

Criteria for Balance in Abelian Gain Graphs, with an Application to Piecewise-Linear Geometry*

Konstantin Rybnikov[†]
and Thomas Zaslavsky[‡]

February 18, 2019

Abstract

Consider a gain graph with abelian gain group having no odd torsion. If there is a basis of the graph's binary cycle space each of whose members can be lifted to a closed walk whose gain is the identity, then the gain graph is balanced, provided that the graph is finite or the group has no nontrivial infinitely 2-divisible elements. We apply this theorem to deduce a result on the structural geometry of PL-realizations of cell-decompositions of manifolds.

Keywords: abelian gain graph, balanced gain graph, binary cycle, Binary Cycle Test, cell complex, piecewise-linear realization, piecewise-linear manifold, Maxwell lifting, reciprocal graph, facet graph, multivariate spline.

Mathematics Subject Classifications (2000): Primary 05C22, 52C25; Secondary: 05C38, 52C22.

1 Introduction

A *gain graph* (Γ, g, G) consists of a graph $\Gamma = (V, E)$, a group G , and a homomorphism g from the free group F_E on the edges of Γ to G . We call g the *gain map* and G the *gain group*.¹ (One thinks of the edges of G as oriented in an arbitrary but fixed way, so that if e is an edge in one direction, then e^{-1} is the same edge in the opposite direction; thus $g(e^{-1}) = g(e)^{-1}$.) The simplest gain graphs are those in which every simple closed walk on Γ lies in the kernel of g ; equivalently (for connected Γ ; we shall assume throughout that G is connected since for general gain graphs one can treat

*We thank Keith Dennis and Kenneth S. Brown for very helpful discussions.

[†]Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Massachusetts at Lowell, Lowell, MA 01854, U.S.A. Part of this research was conducted at Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853-4201, U.S.A.

[‡]Department of Mathematical Sciences, Binghamton University, Binghamton, NY 13902-6000, U.S.A. Research partially supported by National Science Foundation grant DMS-0070729.

¹Gain graphs have been called *voltage graphs* in graph embedding theory—e.g., in Gross and Tucker (1987); we eschew the term “voltage” because gains do not have to obey Kirchhoff’s voltage law.

each component separately), the fundamental group $\pi(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{Ker } g$; such a gain graph is called *balanced*. The problem: how to tell whether or not a gain graph is balanced. We investigate this problem when the gain group is abelian. (Then we call (Γ, g, G) an *abelian gain graph*.)

One simple criterion is expressed in the gains of a fundamental system of circles. A *circle* is the edge set of a nontrivial simple closed walk (a walk in which no vertex or edge is repeated, except that the initial and final vertices are the same). If we take a spanning tree T of Γ , each edge $e \notin T$ belongs to a unique circle in $T \cup e$. These circles constitute the *fundamental system of circles* with respect to T . A circle C can be written as the edge set of a simple closed walk in a way that is unique up to choice of initial vertex and direction. Then it depends only on C , not on the choice of walk, whether the walk is in $\text{Ker } g$. If it is, we say C is *balanced*. It is well known and easy to prove that (Γ, g, G) is balanced if and only if every circle of a fundamental system (with respect to some spanning tree) is balanced.

However, in applications of gain graphs the available information may not include the gains of circles of a fundamental system. We propose here a broader criterion for balance, whose principal difficulty is that it is not always valid. Our topic is the question of the gain groups for which it is valid. To state the criterion we must first define a ‘cycle’ in a graph. There are two kinds of cycle of concern to us:² they are *integral cycles*, i.e., elements of $Z_1(\Gamma) = \text{Ker } \partial$ where ∂ is the standard 1-dimensional boundary operator of cellular homology of Γ , and *binary cycles*, i.e., elements of $Z_1(\Gamma, \mathbb{Z}_2)$, which is similar with \mathbb{Z} replaced by \mathbb{Z}_2 . There are natural epimorphisms

$$\pi(\Gamma) \xrightarrow{a} Z_1(\Gamma) \xrightarrow{[\cdot]} Z_1(\Gamma, \mathbb{Z}_2)$$

that consist, respectively, of abelianization and reduction of coefficients modulo 2. Suppose that b is a binary cycle: a *cyclic orientation* of b is any closed walk \tilde{b} for which $[\tilde{b}^a] = b$. If B is a set of binary cycles, a *cyclic orientation of B* is any set $\tilde{B} = \{\tilde{b} : b \in B\}$ of cyclic orientations of the members of B . This definition is very broad: a binary cycle has many cyclic orientations; and edges may appear in \tilde{b} that are not in the support of b , provided that each such edge appears an even number of times in \tilde{b} . Thus a binary cycle with disconnected support can have a cyclic orientation, which is always connected. There is no cyclic orientation of b that can reasonably be regarded as canonical, except in the case of a binary cycle whose support is a circle.

Now, our test for balance:

Definition. Let (Γ, g, G) be a gain graph and B be a basis of $Z_1(\Gamma; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. We say that B *passes the Binary Cycle Test* if it has a cyclic orientation \tilde{B} such that all elements of \tilde{B} have gain 1. We say the Binary Cycle Test is *valid for* (Γ, g, G) if the existence of a basis B that passes the binary cycle test implies that (Γ, g, G) is balanced. We say the Binary Cycle Test is *valid* for a family of graphs \mathcal{G} and a family of groups \mathcal{H} if it is valid for every gain graph (Γ, g, G) with $\Gamma \in \mathcal{G}$ and $G \in \mathcal{H}$.

In other words, the Binary Cycle Test is valid for a gain graph (Γ, g, G) if the existence of a basis B for $Z_1(\Gamma, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ that has a cyclic orientation all of whose elements have gain 1 implies that (Γ, g, G) is balanced. The converse implication is universal: if (Γ, g, G) is balanced then every cyclic orientation of every binary cycle necessarily has gain 1.

²The graph-theory literature contains at least five incompatible meanings of the term ‘cycle’.

Our main results are that the Binary Cycle Test is valid for any abelian gain group that has no odd torsion if the graph is finite (Theorem 3.3) or if the gain group has no nontrivial infinitely 2-divisible elements (Theorem 3.5). We also show an infinite graph that fails the Binary Cycle Test for all gain groups that have an infinitely 2-divisible element other than 0. (In another paper on this subject (Rybnikov and Zaslavsky 20xx) we prove that for any gain group with non-trivial elements of odd order there is a graph for which the Binary Cycle Test does not work. Focussing on the gain group is one way the present paper differs from Rybnikov and Zaslavsky (20xx), where the emphasis is on the graph.)

Gain graphs have appeared in physics, operations research, psychology, among many other areas (see Zaslavsky’s annotated bibliography (1998) for a survey). In most of these applications the gain graphs are finite and have \mathbb{Z}_2 or \mathbb{R}^* as the gain group. The binary cycle test applies to such situations, since both these groups are abelian and do not have odd torsion. Groups \mathbb{R}^* or \mathbb{R}^d tend to appear in discrete-geometry applications such as Voronoi’s generatrix construction and the Maxwell–Cremona correspondence.

If the gain graph is infinite, our results do not apply to the cases where $G = \mathbb{R}^*$ or \mathbb{R}^d , since these groups are 2-divisible. We know that for certain particular binary cycle bases their passing the Binary Cycle Test does imply balance even then, but that they and the graph have to be carefully selected is shown by Example 4.1. We have not yet found a general description of binary cycle bases whose passing of the test implies balance of infinite gain graphs with 2-divisible gain group, although we do have a conjecture in this direction (see Conjecture 4.3).

Our motivation is multifold. Our test is a vast generalization of testing a fundamental system of circles. Our second motivation for the Binary Cycle Test is its use in piecewise-linear geometry. It may happen that a basis of the binary cycle space is given to us. In particular this may occur in geometric situations (as in Section 5) where the gain graph is the 1-skeleton of a cell complex \mathcal{M} that is a homology manifold. If $H_1(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{Z}_2) = 0$, the boundaries of the 2-cells form a natural basis of the binary cycle space. Our results help to obtain topological generalizations of classical geometric theorems, such as the Maxwell–Cremona correspondence and Voronoi’s generatrix theorem. These are “local-to-global” theorems in which certain discrete geometric objects, such as piecewise-linear surfaces or equilibrium stresses, are constructed via the application of local rules. Applications of this type can be described as topological generalizations of geometrical theorems. As with generalizations of the Maxwell–Cremona correspondence and Voronoi’s generatrix theorem, instead of proving a geometric theorem for a manifold with trivial fundamental group, one can often prove the same theorem for a homology manifold \mathcal{M} with $H_1(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{Z}_2) = 0$. In fact, We conclude the paper (in Section 5) with a rather sophisticated application of our test to piecewise-linear discrete geometry. Using gain graphs we generalize a theorem of Voronoi (1908), that any simple tiling of \mathbb{R}^d is the projection of a (convex) PL-surface which, given the tiling, is uniquely determined by $d + 2$ free real parameters. (A spline theorist would say that the dimension of the space of C_1^0 -splines over the tiling is $d + 2$.) Such a surface is called a (*convex*) *lifting of the tiling to \mathbb{R}^{d+1}* . It is known that the notion of lifting and the space of liftings can be defined for any PL-realization of a homology d -manifold in \mathbb{R}^d . Our generalization consists in showing that the dimension of the space of liftings of any non-degenerate PL-realization in \mathbb{R}^d of a homology d -manifold \mathcal{M} with $H_1(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{Z}_2) = 0$

is $d + 2$, provided that each $(d - 3)$ -cell of \mathcal{M} is incident to exactly four d -cells. This application was chosen because in the course of the proofs gain graphs appear in a number of different geometric disguises; the section illustrates how the Binary Cycle Test can be used in applications.

