_0 P_0 \beta_{t-1}) \\ &= w(\sigma_0 P_0 \beta_{t-1}) \cdot (-\langle \beta_{t-1}, \alpha_t \rangle) \cdot w(\sigma_j P \alpha_t) \\ &= w(\sigma_0 P_0 \beta_{t-1}) \cdot (-\langle \beta_{t-1}, \alpha_t \rangle) \cdot w(\sigma_j P \alpha_t) \cdot (\langle \beta_t, \alpha_t \rangle) \cdot \langle \beta_t, \alpha_t \rangle \cdot (w(\beta_t P_0 \tau_0) \cdot w(\beta_t P_0 \tau_0)) \\ &= - (w(\sigma_0 P_0 \beta_{t-1}) \cdot (-\langle \beta_{t-1}, \alpha_t \rangle) \cdot \langle \beta_t, \alpha_t \rangle) \cdot w(\beta_t P_0 \tau_0) \times (w(\sigma_j P \alpha_t) \cdot (-\langle \beta_t, \alpha_t \rangle) \cdot w(\beta_t P_0 \tau_0)) \\ &= -w(P_0) \cdot w(P). \end{aligned}$$



Similarly, if  $s < t$ , then  $\sigma_j P_1 \alpha_t \bar{P}_0 \beta_s P_2 \tau_i$  is a trajectory in  $\mathcal{Z}_1$  (see Figure 7) and

$$\begin{aligned}
& w(\sigma_j P_1 \alpha_t \bar{P}_0 \beta_s P_2 \tau_i) \\
&= w(\sigma_j P_1 \alpha_t) \cdot (-\langle \beta_{t-1}, \alpha_t \rangle) \cdot w(\beta_{t-1} \bar{P}_0 \beta_s) \cdot w(\beta_s P_2 \tau_i) \\
&= w(\sigma_j P_1 \alpha_t) \cdot (-\langle \beta_{t-1}, \alpha_t \rangle) \cdot w(\beta_{t-1} \bar{P}_0 \beta_s) \cdot w(\beta_s P_2 \tau_i) \cdot (w(\beta_s \bar{P}_0 \sigma_0) \cdot w(\sigma_0 P_0 \beta_s)) \\
&= (w(\sigma_j P_1 \alpha_t) \cdot (-\langle \beta_{t-1}, \alpha_t \rangle) \cdot w(\beta_{t-1} \bar{P}_0 \beta_s) \cdot w(\beta_s \bar{P}_0 \sigma_0)) \times (w(\sigma_0 P_0 \beta_s) \cdot w(\beta_s P_2 \tau_i)) \\
&= w(P_1) \cdot w(P_2).
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

We now define a map  $\phi : \mathcal{T}_1 \times \mathcal{T}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{Z}_2$  as follows. For  $(P_1, P_2) \in \mathcal{T}_1 \times \mathcal{T}_2$ , such that  $\alpha_t$  is the simplex where  $P_1$  meets the trajectory  $P_0$ , and  $\beta_s$  is the simplex where  $P_2$  leaves the trajectory  $P_0$ ,

$$\phi((P_1, P_2)) = \begin{cases} \sigma_j P_1 \alpha_t P_0 \beta_s P_2 \tau_i, & \text{if } s \geq t, \\ \sigma_j P_1 \alpha_t \bar{P}_0 \beta_s P_2 \tau_i, & \text{if } s < t. \end{cases}$$




Figure 6:  $P_1$  (red) is a  $\mathcal{W}$ -trajectory from  $\sigma_j$  to  $\sigma_0$  which meets  $P_0$  at  $\alpha_t$ .  $P_2$  (blue) is a  $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory from  $\sigma_0$  to  $\tau_i$  which leaves  $P_0$  at  $\beta_s$ . For  $s \geq t$ ,  $\phi((P_1, P_2)) = \sigma_j P_1 \alpha_t P_0 \beta_s P_2 \tau_i$  (dotted black).




