BOTT–TAUBES/VASSILIEV COHOMOLOGY CLASSES BY CUT-AND-PASTE TOPOLOGY

ROBIN KOYTCHEFF

Abstract. Bott and Taubes used integrals over configuration spaces to produce finite-type (a.k.a. Vassiliev) knot invariants. Their techniques were then used to construct “Vassiliev classes” in the real cohomology spaces of knots and links in higher-dimensional Euclidean spaces, using classes in graph cohomology, as first promised by Kontsevich. Here we construct integer-valued cohomology classes in spaces of knots and links in \( \mathbb{R}^d \) for \( d > 3 \). We construct such a class for any integer-valued graph cocycle, by the method of gluing compactified configuration spaces. Our classes form the integer lattice among the previously discovered real cohomology classes. Thus we obtain nontrivial classes from trivalent graph cocycles. Our methods generalize to constructing mod-\( p \) classes out of mod-\( p \) graph cocycles, which need not be reductions of classes over the integers.

1. Introduction

This work focuses on spaces of embeddings of 1-manifolds into Euclidean space. The quintessential example of such an embedding space is the space of knots in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \). Its path components are isotopy classes of knots, and locally constant functions on this space are precisely knot invariants. Our main result is a construction of integer-valued cohomology classes in these embedding spaces, which are thus generalizations of invariants of knots and links. This work also opens a new potential avenue for studying the classical case of knots invariants.

Our key methods are further developments of the method of configuration space integrals pioneered by Bott and Taubes [4]. These integrals provided a topological interpretation of knot invariants coming from perturbative Chern–Simons field theory in quantum physics and also generalized the Gauss linking integral from links to knots. Parametrizing these integrals by the space of knots, one can view them as integrals along the fiber of a bundle over that space. Configuration space integrals produce all finite-type knot invariants [34, 39], as well as real cohomology classes in spaces of knots [7] and links [17], invariants of homology 3-spheres [19, 21], and characteristic classes of homology sphere bundles [40, 41]. All of these ideas were outlined in the visionary work of Kontsevich [12, 13]. In our relatively recent work, we considered the setting of cohomology classes in spaces of knots and links (including knot and link invariants) and carried out “homotopy-theoretic Bott–Taubes integration” by replacing integration of differential forms by a Pontrjagin–Thom construction [15, 14]. This produced cohomology classes with arbitrary coefficients rather than just real coefficients. In subsequent work, we refined this construction by gluing configuration spaces and thus recovered the Milnor triple linking number for string links [16, 14]. Our main result here is to produce integer-valued cohomology classes in spaces of knots and links in \( \mathbb{R}^d \).

Theorem 6.2. For each integer-valued graph cocycle \( \gamma \), there is a fiber bundle \( F_\gamma \to X_\gamma \to \mathcal{L}^d_m \) over the space of \( m \)-component long links in \( \mathbb{R}^d \) such that for \( d > 3 \), there is a map

\[
H^*(X_\gamma, \partial X_\gamma; \mathbb{Z}) \to H^{*-\dim F_\gamma}(\mathcal{L}^d_m; \mathbb{Z})
\]
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such that the images of certain elements over all cocycles $\gamma$ span an integer lattice among the configuration space integral cohomology classes.

By “configuration space integral cohomology classes” above, we mean the $\mathbb{R}$-vector space of the classes constructed by Cattaneo, Cotta-Ramusino, and Longoni [7] in spaces of knots, and generalized to spaces of links in joint work with Munson and Volić [17]. By “integer lattice” above, we mean a free $\mathbb{Z}$-module in this $\mathbb{R}$-vector space. Many of the configuration space integral cohomology classes are already known to be nontrivial, and thus the same is true of our $\mathbb{Z}$-valued classes above.

Furthermore, our construction can produce torsion classes with $\mathbb{Z}$ coefficients, and it can be generalized to mod-$p$ cohomology classes which need not be reductions of the integer-valued classes. We conjecture that it indeed produces nontrivial torsion classes with $\mathbb{Z}$ coefficients. (See Section 7.) We also conjecture that our method can be used to deduce counting formulae for finite-type invariants over $\mathbb{Z}/2$, akin to the arrow diagram formulae of Goussarov, Polyak and Viro [9, 26].

The main idea behind our method is simple. Calculating an invariant of knots, links, or 3-manifolds as a sum of configuration space integrals is morally equivalent to calculating the degree of a map, a purely topological feature. This equivalence can be made precise by gluing different configuration spaces together. This approach was pursued in the work of Kuperberg and Thurston in the case of 3-manifold invariants [19]; the work of Polyak and Viro in the case of the type-2 knot invariant [27]; the work of Poirier in the case of all finite-type invariants of knots and links [25]; and our previous work in the case of the triple linking number for long links [16]. The basic idea appears even in the original work of Bott and Taubes [4].

To make this idea precise and topologically reformulate fiberwise integration, we proceed via the Serre spectral sequence in singular cohomology. This is in contrast to the Pontrjagin–Thom constructions we used in our previous works on this subject. So our present construction is at the level of (co)homology rather than at the level of spaces or spectra. The benefit is that we avoid the technical obstacle of endowing the glued configuration space with a smooth structure. The drawback is that we lose potential classes in generalized cohomology theories with respect to which the configuration space bundles involved are orientable. On the other hand, singular cohomology with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}$ or $\mathbb{Z}/p$ are the main cohomology theories which come to mind in this setting (in addition to de Rham cohomology).

We now make some remarks on our construction. First of all, our methods apply just as well to spaces of closed links as to spaces of long links. We choose spaces of long links for definiteness, and also because these spaces have a monoid structure that could be useful for further investigation.

On a somewhat technical note, because of Stokes’ Theorem, a key step for constructing link invariants or cohomology classes is ensuring that the integral along the boundaries of the configuration spaces is ultimately zero. The abovementioned gluing of configuration spaces corresponds to the way in which they combine to yield zero. There are three ways in which this can happen: (1) two non-vanishing integrals along a pair of faces cancel; (2) the integral along a face vanishes by symmetry; (3) the integral along a face vanishes by degeneracy of the form to be integrated. Topologically treating case (2) is most easily done by using a “smaller” compactification of configuration space than the Axelrod–Singer/Fulton–Macpherson compactification. Specifically, we use a compactification which was considered by Kuperberg and Thurston. A compactification considered by Poirier appears to be similar to this one. Our gluing construction is also similar to theirs, but different in that we construct a glued space for each graph cocycle, rather than one glued space for all trivalent graph cocycles. Moreover, we consider cocycles which are not necessarily trivalent.

The fact that our methods do not completely work in the case $d = 3$ is related to the integrals over the “anomalous faces” of configuration space. Whether the integrals vanish along these faces is to our knowledge an open problem, though studied in detail in work of Poirier [25] and unpublished work of Yang [42]. In the setting of homology sphere invariants, one uses a framing of the manifold.
to collapse this face to lower dimension. Thus, the problem in the setting of knot invariants can perhaps be summarized as the failure of a framing of the knot to respect the spherical maps (defined in Section 1.2). In any case, this problem is what stymies our topological construction for \( d = 3 \).

We suspect that our construction is adaptable to the setting of characteristic classes of bundles of homology spheres \([40, 41, 19, 21]\), roughly generalizing from \( S^d \) to homology spheres. We leave this generalization for potential future work.

1.1. Organization of the paper. In Section 2 we provide background on spaces of knots and links, graphs, orientations of graphs, graph cohomology, and fiberwise integration via the Serre spectral sequence.

In Section 3 we define a compactification of configuration spaces. This compactification, which is “smaller” than that of Fulton–Macpherson and Axelrod–Singer, previously appeared in the preprint of Kuperberg and Thurston on 3-manifold invariants \([19]\).

In Section 4 we define bundles over spaces of links whose fibers are the compactified configuration spaces from Section 3. We review the construction of real cohomology classes in spaces of knots and links by fiberwise integration of forms, as in the work of Bott and Taubes \([4]\) and Cattaneo et al \([7]\). Although our main gluing construction makes no direct use of real coefficients or de Rham cohomology, we need this material to establish the nontriviality of our classes.

In Section 5 we describe the gluings of the compactified configuration space bundles described in Section 3. This construction involves gluing, folding, and collapsing various codimension-1 faces, while still leaving some faces to the relative locus. Section 5 is perhaps the most technical part of the paper. Ultimately, we establish that the glued space has fundamental cycle, as well as a map to an appropriate quotient of a (symmetric) product of spheres.

In Section 6 we deduce our main theorem, Theorem 6.2. Using the glued bundle constructed in Section 5 and the Serre spectral sequence, we construct cohomology classes which form an integer lattice among the classes obtained by integration of forms. We discuss some examples, such as the type-2 invariant for knots and the (type-2) triple linking number for long links.

In Section 7 we consider torsion classes that are not apparently reductions of integer-valued classes. These come from Turchin’s calculations in graph complexes. We sketch a potential method for detecting their nontriviality, by constructing dual homology classes out of bracket expressions and associated resolutions of singular knots. This approach would extend work of Pelatt and Sinha.

In Section 8 we consider a variation over \( \mathbb{Z}/p \). We show in Proposition 8.1 that our construction generalizes to \( \mathbb{Z}/2 \), producing classes out of graph cocycles over \( \mathbb{Z}/2 \) which are not necessarily mod-2 reductions of classes over \( \mathbb{Z} \). Such a generalization is also possible over \( \mathbb{Z}/p \) for odd primes \( p \), though we discuss this case only very briefly. We then show in Proposition 8.4 that a variation of our construction can be carried out over \( \mathbb{Z}/2 \) in the classical case \( d = 3 \). We conjecture that our methods here can be used to deduce counting formulae for finite-type invariants over \( \mathbb{Z}/2 \).

1.2. Acknowledgments. We thank the referees for many useful comments and suggestions.
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2. Basic definitions, conventions, and background

Here we provide basic definitions and background material on spaces of links (Section 2.1), graphs and their orientations (Section 2.2), the graph cochain complex (Section 2.3), and fiberwise integration via the Serre spectral sequence (Section 2.4).

2.1. Spaces of knots and links. Let $L^d_m$ denote the space of long $m$-component links in $\mathbb{R}^d$. By the space of long links, we mean the space of embeddings of $\bigsqcup_m \mathbb{R}$ into $\mathbb{R}^d$ with fixed linear behavior outside $\bigsqcup_m [-1, 1]$. For technical reasons, the fixed linear behavior is required to have distinct directions for distinct strands (see [17]). We will also write $K^d$ for the space of long knots $L^d_1$. This paper concerns cohomology classes in spaces of knots and links. In the case of $d = 3$, degree-0 cohomology classes are precisely invariants of knots and links, so arbitrary cohomology classes generalize knot and link invariants. Our work below would apply with minimal modification to spaces of closed links $\text{Emb}(\bigsqcup_m S^1, \mathbb{R}^d)$. We choose long links for the sake of definiteness.

2.2. Graphs. We define certain types of graphs which are crucial for our constructions. Fix an oriented 1-manifold $L$ (without boundary) with finitely many components. We mainly consider the
case where $L$ is a disjoint union of finitely many copies of the real line. We also allow the case $L = \emptyset$, even though the empty set may not qualify as a 1-manifold.

**Definitions 2.1.** An unoriented (link) graph or unoriented (link) diagram $\Gamma$ on $L$ consists of

- $V(\Gamma)$, a (finite) set of vertices, which is partitioned as $V(\Gamma) = V_{\text{seg}}(\Gamma) \cup V_{\text{free}}(\Gamma)$ into segment vertices which lie on $L$ and the remaining free vertices; and
- $E(\Gamma)$, a (finite) set of edges, which abstractly are unordered pairs of vertices (which they join); we call the pair of vertices as the endpoints of an edge, and we call a pair of an edge and one of its endpoints an edge-end.
- $A(\Gamma)$, a (finite) set of arcs, where each arc is part of $L$ between two segment vertices. An arc is not considered an edge, but like an edge, it has endpoints and ends.

We require the valence of each vertex to be at least 3, where ends of edges and arcs alike count towards valence; an edge may not join a free vertex to itself; and if $L \neq \emptyset$, we require that each component of $\Gamma$ be connected to $L$. A self-loop on a vertex is allowed as an edge, and multiple edges (or edge(s) and an arc) may join the same pair of vertices.