Still another motivation for our work on gain graphs is Voronoi's conjecture on parallelohedra, which states that any parallelohedron is an affine copy of the Dirichlet domain of a lattice. The proof of this conjecture can be reduced to a number of questions about a certain type of finite gain graph called the Venkov graph (see Erdahl (1999) for definitions and examples of the Venkov graph), whose gain group is \mathbb{R}^* (see Ordine (2002) and Rybnikov (2002a,b)). The Binary Cycle Test simplifies attacking these questions, because in analyzing particular cases of the Venkov graph, it is much easier to look for a basis of the binary cycle space, rather than of the cycle space over \mathbb{Z} .

Finally, our test can simplify computations. In many computer programs a graph is represented by its incidence matrices. Given the incidence matrix, finding a basis of the binary cycle space may be easier than finding one for the fundamental group. The binary cycle test is especially convenient in such situations.

2 Preliminaries

Our graphs may be infinite. Links (edges with distinct endpoints) and loops (two equal endpoints), as well as multiple edges, are allowed. We assume that Γ is connected and, to save the notation, that it has a fixed (but arbitrary) orientation. A *closed walk* is a sequence $v_0 e_1 v_1 \cdots e_l v_l$ of vertices and edges such that v_{i-1} and v_i are the endpoints of e_i and $v_0 = v_l$. Its *length* is l . It is *trivial* if $l = 0$; it is a *simple closed walk* if it is nontrivial and no vertex or edge is repeated except at the closure of the walk. If \tilde{w} is a closed walk on Γ , denote by \mathbf{w} the corresponding element \tilde{w}^a of $Z_1(\Gamma)$. If $\mathbf{w} \in Z_1(\Gamma)$, denote by $[\mathbf{w}]$ the corresponding element of $Z_1(\Gamma, \mathbb{Z}_2)$.

Switching a gain graph (Γ, g, G) means replacing g by g^f obtained in the following way: take any function $f : V \rightarrow G$ and for an edge e oriented with initial vertex v and final vertex w , define $g^f(e) = f(v)^{-1} g(e) f(w)$. Switching does not change which circles are balanced, nor whether the gain graph is balanced. It is easy to see that G can be switched so that any chosen spanning tree T has identity gain: $g|_T \equiv$ the group identity.

The *essential gain group* of a gain graph is $g(\pi(\Gamma))$. This is the smallest image of any switching of g . It is well defined up to conjugation in G . Evidently, (Γ, g, G) is balanced if and only if the essential gain group is trivial.

Naturally, g induces a homomorphism from $\pi(\Gamma)$ to G and from $\mathbb{Z}E$, the free abelian group on E (hence from $Z_1(\Gamma)$, the abelianization of $\pi(\Gamma)$), to G/G' , the abelianization of G .

A *cyclic orientation*, or *lifting to the fundamental group*, of an element b of $Z_1(\Gamma, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is any element \tilde{b} of $\pi(\Gamma)$ whose abelianization modulo 2 is b . A circle has natural cyclic orientations obtained by taking an element of $\pi(\Gamma)$ corresponding to a walk once around the circle in either direction from any starting point. A *lifting of b to the cycle space* is the image in $Z_1(\Gamma)$ of a cyclic orientation of b . If B is a basis of $Z_1(\Gamma, \mathbb{Z}_2)$, then denote by \tilde{B} a cyclic orientation of B . As one can see from our notation, if b denotes an element of the binary cycle space, then \mathbf{b} denotes one of the possible liftings of b to

the cycle space, and \tilde{b} is one of the liftings of b to the fundamental group.

If $H \leq \pi(\Gamma)$, then H^a denotes $H/(\pi(\Gamma)' \cap H)$, the abelianization of H with respect to $\pi(\Gamma)$; that is, H^a is the image of H in $Z_1(\Gamma)$. If $L, M \leq A$, we denote by L/M the image of L in A/M ; in particular, $L/2A$ is L reduced modulo 2.

3 The Test for Abelian Groups

Lemma 3.1 *Let A be a free abelian group, and let h be a homomorphism from A to G , an abelian group without odd torsion. Let L be a subgroup of A such that $h(L) = 0$ and $L/2A = A/2A$. Suppose K is a subgroup of A such that $K/(L \cap K)$ does not have elements of infinite order. Then $h(K) = 0$.*

Proof. Suppose there is $\mathbf{y} \in K$ such that $h(\mathbf{y}) \neq 0$. Since $h(L) = 0$, $\mathbf{y} \notin L$. There is a minimal $l > 1$ such that $l\mathbf{y} \in L$. Let $l = 2^e a$, where a is odd and $e > 0$ (since otherwise $h(\mathbf{x})$ would have odd order in G).

Now, $h(a\mathbf{y}) \neq 0$, since otherwise $h(\mathbf{y})$ would have odd order in G . Denote $a\mathbf{y}$ by \mathbf{x} . Then 2^e is the order of \mathbf{x} in $K/(L \cap K)$ and $e = \min\{k \mid 2^k \mathbf{x} \in L\}$. Let $\{\mathbf{b}_i\}$ be a basis of L , so that $2^e \mathbf{x} = \sum l_i \mathbf{b}_i$. Since $L/2A = A/2A$, $\{[\mathbf{b}_i]\}_i$ generates $A/2A$. Thus $[\mathbf{x}] = \sum \lambda_i [\mathbf{b}_i]$, i.e., $\mathbf{x} = \sum \lambda_i \mathbf{b}_i + 2\mathbf{z}$ for some $\mathbf{z} \in A$. We have $2^e \mathbf{x} = \sum \lambda_i 2^e \mathbf{b}_i + 2^{e+1} \mathbf{z}$. Thus $\sum (l_i - \lambda_i 2^e) \mathbf{b}_i \in 2A$ and all l_i are divisible by 2, i.e., $l_i = 2m_i$, $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $e > 0$ we have $2^{e-1} \mathbf{x} = \sum m_i \mathbf{b}_i \in L$. This contradicts the choice of e as $\min\{k \mid 2^k \mathbf{x} \in L\}$. Therefore $h(K) = 0$. ■

Lemma 3.2 *Let (Γ, g, G) be a gain graph, where G is an abelian group without odd torsion, and let K be a subgroup of $Z_1(\Gamma)$. If a basis B of $Z_1(\Gamma, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ has some cyclic orientation \tilde{B} that lies in the kernel of g , and if $K/(\langle \tilde{B} \rangle^a \cap K)$ does not have elements of infinite order, then any lifting of K to $\pi(\Gamma)$ lies in the kernel of g .*

Proof. Denote $\langle \tilde{B} \rangle^a$ by L . The homomorphism g induces, in a natural way, a homomorphism h from $Z_1(\Gamma)$ to G . Obviously, $h(L) = 0$ and $L/2Z_1(\Gamma) = Z_1(\Gamma)/2Z_1(\Gamma) = Z_1(\Gamma, \mathbb{Z}_2)$. We can now apply Lemma 3.1 and conclude that K lies in the kernel of h . Since G is abelian, any lifting of K to $\pi(\Gamma)$ also lies in the kernel of g . ■

Theorem 3.3 *Suppose Γ is a finite graph and G is an abelian group without odd torsion. If all elements of a basis B of $Z_1(\Gamma, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ have cyclic orientations that lie in the kernel of g , then (Γ, g, G) is balanced.*

Proof. Since Γ is finite, $\text{rank} \langle \tilde{B} \rangle^a = \text{rank } Z_1(\Gamma)$, so all elements of $Z_1(\Gamma)/\langle \tilde{B} \rangle^a$ have finite order. Now apply Lemma 3.2 with $K = Z_1(\Gamma)$. ■

Lemma 3.4 *Let G be an abelian group without odd torsion. If some basis B of $Z_1(\Gamma, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ has a cyclic orientation \tilde{B} that lies in the kernel of g , and if \tilde{B} is such that $Z_1(\Gamma)/\langle \tilde{B} \rangle^a$ has no elements of infinite order, then $g(\pi(\Gamma))$ is 2-divisible.*

Proof. The elements of $Z_1(\Gamma)$ that have finite order in $Z_1(\Gamma)/\langle \tilde{B} \rangle^a$ form a subgroup in $Z_1(\Gamma)$, which we denote by F . Since $F/\langle \tilde{B} \rangle^a$ does not have elements of infinite order, Lemma 3.2 with $K = F$ implies that $g(F) = 0$. Thus if $\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \in F$, $g(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) = 0$. Therefore, g induces an epimorphism h from $Z_1(\Gamma)/F$ onto $g(\pi(\Gamma))$.

Let $\mathbf{y} \in Z_1(\Gamma)$. Since $\langle \tilde{B} \rangle^a \in F$, there is $x \in F$ such that $\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} = 2\mathbf{z}$ for some $\mathbf{z} \in Z_1(\Gamma)$. Thus $\mathbf{y} \in 2\mathbf{z} + F$, and $\mathbf{y} + F = 2\mathbf{z} + F = 2(\mathbf{z} + F)$. Therefore all elements of $Z_1(\Gamma)/F$ are 2-divisible.