Figure 7:  $P_1$  (red) is a  $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory from  $\sigma_j$  to  $\sigma_0$  which meets  $P_0$  at  $\alpha_t$ .  $P_2$  (blue) is a  $\mathcal{W}$ -trajectory from  $\sigma_0$  to  $\tau_i$  which leaves  $P_0$  at  $\beta_s$ . For  $s < t$ ,  $\phi((P_1, P_2)) = \sigma_j P_1 \alpha_t \bar{P}_0 \beta_s P_2 \tau_i$  (dotted black).

We note that  $\phi$  is a bijection, and thus it follows that

$$\sum_{\substack{(P_1, P_2) \in \mathcal{T}_1 \times \mathcal{T}_2, \\ \phi((P_1, P_2)) \in \mathcal{Z}_1}} w(\phi((P_1, P_2))) = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{Z}_1} w(P)$$

and

$$\sum_{\substack{(P_1, P_2) \in \mathcal{T}_1 \times \mathcal{T}_2, \\ \phi((P_1, P_2)) \in \mathcal{Z}_2}} w(\phi((P_1, P_2))) = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{Z}_2} w(P).$$

So, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{Z}_1} w(P) - \sum_{P \in \mathcal{Z}_2} w(P) &= \sum_{\substack{(P_1, P_2) \in \mathcal{T}_1 \times \mathcal{T}_2, \\ \phi((P_1, P_2)) \in \mathcal{Z}_1}} w(\phi((P_1, P_2))) - \sum_{\substack{(P_1, P_2) \in \mathcal{T}_1 \times \mathcal{T}_2, \\ \phi((P_1, P_2)) \in \mathcal{Z}_2}} w(\phi((P_1, P_2))) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{(P_1, P_2) \in \mathcal{T}_1 \times \mathcal{T}_2, \\ \phi((P_1, P_2)) \in \mathcal{Z}_1}} w(\sigma_j P_1 \alpha_t \bar{P}_0 \beta_s P_2 \tau_i) - \sum_{\substack{(P_1, P_2) \in \mathcal{T}_1 \times \mathcal{T}_2, \\ \phi((P_1, P_2)) \in \mathcal{Z}_2}} w(\sigma_j P_1 \alpha_t P_0 \beta_s P_2 \tau_i) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{(P_1, P_2) \in \mathcal{T}_1 \times \mathcal{T}_2, \\ \phi((P_1, P_2)) \in \mathcal{Z}_1}} w(P_1) \cdot w(P_2) + \sum_{\substack{(P_1, P_2) \in \mathcal{T}_1 \times \mathcal{T}_2, \\ \phi((P_1, P_2)) \in \mathcal{Z}_2}} w(P_1) \cdot w(P_2) \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{from Eqn. (1)} \\ \text{and Eqn. (2)} \end{array} \right) \\ &= \sum_{(P_1, P_2) \in \mathcal{T}_1 \times \mathcal{T}_2} w(P_1) \cdot w(P_2) \\ &= \sum_{P_1 \in \mathcal{T}_1} w(P_1) \cdot \sum_{P_2 \in \mathcal{T}_2} w(P_2). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{P: P \text{ is a} \\ \mathcal{W}\text{-traj. from} \\ \sigma_j \text{ to } \tau_i, \\ P_0 \cap P \neq \emptyset}} w(P) &= \sum_{P \in \mathcal{Z}_1} w(P) \\ &= \sum_{P \in \mathcal{Z}_2} w(P) + \sum_{P_1 \in \mathcal{T}_1} w(P_1) \cdot \sum_{P_2 \in \mathcal{T}_2} w(P_2) \quad (\text{from Equation (3)}) \\ &= \sum_{P \in \mathcal{Z}_2} w(P) + \left( -w(P_0) \cdot \sum_{\substack{P: P \text{ is a} \\ \mathcal{V}\text{-traj. from} \\ \sigma_j \text{ to } \sigma_0}} w(P) \right) \cdot \sum_{P_2 \in \mathcal{T}_2} w(P_2) \quad (\text{from Lemma 3.3}) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{P: P \text{ is a} \\ \mathcal{V}\text{-traj. from} \\ \sigma_j \text{ to } \tau_i, \\ P_0 \cap P \neq \emptyset}} w(P) - \left( w(P_0) \times \sum_{\substack{P: P \text{ is a} \\ \mathcal{V}\text{-traj. from} \\ \sigma_j \text{ to } \sigma_0}} w(P) \times \sum_{\substack{P: P \text{ is a} \\ \mathcal{V}\text{-traj. from} \\ \sigma_0 \text{ to } \tau_i}} w(P) \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

