

# COLLAPSING ALONG MONOTONE POSET MAPS

DMITRY N. KOZLOV

**ABSTRACT.** We introduce the notion of nonevasive reduction, and show that for any monotone poset map  $\varphi : P \rightarrow P$ , the simplicial complex  $\Delta(P)$  **NE-reduces** to  $\Delta(Q)$ , for any  $Q \supseteq \text{Fix } \varphi$ .

As a corollary, we prove that for any order-preserving map  $\varphi : P \rightarrow P$  satisfying  $\varphi(x) \geq x$ , for any  $x \in P$ , the simplicial complex  $\Delta(P)$  collapses to  $\Delta(\varphi(P))$ . We also obtain a generalization of Crapo's closure theorem.

## 1. ORDER COMPLEXES, COLLAPSING AND NE-REDUCTION.

For a poset  $P$  we let  $\Delta(P)$  denote its *nerve*: the simplicial complex whose simplices are all chains of  $P$ . For a simplicial complex  $X$  we let  $V(X)$  denote the set of its vertices.

An *elementary collapse* in a simplicial complex  $X$  is a removal of two open simplices  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  from  $X$ , such that  $\dim \sigma = \dim \tau + 1$ , and  $\sigma$  is the only simplex of  $X$ , different from  $\tau$  itself, which contains the simplex  $\tau$  in its closure.

When  $Y$  is a subcomplex of  $X$ , we say that  $X$  *collapses onto*  $Y$  if there exists a sequence of elementary collapses leading from  $X$  to  $Y$ ; in this case we write  $X \searrow Y$  (or, equivalently,  $Y \nearrow X$ ).

### Definition 1.1.

(1) A finite nonempty simplicial complex  $X$  is called **nonevasive** if either  $X$  is a point, or, inductively, there exists a vertex  $v$  of  $X$ , such that both  $X \setminus \{v\}$  and  $\text{lk}_X v$  are nonevasive.

(2) For two nonempty simplicial complexes  $X$  and  $Y$  we write  $X \searrow_{\text{NE}} Y$  (or, equivalently,  $Y \nearrow_{\text{NE}} X$ ), if there exists a sequence  $X = A_1 \supset A_2 \supset \dots \supset A_t = Y$ , such that for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, t-1\}$  we can write  $V(A_i) = V(A_{i+1}) \cup \{x_i\}$ , so that  $\text{lk}_{A_i} x_i$  is nonevasive.

We recall, that the notion of nonevasive simplicial complexes was introduced in [KSS], and was initially motivated by the complexity-theoretic considerations. For further connections to topology and more facts on nonevasiveness we refer to [Ku90, We99]. Recently an interesting connection has

---

*Date:* October 9, 2018.

*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification.* primary: 57C05, secondary 06A06, 57C10.

*Key words and phrases.* closure operator, evasiveness, collapse, order complex, simple homotopy type.

Research supported by Swiss National Science Foundation Grant PP002-102738/1.

been established between Discrete Morse theory and evasiveness, the standard references are [Fo00, Fo98].

Several classes of simplicial complexes are known to be nonevasive. Perhaps the simplest example is provided by the fact that all cones are nonevasive. A more complicated family of nonevasive simplicial complexes is obtained by taking the order complexes of the noncomplemented lattices, see [Ko98].

In the situation described in Definition 1.1(2), we say that the simplicial complex  $X$  NE-reduces to its subcomplex  $Y$ . The following facts about NE-reduction are useful for our arguments.

**Fact 1.** *If  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are simplicial complexes, such that  $X_1 \searrow_{\text{NE}} X_2$ , and  $Y$  is an arbitrary simplicial complex, then  $X_1 * Y \searrow_{\text{NE}} X_2 * Y$ .*

Here the symbol  $*$  denotes the simplicial join of two simplicial complexes, see [Mu84]. That  $X_1 * Y \searrow_{\text{NE}} X_2 * Y$  follows by induction from the facts that if  $v$  is any vertex of a simplicial complex  $X$ , then we have  $\text{lk}_{X*Y} v = (\text{lk}_X v) * Y$  and  $(X * Y) \setminus \{v\} = (X \setminus \{v\}) * Y$ , for any  $v \in V(X)$ .