- A chord diagram is a graph with no free vertices.
- A subgraph $\Gamma'$ of a graph $\Gamma$ will always be determined by a subset $V' \subset V(\Gamma)$, where the edges and arcs in $\Gamma'$ are those in $\Gamma$ between vertices in $V'$. A subgraph is not required to satisfy the conditions on valence and being connected to $L$.
- An isomorphism of graphs is a homeomorphism of the underlying topological spaces which induces the identity map on the components of $L$. \hspace{1cm} \square

We consider two ways in which graphs on $L$ give rise to ordinary (finite) graphs, i.e. 1-dimensional CW-complexes. Let $U(\Gamma)$ denote the graph obtained by forgetting $L$. Then $U(\Gamma)$ is “at least unitrivalent” in the sense that each free vertex has valence $\geq 3$ and each segment vertex has valence $\geq 1$. Let $T(\Gamma)$ denote the graph obtained by regarding arcs as edges and forgetting the complement in $L$ of all segment vertices and arcs between them. (The pieces we forget here are (a) components in $L$ with no segment vertices and arcs between them. (The pieces we forget here are (a) components in $L$ with no segment vertices and arcs between them. (The pieces we forget here are (a) components in $L$ with no segment vertices and arcs between them. (The pieces we forget here are (a) components in $L$ with no segment vertices and arcs between them.) Thus if $L$ is compact, then $T(\Gamma)$ is an “at least trivalent” graph. In Section 3.2.1, the suspension of graphs from an additional $\infty$ will essentially reduce our considerations to the setting where $L$ is compact. Finally, note that if $L = \emptyset$, then $U(\Gamma) = T(\Gamma) = \Gamma$.

For now, we will use “graph” to mean “unoriented graph”. Below, we will orient our graphs by adding certain decorations, and that point we will only omit the adjectives “unoriented” and “oriented” when the meaning is clear from the context.

**Definitions 2.2.** Call a graph $\Gamma$ connected if $T(\Gamma)$ is connected, i.e., for all vertices $u, v$ there is a path of edges and arcs joining $u$ to $v$; otherwise call $\Gamma$ disconnected. A vertex of a graph $\Gamma$ is called a cut vertex if removing it and all incident edges and arcs in $T(\Gamma)$ produces a disconnected nonempty graph. A graph $\Gamma$ is biconnected if it is connected and has no cut vertices. Call a maximal biconnected subgraph of $\Gamma$ a block of $\Gamma$.

Thus a single edge or arc is biconnected, but a single vertex is not. Some authors use either “vertex-2-connected” or “2-connected” instead of “biconnected.” We prefer “block” to the lengthier term “biconnected component”; Kuperberg and Thurston use the term “lobe” instead of “block.”

**Lemma 2.3.** The intersection of any two distinct blocks $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$ of $\Gamma$ is at most one vertex, which is necessarily a cut vertex of $\Gamma$.

**Proof.** If $\Gamma_1 \neq \Gamma_2$ intersect in more than one vertex, then it is easy to see that their union is biconnected, contradicting maximality. If $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$ intersect in a vertex $u$ that is not a cut vertex, combinatorially, in Section 3.2.1, we will modify a graph on $L$ as defined below to get a graph on a space $L'$ that is a 1-manifold except at one singular point $\infty$.

In Section 2.3, we will quotient by graphs with self-loops on free vertices or multiple edges.
then the removal of \( u \) leaves \( \Gamma \) connected. Thus we can find a path from a vertex \( v \) in \( \Gamma_1 \setminus \Gamma_2 \) to a vertex \( w \) in \( \Gamma_2 \setminus \Gamma_1 \) which does not pass through \( u \). Adjoining this path to \( \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \) creates a biconnected graph, again contradicting maximality.

**Definition 2.4.** Define \( \Upsilon(\Gamma) \), the *block-cut forest* of \( \Gamma \), to be the graph with a vertex for every block \( b \) of \( \Gamma \) and every cut vertex \( c \) of \( \Gamma \), and an edge between \( b \) and \( c \) when the cut vertex \( c \) is contained in \( b \):

\[
V(\Upsilon(\Gamma)) = \{\text{blocks } b \text{ of } \Gamma\} \cup \{\text{cut-vertices } c \text{ of } \Gamma\} \quad E(\Upsilon(\Gamma)) \subseteq \{\text{(block } b, \text{ cut-vertex } c)\}
\]

**Lemma 2.5.**

(a) The graph \( \Upsilon(\Gamma) \) is a forest where the leaves are labeled only by blocks, not cut-vertices. If \( \Gamma \) is connected, then \( \Upsilon(\Gamma) \) is a tree.

(b) If \( \Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_j \) are the blocks of \( \Gamma \), and \( CV(\Gamma) \) is the set of cut-vertices of \( \Gamma \), then

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{j} |V(\Gamma_i)| = |V(\Gamma)| + |E(\Upsilon(\Gamma))| - |CV(\Gamma)|.
\]

**Proof.** For (a), \( \Upsilon(\Gamma) \) has no cycles, for otherwise we contradict the maximality of the blocks. Next, notice that for any pair of vertices \( v, w \) in \( \Gamma \), a path in \( \Upsilon(\Gamma) \) between blocks \( b_v \) and \( b_w \) containing \( v \) and \( w \) can be represented by a path in \( \Gamma \) from \( v \) to \( w \). Indeed, for each edge in the path in \( \Upsilon(\Gamma) \) joining a block \( b \) and a cut vertex \( c \), one can choose a path within \( b \) between \( c \) and any vertex in \( b \). Then if a cut vertex were a leaf in \( \Upsilon(\Gamma) \), its removal would leave \( \Upsilon(\Gamma) \) connected, contradicting that its removal disconnects \( \Gamma \). A path in \( \Gamma \) from \( v \) to \( w \) gives rise to a path in \( \Upsilon(\Gamma) \) between their respective blocks \( b_v \) and \( b_w \), so \( \Upsilon(\Gamma) \) is connected if \( \Gamma \) is.

For (b), notice that the left-hand side counts vertices of \( \Gamma \), except that each cut-vertex is necessarily counted multiple times, by part (a). Specifically, each cut-vertex \( v \) is counted as many times as \( v \) appears in an edge of the block-cut forest of \( \Gamma \).

The following easily verified lemma will be useful in Section 5.4.

**Lemma 2.6.** Suppose \( v \) is a vertex in a subgraph \( \Gamma' \subset \Gamma \) which is bivalent in \( \Gamma' \), joined to vertices \( u \) and \( w \) in \( \Gamma' \). If \( \Gamma'' \subset \Gamma' \) is biconnected and contains \( v \), then either \( \Gamma'' \) is one of the two edges incident to \( v \) or \( \Gamma'' \) contains both \( u \) and \( w \).

**Definition 2.7.** A labeled graph or labeled diagram is a graph \( \Gamma \) together with a labeling. If \( d \) is odd, a labeling consists of an ordering of the vertices, an orientation on each edge, and additionally an ordering of the two edge-ends of each self-loop on a segment vertex. If \( d \) is even, a labeling consists of an ordering of the segment vertices and an ordering of the edges (including self-loops on segment vertices).

For example, line (6) in Section 4.4 below is a linear combination of labeled diagrams. In the next subsection, when we consider linear combinations of diagrams, two diagrams which differ only by their labelings will be set equal up to a sign.

### 2.3. The cochain complex of oriented graphs.

The graphs defined above can be organized into a cochain complex. This construction is not particularly elementary, but we include it in this early Section as a distillation of much of the combinatorics of configuration space integrals. Let \( R \) be a ring. We will mainly consider the cases where \( R \) is \( \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Z}, \) or \( \mathbb{Z}/p \).

**Definition 2.8.** Let \( LD \) denote the free \( R \)-module on labeled link diagrams, modulo the following orientation relations:

- For odd \( d \), if \( \Gamma \) and \( \Gamma' \) differ only by a permutation \( \sigma \) of the vertex labels, a reversal of the orientations on \( i \) edges, and \( j \) transpositions of the orderings of the self-loop edge-ends, then \( \Gamma \sim \text{sign}(\sigma)(-1)^{i+j}\Gamma' \).
• For even $d$, if $\Gamma$ and $\Gamma'$ differ only by a permutation $\sigma$ of the vertex labels and a permutation of the edge-labels, then $\Gamma \sim \text{sign}(\sigma)\text{sign}(\tau)\Gamma'$.

We impose two further relations:
• If $\Gamma$ has a pair of vertices joined by multiple (non-arc) edges, then $\Gamma \sim 0$.
• If $\Gamma$ has a free vertex with a self-loop, then $\Gamma \sim 0$.

Call the resulting equivalence class of a labeling an orientation and the resulting equivalence class of graph an oriented graph or oriented diagram. For a labeled or oriented graph $\Gamma$, let $|\Gamma|$ be the underlying unoriented graph. For two oriented graphs, an isomorphism of their underlying unoriented graphs may be orientation-preserving or orientation-reversing.

Remark 2.9. There are other equivalent definitions of orientations on graphs. For example, for odd $d$, one can use a cyclic ordering of the edge-ends at each vertex (e.g. induced by a planar embedding of the graph) rather than vertex-labelings and edge-orientations. Bar-Natan takes this approach in [1]. The definition above is however more amenable to defining configuration space integrals. Kuperberg and Thurston [19, Section 3.1] provide a thorough discussion of orientations on graphs in this context.

Definitions 2.10.
• Define the defect of a diagram $\Gamma$ to be $2|E(\Gamma)| - |V_{\text{seg}}(\Gamma)| - 3|V_{\text{free}}(\Gamma)|$.
• Define the order of $\Gamma$ to be $|E(\Gamma)| - |V_{\text{free}}(\Gamma)|$.
• Let $\mathcal{LD}^{k,n}$ denote the submodule of diagrams of defect $k$ and order $n$, so that $\mathcal{LD} = \bigoplus_{k,n} \mathcal{LD}^{k,n}$.

Note that Cattaneo et al use the term “degree” instead of “defect.” As in [17], we reserve the term “degree” for cohomological degree. Note that the diagrams with defect 0 are precisely those which are (uni)trivalent, in the sense that each free vertex is trivalent and each segment vertex has one edge and two arcs emanating from it. It is precisely the defect-0 cocycles which index finite-type invariants of knots and links in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

The coboundary operator $\delta : \mathcal{LD}^{k,n} \to \mathcal{LD}^{k+1,n}$ is defined to encode which configuration space integrals yield closed forms (see Section 4.4). We first need one further construction on graphs. If $e$ is an edge or arc in a labeled graph $\Gamma$ joining vertices $i, j$, the contraction $\Gamma/e$ of $e$ has the usual quotient of CW-complexes as its underlying unoriented graph. The vertex labels on $\Gamma/e$ are given by lowering by 1 those vertex labels greater than $\max(i, j)$ and by assigning $\min(i, j)$ to the vertex that is image of $e$. For $d$ odd, if the contraction of $e$ introduces a self-loop, then the order of its edge-ends is determined by the orientation of $L$. (necessarily on a segment vertex) For $d$ even, the labels on the edges are given by lowering by 1 those labels greater than that of $e$.

We now define $\delta$ on each graph $\Gamma$ and extend it to $\bigoplus_{k,n} \mathcal{LD}^{k,n}$ by linearity. On a graph $\Gamma$, it is defined as a signed sum of edge contractions
$$\delta \Gamma := \sum_{e} \varepsilon(e)\Gamma/e$$
over all arcs $e$ and all edges $e$ that are not chords or self-loops. We first define the sign $\varepsilon(e)$ for $d$ odd. Suppose $e$ is an edge or arc with endpoints $i < j$, and set
$$\varepsilon(e) := \begin{cases} (-1)^{j-i-1} & \text{if } e = (i \to j) \\ (-1)^{j} & \text{if } e = (i \leftarrow j) \end{cases}$$
(1)

If $d$ is even and $e$ is an arc with endpoints $i < j$, define $\varepsilon(e)$ as above (where the arc orientation comes from the orientation of $L$). If $d$ is even and $e$ is an edge, set
$$\varepsilon(e) = (-1)^{e+|V_{\text{seg}}(\Gamma)|}$$
(2)
where by abuse of notation $e$ also denotes the label on this edge.
The following theorem was proven by Cattaneo et al over $\mathbb{R}$, but the proof shows that $\delta^2 = 0$ on the basis elements (the graphs), so the statement holds for any ring. Similar constructions appear in other contexts in topology, all of which were outlined in the work of Kontsevich [12].

**Theorem 2.11** ([7]). The sequence $(\bigoplus_{k,n} \mathcal{L}D^{k,n}, \delta)$ is a complex, i.e., $\delta^2 = 0$.

The combinatorial input data for our construction will be a graph cocycle $\gamma$, which is a linear combination of oriented diagrams, but can be represented (in many ways) by a linear combination of labeled diagrams.

### 2.4. Fiberwise integration in singular cohomology

Readers seeking background on fiberwise integration in de Rham cohomology may wish to consult the books of Bott and Tu [5] and Greub, Halperin, and Vanstone [10]. We will now describe an approach via singular cohomology. Ordinary integration over a manifold $M$ is given by pairing with the fundamental class $[M]$. Similarly, integration over the fiber of a bundle $F \to E \to B$ can be described using the fundamental class $[F]$ of the fiber, though to proceed in sufficient generality, one needs more machinery than in the case where $B$ is a point. We will use the Serre spectral sequence, and we follow the treatment given in Morita’s book [23].