We now proceed to the proof of Proposition 3.1.

*Proof of Proposition 3.1.* We have, for all  $j \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ ,  $\partial_k^{\mathcal{V}}(\sigma_j) = \sum_{i=0}^m a_{ij} \tau_i$ , where

$$a_{ij} = \sum_{\substack{P:P \text{ is a} \\ \mathcal{V}\text{-traj. from} \\ \sigma_j \text{ to } \tau_i}} w(P).$$

Since,  $P_0$  is the unique  $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory from  $\sigma_0$  to  $\tau_0$ ,  $a_{00} = w(P_0)$ . For any  $\mathcal{W}$ -critical  $k$ -simplex  $\sigma_j$  and any  $\mathcal{W}$ -critical  $(k-1)$ -simplex  $\tau_i$ , the coefficient of  $\tau_i$  in  $\partial_k^{\mathcal{W}}(\sigma_j)$  is

$$\sum_{\substack{P:P \text{ is a} \\ \mathcal{W}\text{-traj. from} \\ \sigma_j \text{ to } \tau_i}} w(P).$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{P:P \text{ is a} \\ \mathcal{W}\text{-traj. from} \\ \sigma_j \text{ to } \tau_i}} w(P) &= \sum_{\substack{P:P \text{ is a} \\ \mathcal{W}\text{-traj. from} \\ \sigma_j \text{ to } \tau_i, \\ P_0 \cap P = \emptyset}} w(P) + \sum_{\substack{P:P \text{ is a} \\ \mathcal{W}\text{-traj. from} \\ \sigma_j \text{ to } \tau_i, \\ P_0 \cap P \neq \emptyset}} w(P) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{P:P \text{ is a} \\ \mathcal{V}\text{-traj. from} \\ \sigma_j \text{ to } \tau_i, \\ P_0 \cap P = \emptyset}} w(P) + \sum_{\substack{P:P \text{ is a} \\ \mathcal{W}\text{-traj. from} \\ \sigma_j \text{ to } \tau_i, \\ P_0 \cap P \neq \emptyset}} w(P) \quad (\text{by Observation 3.2.(1)}) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{P:P \text{ is a} \\ \mathcal{V}\text{-traj. from} \\ \sigma_j \text{ to } \tau_i, \\ P_0 \cap P = \emptyset}} w(P) + \sum_{\substack{P:P \text{ is a} \\ \mathcal{V}\text{-traj. from} \\ \sigma_j \text{ to } \tau_i, \\ P_0 \cap P \neq \emptyset}} w(P) \\ &\quad - \left( w(P_0) \times \sum_{\substack{P:P \text{ is a} \\ \mathcal{V}\text{-traj. from} \\ \sigma_j \text{ to } \sigma_0}} w(P) \times \sum_{\substack{P:P \text{ is a} \\ \mathcal{V}\text{-traj. from} \\ \sigma_0 \text{ to } \tau_i}} w(P) \right) \quad (\text{by Lemma 3.4}) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{P:P \text{ is a} \\ \mathcal{V}\text{-traj. from} \\ \sigma_j \text{ to } \tau_i}} w(P) - \left( w(P_0) \times \sum_{\substack{P:P \text{ is a} \\ \mathcal{V}\text{-traj. from} \\ \sigma_j \text{ to } \sigma_0}} w(P) \times \sum_{\substack{P:P \text{ is a} \\ \mathcal{V}\text{-traj. from} \\ \sigma_0 \text{ to } \tau_i}} w(P) \right) \\ &= a_{ij} - a_{00} a_{0j} a_{i0}. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Remark 3.5.** Considering the matrix representation of  $\partial_k^\mathcal{V}$ , we get the following.