To NE-reduce  $X_1 * Y$  to  $X_2 * Y$ , simply take the sequence of vertices  $x_1, \dots, x_t \in V(X_1)$  which NE-reduces  $X_1$  to  $X_2$ . We have  $\text{lk}_{X_1*Y}(x_1) = (\text{lk}_{X_1}(x_1)) * Y$ . In turn, the simplicial complex  $(\text{lk}_{X_1}(x_1)) * Y$  is nonevasive: this is seen by induction on the number of vertices of the first factor, with the base given by the fact that all cones are nonevasive. Removing  $x_1$  from  $X_1 * Y$  yields the simplicial complex  $(X_1 \setminus \{x_1\}) * Y$ , hence, continuing in this way, we will NE-reduce  $X_1 * Y$  all the way to  $X_2 * Y$ .

**Fact 2.** *The reduction  $X \searrow_{\text{NE}} Y$  implies  $X \searrow Y$ , which in turn implies that  $Y$  is a strong deformation retract of  $X$ .*

## 2. MONOTONE POSET MAPS.

Next we define a class of maps which are particularly suitable for our purposes.

**Definition 2.1.** *Let  $P$  be a poset. An order-preserving map  $\varphi : P \rightarrow P$  is called a **monotone map**, if for any  $x \in P$  either  $x \geq \varphi(x)$  or  $x \leq \varphi(x)$ .*

*If  $x \geq \varphi(x)$  for all  $x \in P$ , then we call  $\varphi$  a **decreasing map**, analogously, if  $x \leq \varphi(x)$  for all  $x \in P$ , then we call  $\varphi$  an **increasing map**.*

We remark here the fact that while a composition of two decreasing maps is again a decreasing map, and, in the same way, a composition of two increasing maps is again an increasing map, the composition of two monotone maps is not necessarily a monotone map.

**Example.** *Let  $P$  be the lattice of all subsets of  $\{1, 2\}$ , and define  $\varphi(S) = S \cup \{2\}$ , and  $\gamma(T) = T \setminus \{1\}$ , for all  $S, T \subseteq \{1, 2\}$ . The composition  $T \circ S$  maps all the subsets to  $\{2\}$ , in particular it is not a monotone map.*

On the other hand, any power of a monotone map is again monotone. Indeed, let  $\varphi : P \rightarrow P$  be monotone, let  $x \in P$ , and say  $x \leq \varphi(x)$ . Since  $\varphi$  is

order-preserving we conclude that  $\varphi(x) \leq \varphi^2(x)$ ,  $\varphi^2(x) \leq \varphi^3(x)$ , etc. Hence  $x \leq \varphi^N(x)$  for arbitrary  $N$ .

The following proposition shows that monotone maps have a canonical decomposition in terms of increasing and decreasing maps.

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $P$  be a poset, and let  $\varphi : P \rightarrow P$  be a monotone map. There exist unique maps  $\alpha, \beta : P \rightarrow P$ , such that*

- $\varphi = \alpha \circ \beta$ ;
- $\alpha$  is an increasing map, whereas  $\beta$  is a decreasing map;
- $\text{Fix } \alpha \cup \text{Fix } \beta = P$ .

**Proof.** Set

$$(2.1) \quad \alpha(x) := \begin{cases} \varphi(x), & \text{if } \varphi(x) > x; \\ x, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$(2.2) \quad \beta(x) := \begin{cases} \varphi(x), & \text{if } \varphi(x) < x; \\ x, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Clearly,  $\text{Fix } \alpha \cup \text{Fix } \beta = P$ . Let us see that  $\varphi(x) = \alpha(\beta(x))$ , for any  $x \in P$ . This is obvious if  $\varphi(x) \geq x$ , since then  $\alpha(\beta(x)) = \alpha(x) = \varphi(x)$  by (2.1) and (2.2) respectively. Assume  $\varphi(x) < x$ , then  $\beta(x) = \varphi(x)$ , hence  $\alpha(\beta(x)) = \alpha(\varphi(x))$ . Since  $\varphi$  is order-preserving,  $\varphi(x) < x$  implies  $\varphi(\varphi(x)) \leq \varphi(x)$ . Thus (2.1) gives  $\varphi(x) \in \text{Fix } \alpha$ , and we conclude that  $\alpha(\beta(x)) = \alpha(\varphi(x)) = \varphi(x)$ .