Consider a fiber bundle $\pi : X \to B$ where both the base $B$ and the fiber $F$ are compact, oriented manifolds and where $\pi_1(B)$ acts trivially on $H^*(F)$. Consider the Serre spectral sequence for this bundle in cohomology with integer coefficients. First consider the case where $F$ is boundaryless. Let $k$ be the dimension of the fiber, so that $H^k(F; \mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}$, generated by the fundamental class $[F]$, and $H^i(F; \mathbb{Z}) = 0$ for all $i > k$. This immediately implies that $E_{p,k}^0$ is a subspace of $E_{p,k}^2$ for any $p \geq 0$. Furthermore, $E_{p,q}^2$ in general is isomorphic to the filtration quotient $\mathcal{F}_p^{p+q}/\mathcal{F}_{p+1}^{p+q}$, where $\mathcal{F}_p^{p+q}$ is the filtration of $H^{p+q}(X)$ over the $p$-skeleton of $B$. This gives a surjection from $H^n(X)$ onto $E_{p,k}^2$ (again using that the fiber $F$ is $k$-dimensional):

$$H^n(X; \mathbb{Z}) = \mathcal{F}_{n-k}^n / \mathcal{F}_{n-k+1}^n \cong E_{n-k,0}^2 \hookrightarrow E_{n-k,k}^2 \cong H^{n-k}(B; H^k(F)) \cong H^{n-k}(B; \mathbb{Z})$$

Now suppose $F$ has boundary $\partial F$, and let $\partial X$ be the corresponding subspace of $X$. Then we have an analogous map $H^n(X, \partial X; \mathbb{Z}) \to H^{n-k}(B, \mathbb{Z})$ by replacing $[F] \in H^k(F)$ by $[F, \partial F] \in H^k(F, \partial F)$. In either case, we may replace integer coefficients by real coefficients.

**Lemma 2.12.**

1. Suppose $F \to X \to B$ is a fiber bundle with trivial monodromy. If $F$ is a compact manifold without boundary, then the map on cohomology

$$H^n(X; \mathbb{R}) \to H^{n-k}(B; \mathbb{R})$$

from the Serre spectral sequence agrees with fiberwise integration in de Rham cohomology.

2. If $F$ is a compact manifold with boundary, then the map on cohomology

$$H^{p+k}(X, \partial X; \mathbb{R}) \to H^p(B; \mathbb{R})$$

from the Serre spectral sequence agrees with fiberwise integration in de Rham cohomology.

3. Compactified configuration spaces

In this Section, we define certain configuration spaces (Section 3.1), compactifications of them (Section 3.2), and their corner structure (Section 3.3). These compactifications are based on the preprint of Kuperberg and Thurston [19] (though we provide slightly more details), so this Section will be a review for readers familiar with that work.
3.1. Configuration spaces and the blowup. In general, for a space $X$, let $C_q(X)$ be the space of distinct ordered $q$-tuples in $X$, the (uncompactified, or open) configuration space of points in $X$ labeled by $1, \ldots, q$. We will only consider the case when $X = M$, a manifold, often Euclidean space. We ultimately want to perform integration (and an appropriate analogue of it) over such configuration spaces, so we need to replace them by compact versions. We will define compact spaces $C_\Gamma[M]$ of configurations of points in $M$ labeled by the vertices of $\Gamma$, where $\Gamma$ is a $\geq 3$-valent graph as in Section 2. The graph $\Gamma$ may be oriented as in Definition 2.7, but this compactified configuration space $C_\Gamma[M]$ will depend on only the underlying unoriented graph of $\Gamma$. Moreover it will depend only on the underlying graph $T(\Gamma)$, where edges and arcs are not distinguished from each other.

Throughout, we will mainly use the letters $i, j$ (etc.) for labels on vertices of $\Gamma$ and $x_i, x_j$ (etc.) for the corresponding configuration points in $M$. We may occasionally use the same symbol for a vertex and the corresponding configuration point.

**Definition 3.1.** Let $X$ be a manifold and $Y \subset X$ a submanifold. The blowup $\text{Bl}(X, Y)$ of $X$ along $Y$ is defined as the result of replacing $Y$ by the sphere bundle $S(\nu(Y))$ of the normal bundle of $Y$ in $X$. Given a metric on $X$, $\text{Bl}(X, Y)$ can also be described as the result of removing a tubular neighborhood of $Y$. There is a canonical blow-down map $\text{Bl}(X, Y) \to X$ induced by the projection $S(\nu(Y)) \to Y$.

We would like to blowup the diagonal $x_i = x_j$ in $M^{V(\Gamma)}$ for every pair $i \neq j$ of distinct endpoints of an edge or arc in $\Gamma$. This is not possible unless we blow up diagonals of lower dimension. For example, suppose we wanted to blow up $\mathbb{R}^3$ along the planes $x = y, y = z$, and $x = z$. The simultaneous blowup along all three planes is ill defined because their intersection is not transverse. However, if we first blow up the line $x = y = z$, we may then blow up the (images of the) three planes in any order and obtain the same result, regardless of the order of these three blowups. On the other hand, if we wanted to blow up only the planes $x = y$ and $y = z$, we could do this without blowing up the line $x = y = z$ first.

One solution is to blow up all the diagonals in $M^{V(\Gamma)}$, in increasing order of dimension. This gives the “canonical” Axelrod–Singer/Fulton–MacPherson compactification, used by Bott and Taubes. It is however possible to blow up fewer diagonals and still blow up all the diagonals corresponding to edges of $\Gamma$ (in any order). This was the approach of Kuperberg and Thurston, which we follow.

3.2. A “minimal” compactification. The goal of this subsection is to define compactifications that depend on a graph $\Gamma$, namely $C_\Gamma[M]$ for compact $M$ (Definition 3.5(a)) and $C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d]$ (Definition 3.8). The main point is checking that the construction is well defined (Proposition 3.2).

For a subgraph $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma$, let $\Delta_{\Gamma'}$ denote the subset of $M^{V(\Gamma)}$ where all the vertices of $\Gamma'$ have collided, i.e.,

$$
\Delta_{\Gamma'} := \{ f \in M^{V(\Gamma)} : f(x_i) = f(x_j) \forall i, j \in V(\Gamma') \}.
$$

We will blow up $M^{V(\Gamma)}$ along the diagonal $\Delta_{\Gamma'}$ for every biconnected $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma$. Recall that we consider both edges and arcs in our notion of biconnectedness (Definition 2.2). We will perform these blowups in the following order:

- First, we blow up (in any order) all diagonals which are minimal with respect to inclusion among $\Delta_{\Gamma'}$ with $\Gamma'$ biconnected. Note that such a $\Delta_{\Gamma'}$ is minimal precisely if $\Gamma'$ is maximal, i.e. a block of $\Gamma$.
- Then we blow up the remaining minimal diagonals (in any order). A remaining minimal diagonal will correspond to a subgraph of a block.
- We continue this process until all the 2-fold diagonals corresponding to edges and arcs of $\Gamma$ are blown up.

We will check that this process is well defined:
Proposition 3.2. The diagonals which we blow up at each stage above are mutually transverse.

This result will follow immediately from Lemma 3.3 for the minimal diagonals, and Lemma 3.4 for the remaining minimal diagonals at each stage.

Lemma 3.3. The diagonals corresponding to the blocks of \( \Gamma \) intersect transversely.

Proof. In the case \( M = \mathbb{R}^d \), all the diagonals are just linear subspaces, so it suffices to check that the codimension of their intersection is the sum of their codimensions. For general \( M \), this also suffices because a neighborhood of a diagonal in \( M^V(\Gamma) \) is modeled by a neighborhood of a diagonal in Euclidean space. Let \( \Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_j \) denote the blocks of \( \Gamma \), let \( v_i = |V(\Gamma_i)| \), let \( v = |V(\Gamma)| \), and let \( c = |CV(\Gamma)| \). The intersection of all the \( \Delta_{\Gamma_i} \) is just \( \Delta_{\Gamma_j} \), which has codimension \((v - 1)d\). Each \( \Delta_{\Gamma_i} \) has codimension \((v_i - 1)d\). So it suffices to check that \( \sum_{i=1}^j (v_i - 1) = v - 1 \). Since \( \Upsilon(\Gamma) \) is a tree, \(|V(\Upsilon(\Gamma))| - |E(\Upsilon(\Gamma))| = 1 \). Letting \( e = |E(\Upsilon(\Gamma))| \), we rewrite this as \( j + c - e = 1 \), and thus
\[
\sum_{i=1}^j (v_i - 1) = \sum_{i=1}^j v_i - j = (v + e - c) - j = (v + e - c) - (1 + e - c) = v - 1
\]
where Lemma 2.5 justifies the second equality. \( \square \)

Lemma 3.4. The minimal diagonals remaining after blowing up the original collection of minimal diagonals are mutually transverse.

Proof. There are two possibilities:

1. \( V(\Gamma_i \cap \Gamma_j) \geq 2 \) for some pair \( \Gamma_i \neq \Gamma_j \) corresponding to two such minimal diagonals.
2. \( V(\Gamma_i \cap \Gamma_j) \leq 1 \) for all pairs \( \Gamma_i \neq \Gamma_j \) corresponding to two such minimal diagonals.

In case (1), \( \Gamma_i \cup \Gamma_j \) forms a larger biconnected subgraph \( \Gamma' \). Then \( \Delta_{\Gamma_i} \) and \( \Delta_{\Gamma_j} \) do not intersect because \( \Delta_{\Gamma'} \) has already been blown up. Thus the intersection of the diagonals associated to \( \Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_k \) is empty, hence they are transverse.

We now consider case (2). A collection of \( \Gamma_i \) corresponding to minimal remaining diagonals forms a forest \( \mathcal{F} \), in the same way that the maximal biconnected \( \Gamma_i \) formed the tree \( \Upsilon(\Gamma) \) in Lemma 2.5. For each tree (component) of \( \mathcal{F} \), the diagonals associated to the \( \Gamma_i \) in that component intersect transversely, by the same dimension-counting argument as in Lemma 3.3. This reduces the argument to checking transversality of a collection of diagonals in \( M^V(\Gamma) \) which correspond to pairwise disjoint subsets of \( V(\Gamma) \). But this transversality is clear. \( \square \)

This completes the proof of Proposition 3.2 so we may now make the following definition:

Definitions 3.5. Let \( M \) be a compact manifold.

(a) Define \( C_\Gamma[M] \) as the result of blowing up \( M^V(\Gamma) \) along \( \Delta_{\Gamma} \), for every biconnected \( \Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma \), in increasing order of inclusion (i.e., starting with the lowest-dimensional diagonals, or the diagonals with the collisions of the most points). Let \( C_\Gamma(M) \) denote the interior of \( C_\Gamma[M] \). Given an embedding of the 1-manifold \( L \) into \( M \), let \( C_\Gamma[L, M] \) denote the subset of \( C_\Gamma[M] \) where the segment vertices of \( \Gamma \) are required to lie in the image of \( L \). (We suppress the dependence on the embedding from the notation.)

(b) Define \( C_n[M] \) as \( C_{K_n}[M] \), where \( K_n \) is the complete graph on \( n \) vertices (with \( L = \emptyset \)).

As a blowup, \( C_\Gamma[M] \) is a manifold with corners, which one can thus integrate over. Notice that there is a blow-down map
\[
C_\Gamma[M] \to M^V(\Gamma).
\]

Remark 3.6 (Slight abuse of terminology). Since we didn’t blow up every diagonal in \( M^V(\Gamma) \) to get \( C_\Gamma[M] \), a point in the interior of \( C_\Gamma[M] \) is a tuple of points in \( M \) that need not be pairwise distinct. Nonetheless, we will sometimes refer to such a tuple as a configuration.
3.2.1. The case where \( M \) is Euclidean space. For the case \( M = \mathbb{R}^d \), which we are primarily interested in, we will also record directions of approach of any point in \( \Gamma \) to infinity.

**Definition 3.7.** Let \( \Gamma \) be a graph on \( L \). Then \( \Sigma \Gamma \), the suspension of \( \Gamma \), is a graph on a singular 1-manifold \( L' \) defined below (where Definition 2.1 is extended to such \( L' \) in an obvious way):

- The space \( L' \) is the one-point compactification of the union of non-compact components of \( L \), if \( L \) has such components; otherwise \( L' = L \).
- The vertices of \( \Sigma \Gamma \) are the vertices of \( \Gamma \), plus one extra vertex \( \infty \). If \( L \) has non-compact components, this vertex coincides with the extra point in the one-point compactification, and it is considered a segment vertex. Otherwise, \( \infty \) is considered a free vertex.
- The edges of \( \Sigma \Gamma \) are those of \( \Gamma \), plus an edge between \( \infty \) and every free vertex of \( \Gamma \).
- The arcs of \( \Sigma \Gamma \) are those of \( \Gamma \), plus an arc incident to \( \infty \) for every \( \infty \in \mathbb{R} \) and every \( (-\infty, v) \in \mathbb{R} \), where \( v \) is a segment vertex in \( \Gamma \) and the half-open ray contains no other segment vertices.

Note that the vertex \( \infty \) may not satisfy the valence conditions in Definition 2.1.