$$\partial_k^\mathcal{V} = \begin{matrix} & \begin{matrix} \sigma_0 & \sigma_1 & \dots & \sigma_n \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} \tau_0 \\ \tau_1 \\ \vdots \\ \tau_i \\ \vdots \\ \tau_m \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} a_{00} & a_{01} & \dots & a_{0n} \\ a_{10} & a_{11} & \dots & a_{1n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \boxed{a_{i0} & a_{i1} & \dots & a_{in}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ a_{m0} & a_{m1} & \dots & a_{mn} \end{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} R_0 \\ R_1 \\ \vdots \\ R_i \\ \vdots \\ R_m \end{matrix} \end{matrix} \xrightarrow{a_{00} \cdot R_0} \begin{matrix} & \begin{matrix} \sigma_0 & \sigma_1 & \dots & \sigma_n \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} \tau_0 \\ \tau_1 \\ \vdots \\ \tau_i \\ \vdots \\ \tau_m \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a_{00}a_{01} & \dots & a_{00}a_{0n} \\ a_{10} & a_{11} & \dots & a_{1n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \boxed{a_{i0} & a_{i1} & \dots & a_{in}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ a_{m0} & a_{m1} & \dots & a_{mn} \end{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} R_0 \\ R_1 \\ \vdots \\ R_i \\ \vdots \\ R_m \end{matrix} \end{matrix} \quad \left( \begin{matrix} \text{since,} \\ a_{00} = \pm 1 \end{matrix} \right)$$

$$\begin{matrix} & \begin{matrix} \sigma_0 & \sigma_1 & \dots & \sigma_j & \dots & \sigma_n \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} \tau_0 \\ \tau_1 \\ \vdots \\ \tau_i \\ \vdots \\ \tau_m \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} \color{red}{\vdots} \\ \color{red}{0} \end{matrix} & \begin{matrix} \color{red}{a_{00}a_{01}} & \dots & \color{red}{a_{00}a_{0j}} & \dots & \color{red}{a_{00}a_{0n}} \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} \color{red}{\vdots} \\ \color{red}{0} \end{matrix} & \begin{matrix} a_{11} - a_{10} \cdot a_{00}a_{01} & \dots & a_{1j} - a_{10} \cdot a_{00}a_{0j} & \dots & a_{1n} - a_{10} \cdot a_{00}a_{0n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \boxed{a_{i1} - a_{i0} \cdot a_{00}a_{01}} & \dots & \boxed{a_{ij} - a_{i0} \cdot a_{00}a_{0j}} & \dots & \boxed{a_{in} - a_{i0} \cdot a_{00}a_{0n}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ a_{m1} - a_{m0} \cdot a_{00}a_{01} & \dots & a_{mj} - a_{m0} \cdot a_{00}a_{0j} & \dots & a_{mn} - a_{m0} \cdot a_{00}a_{0n} \end{matrix} \end{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} R_0 \\ R_1 \\ \vdots \\ R_i \\ \vdots \\ R_m \end{matrix} \end{matrix} \xrightarrow[\text{for each } i \geq 1]{R_i - a_{i0} \cdot R_0} \begin{matrix} & \begin{matrix} \sigma_0 & \sigma_1 & \dots & \sigma_j & \dots & \sigma_n \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} \tau_0 \\ \tau_1 \\ \vdots \\ \tau_i \\ \vdots \\ \tau_m \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} \color{red}{\vdots} \\ \color{red}{0} \end{matrix} & \begin{matrix} \color{red}{a_{00}a_{01}} & \dots & \color{red}{a_{00}a_{0j}} & \dots & \color{red}{a_{00}a_{0n}} \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} \color{red}{\vdots} \\ \color{red}{0} \end{matrix} & \begin{matrix} a_{11} - a_{10} \cdot a_{00}a_{01} & \dots & a_{1j} - a_{10} \cdot a_{00}a_{0j} & \dots & a_{1n} - a_{10} \cdot a_{00}a_{0n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \boxed{a_{i1} - a_{i0} \cdot a_{00}a_{01}} & \dots & \boxed{a_{ij} - a_{i0} \cdot a_{00}a_{0j}} & \dots & \boxed{a_{in} - a_{i0} \cdot a_{00}a_{0n}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ a_{m1} - a_{m0} \cdot a_{00}a_{01} & \dots & a_{mj} - a_{m0} \cdot a_{00}a_{0j} & \dots & a_{mn} - a_{m0} \cdot a_{00}a_{0n} \end{matrix} \end{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} R_0 \\ R_1 \\ \vdots \\ R_i \\ \vdots \\ R_m \end{matrix} \end{matrix} \parallel \partial_k^\mathcal{W}$$