To see that  $\alpha$  is an increasing map, we just need to see that it is order-preserving. Since  $\alpha$  either fixes an element or maps it to a larger one, the only situation which needs to be considered is when  $x, y \in P$ ,  $x < y$ , and  $\alpha(x) = \varphi(x)$ . However, under these conditions we have  $\alpha(y) \geq \varphi(y) \geq \varphi(x) = \alpha(x)$ , and so  $\alpha$  is order-preserving. That  $\beta$  is a decreasing map can be seen analogously. Finally, the uniqueness follows from the fact that each  $x \in P$  must be fixed by either  $\alpha$  or  $\beta$ , and the value  $\varphi(x)$  determines which one will fix  $x$ .  $\square$

### 3. THE MAIN THEOREM AND IMPLICATIONS.

Prior to this work, it has been known that a monotone map  $\varphi : P \rightarrow P$  induces a homotopy equivalence between  $\Delta(P)$  and  $\Delta(\varphi(P))$ , see [Bj95, Corollary 10.17]. It was also proved in [Bj95] that if the map  $\varphi$  satisfies the additional condition  $\varphi^2 = \varphi$ , then  $\varphi$  induces a strong deformation retraction from  $\Delta(P)$  to  $\Delta(\varphi(P))$ .

The latter result was strengthened in [Ko04, Theorem 2.1], where it was shown that, whenever  $\varphi$  is an ascending (or descending) closure operator,  $\Delta(P)$  collapses onto  $\Delta(\varphi(P))$ . There this fact was used to analyze the effect of the folding operation on the corresponding  $\text{Hom}$  complexes, see also [BK03a, BK03b, BK04, Ko05].

The next theorem strengthens and generalizes the results from [Bj95] and [Ko04].

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $P$  be a poset, and let  $\varphi : P \rightarrow P$  be a monotone map. Assume  $P \supseteq Q \supseteq \text{Fix } \varphi$ ,  $P \setminus Q$  is finite, and, for every  $x \in P \setminus Q$ ,  $P_{<x} \cup P_{>x}$  is finite, then  $\Delta(P) \searrow_{\text{NE}} \Delta(Q)$ , in particular,  $\Delta(P)$  collapses onto  $\Delta(Q)$ .*

**Remarks.**

- 1) Note that when  $P$  is finite, the conditions of the Theorem 3.1 simply reduce to:  $P \supseteq Q \supseteq \text{Fix } \varphi$ .
- 2) Under conditions of Theorem 3.1, the simplicial complex  $\Delta(P)$  collapses onto the simplicial complex  $\Delta(Q)$ , in particular, the complexes  $\Delta(P)$  and  $\Delta(Q)$  have the same simple homotopy type, see [Co68].
- 3) Under conditions of Theorem 3.1, the topological space  $\Delta(Q)$  is a strong deformation retract of the topological space  $\Delta(P)$ .
- 4) Any poset  $Q$  satisfying  $P \supseteq Q \supseteq \varphi(P)$  will also satisfy  $P \supseteq Q \supseteq \text{Fix } \varphi$ , hence Theorem 3.1 will apply. In particular, for finite  $P$ , we have the following corollary:

**Corollary 3.2.** *For any poset  $P$ , and for any monotone map  $\varphi : P \rightarrow P$ , satisfying conditions of Theorem 3.1, we have  $\Delta(P) \searrow_{\text{NE}} \Delta(\varphi(P))$ .*

It is easy to prove Theorem 3.1, once the following auxiliary result is established.