Let a be an element of $g(\pi(\Gamma))$. Since the homomorphism h from $Z_1(\Gamma)/F$ is onto $g(\pi(\Gamma))$, there is $\mathbf{y} \in Z_1(\Gamma)/F$ such that $h(\mathbf{y}) = a$. Since \mathbf{y} is 2-divisible, a is also 2-divisible: $h(\mathbf{y}) = h(2\mathbf{z}) = 2h(\mathbf{z}) = a$. ■

Theorem 3.5 *Let G be an abelian group, without odd torsion, which has no infinitely 2-divisible elements other than the identity. If some basis B of $Z_1(\Gamma, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ has a cyclic orientation \tilde{B} that lies in the kernel of g , then (Γ, g, G) is balanced.*

Proof. If $Z_1(\Gamma)/\langle \tilde{B} \rangle^a$ does not have elements of infinite order, then, an application of Theorem 3.2 with $K = Z_1(\Gamma)$ implies that (Γ, g, G) is balanced. If $Z_1(\Gamma)/\langle \tilde{B} \rangle^a$ has elements of infinite order, then by Lemma 3.4 $g(\pi(\Gamma))$ is 2-divisible, which is only possible if (Γ, g, G) is balanced. ■

Corollary 3.6 *Suppose Γ is a finite graph and G is a free group. If all elements of a basis B of $Z_1(\Gamma, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ have cyclic orientations that lie in the kernel of g , then (Γ, g, G) is balanced.*

Proof. g induces a homomorphism \bar{g} from $\pi(\Gamma)$ into G/G' . G/G' is a free abelian group and, therefore, does not have torsion or infinitely 2-divisible elements. By Theorem 3.5, $\text{Im } \bar{g} = 0$. But this can only happen if $\text{Im } g = 1$, because $\text{Ker } g$ is a free group whose abelianization is $\text{Ker } \bar{g}$. ■

Corollary 3.7 *Let g be a group such that G/G' has no torsion or has only 2-torsion. Let (Γ, g, G) be a gain graph whose gain group is G . If there is a basis B of the binary cycle space $Z_1(\Gamma, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ such that for each $b \in B$ there is a cyclic orientation \tilde{b} for which $g(\tilde{b}) \in G'$, then every circle has gain in G' .*

4 Counterexamples

In discrete geometry the case of an infinite gain graph with an abelian 2-divisible group of gains, such as \mathbb{R}^n or \mathbb{R}^* is one of the most typical ones (see Ryshkov and Rybnikov (1997), Rybnikov (1999)). In such applications the cycle basis for which we can verify the balance property normally consists of *circles*. Might the *Circle Test*, i.e., where all elements of the binary basis are known to be *circles*, work for infinite graphs with 2-divisible groups of gains? Unfortunately, not. We construct an infinite gain graph with a 2-divisible, torsion-free group of gains, unbalanced yet having a binary circle basis all of whose elements are balanced.

Example 4.1 We describe the graph in terms of its rectilinear realization in the plane to make the presentation more visual. The vertices of the graph are points $D_k = (k, k)$, $L_k = (k+1, k)$, $U_k = (k+1, k)$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, where \mathbb{N} stands for the positive integers. The edges of the graph are $D_k L_k$, $D_k U_k$, $L_k L_{k+1}$, and $U_k U_{k+1}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We use the following notation for elements of $Z_1(\Gamma)$: denote $D_i L_i D_{i+1} U_i D_i$ by \mathbf{e}_i , $L_i L_{i+1} D_i L_i$ by \mathbf{g}_i , and $U_i D_{i+1} U_{i+1} U_i$ by \mathbf{h}_i . Then $\{\mathbf{e}_k, \mathbf{g}_{k+1}, \mathbf{h}_{k+1}\}_{k \geq 1}$ is an integral circle basis of

Γ . The graph Γ is shown on Figure 1. As usual, we denote an element of $Z_1(\Gamma, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ corresponding to $\mathbf{x} \in Z_1(\Gamma)$ by $[\mathbf{x}]$.

Let

$$\mathbf{B} = \{\mathbf{e}_k + \mathbf{g}_{k+1} + \mathbf{h}_{k+1}\}_{k \geq 1} \cup \{\mathbf{g}_k + \mathbf{e}_k\}_{k \geq 2} \cup \{\mathbf{h}_k + \mathbf{e}_k\}_{k \geq 2}$$

and let $B = \{[\mathbf{b}] \mid \mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}\}$. B is obviously a basis of $Z_1(\Gamma, \mathbb{Z}_2)$, because $[\mathbf{e}_k] = [\mathbf{e}_k + \mathbf{g}_{k+1} + \mathbf{h}_{k+1}] + [\mathbf{g}_{k+1} + \mathbf{e}_{k+1}] + [\mathbf{h}_{k+1} + \mathbf{e}_{k+1}]$. Let H denote the subgroup of $Z_1(\Gamma)$ (hence of $\mathbb{Z}E$) generated by \mathbf{B} , and let $\chi : \mathbb{Z}E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}E/H$ be the quotient map. Now, let us set the gain group to be $\mathbb{Z}E/H$ and the gain map g to be χa , where a is the abelianization mapping from F_E to $\mathbb{Z}E$. Then the essential gain group $g(\pi(\Gamma)) = \chi(Z_1(\Gamma)) = Z_1(\Gamma)/H$. By construction, B is a basis of the binary cycle space that consists of balanced circles. If we show that $H \neq Z_1(\Gamma)$, then the constructed gain graph is not balanced, because $Z_1(\Gamma)/H = \langle \chi(\mathbf{e}_k), \chi(\mathbf{g}_{k+1}), \chi(\mathbf{h}_{k+1}) \mid k \geq 1 \rangle = g(\pi(\Gamma))$.

Lemma 4.1 *In the above construction, $H \neq Z_1(\Gamma)$.*

Proof. The proof is based on the observation that there is no finite linear combination of elements of H that is equal to \mathbf{e}_1 . Suppose there is such a combination. Then the coefficient in front of $\mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{g}_2 + \mathbf{h}_2$ is 1. This, in turn, implies that the coefficients in front of $\mathbf{e}_2 + \mathbf{h}_2$ and $\mathbf{e}_2 + \mathbf{g}_2$ are -1 . Suppose we have shown that the coefficient in front of $\mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{g}_{i+1} + \mathbf{h}_{i+1}$ must be $(-2)^{i-1}$. Then, obviously, the coefficients in front of $\mathbf{e}_{i+1} + \mathbf{h}_{i+1}$ and $\mathbf{e}_{i+1} + \mathbf{g}_{i+1}$ are $(-2)^{i-1}$. Therefore, the coefficient in front of $\mathbf{e}_{i+1} + \mathbf{g}_{i+2} + \mathbf{h}_{i+2}$ is $(-2)^i$. Thus, there is no finite linear combination of elements of H that gives \mathbf{e}_1 . ■

We want to prove that the essential gain group $g(\pi(\Gamma))$ is 2-divisible. Denote by $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{2}]$ the ring of dyadic rationals, i.e., the ring of rational numbers whose denominators are powers of 2. Its additive group $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{2}]^+$ is the unique smallest group that contains an infinitely 2-divisible element of infinite order.

Lemma 4.2 *$Z_1(\Gamma)/H$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{2}]^+$.*

Proof. It is well known that $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{2}]^+$ can be written as $\langle d_1, d_2, \dots \mid d_1 = 2d_2, d_2 = 2d_3, \dots \rangle = A/D$, where A is the free abelian group with generators d_1, d_2, \dots and D is its subgroup generated by $d_i - 2d_{i+1}$. Let φ be the map from $Z_1(\Gamma)/H$ to A/D defined by $\varphi(\mathbf{e}_i + H) = d_i + D$ ($i \geq 1$), $\varphi(\mathbf{g}_i + H) = -d_i + D$ ($i \geq 2$) and $\varphi(\mathbf{h}_i + H) = -d_i + D$ ($i \geq 2$). It is easy to see that φ is an isomorphism. ■

Notice that a circle $\mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{g}_{i+1} + \mathbf{h}_{i+1}$ has 5 edges. We do not know if one can construct an example of an unbalanced infinite abelian gain graph with a torsion-free gain group, where there is a basis of the binary cycle space that consists of balanced circles with at most 4 edges. We suspect that such an example exists. However, we have the following conjecture.

Conjecture 4.3 *Let G be a torsion-free abelian group, possibly 2-divisible, and suppose $Z_1(\Gamma)$ has a basis that consists of balanced circles with at most 3 edges. Then (Γ, g, G) is balanced!*

There are also finite counterexamples, but the gain group necessarily has an element of odd order.




Figure 1: Counterexample to the Circle Test with infinitely 2-divisible elements.




Figure 2: The wheel W_6 with gains switched as in Example 4.2. All products $g_{i+1}g_{i+2} \cdots g_{i-1} = 1$.

Example 4.2 From Rybnikov and Zaslavsky (20xx), Theorem 6.16, we take the example of the wheel W_{2k} with gain group \mathbb{Z}_{2k-1} (Figure 2). The binary cycle basis consists of the $2k$ Hamiltonian circles. Switch so the spokes of the wheel have identity gain; then balance of the Hamiltonian circles implies that any $2k - 1$ consecutive edges along the outer circle have gain product 1. From this it follows that they all have the same gain a and $a^{2k-1} = 1$. These gains with gain group \mathbb{Z}_{2k-1} give an unbalanced gain graph that has a binary cycle basis composed of balanced circles.