**Definition 3.8.** View \( S^d \) as the one-point compactification of \( \mathbb{R}^d \). Define \( C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d] \) as the subset of \( C_{\Sigma \Gamma}[S^d] \) where the extra vertex is fixed at \( \infty \in S^d \).

That is, \( C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d] \) is defined as the subset of points in \( C_{\Sigma \Gamma}[S^d] \) which blow down to \((x_1, \ldots, x_{|V(\Gamma)|}, \infty) \in (S^d)^{|V(\Sigma \Gamma)|}\) for some \( x_i \in S^d \). Note that a biconnected subgraph of \( \Sigma \Gamma \) is either a biconnected subgraph of \( \Gamma \) or the “suspension” of a connected subgraph of \( \Gamma \) by the extra vertex \( \infty \). (However, the converse is not quite true: for connected \( \Gamma' \subset \Gamma \) with segment vertices, the corresponding subgraph of \( \Sigma \Gamma \) need not be biconnected.) Thus we have defined \( C_\Gamma[M] \) when \( M \) is either compact or Euclidean space.

**Remark 3.9** (Relationships to other compactifications).

1. The space \( C_n[M] \) is precisely the Axelrod–Singer compactification, used by Bott and Taubes in [4] and Cattaneo et al in [7]. In \( C_n[M] \), a collision of any two points is accompanied by the datum of a direction of collision, and a collision of any three points is further accompanied by the datum of a relative rate of approach \((|x_j - x_i|/|x_k - x_j|)\). See for example the work of Sinha [30].

2. In our work with Munson and Volić, we also considered spaces obtained by blowing up only some of the diagonals in the cartesian product [17, Section 4.2.4]. That construction is however somewhat different from the one we will use below. The construction in [17] involves altering \( \Gamma \) into a “hybrid” with “graft components” for the purpose of working with homotopy links (i.e. link maps) rather than links (i.e. embeddings). Here we work only with embeddings, so the hybrid is not needed. Also, in [17], every diagonal in each “graft component” is blown up, whereas we blow up even fewer diagonals here.

3. The compactification used by Poirier [25] appears to be closer to the Kuperberg–Thurston compactification that we will use below. It is defined differently from the latter compactification but seems to share the feature of blowing up only those 2-fold diagonals corresponding to edges in \( \Gamma \).

4. The canonical compactification \( C_{[V(\Gamma)]}[\mathbb{R}^d] \) can be obtained from \( C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d] \) by merely blowing up (in increasing order of dimension) the images of all the diagonals which have not already been blown up. There is then a blow-down map \( C_{[V(\Gamma)]}[\mathbb{R}^d] \to C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d] \).

3.3. The corners of the compactified configuration spaces. We review and elaborate on some details regarding the corner structure from Section 4.3 of [19]. These details will help us verify that various gluings and foldings of codimension-1 faces extend to their corners. They will also be useful in the degeneracy arguments, where we consider the images of various faces under the spherical maps, in Lemma 5.16.
Let $M$ be a $d$-dimensional manifold. Corners of codimension $k$ in $C_\Gamma[M]$ are indexed by sets of subgraphs $S = \{\Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_k\}$ of $\Gamma$, where each $\Gamma_i$ is a biconnected graph on at least two vertices, and where $S$ satisfies certain conditions, described below. Such a set $S$ indexes a corner which is the intersection of the closures of all of the codimension-1 faces indexed by $\{\Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_k\}$. Different $\Gamma_i$ may correspond to different scales, and the conditions on $S$ can be checked at each scale, much like we repeatedly used Lemma 3.4 at various scales to ensure that the blowups are well defined:

(1) At the largest scale are the $\Gamma_i$ which are maximal biconnected subgraphs of $\Gamma' := \Gamma_1 \cup \cdots \cup \Gamma_k$. These subgraphs thus form the block-cut forest of $\Gamma'$. The datum at this scale is a configuration in $M$. The points are indexed by the vertices in the quotient of $\Gamma$ by collapsing every tree in the block-cut forest of $\Gamma'$ to a point.

(2) At the next level are subgraphs in $S$ contained in a biconnected component of $\Gamma'$, say $\Gamma_i$. The union of these graphs $\Gamma_i' := \Gamma_{i_1} \cup \cdots \cup \Gamma_{i_p}$ must be a proper subgraph of $\Gamma_i$, and each $\Gamma_{ij}$ must be a maximal biconnected subgraph of $\Gamma_i'$. Thus the $\Gamma_{ij}$ are the blocks of $\Gamma_i$. The datum at this stage is a configuration of points in $\mathbb{R}^{d(= T_p M)}$, modulo translation and positive scaling. The configuration is indexed by vertices in the quotient of $\Gamma_i$ obtained by collapsing every tree in the block-cut forest of $\Gamma_i'$ to a point. We call this quotient of configuration space a screen space and a point in it a screen. We allow the possibility $\Gamma_i' = \emptyset$.

(3) A subgraph $\Gamma_{ij}$ may then contain further subgraphs, and in general step (2) may be repeated an arbitrary finite number of times.

One can check whether a set $S$ indexes a (nonempty) corner by discarding the $\Gamma_i$ maximal in $\bigcup \Gamma_i$, then checking the conditions in step (2) for the remaining maximal subgraphs, then discarding those subgraphs and checking (2) for the remaining maximal subgraphs, and so on. The next statement gives a necessary (though not quite sufficient) condition for $S$ to index a corner.

**Proposition 3.10.** If $S = \{\Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_k\}$ indexes a corner, then the $\Gamma_i$ must either be disjoint, be nested, or intersect in a single vertex.

**Proof.** Any $\Gamma_i$ is a block of a graph contained in some other $\Gamma_j$, so this follows from Lemma 2.3. \qed

Ultimately, a point in the corner indexed by $S$ is given by a configuration of points in $M$ plus one screen for each $\Gamma_i$ in $S$. Faces indexed by $S$ and $S'$ intersect precisely when the union $S \cup S'$ satisfies the above conditions. In that case, $S \cup S'$ is the indexing set of the intersection.

A stratum (i.e. corner) indexed by a set $S$ of subgraphs in $\Gamma$ will be denoted $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma, S)$. If $S$ consists of a single subgraph $\Gamma'$ or a single edge $e$, we write $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma, \Gamma')$ and $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma, e)$ respectively.

**Example 3.11.** The 6 circled subgraphs shown in Figure 1(a) correspond to a corner of codimension 6. At the largest scale, the vertices shown below correspond to 2 configuration points in $M$, one for the edge labeled $h$ and one for the remaining vertices. At the next scale, we have a screen with 2 points for edge $h$, a screen with 3 points for the triangle, and a screen with 3 points from collapsing all the circled subgraphs in the double-square. At the smallest scale, we have three screens with 2 points, one for each circled edge in the double-square. (Note that the screens for the edges $e$ and $f$ are independent, but this poses no problems since we do not blow up every diagonal.) The reader may verify that the resulting dimension of this corner is such that its codimension is indeed 6.

Figure 1(b), where an extra subgraph is added, represents a corner of codimension 7. Compared to the corner represented by Figure 1(a), a screen with 3 points at the intermediate scale is replaced by a screen with 2 points (one for the square and one for edge $g$) and, at a smaller scale, a screen with 2 points (one for edges $e$ and $f$ and one for the remaining vertex in the square). \qed
Figure 1. Two examples of sets of subgraphs which index corners, of codimensions 6 and 7 respectively.

We partition the codimension-1 faces of $C_{\Gamma}[M]$ into three types, using standard terminology:

**Definition 3.12.**

- A *principal face* is a face obtained by blowing up a 2-fold diagonal in $M^{V(\Gamma)}$. In the case of $M = \mathbb{R}^d$, where $C_{\Gamma}[\mathbb{R}^d] \subset C_{\Sigma\Gamma}[S^d]$, the principal faces are those obtained by blowing up any diagonal involving 2 of the first $|V(\Gamma)|$ points.
- For $M = \mathbb{R}^d$, a *face at infinity* is a face where one or more points have collided with $\infty \in S^d$.
- The remaining codimension-1 faces are called *hidden faces*. These are faces involving a collision of more than two points (none of which is $\infty$, if $M = \mathbb{R}^d$).

Note that sometimes the term “hidden face” is used to describe any face that is not a principal face, in which case faces at infinity are considered to be a special type of hidden face.

Each type of codimension-1 face corresponds to a certain type of subgraph of $\Gamma$:

- each principal face corresponds to an edge of $\Gamma$,
- each face at infinity corresponds to a biconnected subgraph of $\Sigma\Gamma$ containing the vertex $\infty$ (whose removal gives a connected subgraph of $\Gamma$),
- and each hidden face corresponds to a biconnected subgraph $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma$ with $|V(\Gamma')| > 2$. 
4. Bundles over spaces of links and resulting real cohomology classes

We now use the compactification from Section 3 to construct bundles over spaces of links (Section 4.1) and pull back spherical cohomology classes (Section 4.2). We then fiberwise integrate differential forms (Section 4.3) and recall why this produces a cohomology class out of any graph cocycle (Section 4.4). The purpose of this detour into de Rham cohomology (which is not used in our main construction) is to connect our main construction to previous results. In particular, we need the nontriviality of the resulting cohomology classes (Theorem 4.5). This Section will be mostly familiar material to readers acquainted with the work of Cattaneo et al [4] (or of Bott and Taubes [11]) or of Munson, Volic, and the author [17]. Our choice of the Kuperberg–Thurston compactification from Section 3 (which is “smaller” than the canonical Fulton–Macpherson/Axelrod–Singer compactification) is the only new twist, but Lemma 4.3 ensures that this causes no difficulties.

4.1. A fiber bundle over the space of links. We now build a fiber bundle over the space of links using the compactified configuration spaces $C_s[\mathbb{R}^d]$ described above. It will be clear that the bundle depends on the full data in the underlying unoriented graph $\Gamma$ on $L$, rather than just $T(\Gamma)$. (The orientation on $\Gamma$ will be used later, in defining integrals over these bundles.)

We need a suitable compactified configuration space of points in the 1-manifold $L$.

Definitions 4.1. Suppose $L \neq \emptyset$, and let $\Gamma$ be a graph on the 1-manifold $L$.

- Let $s(\Gamma)$ be the subdiagram of $\Gamma$ of the segment vertices and all edges (chords) and arcs between them.

Let $\text{Map}_{s(\Gamma)}[L]$ be the space of maps $V(s(\Gamma)) \to L$ which respect the components that the vertices lie on and the order of the vertices on these components. (The order is determined by the orientation on $L$.) Let $C_{s(\Gamma)}^0[L]$ be the result of blowing up in $\text{Map}_{s(\Gamma)}[L]$ the diagonal for every biconnected subgraph of $s(\Gamma)$, in increasing order of inclusion as in Definition 3.5. This is a configuration space that is compactified near every collision, except for collisions at infinity. Finally fix any smooth embedding $e$ of $L$ into some $\mathbb{R}^d$ for $d \geq 3$, such that $e$ is affine-linear outside a compact subset and such that the directions of approach to infinity of the $2m$ rays of $L$ are pairwise distinct.

- Define $C_{s(\Gamma)}[L]$ as the closure of the image of the map $C_{s(\Gamma)}^0[L] \to C_{s(\Gamma)}[\mathbb{R}^d]$ induced by $e$.

A key feature of the compact space $C_{s(\Gamma)}[L]$ is that it not only includes limit points at infinity, but also records relative rates of approach of points to infinity. Any two choices for $e$ will yield diffeomorphic spaces $C_{s(\Gamma)}[L]$. This space is very similar to one that we defined and elaborated on in [17]. Note that if $L$ is closed, then Definition 4.1 agrees with Definition 3.5 with $M = L$, and that if $L = \mathbb{R}$, then Definition 4.1 agrees with Definition 3.8 with $d = 1$.

Now consider the pullback

\begin{equation}
\begin{array}{ccc}
X[\Gamma] & \longrightarrow & C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d] \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathcal{L}_m^d \times C_{s(\Gamma)}[L] & \longrightarrow & C_{s(\Gamma)}[\mathbb{R}^d]
\end{array}
\end{equation}

We claim that there is a well defined projection map $C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d] \to C_{s(\Gamma)}[\mathbb{R}^d]$ as shown in the right-hand column above. In fact, a biconnected subgraph of $\Sigma(s(\Gamma))$ is a biconnected subgraph of $\Sigma\Gamma$. Thus under the projection of the cartesian products $(S^d)^{V(\Sigma\Gamma)} \to (S^d)^{V(\Sigma(s(\Gamma)))}$, the preimage of every diagonal that is blown up to construct $C_{s(\Gamma)}[\mathbb{R}^d]$ is blown up in constructing $C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d]$.

The lower horizontal map comes from the fact that an embedding $(f : L \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^d) \in \mathcal{L}_m^d$ induces for any $\Gamma$ a map of compactifications $C_{s(\Gamma)}[L] \to C_{s(\Gamma)}[\mathbb{R}^d]$.