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $P$  be a poset, and let  $\varphi : P \rightarrow P$  be a monotone map. Assume  $x \in P$ , such that  $\varphi(x) \neq x$ , and  $P_{<x} \cup P_{>x}$  is finite, then  $\Delta(P_{<x}) * \Delta(P_{>x})$  is nonevasive. More precisely, if  $\varphi(x) < x$ , then  $\Delta(P_{<x})$  is nonevasive, and if  $\varphi(x) > x$ , then  $\Delta(P_{>x})$  is nonevasive.*

**Proof.** Since the expression  $\Delta(P_{<x}) * \Delta(P_{>x})$  is symmetric with respect to inverting the partial order of  $P$ , it is enough, without loss of generality, to only consider the case  $\varphi(x) < x$ . Let us show that in this case  $\Delta(P_{<x})$  is nonevasive. We proceed by induction on  $|P_{<x}|$ . If  $|P_{<x}| = 1$ , then the statement is clear, so assume  $|P_{<x}| \geq 2$ .

Let  $\psi : P_{<x} \rightarrow P_{<x}$  denote the restriction of  $\varphi$ . It is easy to see that  $\psi$  is a monotone map of  $P_{<x}$ . To verify that  $\Delta(P_{<x}) \searrow_{\text{NE}} \Delta(P_{\leq \varphi(x)})$ , order the elements of  $P_{<x} \setminus P_{\leq \varphi(x)}$  following an arbitrary linear extension in the decreasing order, say  $P_{<x} \setminus P_{\leq \varphi(x)} = \{a_1, \dots, a_t\}$ , and  $a_i \not\leq a_j$ , for  $i < j$ . By the choice of the order of  $a_i$ 's, we have  $P_{<a_i} = P_{<a_i}^i$ , where  $P^i = P \setminus \{a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}\}$ . Therefore, by the induction assumption,  $\Delta(P_{<a_i})$  is nonevasive for all  $1 \leq i \leq t$ , and we have

$$\Delta(P_{<x}) = \Delta(P_{<x}^1) \searrow_{\text{NE}} \Delta(P_{<x}^2) \searrow_{\text{NE}} \dots \searrow_{\text{NE}} \Delta(P_{<x}^{t+1}) = \Delta(P_{\leq \varphi(x)}).$$

On the other hand,  $\Delta(P_{\leq \varphi(x)})$  is a cone, hence it is nonevasive, and therefore  $\Delta(P_{<x})$  is nonevasive as well. It follows that  $\Delta(P_{<x}) * \Delta(P_{>x})$  is nonevasive.  $\square$

**Proof of the Theorem 3.1.** The proof is by induction on  $|P \setminus Q|$ . The statement is trivial when  $|P \setminus Q| = 0$ , so assume  $|P \setminus Q| \geq 1$ .

To start with, we replace the monotone map  $\varphi$  with a monotone map  $\gamma$  satisfying  $\gamma(P) \subseteq Q$  and  $\text{Fix } \gamma = \text{Fix } \varphi$ . To achieve that objective we can set  $\gamma := \varphi^N$ , where  $N = |P \setminus Q|$ . With this choice of  $\gamma$ , the inclusion  $\gamma(P) \subseteq Q$  follows from the assumption that  $\text{Fix } \varphi \subseteq Q$ , since  $\text{Fix } \gamma = \gamma(P)$ .

Take arbitrary  $x \in P \setminus Q$ . Since  $x \notin \gamma(P)$ , we have  $x \neq \gamma(x)$ , hence by Proposition 3.3 we know that  $\text{lk}_{\Delta(P)} x = \Delta(P_{<x}) * \Delta(P_{>x})$  is nonevasive. This means  $\Delta(P) \searrow_{\text{NE}} \Delta(P \setminus \{x\})$ .

Let  $\psi : P \setminus \{x\} \rightarrow P \setminus \{x\}$  be the restriction of  $\gamma$ . Clearly,  $\psi$  is a monotone map, and  $\text{Fix } \psi = \text{Fix } \gamma$ . This implies that  $\text{Fix } \psi \subseteq Q$ , hence, by the induction hypothesis  $\Delta(P \setminus \{x\}) \searrow_{\text{NE}} \Delta(Q)$ . Summarizing, we conclude that  $\Delta(P) \searrow_{\text{NE}} \Delta(Q)$ .  $\square$

On the enumerative side, we obtain the following generalization of the Crapo's Closure Theorem from 1968, see [Cr68, Theorem 1].