Another example from Rybnikov and Zaslavsky (20xx), Theorem 6.16, is $2C_{2k}$, an even circle with all edges doubled, with the same gain group.

5 Gain graphs in geometry

In discrete geometry, there are a number of local-to-global results about tilings of spaces of constant curvature and PL-realizations of manifolds in \mathbb{R}^d . Well known examples are Poincaré’s work on Fuchsian groups (1882), Coxeter’s theorem reducing the classification of reflection groups to that of Coxeter simplices (1940), Alexandrov’s tiling theorem (1994), Dolbilin’s extension theorem (2000), Voronoi’s construction of the generatrix (*generatrice* in the French original, *generatrissa* in Russian) (1908), the Maxwell–Cremona correspondence (see Crapo and Whiteley (1993), Rybnikov (1999)), colorings of manifolds (Edwards (1977); Goodman, Onishi (1978); Ryshkov, Rybnikov (1997)) etc. Recently, Joswig and Izvestiev (2003) applied this approach to the study of 3-manifolds as finite covering spaces of \mathbb{S}^3 .

In this section we show how gain graphs can be used to obtain a topological generalization of Voronoi’s construction of a generatrix. Among other of their applications are colorings of graphs and polyhedra (Ryshkov and Rybnikov (1997)) and various generalizations of the Maxwell–Cremona correspondence (Rybnikov (1999), Erdahl *et al.* (2001)).

Given a tiling of \mathbb{R}^d by convex polytopes, it is natural to ask whether this tiling can be thought of as the vertical projection of a convex PL-surface, or, more generally, any PL-surface. A PL-function on \mathbb{R}^d is known as a C_1^0 -spline in approximation theory. The question of the dimension of the space of such splines on a given tiling has received significant attention from discrete geometers and spline enthusiasts (see, e.g., Whiteley (1996) or Billera (1989) for details). Voronoi (1908) showed that any *simple* tiling, i.e., such that each vertex is incident to exactly $d + 1$ tiles, is indeed the projection of a convex surface; furthermore, a surface that gives this tiling as a projection is uniquely determined by the choice of an affine support function and a dihedral angle. A tiling of \mathbb{R}^d is an example of a more general concept, namely a PL-realization M of a d -dimensional manifold \mathcal{M} in \mathbb{R}^d . We now ask about possible PL-realizations of \mathcal{M} in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} that give M as a vertical projection.

If M is a PL-realization of a cell-complex (e.g., in the sense of Seifert and Threlfall (1934)) \mathcal{M} in \mathbb{R}^d , and L is another PL-realization of \mathcal{M} , but in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} , such that for each cell C of \mathcal{M} its realization in M is the vertical projection of its realization in L , then L is called a *lifting* of M . The notion of lifting naturally generalizes that of C_1^0 -spline. The graph of a C_1^0 -spline is a lifting of the tiling over which it is defined, while a lifting of a PL-realization M of a d -manifold \mathcal{M} in \mathbb{R}^d is the graph of a C_1^0 -spline if and only if M is an embedding. Obviously, liftings can be added, just like C_1^0 -splines. The space

of liftings of M is denoted by $\text{Lift}(M)$. We call a PL-realization of a d -complex in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} *sharp* if any two adjacent d -cells are realized on different affine hyperplanes.

Of course, questions about projections of piecewise-linear surfaces belong to the realm of projective geometry. To make our presentation more visual and accessible we do all our geometry in the real affine space \mathbb{R}^d , although at the end of the section we give our result a proper projective interpretation.

Although some of the constructions that we treat below were considered in Rybnikov (1999), the Binary Cycle Test is formulated incorrectly there (in Lemma 4.1). Roughly speaking, that formulation does not have any restriction on gain groups, due to the fact that the author had in mind only abelian groups. However, since the test was applied there for abelian, torsion-free groups only, all the geometric results of Rybnikov (1999) about PL-realizations of (and splines over) a manifold \mathcal{M} with $H_1(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{Z}_2) = 0$ hold true if one assumes that the manifold has finitely many cells; this last requirement was also omitted in Rybnikov (1999). (When \mathcal{M} is simply connected the finiteness restriction is not necessary, since in this case there is an alternative argument, which uses the fundamental group—see Ryshkov and Rybnikov (1997) for proofs and examples.)

5.1 Technical Preparation

Algebra on gain graphs

In work of this kind gain graphs are normally used in the following setup. Let (Γ, g, G) be a gain graph. Let Q be a set, which we call the set of *qualities*, and suppose G acts on Q ; for $q \in Q$ and $h \in G$ we denote the result of the action by $[q]h$. For instance, it may be that $Q = G$ and the action is by right multiplication (the *right regular action*). The combination (Γ, g, G, Q) is a *permutation gain graph*. A *state* of the graph is an assignment s of qualities to the vertices of Γ . We want to find a state such that for any two adjacent vertices v and w their qualities $s(v)$ and $s(w)$ are connected by $s(w) = [s(v)]g(vw)$. Such a state is called *satisfied* with respect to g , g -satisfied. The set of all g -satisfied states is denoted by $\text{Sat}_g(\Gamma, G, Q)$. The set of all states that are satisfied with respect to at least one element of G is denoted by $\text{Sat}(\Gamma, G, Q)$. A g -satisfied state always exists if g is balanced, because in this case one can arbitrarily choose the state of one vertex in each connected component, then assign the states of other vertices according to the rule of satisfaction. The exact rule is that, if $s(v_0)$ is the arbitrary state and v is a vertex connected to v_0 by a walk W , then $s(v) = [s(v_0)]g(W)$. The number of balanced gain maps on a connected graph $\Gamma(V, E)$ is $|G|^{|V|-1}$, because one can assign gains arbitrarily to the edges of a spanning tree and then other edge gains are uniquely determined by balance.

The set G^E of all gain maps with values in G forms a group, which we denote by $\text{Gain}(\Gamma, G)$, under componentwise multiplication, $gg'(e) = g(e)g'(e)$. If G is abelian the set $\text{Balance}(\Gamma, G)$ of all balanced gain maps is a subgroup of G^E . If Γ is also connected, then $\text{Balance}(\Gamma, G) \cong G^{|V|-1}$, since the number of edges in a spanning tree is $|V| - 1$. *From now on we assume that $\Gamma(V, E)$ is connected.*

If Q is a group, the set Q^V of states forms a group under componentwise multiplication, $ss'(v) = s(v)s'(v)$. *From now on we assume that Q is a group.* We do not assume, in general, that the action of G on Q is a group action.

If G does act on Q in the manner of a *group action* (i.e., through a homomorphism $G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(Q)$), then the set of all g -satisfied states $\text{Sat}_g(\Gamma, G, Q)$ forms a subgroup of

the Q^V . If Γ is connected and g is balanced, $\text{Sat}_g(\Gamma, G, Q) \cong Q$ because the choice of $s(v)$ at one vertex v determines s .

Another way G may act on Q is by a *product action*, that is, where

$$(5.1) \quad [qq'](ff') = ([q]f)([q']f').$$

Affine action of \mathbb{R}^n on itself (by translations) is an example of product action in geometry. We discuss product action in Lemma (5.2).

We call $(g, s) \in G^E \times Q^V$ a satisfied pair if s is a satisfied state with respect to gain map g . With a product action of G on Q , the set of satisfied pairs forms a group $\text{SatPair}(\Gamma, G, Q)$ with respect to componentwise multiplication, $(g, s)(g', s') = (gg', ss')$. If $H \subset G^E$, then $\text{SatPair}_H(\Gamma, G, Q)$ stands for the set of all satisfied pairs (s, g) , where $g \in H$. If G is abelian and H happens to be a subgroup of $\text{Balance}(\Gamma, G)$, $\text{SatPair}_H(\Gamma, G, Q)$ forms a subgroup of $\text{SatPair}(\Gamma, G, Q)$.

We call an action of G on Q *fixed-point free* if every element of G , other than the identity, acts without fixed points. If Γ is connected and the action of G is fixed-point free, then $\text{Sat}(\Gamma, G, Q) \cong \text{Balance}(\Gamma, G) \times Q$, because, as shown in the following lemma, any $g \in G$ and the value $q \in Q$ at one vertex together determine a satisfied state if and only if $g \in \text{Balance}(\Gamma, G)$.

Lemma 5.1 *Suppose the action of G on Q is fixed-point free. Then a permutation gain graph (Γ, g, G, Q) has a satisfied state if and only if (Γ, g, G) is balanced.*

Proof. Given (Γ, g, G, Q) , let s be a state. Let W_v denote a simple closed walk from v to v . Then s is satisfied if and only if $[s(v)]g(W_v) = s(v)$ for all choices of v and W_v . Under the hypothesis on fixed points, this is true if and only if $g(W_v) = 1$ for all choices of W_v , i.e., if and only if g is balanced. ■

In particular, this lemma implies that if H is a subgroup of $\text{Balance}(\Gamma, G)$, then there is a natural bijection between Sat_H and $H \times Q$.