### 3.1 Analogous result for the co-Morse complex

For a simplicial complex  $\Delta$  and a gradient vector field  $\mathcal{V}$  defined on it, a co- $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory from a  $(q-1)$ -simplex  $\tau$  to a  $q$ -simplex  $\sigma$  is just a  $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectory from  $\sigma$  to  $\tau$  with the order of the sequence reversed. Moreover, the weights of the co- $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectories and the corresponding  $\mathcal{V}$ -trajectories are same. So we can say,

$$\sum_{\substack{P: P \text{ is a} \\ \mathcal{V}\text{-traj. from} \\ \tau \text{ to } \sigma}} w(P) = \sum_{\substack{Q: Q \text{ is a} \\ \text{co-}\mathcal{V}\text{-traj. from} \\ \tau \text{ to } \sigma}} w(\bar{P}).$$

This implies, for any  $\sigma \in \text{Crit}_q^\mathcal{V}(\Delta)$  and  $\tau \in \text{Crit}_{q-1}^\mathcal{V}(\Delta)$ , the coefficient of  $\tau$  in  $\partial_q^\mathcal{V}(\sigma)$  and the coefficient of  $\sigma$  in  $\delta_q^\mathcal{V}(\tau)$  are equal. Hence, the matrix representation of  $\delta_q^\mathcal{V}$  is just the transpose of the matrix of  $\partial_q^\mathcal{V}$ . Therefore, by an analogous argument used while proving Theorem 1.1, we obtain the following for the coboundary operators of the co-Morse complex of  $\Delta$ .

**Theorem 3.6.** *Let  $\Delta$  be a  $d$ -dimensional simplicial complex with an assigned gradient vector field  $\mathcal{V}$ . Let  $(\sigma_0^{(k)}, \tau_0^{(k-1)})$  be a cancellable critical pair, for some  $k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ , and  $\mathcal{W}$  be the gradient vector field obtained by cancelling  $(\sigma_0^{(k)}, \tau_0^{(k-1)})$  from  $\mathcal{V}$ . Let  $\delta_q^\mathcal{V} : C_{q-1}^\mathcal{V}(\Delta) \rightarrow C_q^\mathcal{V}(\Delta)$  and  $\delta_q^\mathcal{W} : C_{q-1}^\mathcal{W}(\Delta) \rightarrow C_q^\mathcal{W}(\Delta)$  be the  $q$ -th coboundary maps of the co-Morse complexes of  $\Delta$  corresponding to  $\mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathcal{W}$ , respectively. Then the following hold.*