**Corollary 3.4.** *Let  $P$  be a finite poset with  $\hat{0}$  and  $\hat{1}$ , and let  $\varphi : P \rightarrow P$  be an increasing map. Assume  $P \supseteq Q \supseteq \text{Fix } \varphi$ , and  $Q \cap \varphi^{-\infty}(\hat{1}) = \{\hat{1}\}$ . Then, we have*

$$\sum_{\varphi^\infty(z)=\hat{1}} \mu_P(\hat{0}, z) = \begin{cases} \mu_Q(\hat{0}, \hat{1}), & \text{if } \hat{0} \in \text{Fix } \varphi; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Here  $\varphi^\infty$  is the stabilization of  $\varphi$ , say  $\varphi^\infty := \varphi^{|P|}$ , so  $\varphi^{-\infty}(\hat{1})$  denotes the set of all elements of  $P$  which map to  $\hat{1}$  after a sufficiently high iteration of  $\varphi$ .

Before we give the proof, recall the following convention: whenever  $P$  is a poset with  $\hat{0}$  and  $\hat{1}$ , we let  $\bar{P}$  denote  $P \setminus \{\hat{0}, \hat{1}\}$ .

**Proof of the Corollary 3.4.** Assume first that  $\hat{0} \in \text{Fix } \varphi$ , hence  $\hat{0}, \hat{1} \in Q$ , and, since  $\varphi$  is increasing,  $\varphi^{-\infty}(\hat{0}) = \{\hat{0}\}$ . Set  $R := (P \setminus \varphi^{-\infty}(\hat{1})) \cup \{\hat{0}, \hat{1}\}$ , i.e.,  $R$  is the set of all elements of  $\bar{P}$  which shall not map to  $\hat{1}$ , no matter how high iteration of  $\varphi$  we take, with the maximal and the minimal elements attached. Let  $\psi : \bar{R} \rightarrow \bar{R}$  be the restriction of  $\varphi$ . Clearly,  $\psi$  is a monotone map, and  $\text{Fix } \psi = \text{Fix } \varphi \setminus \{\hat{0}, \hat{1}\}$ .

Since  $\bar{R} \supseteq \bar{Q} \supseteq \text{Fix } \psi$ , we conclude that  $\Delta(\bar{R})$  collapses onto  $\Delta(\bar{Q})$ ; in particular the simplicial complexes  $\Delta(\bar{R})$  and  $\Delta(\bar{Q})$  have the same Euler characteristic. By Ph. Hall Theorem, see [St97], for any poset  $P$  with a maximal and a minimal element we have  $\chi(\Delta(\bar{P})) = \mu_P(\hat{0}, \hat{1})$ , therefore here we conclude that  $\mu_Q(\hat{0}, \hat{1}) = \mu_R(\hat{0}, \hat{1})$ .

On the other hand, by definition of the Möbius function, we have the equality  $\sum_{z \in P} \mu_P(\hat{0}, z) = 0$ , which can be rewritten as  $\sum_{z \in \varphi^{-\infty}(\hat{1})} \mu_P(\hat{0}, z) = -\sum_{z \notin \varphi^{-\infty}(\hat{1})} \mu_P(\hat{0}, z)$ . Similarly,  $\mu_R(\hat{0}, \hat{1}) = -\sum_{x \in R \setminus \{\hat{1}\}} \mu_P(\hat{0}, x)$ . Since the condition  $z \notin \varphi^{-\infty}(\hat{1})$  is equivalent to the condition  $z \in R \setminus \{\hat{1}\}$ , and

$R_{<x} = P_{<x}$ , for any  $x \in R$ , we conclude that  $\mu_Q(\hat{0}, \hat{1}) = \mu_R(\hat{0}, \hat{1}) = \sum_{z \in \varphi^{-\infty}(\hat{1})} \mu_P(\hat{0}, z)$ .