Suppose G acts on Q in the manner of group action. If Q is a module over a ring \mathcal{R} and the group action is linear over \mathcal{R} , then for any gain map g , $\text{Sat}_g(\Gamma, G, Q)$ is also an \mathcal{R} -module. Furthermore, by Lemma (5.1)

$$(5.2) \quad \text{Sat}_g(\Gamma, G, Q) \cong Q.$$

If G is also an \mathcal{R} -module and H is a submodule of $\text{Balance}(\Gamma, G)$, then the action of G on Q is indeed a product action and $\text{SatPair}_H(\Gamma, G, Q)$ is a subgroup of $\text{SatPair}_H(\Gamma, G, Q)$.

$$(5.3) \quad \text{SatPair}_H(\Gamma, G, Q) \cong Q \bigoplus H.$$

In particular, $\text{SatPair}(\Gamma, G, Q) \cong Q \bigoplus G^{|V|-1}$. If the action of module G on module Q is also fixed-point free, then by Lemma 5.1:

$$(5.4) \quad \text{Sat}_H(\Gamma, G, Q) = \text{SatPair}_H(\Gamma, G, Q) \cong Q \bigoplus H$$

A product action is very restricted.

Lemma 5.2 *An action of G on Q is a product action if and only if it has the form $[q]f = qc(f)$, where $c : G \rightarrow Q$ is a homomorphism of G into the center of Q .*

Proof. Any action of this form is clearly a product action. For the converse, compare the two sides of (5.1). First, with $q = q' = 1$; this establishes the existence of a homomorphism c given by $c(f) = [1]f$. Next, with $q' = 1$, and $f = 1$; this establishes that $[q]f' = ([q]1) \cdot c(f')$. Taking $q = 1$ and $f' = 1$ establishes that $[q]f = c(f)q'$; combining this with the previous conclusion we get $qc(f) = [q]f = c(f)q$ for all $q \in Q$. So, $c(f)$ is in the center of Q . ■

A special case of permutation gain graphs has been studied by M. Joswig and I. Izmistiev (2002, 2003) in connection with coloring of tilings of manifolds and problems in geometric topology of covering spaces. Namely, Joswig considered gain graphs whose underlying graphs appear as dual graphs of simplicial PL-manifolds. In this case, the underlying graph Γ is the dual graph of some finite, pure, d -dimensional, strongly-connected simplicial complex Δ on n vertices, and the gain group is S_n , the symmetric group on the vertices of Δ . The gain map g is determined by the triangulation of Δ as follows: an edge $\sigma\tau$ of Γ , where σ and τ are adjacent d -simplices of Δ , is mapped to the transposition that permutes two vertices of $\sigma \cup \tau$ that do not belong to their common facet. Thus, $g(\pi_1(\Gamma))$ is a subgroup of S_n , generated by a subset of transpositions on $\{1, \dots, n\}$ that correspond to adjacent d -simplices (such transpositions are called "perspectivities" by Joswig). Let us fix a vertex v of Γ (i.e. a d -simplex $v = \{1, \dots, d+1\}$ of Δ) and consider the group of all closed paths on Γ which start and end at v ; this group can be identified with $\pi_1(\Gamma)$. Then $g(\pi_1(\Gamma))$ is the subgroup of all permutations that can be written as products of transpositions along closed paths starting at v . Such products of transpositions are called "projectivities" by Joswig (2002) and their group is denoted by $\Pi(\Delta, v)$ and referred to as the group of projectivities. (Thus, Joswig's $\Pi(\Delta, v)$ is the same as $g(\pi_1(\Gamma))$ in our notation.) If $[v, v_1, \dots, v_n, v]$ is a closed path in the dual graph starting from simplex v , then it is clear that $g([v, v_1, \dots, v_n, v])$, restricted to the vertices of v , is a permutation on $\{1, \dots, d+1\}$. Therefore, $g(\pi_1(\Gamma))$ is a subgroup of the set-stabilizer (also called isotropy subgroup) of $1, \dots, d+1$. The main object of Joswig's (2002, 2003) and Izmistiev's (2003) study is the size and structure of this subgroup for various combinatorial manifolds.

Piecewise-linear topology

We use standard notions of PL-topology. (See for example Munkres (1984) or Seifert and Threlfall (1980).) A *regular CW-complex* is a locally finite CW-complex in which all gluing mappings are homeomorphisms. A regular CW-complex has a barycentric subdivision, which is a simplicial complex. Any regular CW-complex has a natural dual structure, called the *dual cell-decomposition*. The k -cells of the dual cell-decomposition of \mathcal{K} are formed by those simplices of the barycentric subdivision of \mathcal{K} whose closures share a $(d-k)$ -cell of \mathcal{K} . A pure d -dimensional CW-complex is *strongly connected* if any two d -cells can be joined by a sequence of d -cells such that every two consecutive d -cells share a $(d-1)$ -cell. A *homology sphere* is defined inductively: a homology 0-sphere is a standard sphere, and a higher-dimensional homology sphere is a strongly connected regular CW-complex such that: (1) all its homology groups are like those of a standard sphere and (2) the boundaries of all cells of the barycentric subdivision are homology spheres. We call the boundaries of the cells of the barycentric subdivision *links*. A

homology d -manifold (with boundary) is a strongly connected regular CW-complex in which the link of each k -cell, for all $0 \leq k < d$, is a homology sphere (or disk) of dimension $d - k - 1$. A homology ball is a cone over a homology sphere.

Seifert and Threlfall allow the cells of a homology manifold to be homology balls. All of our results hold for this more general definition. If in our considerations we replaced CW-complexes by homology CW-complexes, i.e., complexes where all cells are homology balls, then we would include all the homology manifolds considered by Seifert and Threlfall.

If \mathcal{K} is a regular CW-complex and r is a mapping from the barycentric subdivision of \mathcal{K} to \mathbb{R}^N such that (1) each abstract k -simplex is mapped one-to-one to an affine k -simplex, and (2) the k -simplices making up a k -cell of \mathcal{K} are realized in the same k -dimensional affine flat, then $K = (\mathcal{K}, r)$ is called a *PL-realization* of \mathcal{K} . The realization is called *non-degenerate* if r is a bijection on the closure of each cell C of \mathcal{K} .

5.2 Local Considerations

In a pure d -dimensional complex we call $(d - 2)$ -dimensional cells *ridges* and $(d - 1)$ -dimensional cells *facets*. An *oriented facet* is an ordered pair of adjacent d -cells. The minimum possible number of d -cells that make contact at a k -cell of a convex tiling of \mathbb{R}^d , or of a $(d + 1)$ -polytope, is $d - k + 1$. We call the star of a k -cell in a manifold *simple* (a.k.a. *primitive* in the theory of parallelohedra) if the cell is incident to only $d - k + 1$ d -cells. A d -manifold is called *k -simple* if the star of each k -cell is simple. A manifold with boundary is *k -simple* if the stars of all its interior k -cells are simple. Notice that k -simplicity implies m -simplicity for $m > k$.

The *dual graph* $\Gamma(\mathcal{M})$ of a homology d -manifold \mathcal{M} (possibly with boundary) is the graph of adjacency of d -cells. The vertices are the d -cells of \mathcal{M} and the edges are the pairs of d -cells that share a common facet. The edges of $\Gamma(\mathcal{M})$ can be thought of as the internal $(d - 1)$ -cells of \mathcal{M} . In the dual graph of a k -simple manifold, the subgraphs corresponding to the stars of k -cells are $(d - k)$ -simplices. Subgraphs of $\Gamma(\mathcal{M})$ that correspond to the stars of ridges are circles; we call them *ridge circles* and, in the case when the stars of ridges are simple, *ridge triangles*.

A *reciprocal* for a PL-realization M of a manifold \mathcal{M} (possibly with boundary) in \mathbb{R}^d is a rectilinear realization R in \mathbb{R}^d of the dual graph $\Gamma(\mathcal{M})$ such that the edges of R are perpendicular to the corresponding facets. If none of the edges of a reciprocal collapses into a point, the reciprocal is called *non-degenerate*. A reciprocal for the star of a cell C is called a *local reciprocal* of C . Reciprocals were originally considered by Maxwell (1862) in connection with stresses in plane frameworks. Let G be a rectilinear realization of a graph Γ in the plane. If Γ can be thought of as the 1-skeleton of a polyhedral sphere \mathcal{S} , then G induces a realization S_G of \mathcal{S} in the plane. Maxwell and, almost at the same time, Cremona (1870), noticed that the reciprocals of S_G (reciprocal diagrams of the graph G , in the language of Maxwell) correspond, in a one-to-one fashion, to equilibrium stresses on G and also encode all possible 3-dimensional polytopes that project onto G . Crapo and Whiteley (1993) gave an explicit treatment of the theory of reciprocals, stresses, and liftings of 2-manifolds. Obviously, reciprocals can be added and multiplied by real scalars. Geometrically multiplication corresponds to scaling. The addition is induced by vector addition of the vertices. Thus, for a given M the reciprocals form a linear space. This space, factored by all translations, is denoted $\text{Rec}(M)$.