For each $\Gamma$, we will consider the bundle $p : X[\Gamma] \to \mathcal{L}_m^d$, where $p$ is given by the left-hand vertical map above followed by the projection to $\mathcal{L}_m^d$. 


Let \( F[\Gamma] \) denote the fiber of this bundle, say over a link \( f : L \to \mathbb{R}^d \). Its dimension is lower than that of \( C_T[\mathbb{R}^d] \), since some points are constrained to lie in the image of \( f \). Nonetheless its corner structure is the same as that of \( C_T[\mathbb{R}^d] \). That is, the faces of \( F[\Gamma] \) are in one-to-one correspondence with those of \( C_T[\mathbb{R}^d] \), and this correspondence preserves codimension. Thus \( F[\Gamma] \) (or alternately \( X[\Gamma] \)) has principal faces, faces at infinity, and hidden faces corresponding precisely to those of \( C_T[\mathbb{R}^d] \).

**Remark 4.2.** This bundle is similar to the one used by Bott and Taubes and Cattaneo et al. In fact, a pullback square similar \( \square \) but with \( C_T[\mathbb{R}^d] \) replaces \( C_T[\mathbb{R}^d] \) replaces \( C_{\{\text{seg}\}}[\mathbb{R}^d] \) and \( C_{\{\text{vseg}\}}[\mathbb{R}^d] \) respectively produces their bundle. Their depends only on the numbers of segment vertices (say \( q_1 + \cdots + q_m \)) and free vertices (say \( t \)) rather than all the data in the graph \( \Gamma \). Call the total space of this bundle \( X[q_1, \ldots, q_m; t] \) and call its fiber \( F[q_1, \ldots, q_m; t] \).

### 4.2. Spherical maps.

To define classes in \( H^*(X[\Gamma]) \), we will use the orientation on \( \Gamma \). Note that we do not use the suspension \( \Sigma \Gamma \) in defining the maps below.

For every edge in \( \Gamma \) with endpoints \( i \neq j \), we consider the map \( \varphi_{ij} \) defined by the composition

\[
\varphi_{ij} : X[\Gamma] \to C_T[\mathbb{R}^d] \to S^{d-1}
\]

where the second map is given on the interior by

\[
(x_1, x_2, \ldots) \mapsto \frac{x_j - x_i}{|x_j - x_i|}.
\]

This map is well defined because we have blown up the 2-fold diagonal \( x_i = x_j \) for every edge with endpoints \( \{i, j\} \) when constructing \( C_T[\mathbb{R}^d] \).

For a self-loop on a segment vertex \( i \), consider the map

\[
\Phi_i : X[\Gamma] \to S^{d-1}
\]

given by the unit tangent vector to \( L \) at the point \( x_i \).

If \( d \) is odd, define

\[
\Phi = \Phi_\Gamma := \prod_i \varphi_{ij} : X[\Gamma] \to \prod_i S^{d-1}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (4)

where both products are taken over all edges \( (i \to j) \) (including self-loops \( (i \to i) \)) in \( \Gamma \), and where the order of factors in the product is chosen arbitrarily. If \( d \) is even, define \( \Phi \) similarly, by arbitrarily choosing either \( \varphi_{ij} \) or \( \varphi_{ji} \) for each edge between vertices \( i \) and \( j \), but ordering the factors according to the order of the edges. We will call \( \Phi \) the spherical map.

### 4.3. Fiberwise integrals.

Although singular cohomology is more the spirit of this paper than de Rham cohomology, we will now consider integration of forms in order to connect our results to the previously found Bott–Taubes/Vassiliev \( \mathbb{R} \)-valued cohomology classes.

Let \( \omega \) denote the volume form on \( S^{d-1} \). For each edge of \( \Gamma \) with endpoints \( i, j \) let \( \theta_{ij} = \varphi^*_{ij} \omega \in \Omega^{d-1}_{dR}(X[\Gamma]) \). For brevity, we will sometimes write \( \alpha_\Gamma := \prod_{\text{edges in } \Gamma} \theta_{ij} \). As above, the labeling of \( \Gamma \) determines (only) the order of the indices \( i, j \) if \( d \) is odd and (only) the order of the factors in the product if \( d \) is even. In either case, this uniquely determines \( \alpha_\Gamma \), regardless of the remaining arbitrary choices.

We consider the integral \( I_\Gamma \) over the fiber of the bundle \( F[\Gamma] \to X[\Gamma] \to \mathcal{L}_m^d \), defined by

\[
I_\Gamma := \int_{F[\Gamma]} \alpha_\Gamma = \int_{F[\Gamma]} \prod \theta_{ij},
\]

which is a differential form on \( \mathcal{L}_m^d \).

\(^6\)In our previous work, we called such a pullback \( E[q_1, \ldots, q_m; t] \). In this article we use \( X \) instead of \( E \) to avoid overloading notation. Other authors use various other notations for this total space.
We will first note that this integral over our bundle $X$ agrees with the corresponding integral over the slightly different original Bott–Taubes bundle $X[q_1, \ldots, q_m; t]$ (see Remark 4.2 for its definition). In fact, one can easily define a form on $X[q_1, \ldots, q_m; t]$ similar to the form $\alpha_\Gamma$ on $X[\Gamma]$. We will use the same notation for both forms. To compare the fiberwise integrals of $\alpha_\Gamma$ over these two bundles, recall that $C[q_1, \ldots, q_m; t] \rightarrow X[q_1, \ldots, q_m; t]$ (see Remark 4.2 for its definition).

Thus the integrals of $\alpha_\Gamma$ over $F[q_1, \ldots, q_m; t]$ and $F[\Gamma]$ agree on complements of arbitrarily small neighborhoods of the boundary:

\[ \int_{F[q_1, \ldots, q_m; t]} \theta_{i_1 j_1} \cdots \theta_{i_k j_k} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{F[\Gamma]} \theta_{i_1 j_1} \cdots \theta_{i_k j_k} \]

along the fibers of the bundles

$F[q_1, \ldots, q_m; t] \rightarrow X[q_1, \ldots, q_m; t] \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_m^d \quad \text{and} \quad F[\Gamma] \rightarrow X[\Gamma] \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_m^d$

agree.

Thus we may refer to either integral as $I_\Gamma$.

4.4. Real cohomology classes from graph cocycles. We next review the arguments for the construction of nontrivial cohomology classes over $\mathbb{R}$ by integration of forms. Although we discuss the integrals over $F[\Gamma]$, the arguments used in previous literature for integrals over $F[q_1, \ldots, q_m; t]$ apply with minimal modification, as suggested by Lemma 4.3. We will give a topological reinterpretation of these arguments in Section 5 in detail, so our treatment here is brief.

The forms that are integrated along the fiber are sums of products of the $\theta_{ij}$. One wants to produce cohomology classes, so one needs to produce closed forms. Since the fiber $F = F[\Gamma]$ has nonempty boundary, Stokes’ Theorem implies that

\[ d \int_F \alpha_\Gamma = \int_F d\alpha_\Gamma = 0 \int_{\partial F} \alpha_\Gamma|_{\partial E} \]

Thus the key is to show that, for certain sums of products of $\theta_{ij}$, the integral along the boundary $\int_{\partial F} \alpha_\Gamma|_{\partial E}$ is zero.

Since the corner structure of $F[\Gamma]$ comes from that of $C[\mathbb{R}^d]$, $F[\Gamma]$ has codimension-1 faces corresponding to those defined in Definition 3.12 (though the dimension of some of these faces is lower in $F[\Gamma]$ because some points are constrained to lie on the link). If we let the link in the base space $\mathcal{L}_m^d$ vary, we can alternately think of these faces as faces of the fiber $F[\Gamma]$ and faces of the total space $X = X[\Gamma]$. The arguments for the vanishing along boundary faces differs depending on the type of the face.

Remark 4.4. For $d \geq 4$, the vanishing arguments for integrals along these types of faces are respectively as follows:

- The integrals over principal faces do not vanish. Instead, choosing appropriate linear combinations of integrals ensures that these contributions cancel. We can call this reason for vanishing cancellation.
- For certain hidden faces, one argues the vanishing by symmetry. That is, the configuration space over which one integrates has an involution which either preserves the form and reverses the orientation, or multiplies the form by $-1$ and preserves the orientation. Thus the integral is equal to its own negative and must vanish.
- The integrals over the remaining hidden faces, as well as faces at infinity, vanish because of degeneracy: the image of this face under the map $\Phi$ defined in 4 has positive codimension.
Thus the problem of constructing closed forms is reduced to the problem of finding those linear combinations of integrals \( \sum c_i I_{\Gamma_i} \), for which the principal face contributions cancel. Via the association \( \Gamma \mapsto I_{\Gamma} \) of configuration space integrals to graphs, one can rephrase this problem in terms of the graph complex defined in Section 2.3. Part (1) of the following theorem implies that the linear combinations of integrals which are closed forms correspond exactly to those \( \sum c_i \Gamma_i \) in the graph complex which are cocycles.

**Theorem 4.5 ([7, 17]).**

1. The association \( \Gamma \mapsto I_{\Gamma} \) is a chain map

\[
I : \bigoplus_{k,n} \mathcal{LD}^{k,n} \to \Omega^*_d(L^d_m)
\]

from the cochain complex of graphs to the de Rham cochain complex on the space of knots \( \mathcal{L}^d_m \), provided \( d \geq 4 \). It sends a cochain in \( \mathcal{LD}^{k,n} \) to a de Rham cochain of degree \( n(d-3)+k \).

2. For defect \( k = 0 \), the integration map \( I \) induces an injection in cohomology, producing a nontrivial cohomology class in \( H^{n(d-3)}(L^d_m) \) for each nontrivial cocycle in \( \mathcal{LD}^{0,n} \).

An analogue of statement (1) was established in [7] for the case of closed knots \( m = 1 \). The case of long links was treated in [17]. (The case of closed links can also be covered by all the arguments in [17]...) Notice that since the coboundary map raises the defect by 1, the space of defect-0 cocycles is equal to the space of defect-0 cohomology classes. Part (2) was proven in [7] for closed knots, and the proof there can be easily generalized to links (long or closed).

While integration \( I \) is not known to be a cochain map for \( d = 3 \), this deficiency can be corrected by adding “anomaly terms” (which conjecturally vanish). In that case, the injectivity result holds, and in fact, integration then gives an isomorphism \([34, 39, 17]\) between the space \( Z(\mathcal{LD}^{0,n}) \) of defect-0, order-\( n \) cocycles and the space of all finite-type knot or link invariants of type \( n \) (studied by Vassiliev \([38]\) and others). The former space is the space of (uni)trivalent graph cocycles, and this isomorphism is sometimes called the Fundamental Theorem of Finite-Type Invariants. Theorem 4.5 is thus an analogue of that theorem on knot and link invariants to cohomology classes of higher degree. Moreover, work of Bar-Natan \([1]\) implies that the cohomology of defect-0 graphs \( Z(\mathcal{LD}^{0,+}) \) has many nontrivial elements. Thus Theorem 4.5 gives the existence of many nontrivial cohomology classes in embedding spaces.

**Example 4.6.** The simplest nontrivial example for odd \( d \), illustrates the above Theorem. Consider \( L = \mathbb{R} \), and define \( \gamma_2^{\text{odd}} = X - Y \) by

\[
\gamma_2^{\text{odd}} = \begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\uparrow & \downarrow & \uparrow & \downarrow \\
\downarrow & \uparrow & \downarrow & \uparrow \\
2 & 3 & 4 & 1 \\
\end{array}
\]

An analogue of this cocycle (with \( S^1 \) instead of \( \mathbb{R} \) and with coefficients related to symmetries of the circular versions of these graphs) features prominently in the original work of Bott and Taubes. One can show that \( \gamma_2^{\text{odd}} \) is a cocycle, since the contraction of each of the four arcs of the circle in the first graph produces the same graph as the contraction of each of the three edges in the second graph. The associated integral

\[
I(\gamma_2^{\text{odd}}) = \frac{1}{4} \int_{F[4;0]} \theta_{13}\theta_{24} - \frac{1}{3} \int_{F[3;1]} \theta_{14}\theta_{24}\theta_{34}
\]

is an invariant of long knots (which is finite-type of order, or type, 2). Note that since the underlying trivalent graphs of both graphs (after compactifying at infinity) are complete graphs, the compactified configuration space fibers \( F[\Gamma_i] \) are in fact the Axelrod–Singer compactifications. That is,
the distinction between their compactification and the one we use (see Remark 4.2) does not exist here. When \( d = 3 \), the above integral expression (7) gives the type-2 invariant of knots. There is a similar cocycle of order 2 for even \( d \), which by a mild abuse of notation (i.e. ignoring orientations) we may also write as \( \gamma_{2,\text{even}}^\Gamma = X - Y \):

\[
\gamma_{2,\text{even}}^\Gamma := \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\end{array}
\end{array} - \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 \\
\end{array}
\end{array}
\] (8)

5. Gluing configuration spaces

We now provide a recipe for associating to a graph cocycle \( \gamma \) a space obtained by gluing together configuration spaces. We will glue together the bundles \( X[\Gamma_i] \) for the various graphs \( \Gamma_i \) in the cocycle \( \gamma \). This will be a fiberwise construction, meaning that we fix a link \( L \) in the base space \( \mathcal{L}_m^d \) and then glue together the various fibers \( F[\Gamma_i] \) over \( L \) to produce a space \( F_\gamma \) for each \( L \). The space \( F_\gamma \) will have a fundamental class, relative to \( \partial F_\gamma \). Thus allowing the link \( L \) to vary yields a bundle \( X_\gamma \) over \( \mathcal{L}_m^d \) whose fiber has a fundamental class, relative to its boundary. The gluing will be done so that the space \( X_\gamma \) will have a map \( \Phi_\gamma \) to (roughly) a product of \( (d-1) \)-spheres. The image under \( \Phi_\gamma \) of the remaining boundary \( \partial X_\gamma \) will have positive codimension, so this boundary can be thought of as the “degenerate locus.” This will allow us to pull back the top-dimensional cohomology class on the product of spheres and use the fundamental class \( [F_\gamma, \partial F_\gamma] \) to produce a cohomology class in \( \mathcal{L}_m^d \). The resulting class will correspond to the fiberwise integral of the product of spherical forms.