(1) For  $q > k + 1$  or  $q < k - 1$ ,

$$\delta_q^{\mathcal{W}} = \delta_q^{\mathcal{V}}.$$

(2) If  $\text{Crit}_{k-1}^{\mathcal{W}}(\Delta) = \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_m\}$  and for any  $\beta \in \text{Crit}_{k-2}^{\mathcal{W}}$ ,  $\delta_{k-1}^{\mathcal{V}}(\beta) = \sum_{i=0}^m b_i \tau_i$ , then,

$$\delta_{k-1}^{\mathcal{W}}(\beta) = \sum_{i=1}^m b_i \tau_i.$$

(3) The boundary operator  $\delta_{k+1}^{\mathcal{W}}$  is the restriction of  $\delta_{k+1}^{\mathcal{V}}$  to the subgroup  $C_k^{\mathcal{W}}(\Delta)$ , i.e.,

$$\delta_{k+1}^{\mathcal{W}} = \delta_{k+1}^{\mathcal{V}} \Big|_{C_k^{\mathcal{W}}(\Delta)}.$$

(4) Let  $\text{Crit}_k^{\mathcal{V}}(\Delta) = \{\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n\}$ ,  $\text{Crit}_{k-1}^{\mathcal{V}}(\Delta) = \{\tau_0, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_m\}$ , and for all  $i \in \{0, \dots, m\}$ ,  $\delta_k^{\mathcal{V}}(\tau_i) = \sum_{j=0}^n a_{ji} \sigma_j$ . Then, for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,

$$\delta_k^{\mathcal{W}}(\tau_i) = \sum_{j=1}^n (a_{ji} - a_{00} a_{0i} a_{j0}) \cdot \sigma_j.$$

## References

- [1] Adiprasito, K.A., Benedetti, B., Lutz, F.H.: Extremal examples of collapsible complexes and random discrete Morse theory. *Discrete & Computational Geometry* **57**, 824–853 (2017), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00454-017-9860-4>
- [2] Benedetti, B., Lai, C., Lofano, D., Lutz, F.H.: Random simple-homotopy theory. *Journal of Applied and Computational Topology* (2023), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41468-023-00139-4>
- [3] Benedetti, B., Lutz, F.H.: Random discrete Morse theory and a new library of triangulations. *Experimental Mathematics* **23**(1), 66–94 (2014), <https://doi.org/10.1080/10586458.2013.865281>
- [4] Chari, M.K.: On discrete Morse functions and combinatorial decompositions. *Discrete Mathematics* **217**(1), 101–113 (2000), [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-365X\(99\)00258-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-365X(99)00258-7)
- [5] Egecioglu, Ö., Gonzalez, T.F.: A computationally intractable problem on simplicial complexes. *Computational Geometry* **6**(2), 85–98 (1996), [https://doi.org/10.1016/0925-7721\(95\)00015-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0925-7721(95)00015-1)
- [6] Forman, R.: Morse theory for cell complexes. *Advances in Mathematics* **134**(1), 90–145 (1998), <https://doi.org/10.1006/aima.1997.1650>
- [7] Forman, R.: Discrete morse theory and the cohomology ring. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **354**(12), 5063–5085 (2002), <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9947-02-03041-6>

- [8] Forman, R.: A user’s guide to discrete Morse theory. Séminaire Lotharingien de Combinatoire [electronic only] **48**, B48c–35 (2002)
- [9] Gallais, E.: Combinatorial realization of the Thom–Smale complex via discrete Morse theory. Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa-Classe di Scienze **9**(2), 229–252 (2010), <https://doi.org/10.2422/2036-2145.2010.2.01>
- [10] Hersh, P.: On optimizing discrete Morse functions. Advances in Applied Mathematics **35**(3), 294–322 (Sep 2005). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aam.2005.04.001>, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.aam.2005.04.001>
- [11] Joswig, M., Pfetsch, M.E.: Computing optimal discrete Morse functions. Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics **17**, 191–195 (2004), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.endm.2004.03.038>
- [12] Knudson, K.P.: Morse theory: Smooth and discrete. World Scientific Publishing (Jul 2015), <https://doi.org/10.1142/9360>
- [13] Kozlov, D.N.: Organized collapse: An introduction to discrete Morse theory. Graduate studies in mathematics, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (Sep 2020)
- [14] Lewiner, T., Lopes, H., Tavares, G.: Toward optimality in discrete morse theory. Exp. Math. **12**(3), 271–285 (Jan 2003), <https://doi.org/10.1080/10586458.2003.10504498>
- [15] Mondal, A., Mukherjee, S., Saha, K.: Topology of matching complexes of complete graphs via discrete Morse theory. Discrete Mathematics & Theoretical Computer Science **vol. 26:3** (2024), <https://doi.org/10.46298/dmtcs.12887>
- [16] Munkres, J.R.: Elements of algebraic topology. CRC Press, London, England (Jun 2019), <https://doi.org/10.1201/9780429493911>
- [17] Scoville, N.A.: Discrete Morse theory. Student mathematical library, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (Dec 2019)