Lemma 5.3 *For each non-degenerate PL-realization in \mathbb{R}^d of a simple star of a cell of a homology manifold there is a non-degenerate reciprocal. It is unique up to translations, homotheties, and reflections.*

Proof. The existence of a non-degenerate reciprocal for a simple star is a trivial exercise in linear algebra. Geometrically it can be seen in the following way. The simple star of a k -cell gives rise to a complex \mathcal{P} in \mathbb{R}^d that consists of $d - k + 1$ convex polyhedral d -cones (and their faces) with a common k -subspace as base. Take a point \mathbf{p} in \mathbb{R}^d and draw $d - k$ lines perpendicular to the facets of one of the d -cones of \mathcal{P} . Then take a hyperplane H perpendicular to that $(k + 1)$ -face of \mathcal{P} which is not a face of the chosen cone; such a face exists and is unique because the star is simple. The points of intersection of H and the lines, together with the point \mathbf{p} , give the vertex set of a reciprocal for the star. Since any two edges of the dual graph can be connected by a chain of adjacent triangles, and the realization of an edge of a triangle uniquely determines the realizations of the other two edges, the choice of any of the edges of the reciprocal uniquely determines the other edges. ■

Lemma 5.4 *If $Star$ is a simple star of a k -cell, then $\dim \text{Lift}(Star) = d + 2$.*

Proof. Any three d -cells of $Star$ form a triangle in the dual graph. Therefore, while constructing a lifting of $Star$, if we fix two affine functions that lift two chosen adjacent d -cells of $Star$ so that these functions coincide on the common facet, then we fix the lifting for all of $Star$. Since the lifting of two adjacent d -cells is defined by $d + 2$ parameters (e.g., the coefficients of an affine function in n variables and a dihedral angle in $(n + 1)$ -space), $\dim \text{Lift}(Star) = d + 2$. ■

In the remainder of the section we will show that, subject to the topological restriction that $H_1(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{Z}_2) = 0$ and the combinatorial restriction of $(d - 3)$ -simplicity, liftings of $(d - 2)$ -simple manifolds behave in the same way as those of simple stars.

5.3 From Local to Global

Lemma 5.5 *Let \mathcal{M} be a finite, $(d - 3)$ -simple homology d -manifold with $d \geq 2$ and with $H_1(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{Z}_2) = 0$. Let $(\Gamma(\mathcal{M}), g, G)$ be an abelian gain graph whose underlying graph is $\Gamma(\mathcal{M})$ and whose gain group has no odd torsion. Then the gain graph is balanced if and only if the ridge circles of $\Gamma(\mathcal{M})$ are balanced.*

Proof. The “only if” part follows from the definition of balanced graph.

Consider the dual cell-decomposition of \mathcal{M} . The 2-cells of this decomposition are in one-to-one correspondence with the ridges of \mathcal{M} . Since $H_1(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{Z}_2) = 0$, the boundaries of the 2-cells of the dual cell-decomposition generate $Z_1(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{Z}_2)$. These boundaries are circles and they are balanced by our assumption. According to the Binary Cycle Test for finite graphs, $(\Gamma(\mathcal{M}), g, G)$ must be balanced. ■

Corollary 5.6 *The statement of Lemma 5.5 holds true for homology spheres of dimension at least 2.*

Theorem 5.7 *Let \mathcal{M} be a finite, $(d - 3)$ -simple homology d -manifold without boundary, with $d \geq 3$, and with $H_1(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{Z}_2) = 0$. Let M be a non-degenerate PL-realization in \mathbb{R}^d . Then M has a non-degenerate reciprocal and $\dim \text{Rec}(M) = 1$.*

Proof. The main ingredients of the proof are the dual cell-decomposition \mathcal{M}^* of \mathcal{M} , the notion of gain graph, and the Binary Cycle Test for balance.

The edges of a reciprocal have a natural interpretation as the linear parts of the equations defining the facets of M . (These linear parts are often called the *covectors* corresponding to the facets.) Consider two facets of M that share a ridge R . Since there are only three facets making contact at each ridge of M , any reciprocal for the star of R is a triangle. Since all the facets lie on different hyperplanes, once we fix an edge of the reciprocal corresponding to one of the facets, we determine the other two edges. Since any two facets of \mathcal{M} can be connected by a chain of facets in which every two consecutive facets share a ridge, $\dim \text{Rec} = 1$.

We define an *oriented facet* to be an ordered pair of adjacent d -cells. Oriented facets can be thought of as oriented edges of $\Gamma(\mathcal{M})$. We associate with each oriented facet (C_1, C_2) a unit vector $\mathbf{n}(C_1, C_2)$, normal to the common ridge of C_1 and C_2 in M , so that $\mathbf{n}(C_1, C_2) = -\mathbf{n}(C_2, C_1)$.

Consider the *facet graph* \mathcal{F} , whose vertices are the (ordinary) facets of \mathcal{M} and whose edges are the pairs of facets sharing ridges. Orient the edges of \mathcal{F} in an arbitrary way. Take a ridge R where d -cells C_1, C_2, C_3 make contact. Denote by F_{ij} the common facet of C_i and C_j and by $\mathbf{n}(C_i, C_j)$ the normal for the pair of adjacent facets (C_i, C_j) . Up to scaling there is only one linear combination of $\mathbf{n}(C_1, C_2)$, $\mathbf{n}(C_2, C_3)$, $\mathbf{n}(C_3, C_1)$ equal to zero. If, say, $\mathbf{n}(C_1, C_2)$ enters this combination with coefficient $+1$, then the coefficients of the other two normals are uniquely determined. In other words, up to scaling there is only one local reciprocal for the star of R , whose edge corresponding to (C_1, C_2) is $\mathbf{n}(C_1, C_2)$. Let $\mathbf{v}(C_2, C_3)$ be the oriented edge of this triangle whose start point coincides with the end point of $\mathbf{n}(C_1, C_2)$. We define the map g from the oriented edges of \mathcal{F} to \mathbb{R}^* by setting

$$g(F_{12}F_{23}) = \mathbf{v}(C_2, C_3) \cdot \mathbf{n}(C_2, C_3).$$

Obviously, $g(F_{12}F_{23})$ depend only on the geometric realization M of \mathcal{M} and on the choice of normals $\mathbf{n}(A, B)$ for ordered pairs (A, B) of adjacent d -cells of M . This way we define the map g on all *ordered pairs of adjacent d -cells*. We need now to establish a few important properties of the map g . A direct inspection shows that $g(F_{12}F_{23}) = g(F_{23}F_{12})^{-1}$. Thus g is a gain map. By construction, the gains of edges joining facets F_{12} , F_{23} , and F_{31} satisfy

$$(5.5) \quad \mathbf{n}(C_1, C_2) + g(F_{12}F_{23})\mathbf{n}(C_2, C_3) + g(F_{23}F_{31})g(F_{12}F_{23})\mathbf{n}(C_3, C_1) = 0.$$

By definition, $\mathbf{n}(C_1, C_2) + g(F_{12}F_{23})\mathbf{n}(C_2, C_3) + g(F_{12}F_{31})\mathbf{n}(C_3, C_1)$. By comparing coefficients with (5.5), we have $g(F_{12}F_{23})g(F_{23}F_{31}) = g(F_{12}F_{31})$. But since $g(F_{31}F_{12}) = g(F_{12}F_{31})^{-1}$, we have

$$(5.6) \quad g(F_{12}F_{23}) \cdot g(F_{23}F_{31}) \cdot g(F_{31}F_{12}) = 1$$

for each triangle of the facet graph corresponding to a ridge of M .

Since $H_1(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{Z}_2) = 0$, for any $c \in Z_1(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ there is a 2-chain $\Delta \in C_2(\mathcal{M}^*, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ such that $c = \partial\Delta$. The chain Δ can be decomposed as $\Delta_1 + \Delta_2$, the sum of $\Delta_1 = \sum \partial\Delta_{1j}$, where each Δ_{1j} is a triangle whose vertices are the barycenters of facets of \mathcal{M} making contact at a ridge, and $\Delta_2 = \sum \Delta_{2i}$, where the vertex set of each Δ_{2i} is a subset of vertices of some d -cell. Therefore $c = \sum \partial\Delta_{1j} + \sum \partial\Delta_{2i}$ where each term in the first

sum is a ridge triangle of \mathcal{F} and each term in the second sum is a cycle on the boundary of a d -cell of \mathcal{M} . This shows that ridge triangles and d -cell boundary cycles generate $Z_1(\mathcal{F}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$.

Since \mathcal{M} is $(d-3)$ -simple, the boundary of each d -cell C is $((d-1)-2)$ -simple. \mathcal{F}_C , the subgraph of \mathcal{F} on the vertices that belong to C , is the dual graph of the boundary cell-complex of C . The corresponding gain subgraph is $(\mathcal{F}_C, g, \mathbb{R}^*)$. By Lemma 5.3 the ridge circles of \mathcal{F}_C are balanced. Since $\dim \partial C \geq 2$, Lemma 5.5 implies that $(\mathcal{F}_C, g, \mathbb{R}^*)$ is balanced and, therefore, all cyclic orientations of binary cycles of \mathcal{F}_C have gain 1. We have seen that all ridge circles are balanced; now we can conclude that all cycles lying on the boundaries of d -cells have cyclic orientations that have gain 1. We have seen that binary cycles of these two types generate $Z_1(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{Z}_2)$. By the Binary Cycle Test for finite graphs, $(\mathcal{F}, g, \mathbb{R}^*)$ is balanced. Suppose the set of qualities Q is taken to be \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{R}^* acts on \mathbb{R} by multiplication. This action of \mathbb{R}^* on \mathbb{R} is fixed-point free and therefore, by Lemma 5.1, $\text{Sat}_g(\Gamma, \mathbb{R}^*, \mathbb{R}) \cong \mathbb{R}$. Notice that in this case G is defined by M , that is by the geometry of the PL-realization of \mathcal{M} in \mathbb{R}^d . Each element of $\text{Sat}_g(\Gamma, \mathbb{R}^*, \mathbb{R})$ obviously corresponds to a reciprocal. $\text{Sat}_g(\Gamma, \mathbb{R}^*, \mathbb{R})$ can be regarded as a 1-dimensional subspace of $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{|E|}$, where $|E|$ is the number of edges of $\Gamma(\mathcal{M})$, the dual graph of \mathcal{M} .