In Section 5.1, we consider integer-valued cocycles \( \sum c_i \Gamma_i \), which are the input for our construction. We also discuss how to associate to such a cocycle a disjoint union of oriented configuration spaces \( X[\Gamma_i] \). Then in Section 5.2 we glue the \( X[\Gamma_i] \) along their principal faces. After gluing, it remains to fold (Section 5.4) and collapse (Section 5.5) some faces. At each of these steps, we observe that the space has a fundamental class relative to the remaining boundary faces. We will then work relative to these faces, which are listed in Section 5.7. Finally, in Section 5.8 we establish the appropriate map to a product of spheres.

5.1. Preliminaries.

5.1.1. Integer-valued cocycles. Although the graph complex considered in \([7]\) is defined over the real numbers, it is easy to see that one can define it equally well over \( \mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z}/p \), or any ring \( R \). We will first restrict our attention to \( R = \mathbb{Z} \). A cocycle \( \gamma \) over \( \mathbb{Z} \) can be represented by a finite linear combination of oriented diagrams \( \Gamma_i \) (see Definitions 2.7 and 2.8):

\[
\gamma = \sum c_i \Gamma_i
\]

Note that the space of cocycles over \( \mathbb{R} \) is just the tensor product of the space of cocycles over \( \mathbb{Z} \) with \( \mathbb{R} \); that is, these spaces are free modules of the same rank. In defect zero, there are no coboundaries, so the space of cocycles is precisely the cohomology. (Of course in general defect \( k \), the universal coefficient theorem applies to show that the cohomology over \( \mathbb{R} \) has the same dimension as the rank of the cohomology over \( \mathbb{Z} \), though the cohomology over \( \mathbb{Z} \) may also have torsion summands.)

Consider a cocycle \( \gamma = \sum c_i \Gamma_i \) in \( \mathcal{D} \) with \( c_i \in \mathbb{Z} \). Because \( \mathcal{D} \) is a quotient by orientation relations, there are multiple such expressions \( \sum c_i \Gamma_i \) which represent \( \gamma \).

**Definitions 5.1.** For an integral cocycle \( \gamma \), call a representative expression \( \sum c_i \Gamma_i \) simplified if the underlying unoriented graphs \( |\Gamma_i| \) are in distinct isomorphism classes, and if none of the \( \Gamma_i \) is 0 in
Define $S_\gamma$, the support of $\gamma$, as the set of unoriented isomorphism classes which appear in a simplified expression for $\gamma$:

$$S_\gamma := \{ |\Gamma_i| : c_i \neq 0 \}.$$  

Call a cocycle $\gamma = \sum c_i \Gamma_i$ minimal if both of the conditions below are satisfied:

1. there is no cocycle $\beta = \sum b_i \Gamma_i$ such that $S_\beta$ is a nonempty proper subset of $S_\gamma$ and such that $b_i = c_i$ for some $i$, and
2. there is no cocycle $\beta$ such that $\gamma = c\beta$ for some $c \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $|c| > 1$.

Any expression for a cocycle $\gamma$ can be turned into a simplified one, by possibly relabeling the $\Gamma_i$, adding minus signs if necessary, and combining like terms. Thus $S_\gamma$ is always defined, and it does not depend on the choice of simplified expression for $\gamma$. Note that in a simplified expression, no $\Gamma_i$ has a multiple edge or an orientation-reversing automorphism. The next Proposition allows us to restrict our attention to minimal cocycles.

**Proposition 5.2.** Any cocycle can be decomposed into a sum of minimal cocycles.

**Proof.** If an integer-valued cocycle $\gamma$ fails to be minimal because of condition (1) above, then we can write $\gamma = (\gamma - \beta) + \beta$, where the support of each summand on the right-hand side is strictly smaller than that of $\gamma$. Iterating this step a finite number of times decomposes $\gamma$ into a sum of cocycles satisfying (1) above. If any summand fails to satisfy (2) as above, we may rewrite it as a sum of $|c|$ terms each of which is minimal. □

**5.1.2. The configuration spaces to be glued.** Fix a minimal integer-valued cocycle $\gamma$. Let $N \geq 1$ be any integer at least as large as the maximum number of edges over all the $\Gamma_i$ in $S_\gamma$. (Recall that we do not count arcs as edges. Thus there may be no edges in a cocycle, in which case we still require $N \geq 1$.) Following terminology of Poirier [25], we let $a_i := N - |E(\Gamma_i)|$ be the number of “absent edges” in $\Gamma_i$. Our first step in constructing the glued space $F$ is to start with $|c_i|$ disjoint copies of $(S^{d-1})^{a_i} \times X[\Gamma_i]$ for each $i$. Often we will abbreviate this total space as $\tilde{X}[\Gamma_i] := (S^{d-1})^{a_i} \times X[\Gamma_i]$ and its fiber as $\tilde{F}[\Gamma_i] := (S^{d-1})^{a_i} \times F[\Gamma_i]$. By a slight abuse of notation, we will write $\Phi_i$ for the map from $\tilde{X}[\Gamma_i]$ (or $\tilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$) to $(S^{d-1})^N$.

**5.1.3. Orientations on the spaces to be glued.** Orientations were of course implicitly used in the integration of forms that we reviewed in Section 4.3. We will now consider them in some detail, so that we fix an orientation on $M = \mathbb{R}^d$. For every $\Gamma_i$, this together with the orientation of $\Gamma_i$ determines an orientation on $M^{V(\Gamma_i)}$ and hence on $C_{\Gamma_i}[\mathbb{R}^d]$. We fix an (arguably canonical) orientation on $\mathbb{R}$, and then an orientation of $\Gamma_i$ yields an orientation on the fibers $F[\Gamma_i]$ of the bundle $X[\Gamma_i] \to \mathcal{L}_m$.

To address the sphere factors and boundary faces in $\tilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$, orient all boundaries of manifolds using the convention of outward-pointing normal vector first. We then orient $S^{d-1}$ as the boundary of the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^d$. This determines an orientation of $\tilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$. If $c_i > 0$, take this orientation on (all $|c_i|$ copies of) $\tilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$, while if $c_i < 0$, take the opposite of this orientation. The fiber $F_i$ of the glued space will be a quotient of this disjoint union of oriented manifolds with corners. Note that there is an obvious bijection between the faces and corners of $\tilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$ and those of $F[\Gamma_i]$. Finally, note that any codimension-1 face $\Theta(\Gamma_i, \Gamma')$ can be oriented as the boundary of $\tilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$.

**5.1.4. Comparisons to earlier work.** For the remainder of Section 5, we will recast in a more topological framework all the vanishing arguments alluded to in Remark 4.3. We collect here our remarks comparing our steps below to earlier works containing those arguments:

- In Section 5.2, we glue principal faces two at a time, unlike the construction of Kuperberg and Thurston [19]. The advantage of our method is some amenability to smooth structures, such as in our earlier work [10].
• The hidden face involution $\iota$ in Section 5.4 is due to Kontsevich [12], and also found in the work of Bott and Taubes [4], D. Thurston [24], Bott and Cattaneo [3], Kuperberg and Thurston [19], and Cattaneo, Cotta-Ramusino, and Longoni [7].

• The collapse for bivalent segment vertices with no incident edge in Section 5.5.1 is an analogue of Lemma A.9 of [7] (while analogues of the Lemmas A.7 and A.8 in that paper are not needed because we performed blow-ups for only biconnected subgraphs).

• The collapse for disconnected underlying untrivalent graphs in Section 5.5.2 corresponds to the argument which rules out boundary contributions from disconnected graphs (e.g. as in the works [34, Section 5.2], [39, Section 4.2] on invariants of knots in $\mathbb{R}^3$).

• Proposition 5.17 encodes the degeneracy arguments and is analogous to statements in [7, Proposition 4.5, Theorem A.11], [34, Section 4.2], and our joint work with Munson and Volic [17, Theorem 4.36].

• Lemma 5.16 is the main step in establishing the degeneracy arguments of Proposition 5.17 and its proof via several cases is a topological restatement of the arguments given in [7, 17].

We have preserved the numbering of the various cases used in those references.

5.2. Gluing configuration spaces along principal faces. In this section, we glue the configuration space bundles along their principal faces. We do the principal face gluing in two steps. First we check that a pair of principal faces whose contributions in $\delta \gamma$ cancel can in fact be identified; this involves identifying first the interiors and then the closures. Then we check that we can pairwise glue all of these faces so that every identification is orientation-reversing.

5.2.1. Gluing a pair of faces. Consider the fiber $\bigsqcup c_i \tilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$ of the space associated to an expression for $\gamma$. Recall from Section 3.3 that an edge or arc $e$ of a $\Gamma_i$ corresponds to a principal face of $F[\Gamma_i]$, denoted $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, e)$. We use the same notation $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, e)$ for the corresponding face in $\tilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$. By this correspondence, we can view $\delta \gamma$ as a disjoint union of principal faces of $\tilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$ (or $-\tilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$ in the case of negative $c_i$), which we will glue in pairs.

Lemma 5.3.

(1) Given labeled graphs $\Gamma_i$ and $\Gamma_j$, an isomorphism $\Gamma_i/e \to \Gamma_j/f$ gives rise to a diffeomorphism of the interiors of the corresponding principal faces $g: \mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, e) \to \mathcal{S}(\Gamma_j, f)$.

(2) Suppose the isomorphism $\varepsilon(e)\Gamma_i/e \to \varepsilon(f)\Gamma_j/f$ preserves (respectively reverses) orientation. Then we can find a diffeomorphism $g: \mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, e) \to \mathcal{S}(\Gamma_j, f)$ which preserves (respectively reverses) orientation such that the spherical maps $\Phi_{\Gamma_i}$ and $\Phi_{\Gamma_j} \circ g$ agree up to an orientation-preserving diffeomorphism of $(S^{d-1})^N$ (in both cases).

Proof. Let $v$ and $w$ be the endpoints of $e$. If $d$ is odd, suppose $e$ is oriented from $v$ to $w$. An interior point of $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, e)$ is given by a configuration of points in $\Gamma_i/e$ together with a direction of collision of two points. For $d$ odd, we take this to be the direction from the point $x_v$ to the point $x_w$, while for $d$ even we arbitrarily choose one of the two possible directions. There are two cases for this direction of collision.

(i) If $v$ and $w$ are both segment vertices, then this is a direction in $\mathbb{R}$, i.e., a point in $S^0 = \{+, -\}$, necessarily $+$ since the arc orientation coincides with the orientation of $\mathbb{R}$. Then

$$\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, e) \cong \tilde{F}[\Gamma_i/e] = (S^{d-1})^N \times F[\Gamma_i/e].$$

(ii) Otherwise, it is a direction in $\mathbb{R}^d$, i.e., a vector in $S^{d-1}$. Then

$$\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, e) \cong \tilde{F}[\Gamma_i/e] = (S^{d-1})^{N+1} \times F[\Gamma_i/e].$$

Note that in either case, the space on the right-hand side of the isomorphism has an orientation coming from the labeling of $\Gamma_i/e$. One can also define a map $\Phi_{\Gamma_i/e}$ from these spaces to $(S^{d-1})^N$. This map is canonical up to permutations of the $N$ factors for odd $d$ and up to antipodal maps on the factors for even $d$; both of these types of transformations preserve orientation.
A similar dichotomy as above applies for $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_j, f)$. The numbers $a_i$ and $a_j$ of absent edges in $\Gamma_i$ and $\Gamma_j$ agree precisely when either both are in case (i) or both are in case (ii). In these cases, the diffeomorphism is clear, by identifying $F[\Gamma_i/e] \to F[\Gamma_j/f]$ via the graph isomorphism $\Gamma_i/e \to \Gamma_j/f$.