## Appendix A An example of simultaneous cancellation

In [15, Section 4], the (discrete) Morse homology groups of the *matching complex* of the complete graph of order 7 are computed with respect to a ‘near optimal’ gradient vector field  $\mathcal{V}$  (denoted by  $\mathcal{M}^*$  in [15]). There are four  $\mathcal{V}$ -critical 1-simplices and twenty four  $\mathcal{V}$ -critical 2-simplices. If  $\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_{24}$  are the critical 2-simplices and  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_4$  are the critical 1-simplices, then  $\partial_1^{\mathcal{V}}(\sigma_i) = 0$ , for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$ , and the following table (reproduced from [15, Table 1]) represents the images of the 2-simplices under the boundary map  $\partial_2^{\mathcal{V}}$ .

From these we deduce that the first Morse homology group is  $\mathbb{Z}_3$ .

In [15, Subsection 4.3], it is shown that the critical pairs  $(\eta_8^{(2)}, \sigma_3^{(1)})$  and  $(\eta_{18}^{(2)}, \sigma_4^{(1)})$  satisfy Theorem 2.9, and thus, they are simultaneously cancellable. Let  $\mathcal{W}_1$  be the gradient vector field obtained after cancelling  $(\eta_8^{(2)}, \sigma_3^{(1)})$  from  $\mathcal{V}$ , and  $\mathcal{W}_2$  be the gradient vector field obtained after cancelling  $(\eta_{18}^{(2)}, \sigma_4^{(1)})$  from  $\mathcal{W}_1$ .

$\eta$	$\partial_2^{\mathcal{V}}(\eta)$	$\eta$	$\partial_2^{\mathcal{V}}(\eta)$	$\eta$	$\partial_2^{\mathcal{V}}(\eta)$	$\eta$	$\partial_2^{\mathcal{V}}(\eta)$
$\eta_1$	$\sigma_2 - \sigma_3$	$\eta_2$	$\sigma_1 - \sigma_2 - \sigma_3$	$\eta_3$	$\sigma_1 - \sigma_3 + \sigma_4$	$\eta_4$	$\sigma_2 + \sigma_3 - \sigma_4$
$\eta_5$	$\sigma_1 - \sigma_4$	$\eta_6$	$-\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 - \sigma_4$	$\eta_7$	$-\sigma_1 + \sigma_4$	$\eta_8$	$-\sigma_2 + \sigma_3$
$\eta_9$	$-\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 + \sigma_3$	$\eta_{10}$	$-\sigma_1 + \sigma_3 - \sigma_4$	$\eta_{11}$	$-\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 + \sigma_3$	$\eta_{12}$	$\sigma_1 - \sigma_2 + \sigma_4$
$\eta_{13}$	$-\sigma_2 - \sigma_3 + \sigma_4$	$\eta_{14}$	$-\sigma_2 - \sigma_3 + \sigma_4$	$\eta_{15}$	$\sigma_2 - \sigma_3$	$\eta_{16}$	$\sigma_1 - \sigma_4$
$\eta_{17}$	$\sigma_1 - \sigma_2 + \sigma_4$	$\eta_{18}$	$-\sigma_1 + \sigma_4$	$\eta_{19}$	$-\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 - \sigma_4$	$\eta_{20}$	$\sigma_1 - \sigma_2 - \sigma_3$
$\eta_{21}$	$-\sigma_1 + \sigma_3 - \sigma_4$	$\eta_{22}$	$-\sigma_2 + \sigma_3$	$\eta_{23}$	$\sigma_2 + \sigma_3 - \sigma_4$	$\eta_{24}$	$\sigma_1 - \sigma_3 + \sigma_4$