Since \mathcal{M} is a $(d-3)$ -simple manifold, any two edges of its dual graph can be connected by a chain of triangles. This implies, by Lemma 5.3, that $\dim \text{Rec}(M) \leq 1$. Let us prove that $\dim \text{Rec}(M) = 1$. This is equivalent to showing that there is a reciprocal that does not collapse into a point. Our strategy is (1) to assign non-zero real numbers $c(F_{ij}) = c(C_i, C_j)$ to the non-oriented facets F_{ij} of M so that for each ridge where d -cells C_1, C_2, C_3 make contact the local condition

$$(5.7) \quad c(C_1, C_2)\mathbf{n}(C_1, C_2) + c(C_2, C_3)\mathbf{n}(C_2, C_3) + c(C_3, C_1)\mathbf{n}(C_3, C_1) = 0.$$

is satisfied, and then (2) to construct a global reciprocal which has these numbers as oriented edge lengths. It turns out that the only possible choices of function c on the facets of M are the satisfied states of $(\mathcal{F}, g, \mathbb{R}^*, \mathbb{R})$, constructed above.

The dual graph of \mathcal{M} is $\Gamma(\mathcal{M}) = \text{Sk}_1(\mathcal{M}^*)$. Fix a non-zero satisfied state s of $(\mathcal{F}, g, \mathbb{R}^*, \mathbb{R})$; we denote by $s(C_i, C_j)$ the value of s on a vertex of \mathcal{F} corresponding to a facet between d -cells C_i and C_j . We will construct yet another gain graph $(\Gamma(\mathcal{M}), h, \mathbb{R}^d)$, this time with the gain group \mathbb{R}^d . Assign to each oriented edge C_1C_2 of $\Gamma(\mathcal{M})$ the vector $h(C_1C_2) = s(C_1, C_2)\mathbf{n}(C_1, C_2)$. Since $\mathbf{n}(C_1, C_2) = -\mathbf{n}(C_2, C_1)$ and $s(C_1, C_2) = s(C_2, C_1)$, $h(C_2C_1) = -h(C_1C_2)$. Since $H_1(\mathcal{M}^*, \mathbb{Z}_2) = H_1(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{Z}_2) = 0$, the triangles of $\Gamma(\mathcal{M})$, corresponding to the ridges of \mathcal{M} , generate $Z_1(\Gamma(\mathcal{M}), \mathbb{Z}_2)$. To conclude that these triangles are balanced we have to show that $s(C_1, C_2)\mathbf{n}(C_1, C_2) + s(C_2, C_3)\mathbf{n}(C_2, C_3) + s(C_3, C_1)\mathbf{n}(C_3, C_1) = 0$.

Let us divide this equation by $s(C_1, C_2)$ and recall that $s(C_{i+1}, C_{i+2})/s(C_i, C_{i+1}) = g(F_{i,i+1}F_{i+1,i+2})$ (indices are taken modulo 3) for the star of each ridge. So, we need

$$\mathbf{n}(C_1, C_2) + g(F_{12}F_{23})\mathbf{n}(C_2, C_3) + g(F_{12}F_{31})\mathbf{n}(C_3, C_1) = 0.$$

By Equation (5.6), $g(F_{12}F_{31}) = g(F_{12}F_{31})^{-1}$ can be replaced by $g(F_{13}F_{23})g(F_{23}F_{31})$. The resulting equation immediately follows from Equation (5.5). Thus each ridge triangle is balanced and $(\Gamma(\mathcal{M}), h, \mathbb{R}^d)$ is balanced by the binary cycle test. Consider now the permutation gain graph $(\Gamma(\mathcal{M}), h, \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$, where the first three component are as above and \mathbb{R}^d acts on \mathbb{R}^d by right regular action (by translation in this case).

This action is obviously fixed-point free. Since a reciprocal is completely defined by coordinates of its vertices, all reciprocals form a linear subspace of $(\mathbb{R}^d)^V$, where V is the vertex set of $\Gamma(\mathcal{M})$. Thus, a satisfied state for this graph is a reciprocal whose edge lengths have been decided by the gain graph $(\Gamma(\mathcal{M}), h, \mathbb{R}^d)$. That is, since $(\Gamma(\mathcal{M}), h, \mathbb{R}^d)$ is balanced and connected, we can start from any point in \mathbb{R}^d as a vertex of the reciprocal and construct all other vertices. By Lemma 5.1 this construction gives all of $\text{Sat}_h(\Gamma(\mathcal{M}), \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$. Edges of any reciprocal define a gain map for the graph $\Gamma(\mathcal{M})$. Let H be a subspace of $\text{Balance}(\Gamma(\mathcal{M}), \mathbb{R}^d)$ that consists of gain maps defined by edges of reciprocals. We established earlier that $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} H = 1$. Since the right regular action of \mathbb{R}^d on \mathbb{R}^d is fixed-point free, by Lemma 5.1 $\text{Sat}_H(\Gamma(\mathcal{M}), \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d) \cong \mathbb{R}^d \oplus \mathbb{R}$. If reciprocals are considered up to translational equivalence, we get that $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \text{Rec}(M) = 1$.

■

Theorem 5.8 *Let \mathcal{M} and M be as in Theorem 5.7. Then M has a sharp lifting and $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \text{Lift}(M)$ is $d + 2$.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{M} is $(d - 2)$ -primitive, in any lifting of M the position of a d -cell C from the star $\text{Star}(R)$ of a $(d - 2)$ -cell R is completely defined by the positions of the other two d -cells of $\text{Star}(R)$. Therefore, if the lifting of $\text{Star}(R)$ can be extended to a lifting of M , the resulting lifting of M is completely defined by the lifting of $\text{Star}(R)$. By Lemma 5.4, $\dim \text{Lift}(M) \leq d + 2$.

Let us now prove that $\dim \text{Lift}(M) = d + 2$. Let H be as in the above theorem, i.e. let H be a subspace of $\text{Balance}(\Gamma(\mathcal{M}), \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ that consists of those realizations of the dual graph of \mathcal{M} that are reciprocals of M . Consider gain graphs where the underlying graph is the dual graph $\Gamma(M)$ of \mathcal{M} , the gain group is the additive group A_d of all affine functions on \mathbb{R}^d (which is isomorphic to \mathbb{R}^{d+1}). A_d acts on itself by additions and this action is fixed-point free. Therefore, by Lemma 5.1, liftings of M can be identified with all satisfied states $(\Gamma(M), h_1, \mathbb{R}^{d+1}, A_d)$ where h_1 is taken from the following subgroup of $\text{Balance}(\Gamma(M), \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$: subgroup H_1 consists of gain maps of the form $h_1(F) = \mathbf{e}_F \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_F)$, where F is an oriented facet F , \mathbf{e}_F is the oriented edge of a reciprocal which (i.e. edge) corresponds to F , \mathbf{c}_F is a vector pointing from the origin to any point on F , and \mathbf{x} is the variable vector. This gain map can be written as $h_1(F) = h(F) + c(F)$, where $h(F) = \mathbf{e}_F \cdot \mathbf{x}$ is a gain map from $H \subset \text{Balance}(\Gamma(M), \mathbb{R}^d)$. We know that $H \cong \mathbb{R}^+$. Therefore, a state s corresponds to a lifting if and only if the gain map $c(F) = -\mathbf{e}_F \cdot \mathbf{x}$ is balanced. It is easy to see that all cycles of $\Gamma(\mathcal{M})$ corresponding to the $(d - 2)$ -cells of \mathcal{M} are balanced with respect to this gain map. These cycles generate all of $H_1(\mathcal{M}^*, \mathbb{Z}_2) = H_1(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Therefore, by the Binary Cycle Test c is balanced. Thus, by Lemma 5.4 $\text{Lift}(M) \cong A_d \oplus \mathbb{R} \cong \mathbb{R}^{d+2}$.

■

We close with a few remarks.

If \mathcal{M} is a manifold with boundary that satisfies the conditions of Theorem 5.8, then $\dim \text{Lift}(M)$ can be greater than $d + 2$, but it always has at least a 1-parameter family of sharp liftings.

The proofs of Theorems 5.7 and 5.8 do not work in the case when \mathcal{M} has infinitely many cells, since the Binary Cycle Test for infinite gain graphs requires the gain group to be free of infinitely 2-divisible elements, while \mathbb{R}^d and \mathbb{R}^* are infinitely 2-divisible.

Although the above theorem is formulated for vertical projections, it, indeed, holds for central projections from \mathbb{R}^{d+1} to $\mathbb{R}^d \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. It also holds for central projections (from the origin) of d -manifolds realized in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} to the standard d -sphere in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} (see Rybnikov (1999) for details), or projections from $(0, \dots, 0, -1)$ of d -manifolds realized in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} to the Minkowski hyperboloid in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} . Of course, the reason for such universality is that the above theorem 5.8 is a theorem of projective geometry. Now, we reformulate it in the language of projective geometry.