The remaining cases are when $a_i$ and $a_j$ differ by 1. Without loss of generality, suppose $a_j = a_i + 1$. Then the collision in $\Gamma_j$ is of two segment vertices, so there is no direction of collision to specify as part of the data. In $\Gamma_i$ however it is a collision of a free vertex with a segment vertex, parametrized by a vector in $S^{d-1}$. We then map $F[\Gamma_i/e] \to F[\Gamma_j/f]$ by sending this vector into the first $S^{d-1}$ factor in $F[\Gamma_j/f]$. In summary, in any of the cases, we have a composition of diffeomorphisms:

$$\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, e) \cong F[\Gamma_i/e] \cong F[\Gamma_j/f] \cong \mathcal{S}(\Gamma_j, f)$$

(11)

This completes the proof of statement (1) for $d$ odd.

For statement (2), the first and last diffeomorphisms in (11) are orientation-preserving. They are also compatible (on the nose) with the spherical maps. Suppose first that $\varepsilon(e) \Gamma_i/e \to \varepsilon(f) \Gamma_j/f$ is orientation-reversing. Then by construction, the combined effects on orientation of (a) the middle isomorphism and (b) the map on $(S^{d-1})^N$ making the following diagram commute is $+1$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
F[\Gamma_i/e] & \to & F[\Gamma_j/f] \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
(S^{d-1})^N & \to & (S^{d-1})^N
\end{array}$$

If both signs are $+1$, we are done. If both signs are $-1$, then since $N \geq 1$, each space in the top row has at least one factor of $S^{d-1}$, and we can compose the top horizontal map with the antipodal map on some $S^{d-1}$ to change both signs to $+1$. If instead $\varepsilon(e) \Gamma_i/e \to \varepsilon(f) \Gamma_j/f$ is orientation-reversing, then a similar argument shows that we can arrange for the two signs to be $-1$ and $+1$ respectively.

Finally, suppose $d$ is even. We find diffeomorphisms as in the odd case, except that the choice of direction between $x_v$ and $x_w$ is arbitrary but has no effect on orientation. To get the desired effect on orientation, we cannot use the antipodal map, but we can instead use an orientation-reversing diffeomorphism on some factor of $S^{d-1}$, such as a reflection in a hyperplane. $\square$

5.2.2. Collapses induced by gluing closures of principal faces. Now suppose we have a diffeomorphism $g : \text{int}(\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, e)) \to \text{int}(\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_j, f))$ of the interiors of principal faces of $\bar{F}[\Gamma_i]$ and $\bar{F}[\Gamma_j]$. We want to extend this identification to the closures of these faces. Because the compactification $C_T[\mathbb{R}^d]$ is a blowup of only some diagonals, depending on $\Gamma$, it is possible that, for example, two corresponding corners of $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, e)$ and $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_j, f)$ have different codimension. See Figures 2 and 3, which by the following lemma reasonably exemplify the general pathology.

**Lemma 5.4.** A diffeomorphism $g : \text{int}(\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, e)) \to \text{int}(\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_j, f))$ extends to a homeomorphism $g : \mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, e) \to \mathcal{S}(\Gamma_j, f)$ of the closures after performing certain canonical collapses in possibly both the domain and codomain. Locally, the collapses are submersions of Euclidean spaces.

**Proof.** Let us consider the possible effect of the extension of $g$ to the boundary on a corner contained in the face $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, e)$. Such a corner $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, S)$ is indexed by a set $S$ of biconnected subgraphs of $\Sigma \Gamma_i$ satisfying the properties given in Section 3.3 among which is the edge $e$. The graphs $\Gamma_i$ and $\Gamma_j$ differ precisely by an edge reconnection as shown in Figure 2 that is, a re-partitioning of those edge-ends which are incident to some endpoint of $e$. The same is true of their suspensions. After this reconnection, the corresponding subgraph in $\Sigma \Gamma_j$ may or may not be biconnected. If it is, the codimension is unchanged, but if it is not, it may increase the codimension of $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, S)$. We need to consider the effect on only those subgraphs of $\Sigma \Gamma_i$ containing $e$, for if a subgraph $\Gamma'' \subset \Sigma \Gamma_i$ intersects $e$ in at most one endpoint, then there is a corresponding isomorphic subgraph $\Gamma''' \subset \Sigma \Gamma_j$, and this subgraph has no effect on the codimension of the corner $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, S)$. 

Figure 2. This is an example where a principal face gluing identifies corners of different dimension, as in [19]. The two graphs (with orientations omitted) agree outside of the pictured portions. Contracting the middle edge in each figure gives isomorphic graphs, so the interiors of the corresponding principal faces can be glued together. Consider the codimension-2 face of the left-hand space indexed by the circled subgraphs, i.e., the double-square and the middle edge. The six vertices in the right-hand graph do not form a biconnected subgraph, so the corresponding corner of the right-hand principal face (where all six points have collided) is indexed by the left triangle, the middle edge, and the right triangle, and is thus a codimension-3 face. The canonical way to identify these corners is via the blow-down map from the left-hand, codimension-2 corner to the right-hand, codimension-3 corner.

So suppose a subgraph $\Gamma' \subset \Sigma \Gamma_i$ properly contains $e$ and that after reconnection, the corresponding subgraph $\Gamma'' \subset \Sigma \Gamma_j$ is no longer biconnected. Let $A$ and $B$ denote the connected components resulting from the removal of $f$ from $\Gamma''$. If one of them (say $B$) is a single vertex, then $\Gamma''$ is merely replaced by $A$, and the codimension is unchanged. Otherwise, $\Gamma'$ is replaced by $A, B$, and the codimension increases by 1. More concretely, a space of screens labeled by $\Gamma'$ is replaced by a product of two spaces of screens: one labeled by $A$ and one labeled by $B$. This lowers the dimension by 1, and in fact, the inverse to this collapse is given by providing a ratio in $[0, \infty]$ of, say, the size of the screen labeled by $A$ to the size of the screen labeled by $B$:

$$[0, \infty] \times C_A(T_p \mathbb{R}^d)/(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+) \times C_B(T_p \mathbb{R}^d)/(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+) \longrightarrow C_{\Gamma'}(T_p \mathbb{R}^d)/(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+)$$

It is possible that $g$ induces multiple such collapses of the corner $\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_i, S)$. The situation with respect to corners contained in $\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_j, f)$ is symmetric in that $g$ may also induce collapses of such a corner. Note that it is possible that $g$ induces collapses of both a corner $\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_i, S) \subset \mathcal{G}(\Gamma_i, e)$ and a corner $\mathcal{G}(\Gamma_j, T) \subset \mathcal{G}(\Gamma_j, f)$, as shown in Figure 3. In any case, the overall modification to each corner is given by forgetting some number of relative rates of approach, and this number is precisely the number by which the codimension increases. We thus see that these collapses are canonical and that they are locally modeled by submersions of Euclidean spaces.

5.2.3. Implementing the gluings. We now glue the principal faces by partitioning the graphs in an expression for $\delta_{\Gamma}$ into unoriented isomorphism classes. For each class, the terms sum to zero when one accounts for orientations. Thus within each class, we can group the terms in pairs with opposite orientations. We arbitrarily choose any such pairings, where each pair determines an orientation-reversing isomorphism of graphs. Then as in Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4, we get an orientation-reversing diffeomorphism of their interiors, collapses of some of their corners, and then a homeomorphism of the resulting closures.

Let $g$ denote the equivalence relation generated by the gluings specified above.

5.3. Folding principal faces with involutions. Recall that graphs with orientation-reversing automorphisms are zero in the graph complex.
Let $e$ and $f$ be the circled edges above in $\Gamma_i$ (left) and $\Gamma_j$ (right). Consider corners $S(\Gamma_i, S)$ and $S(\Gamma_j, T)$, where $S$ and $T$ each consist of the four circled subgraphs in the left and right pictures respectively. This is an example where a principal face gluing induced by $\Gamma_i/e \cong \Gamma_j/f$ reduces the dimension of both identified corners, even though both corners are of codimension 4. The contraction of the circled edge in each figure yields isomorphic graphs and hence a principal face gluing. For either face, the gluing results in forgetting a relative rate of approach when passing from a double-square to two triangles joined by an edge. That is, we forget the relative sizes of the two triangles involved, which was part of the data in the double-square, and the corners become of codimension 5.

**Lemma 5.5.** Suppose $\Gamma_i/e$ has an orientation-reversing automorphism. Then we can take the associated diffeomorphism $\iota$ of $S(\Gamma_i, e)$ to be orientation-reversing, and the spherical maps $\Phi_{\Gamma_i}$ and $\Phi_{\Gamma_i} \circ \iota$ to agree up to an orientation-preserving diffeomorphism of the codomain.

**Proof.** As in Lemma 5.3, a graph automorphism $\alpha$ of $\Gamma_i/e$ determines a diffeomorphism $\iota$ of $S(\Gamma_i, e)$. Suppose $\alpha$ is orientation-reversing. If $\iota$ reverses orientation, then $\Phi_{\Gamma_i}$ and $\Phi_{\Gamma_i} \circ \iota$ must agree up to an orientation-preserving diffeomorphism, since the sign of $\alpha$ is the product of these two signs. In this case, we are done. If $\iota$ preserves orientation, then $\Phi_{\Gamma_i}$ and $\Phi_{\Gamma_i} \circ \iota$ must agree up to an orientation-reversing diffeomorphism. In this case, we complete the proof by composing $\iota$ with an orientation-reversing map of a factor $S^{d-1}$, as in the proof of Lemma 5.3. □

The next lemma is proven by similar arguments as those given in the proof of Lemma 5.4.

**Lemma 5.6.** Let $\iota$ be a diffeomorphism of $S(\Gamma_i, e)$ coming from a graph automorphism $\alpha$ of $\Gamma_i/e$. Then $\iota$ extends to the closure of $S(\Gamma_i, e)$. □

Now for either parity of $d$, we fold $S(\Gamma_i, e)$, identifying $x \in S(\Gamma_i, e)$ with $\iota(x) \in S(\Gamma_i, e)$, for every such principal face in $\gamma$. If a principal face has multiple such automorphisms, we arbitrarily choose one (with no claim that different choices will yield identical homeomorphism types).

Let $r$ denote the equivalence relation given by folding all principal faces with orientation-reversing automorphisms.

At this point, the only principal faces unaccounted for are those corresponding to $\Gamma_i/e$ with a multiple edge. Such a graph is zero in the graph complex because the associated configuration space integral has a factor $\theta^2_{ij}$ and hence vanishes. In our construction, we leave the corresponding face $S(\Gamma_i, e)$ unglued to any other face, to be relegated to the degenerate locus $\partial F_\gamma$ in Section 5.7.

### 5.4. Folding hidden faces with involution.

Having completed principal face gluings, we will modify the result $\widetilde{F}[\Gamma_i]/(c, g, r)$ by folding certain hidden faces. A hidden face of $\widetilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$ corresponds...
to a proper, biconnected subgraph $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma_i$. We will denote such a hidden face by $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma')$. Recall that a point in $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma')$ can be described by a configuration in $\mathbb{R}^d$ of the vertices of $\Gamma_i/\Gamma'$, together with a configuration of the vertices of $\Gamma'$ in $T_p\mathbb{R}^d$, modulo translation and oriented scaling, where $p$ is the location of the basepoint in $\Gamma_i/\Gamma'$. (Unlike in the work of Kuperberg and Thurston on 3-manifold invariants, some of these points are constrained to the link, or in the case of the infinitesimal configuration, the tangent line to the link at a point.) Since $\Gamma'$ is biconnected, it has no 0-valent vertices and no univalent vertices.

In this Subsection, we consider only hidden faces $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma')$ such that $\Gamma'$ has a bivalent free vertex $v$. Let $u, w$ be the vertices in $\Gamma'$ joined by edges to $v$. We consider an involution of $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma')$ which comes from an involution of the screen space $C_{\Gamma'}(T_pS^d)/(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^+)$, given by $x_v \mapsto x_u + x_w - x_v$ and fixing all the other vertices of $\Gamma'$. Denote the resulting involution of $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma')$ by $\iota$.

**Lemma 5.7.** The involution $\iota$ extends from the interior of $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma')$ to its corners.

**Proof.** As before, such a corner is indexed by a set $S$ of biconnected subgraphs of $\Sigma \Gamma_i$. We consider all the cases of such subgraphs involved in a corner contained in $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma')$, and their associated screen spaces. By Proposition 3.10 applied to $C_{\Sigma \Gamma_i}[S^d]$, these subgraphs either are disjoint from $\Gamma'$, contain $\Gamma'$, are contained in $\Gamma'$, or intersect $\Gamma'$ in a single vertex. The only screens possibly affected are those involving $v$. The screen spaces involving $v$ but neither $u$ nor $w$ are unaffected. Those involving both $u$ and $w$ incur an involution just like the screen space for $\Gamma'$. This leaves the case of a biconnected subgraph $\Gamma''$ of $\Gamma'$ containing $v$, but only one of $u$ and $w$. By Lemma 2.6, $\Gamma''$ is one of the edges $\{u, v\}$ and $\{v, w\}$. In this case the screen spaces for those edges are interchanged. That is, such a corner indexed by $S$ is mapped to the corner indexed by $T$, where $S$ and $T$ differ by exchanging the edges $\{u, v\}$ and $\{v, w\}$.