Consider now the case  $\hat{0} \notin \text{Fix } \varphi$ . If  $\varphi^\infty(\hat{0}) = \hat{1}$ , then the statement follows from the definition of the Möbius function, since then  $\varphi^\infty(z) = \hat{1}$  for all  $z \in P$ . Assume  $\varphi^\infty(\hat{0}) \neq \hat{1}$ . We can define a new map  $\psi$  by changing the value of  $\varphi$  in one element:

$$\psi(x) = \begin{cases} \hat{0}, & \text{if } x = \hat{0}; \\ \varphi(x), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Clearly,  $\psi$  is a monotone function,  $\text{Fix } \psi = \text{Fix } \varphi \cup \{\hat{0}\}$ , and  $\varphi^{-\infty}(\hat{1}) = \psi^{-\infty}(\hat{1})$ . Hence, the first part of the proof applies, and we conclude that

$$\sum_{\psi^\infty(z)=\hat{1}} \mu_P(\hat{0}, z) = \sum_{\varphi^\infty(z)=\hat{1}} \mu_P(\hat{0}, z) = \mu_Q(\hat{0}, \hat{1}),$$

for any  $Q$  such that  $P \supseteq Q \supseteq \text{Fix } \psi$ , and such that  $Q \cap \varphi^{-\infty}(\hat{1}) = \{\hat{1}\}$ . Choose  $Q = (P_{\geq \varphi(\hat{0})} \setminus \varphi^{-\infty}(\hat{1})) \cup \{\hat{0}, \hat{1}\}$ . Since  $\varphi(\hat{0}) \notin \varphi^{-\infty}(\hat{1})$ , the poset  $Q$  has only one atom  $\varphi(\hat{0})$ , thus we have  $\mu_Q(\hat{0}, \hat{1}) = 0$ , and the proof is complete.  $\square$

#### 4. NE-REDUCTION AND COLLAPSES

The NE-reduction can be used to define an interesting equivalence relation on the set of all simplicial complexes.

**Definition 4.1.** *Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be simplicial complexes. Recursively, we say that  $X \simeq_{\text{NE}} Y$  if  $X \searrow_{\text{NE}} Y$ , or  $Y \nearrow_{\text{NE}} X$ , or if there exists a simplicial complex  $Z$ , such that  $X \simeq_{\text{NE}} Z$  and  $Y \simeq_{\text{NE}} Z$ .*

Clearly, if  $X$  is nonevasive, then  $X \simeq_{\text{NE}} \text{pt}$ , but is the opposite true? The answer to that is "no". To see this, consider the standard example of a space which is contractible, but not collapsible: let  $H$  be the so-called *house with two rooms*, see Figure 4.1.

The space  $H$  is not collapsible, hence nonevasive, see [Co68] for an argument. On the other hand, we leave it to the reader to see that it is possible to triangulate the filled cylinder  $C$  given by the equations  $|z| \leq 1$ ,  $x^2 + y^2 \leq 1$ , so that  $C \searrow_{\text{NE}} H$ .

The analogous equivalence relation, where  $\searrow_{\text{NE}}$ , and  $\nearrow_{\text{NE}}$ , are replaced by  $\searrow$ , and  $\nearrow$ , is called the simple homotopy equivalence; its equivalence classes are called simple homotopy types. The celebrated theorem of J.H.C. Whitehead states that the simplicial complexes with the simple homotopy type of a point are precisely those, which are contractible, see [Co68]. Therefore, the class of the simplicial complexes which are NE-equivalent to a point relates to nonevasiveness in the same way as contractibility refers to collapsibility. Clearly, this means that this class should constitute an interesting object of study.




FIGURE 4.1. A house with two rooms.

We conjecture that the NE-equivalence is much finer than the Whitehead’s simple homotopy type. We make two conjectures: a weak and a strong one.

**Conjecture 4.2.** *There exist finite simplicial complexes  $X$  and  $Y$  having the same simple homotopy type, such that  $X \not\approx_{\text{NE}} Y$ .*

**Conjecture 4.3.** *There exists an infinite family of finite simplicial complexes  $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ , which all have the same simple homotopy type, such that  $X_i \not\approx_{\text{NE}} X_j$ , for all  $i \neq j$ .*

Again, in the simple homotopy setting, the phenomenon of the Conjectures 4.2 and 4.3 is governed by an algebraic invariant called the *Whitehead torsion*, namely: a homotopy equivalence between finite connected CW-complexes is simple if and only if its Whitehead torsion is trivial, see [Co68, (22.2)]. It is enticing to hope for an existence of some similar invariant in our NE-setting.