As with the notion of a PL-realization of a manifold in \mathbb{R}^d , we can talk about a piecewise-flat realization of \mathcal{M} in \mathbb{RP}^d . The definition of such a projective realization repeats the definition of a PL-realization, except that the cells are realized on projective subspaces instead of affine subspaces. All of the considerations in this section can be carried out in the projective setup. The orthogonality between the edges of the reciprocal and facets of M is replaced with duality between lines and subspaces of codimension 1 in \mathbb{RP}^d . A piecewise-flat realization of a d -manifold in \mathbb{RP}^{d+1} is called sharp if any two adjacent d -cells are realized on different d -subspaces of \mathbb{RP}^{d+1} . The following theorem can be proven, for example, by designating a hyperplane at infinity and passing to the affine setup.

Theorem 5.9 *Let \mathcal{M} be a finite $(d-3)$ -simple homology d -manifold with $H_1(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{Z}_2) = 0$. Let M be its generic piecewise-flat realization in \mathbb{RP}^d . Then M has a sharp piecewise-flat realization L in \mathbb{RP}^{d+1} which is projectively equivalent to M . Such a realization is uniquely determined by choosing $d+2$ free real parameters.*

The following is a corollary of Theorem 5.8.

Corollary 5.10 *Let \mathcal{M} be a finite simple homology d -manifold, where $d \geq 3$, such that $H_1(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{Z}_2) = 0$. Let M be a generic PL-realization in \mathbb{R}^d whose d -cells are convex. Then M is a projection of a convex polytope in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} .*

Proof. Since \mathcal{M} is simple, it is $(d-3)$ -simple, and therefore there is a sharp lifting L of M to \mathbb{R}^{d+1} . Since all cells of \mathcal{M} are homeomorphic to convex polytopes, and there are $d-k+1$ d -cells making contact at each k -face, \mathcal{M} is a topological manifold. The sharp lifting L is then a simple PL-surface in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} , realizing abstract manifold \mathcal{M} . L must be an immersion, since each cell is embedded and the star of each vertex is embedded. So, we have a realization of a d -manifold in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} which has the following properties: (1) it is an immersion, (2) it is locally (non-strictly) convex at each vertex, and (3) it is strictly convex at each vertex. By Van Heijenoort's (1952) theorem L is the boundary of a convex body. Since \mathcal{M} is finite and L is piecewise-linear, L is a convex polytope. ■

Remark 5.11 *In fact, as follows from recent work of Rybnikov (200x), even if in the above corollary \mathcal{M} is only $(d-3)$ -simple, it is still the projection of a convex polytope. This is a consequence of the fact that convexity at $(d-3)$ -faces (plus other van Heijenoort (1952) conditions) is sufficient to establish global convexity.*

References

- [1] A. D. Alexandrov (1954), On tiling a space by polyhedra. (In Russian.) *Vestnik Leningrad Univ. Ser. Mat. Fiz. Him.* **9**, 33–43. Repr. in *Selected Works. Part I:*

- Selected Scientific Papers*. Classics of Soviet Mathematics, 4. Gordon and Breach, Amsterdam, 1996. MR 2000a:01035. Zbl. 960.01035.
- [2] L. Billera (1989), The algebra of continuous piecewise polynomials. *Adv. Math.* **76**, 170–183. MR 90g:13021. Zbl. 703.13015.
 - [3] H. S. M. Coxeter (1934), Discrete Groups Generated by Reflections. *Annals of Math.* **35**, 588–621. MR 2, 10b. Repr. in *Kaleidoscopes: Selected Writings of H. S. M. Coxeter*, F. A. Sherk *et al.*, eds., Wiley, New York, 1995. MR 96f:01041. Zbl. 976.01023.
 - [4] H. Crapo and W. Whiteley (1993), Autocontraintes planes et polyèdres projetés. I. Le motif de base. [Plane self stresses and projected polyhedra. I. The basic pattern.] *Structural Topology* No. 20, 55–78. MR 94g:52028. Zbl. 793.52006.
 - [5] L. Cremona (1890), *Graphical Statics*. Oxford Univ. Press, London. English trans. of 1872 Italian original.
 - [6] N. P. Dolbilin (2000), The extension theorem. *Discrete Math.* **221**, 43–59. MR 2001e:52038. Zbl. 970.52011.
 - [7] R. D. Edwards (1977), An amusing reformulation of the four color problem, *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.* **24**, A-257.
 - [8] R. M. Erdahl (1999), Dicings and Voronoi’s conjecture on parallelhedra. *European J. Combin.* 20, 527–549.
 - [9] R. M. Erdahl, K. A. Rybnikov, and S. S. Ryshkov (2001), On traces of d -stresses in the skeletons of lower dimensions of piecewise-linear d -manifolds. *European J. Combin.* 22, 801–820.
 - [10] J. L. Gross and T. W. Tucker (1987), *Topological Graph Theory*. Wiley, New York. MR 88h:05034. Zbl. 621.05013. Repr. with minor additions: Dover, Mineola, N.Y., 2001.
 - [11] J. E. Goodman and H. Onishi (1978), Even triangulations of \mathbb{S}^3 and the coloring of graphs, *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* **246**, 501–510.
 - [12] I. Izmistiev, M. Joswig (2003), Branched coverings, triangulations, and 3-manifolds. *Adv. Geom.* **3**, no. 2, 191–225.
 - [13] M. Joswig (2002), Projectivities in simplicial complexes and colorings of simple polytopes. *Math. Z.* **240**, no. 2, 243–259.
 - [14] J. C. Maxwell (1864), On reciprocal figures and diagrams of forces. *Philos. Mag.* (4) **27**, 250–261.
 - [15] J. R. Munkres (1984), *Elements of Algebraic Topology*. Addison-Wesley, Menlo Park, Cal. MR 85m:55001. Zbl. 673.55001.
 - [16] A. Ordine (2002), Tilings by reducible and irreducible parallelotopes, Talk at Janos Bolyai Conference on Hyperbolic Geometry, 8 July 2002, Budapest. Abstracts of Talks, pp. 43–44. To appear in the Ph.D. thesis of Ordin, Queen’s University, Ontario.
 - [17] H. Poincaré (1882), Théorie des groupes fuchsien. *Acta Math.* **1**, 1–62.
 - [18] K. Rybnikov (1999), Stresses and liftings of cell-complexes. *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **21**, 481–517. MR 2001a:52016. Zbl. 941.52008.

- [19] K. A. Rybnikov (1999a), *Polyhedral Partitions and Stresses*. Ph.D. thesis, Queen's University, Kingston, Ont., Canada.
WWW: <http://faculty.uml.edu/krybnikov/PS/disser.ps.gz>
- [20] K. A. Rybnikov (200x), On locally convex PL-manifolds and fast verification of convexity. Talk at Kolmogorov Centennial Conference, Moscow, June 18 of 2003. Abstracts of Talks, Moscow 2003, p. 236. WWW: <http://faculty.uml.edu/krybnikov/PDF/LocalGlobalAbstract.pdf>
- [21] K. A. Rybnikov (2002a), Gain graphs and tilings of manifolds, Talk at Janos Bolyai Conference on Hyperbolic Geometry, 8 July 2002, Budapest. Abstracts of talks, p. 44.
- [22] K. A. Rybnikov (2002b), On the state of Voronoi's conjecture on parallelohedra, Talk at the AMS meeting, Northeastern University, October 2002. *[Need better data on this.]*
- [23] K. A. Rybnikov and T. Zaslavsky (20xx), Cycle and circle tests of balance in gain graphs: Forbidden minors and their groups. Submitted for publication.
WWW: <http://www.math.binghamton.edu/zaslav/Tpapers> and [arXiv.org](http://arxiv.org)
- [24] S. S. Ryshkov and K. A. Rybnikov, Jr. (1997), The theory of quality translations with applications to tilings. *European J. Combin.* **18**, 431–444. MR 98d:52031. Zbl. 881.52015.
- [25] H. Seifert and W. Threlfall (1980), *Seifert and Threlfall: A Textbook of Topology*. Academic Press, New York. (English translation of 1934 German original.) MR 82b:55001. Zbl. 469.55001.
- [26] J. Van Heijenoort (1952), On locally convex manifolds. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **5**, 223–242. MR 14, 577b.
- [27] G. F. Voronoi (1908), Nouvelles applications des paramètres continus à la théorie des formes quadratiques. Deuxième mémoire: Recherches sur les paralléloèdres primitifs. *J. reine angew. Math.* **134**, 198–287.
- [28] W. Whiteley (1996), Some matroids from discrete applied geometry. In *Matroid Theory* (Seattle, Wash., 1995), J. Bonin *et al.*, eds., pp. 171–312. Contemp. Math., Vol. 197. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I. MR 97h:05040. Zbl. 860.05018.
- [29] T. Zaslavsky (1989), Biased graphs. I. Bias, balance, and gains, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **47**, 32–52. MR 90k:05138. Zbl. 714.05057.
- [30] T. Zaslavsky (1998), A mathematical bibliography of signed and gain graphs and allied areas. Manuscript prepared with Marge Pratt. *Electron. J. Combin.* 5 (1998), no. 1, Dynamic Surveys 8, 124 pp. (electronic).