Table 1: Images of all critical 2-simplices under the boundary operator  $\partial_2^{\mathcal{V}}$ .

We obtain the boundary operators  $\partial_2^{(\mathcal{W}_1)}$  and  $\partial_2^{(\mathcal{W}_2)}$ , from  $\partial_2^{(\mathcal{V})}$  and  $\partial_2^{(\mathcal{W}_2)}$ , respectively, by a sequence of elementary row operations (see Remark 3.5) as follows.

$$(\partial_2^{\mathcal{V}})^T = \begin{matrix} & \begin{matrix} \sigma_1 & \sigma_2 & \sigma_3 & \sigma_4 \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \\ \eta_3 \\ \eta_4 \\ \eta_5 \\ \eta_6 \\ \eta_7 \\ \eta_8 \\ \eta_9 \\ \eta_{10} \\ \eta_{11} \\ \eta_{12} \\ \eta_{13} \\ \eta_{14} \\ \eta_{15} \\ \eta_{16} \\ \eta_{17} \\ \eta_{18} \\ \eta_{19} \\ \eta_{20} \\ \eta_{21} \\ \eta_{22} \\ \eta_{23} \\ \eta_{24} \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{-1} & \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{0} \\ -1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}, \quad
(\partial_2^{(\mathcal{W}_1)})^T = \begin{matrix} & \begin{matrix} \sigma_1 & \sigma_2 & \sigma_4 \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \\ \eta_3 \\ \eta_4 \\ \eta_5 \\ \eta_6 \\ \eta_7 \\ \eta_8 \\ \eta_9 \\ \eta_{10} \\ \eta_{11} \\ \eta_{12} \\ \eta_{13} \\ \eta_{14} \\ \eta_{15} \\ \eta_{16} \\ \eta_{17} \\ \eta_{18} \\ \eta_{19} \\ \eta_{20} \\ \eta_{21} \\ \eta_{22} \\ \eta_{23} \\ \eta_{24} \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \mathbf{0} \\ 1 & -2 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 2 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 2 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & -2 & 1 \\ 0 & -2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 \\ \mathbf{-1} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{1} \\ -1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & -2 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}, \quad
(\partial_2^{(\mathcal{W}_2)})^T = \begin{matrix} & \begin{matrix} \sigma_1 & \sigma_2 \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \\ \eta_3 \\ \eta_4 \\ \eta_5 \\ \eta_6 \\ \eta_7 \\ \eta_8 \\ \eta_9 \\ \eta_{10} \\ \eta_{11} \\ \eta_{12} \\ \eta_{13} \\ \eta_{14} \\ \eta_{15} \\ \eta_{16} \\ \eta_{17} \\ \eta_{18} \\ \eta_{19} \\ \eta_{20} \\ \eta_{21} \\ \eta_{22} \\ \eta_{23} \\ \eta_{24} \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -2 \\ 2 & -1 \\ -1 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 \\ -2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 2 \\ -2 & 1 \\ -1 & 2 \\ 2 & -1 \\ 1 & -2 \\ 1 & -2 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 2 & -1 \\ -2 & 1 \\ 1 & -2 \\ -2 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 2 \\ 2 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}.$$

We may check that the first Morse homology group, with respect to both  $\mathcal{W}_1$  and  $\mathcal{W}_2$ , turns out to be  $\mathbb{Z}_3$  as expected.