Finally, let us remark, that whenever we have simplicial complexes  $X \simeq_{\text{NE}} Y$ , there exists a simplicial complex  $Z$ , such that  $X \nearrow_{\text{NE}} Z \searrow_{\text{NE}} Y$ . Indeed, assume  $A \searrow_{\text{NE}} B \nearrow_{\text{NE}} C$ , for some simplicial complexes  $A, B$ , and  $C$ . Let  $S = V(A) \setminus V(B)$ , and  $T = V(C) \setminus V(B)$ . Let  $D$  be the simplicial complex obtained by attaching to  $A$  the vertices from  $T$  in the same way as they would be attached to  $B \subseteq A$ . Clearly, since the links of the vertices from  $S$  did not change, they can still be removed in the same fashion as before, and therefore we have  $A \nearrow_{\text{NE}} D \searrow_{\text{NE}} C$ . Repeating this operation several times, and using the fact that the reductions  $\nearrow_{\text{NE}}$  (as well as  $\searrow_{\text{NE}}$ ) compose, we prove the claim.

**Acknowledgments.** We would like to thank the Swiss National Science Foundation and ETH-Zürich for the financial support of this research. We also thank the referee for several valuable comments.

## REFERENCES

- [BK03a] E. Babson, D.N. Kozlov, *Topological obstructions to graph colorings*, Electron. Res. Announc. Amer. Math. Soc. **9** (2003), pp. 61–68.  
[arXiv:math.CO/0305300](#)
- [BK03b] E. Babson, D.N. Kozlov, *Complexes of graph homomorphisms*, Israel J. Math., in press.  
[arXiv:math.CO/0310056](#)
- [BK04] E. Babson, D.N. Kozlov, *Proof of the Lovász Conjecture*, Annals of Mathematics (2), in press.  
[arXiv:math.CO/0402395](#)
- [Bj95] A. Björner, *Topological Methods*, in “Handbook of Combinatorics” (eds. R. Graham, M. Grötschel and L. Lovász), Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1995, pp. 1819–1872.
- [Co68] M. Cohen, *A course in simple-homotopy theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 10, Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1973.
- [Cr68] H.H. Crapo, *Möbius inversion in lattices*, Arch. Math. (Basel) **19**, (1968), 595–607.
- [Fo00] R. Forman, *Morse theory and evasiveness*, Combinatorica **20**, (2000), no. 4, 489–504.
- [Fo98] R. Forman, *Morse theory for cell complexes*, Adv. Math. **134**, (1998), no. 1, 90–145.
- [KSS] J. Kahn, M. Saks, D. Sturtevant, *A topological approach to evasiveness*, Combinatorica **4**, (1984), no. 4, 297–306.
- [Ko05] D.N. Kozlov, *Chromatic numbers, morphism complexes, and Stiefel-Whitney characteristic classes*, in: *Geometric Combinatorics* (eds. E. Miller, V. Reiner, B. Sturmfels), IAS/Park City Mathematics Series **14**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI; Institute for Advanced Study (IAS), Princeton, NJ; in press.  
[arXiv:math.AT/0505563](#)
- [Ko04] D.N. Kozlov, *A simple proof for folds on both sides in complexes of graph homomorphisms*, to appear in Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.  
[math.CO/0408262](#)
- [Ko98] D.N. Kozlov, *Order complexes of noncomplemented lattices are nonevasive*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **126**, (1998), no. 12, 3461–3465.  
[math.CO/0503416](#)
- [Ku90] H. Kurzweil, *A combinatorial technique for simplicial complexes and some applications to finite groups*, Discrete Math. **82**, (1990), 263–278.
- [Mu84] J.R. Munkres, *Elements of algebraic topology*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Menlo Park, CA, 1984.
- [St97] R.P. Stanley, *Enumerative combinatorics*, Vol. 1, Corrected reprint of the 1986 original, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, **49**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- [We99] V. Welker, *Constructions preserving evasiveness and collapsibility*, Discrete Math. **207**, (1999), 243–255.

INSTITUTE OF THEORETICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE, EIDGENÖSSISCHE TECHNISCHE HOCHSCHULE, ZÜRICH, SWITZERLAND  
E-mail address: [dkozlov@inf.ethz.ch](mailto:dkozlov@inf.ethz.ch)