For $d$ odd, we “fold” $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma')$ via the identification $x \sim \iota(x)$ for every biconnected $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma_i$ with a bivalent free vertex. If $\Gamma'$ has multiple bivalent free vertices, we arbitrarily choose one (again with no claim that different choices yield homeomorphic spaces). For $d$ even, let $\rho$ be an orientation-reversing diffeomorphism of some $S^{d-1}$ factor of $\tilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$, such as a reflection in a hyperplane. We then identify $x \sim \rho \circ \iota(x)$ for every biconnected $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma_i$ with a bivalent free vertex, possibly making arbitrary choices as we did for $d$ odd.

Let $h$ denote the equivalence relation given by folding hidden faces by an involution as above.

**Remark 5.8.** Note that since we do not blow up all the diagonals of $(T_pS^d)^{\nu(\Gamma')}$ to get $C_{\Gamma'}(T_pS^d)$, the involution is well defined. In particular, $\Delta_{\{v, u\}}$ and $\Delta_{\{v, w\}}$ are the only two-fold diagonals involving $v$ that are blown up. If we had blown up all the diagonals, then the involution would not be defined on the whole configuration space. Instead, it would only be defined on the configuration space of 3 points corresponding to $u, v, w$. This latter approach is taken in the setting of integration of forms in [7], where integration over the remaining configuration points is performed before applying the involution to this 3-point configuration space.

### 5.5. Collapsing certain remaining hidden faces.

Finally, we want to ensure that all the remaining hidden faces $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma')$ satisfy the conditions that

(1) every free vertex in $\Gamma'$ has valence $\geq 3$ and
(2) every segment vertex in $\Gamma'$ has an incident edge (i.e., is joined by an edge to another vertex in $\Gamma'$).

Condition (1) is ensured by the folding in the previous Subsection; indeed, vertices cannot have valence 0 or 1, since $\Gamma'$ is biconnected. Condition (2) is not yet satisfied, but we will collapse those faces $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma')$ which violate it. This is the first type of collapse that we will perform. We will also perform a second type of collapse that will be useful later. In both cases, the collapse amounts to forgetting a relative rate of approach.
5.5.1. Bivalent segment vertices with no incident edge. Suppose $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma_i$ has a segment vertex $v$ with no incident edge. The neighbors $u$, $w$ of $v$ on the segment must be in $\Gamma'$ because $\Gamma'$ is biconnected. Let $L$ be the link over which $F[\Gamma_i]$ is the fiber of $X[\Gamma_i] \to \mathcal{L}^d_m$. Recall that $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma')$ can be described as a bundle over $F[\Gamma_i/\Gamma']$. The fiber of this latter bundle, over a configuration where the basepoint of $\Gamma_i/\Gamma'$ is located at $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$, is the subspace of $C_T/[T_p \mathbb{R}^d]/(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^+)$ with the segment vertices of $\Gamma'$ constrained to lie in $T_p L$. This fiber records the relative rate of approach $|v - u|/|v - w|$. We can forget this relative rate of approach without altering the associated spherical map (cf. Section 5.8 below). In other words, we will forget $v$ from $C_T/[T_p \mathbb{R}^d]/(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^+)$, thus mapping $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma)$ to a space whose fiber dimension is 1 lower. Thus in $F[\Gamma_i]$, we have collapsed the codimension-1 face $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma')$ to a codimension-2 face. We perform such a collapse for every subgraph $\Gamma'$ of some $\Gamma_i$ with a segment vertex with no incident edge.

Let $c_1$ denote the equivalence relation which results in this first type of collapse as above.

5.5.2. Disconnected underlying unitrivalent graphs. It is not strictly necessary for links in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with $d > 3$; in fact, a careful reader may verify that this second type of collapse, unlike the first type above, is used nowhere in the proof of Lemma 5.16. However, it is useful for carrying out a similar construction specifically for chord diagrams for links in $\mathbb{R}^3$, namely in Proposition 8.4 below.

Suppose $\Gamma_i$ is a trivalent graph whose underlying unitrivalent graph $U(\Gamma_i)$ is disconnected. Suppose $\Gamma'$ is a biconnected subgraph of $\Gamma_i$ indexing a face of $X[\Gamma_i]$, and suppose $\Gamma'$ has vertices in (at least) two distinct components $A$ and $B$ of $U(\Gamma_i)$. Since $\Gamma'$ is connected, there must be vertices $v \in A$ and $w \in B$ joined by an arc, but not by an edge. Since $\Gamma'$ indexes a face of $X[\Gamma_i]$, and all segment vertices of $\Gamma'$ must lie on one (long) component of $L$, for otherwise the corresponding configuration points cannot all collide. This fact together with the biconnectedness of $\Gamma'$ and trivalence of $\Gamma_i$ imply that the remaining segment neighbors $u$ and $x$ of $v$ and $w$ must also lie in $\Gamma'$. In $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma')$, we perform a collapse by forgetting the relative rates of approach of $u, v, w$, and $x$ (without altering the spherical map), thus lowering the dimension of $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma')$ by 2. We perform this collapse for every such $\Gamma'$.

Let $c_2$ denote the equivalence relation which results in this second type of collapse as above.

5.6. Implementing the gluings, foldings, and collapses. Recall the gluings $g$, the foldings $r$ and $h$, and the collapses $c_1, c_2$ from the previous Sections. For any minimal cocycle $\gamma = \sum_i e_i \Gamma_i$, define the final glued space $F_\gamma$ as

$$F_\gamma := \coprod_i \tilde{F}[\Gamma_i]/(g, r, h, c_1, c_2)$$

by which we mean the transitive closure of these equivalence relations. Since $\gamma$ is minimal, $F_\gamma$ is connected. The diffeomorphism types of the constituent pieces are independent of the vertex-labelings and edge-orientations in the representative expression for $\gamma$. However, the homeomorphism type of this glued space may depend on the arbitrary choices of gluings. Carrying out this gluing for the fibers over all links in the base $\mathcal{L}^d_m$ yields a glued total space $X_\gamma$ whose fiber over a link in $\mathcal{L}^d_m$ is $F_\gamma$. We now establish some properties of $F_\gamma$. It need not be a manifold with corners, but it is not too pathological:

Proposition 5.9. The space $F_\gamma$ can be given a CW (i.e. cellular) structure.

Proof. The identifications that produce $F_\gamma$ are locally of several types, which we now describe.

First, the gluings $g$ locally look like the gluings of two half-balls along their boundary faces, at least at a point in the interior of a codimension-1 face. The same is true of $h$ and $r$, away from the fixed points of the involutions. Note that for either $h$ or $r$, we need not treat corners separately from interior points (see Lemma 5.6 and Lemma 5.7).
Second, at a corner, $g$ may induce a collapse, as in Lemma 5.4, which is given by forgetting relative rates of approach. Locally, such a collapse is the collapse of a boundary stratum of a Euclidean ball with corners by a standard submersion of Euclidean spaces. The collapses $c_1, c_2$ are also given by forgetting relative rates of approach and thus have the same local description as those induced by $g$.

Third, near a fixed point of a hidden face involution, $h$ is locally the identification of points (in the boundary face of a Euclidean ball with corners) with their mirror images across a hyperplane in that boundary face. Fourth and finally, near a fixed point of an automorphism of a principal face, the situation is similar, except that $r$ is locally a permutation of coordinates in the relevant boundary face of a Euclidean ball with corners. In this case, the fixed point set will be some diagonal of this boundary face.

Now imposing all the relations $g, r, h, c_1, c_2$ may induce foldings or collapses of corners that were not originally implicated (i.e., a corner $\sigma$ may incur collapses not just from identifications of faces containing it, but also from identifications of faces containing a corner $\sigma'$ to which $\sigma$ is glued, and from identifications of faces containing a corner $\sigma''$ to which $\sigma'$ is glued, and so on).

To see the cellular structure on $F_\gamma$, start with a triangulation of the original manifold with corners $[i]$, which is sufficiently fine so that it restricts to triangulations of all the strata, as well as the fixed-point sets of the involutions (which are locally linear subspaces). Performing the identifications in the following order will elucidate the structure on the resulting quotient. First perform all the necessary collapses of faces and corners, including those induced by transitivity. Such a quotient clearly inherits a cellular structure. In fact, for a sufficiently fine triangulation, a collapse is on each simplex the collapse of a codimension-1 face to a lower-dimensional simplex. The image of each simplex is then still a ball with a CW structure. Next perform all the necessary foldings, including those induced by transitivity. For a sufficiently fine triangulation, each folding just identifies pairs of cells, some of which may share a boundary face. So the resulting quotient inherits a CW structure. Finally, the gluings just identify certain closed subspaces by homeomorphisms, and again with a sufficiently fine triangulation, the quotient inherits a CW structure. \hfill \Box

### 5.7. The degenerate locus

**Definition 5.10.** Consider (the closures of) all the codimension-1 faces in the $\tilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$ which have not been glued or folded. Let $\partial F_\gamma$, their union and, letting the link in the base vary, let $\partial X_\gamma$ denote the corresponding subspace in $X_\gamma$. Every such remaining face is either

- a principal face $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, e)$ of some $\tilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$ such that $\Gamma_i/e$ has a multiple edge; or
- a hidden face $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma')$ of some $\tilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$ such that in $\Gamma'$, every free vertex has valence $\geq 3$, and every segment vertex has valence $\geq 1$; or
- a face at infinity of some $\tilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$.

Note that the converse is not true, since some hidden faces as in the list above were collapsed to higher codimension in the previous Subsection. We call $\partial F_\gamma$ (or $\partial X_\gamma$) the degenerate locus of $F_\gamma$ (respectively $X_\gamma$).

The following is the most important property of $F_\gamma$:

**Proposition 5.11.** The space $F_\gamma$ has a fundamental cycle over $\mathbb{Z}$ relative to $\partial F_\gamma$. That is, the chain consisting of all the top-dimensional cells in some cell structure on $F_\gamma$ is a cycle in $H_\ast(F_\gamma, \partial F_\gamma, \mathbb{Z})$.

**Proof.** Each $\tilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$ has a fundamental class $[\tilde{F}[\Gamma_i]]$ relative to its boundary, which we may view as the union of top-dimensional cells in some given cell structure. The class $\sum_i [\tilde{F}[\Gamma_i]]$ will be our desired class.

For the principal face gluings $g$, recall that each gluing of some $\pm \mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, e)$ to some other $\pm \mathcal{S}(\Gamma_j, f)$ in Section 5.2.3 is orientation-reversing, so the contributions from these faces also cancel in $\partial \sum_i [\tilde{F}[\Gamma_i]]$. The same applies to each identification in $r$ in Section 5.3 where a face $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, e)$ is glued to itself.
Next, we address the folding by the hidden face involutions \( h \). For \( d \) odd, each involution \( h \) is orientation-reversing, so all the contributions from hidden faces cancel in \( \partial \tilde{F}[\Gamma_i] \). For \( d \) even, \( h \) preserves orientation, but in this case we glue via \( \alpha \circ h \) where \( \alpha \) reverses orientation, so the hidden face contributions cancel here too.

Finally, we claim that the collapses \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \) simply remove the corresponding faces from the cellular boundary \( \partial \tilde{F}[\Gamma_i] \). Indeed, let \( m \) be the dimension of \( \tilde{F}[\Gamma_i] \) (which is independent of \( i \)). Then after collapsing, these faces are of codimension at least 2, hence zero in the space of \((m-1)\)-dimensional cellular chains.

\[\Box\]

5.8. **Mapping to spheres.** Recall that before gluing and folding, each piece \( \tilde{X}[\Gamma_i] := X[\Gamma_i] \times (S^{d-1})^{\alpha_i} \) of \( X \) had a map \( \Phi_i \) to the \( N \)-fold cartesian product \((S^{d-1})^N\). The gluing and folding do not quite respect these maps, but they will if we allow for certain symmetries of this cartesian product. We will define a subgroup \( G \) of symmetries of \((S^{d-1})^N\), which will depend on the parity of \( d \). We will write \( G_o \) and \( G_e \) for the odd and even cases respectively, but we will simply write \( G \) in contexts where the parity is not needed.

Let \( \alpha \) denote the antipodal map on \( S^{d-1} \), and for each \( j = 1, \ldots, N \), let \( \alpha_j \) denote the antipodal map on the \( j \)-th copy of \( S^{d-1} \). For even \( d \), fix an arbitrary reflection \( \rho \) of \( S^{d-1} \), and let \( \rho_j \) denote this reflection on the \( j \)-th copy of \( S^{d-1} \). We let the symmetric group \( \Sigma_N \) act on \((S^{d-1})^N\) by permuting the factors.

**Definition 5.12.**

(d odd) Let \( G_o \) be the subgroup of the group generated by \( \Sigma_N \) and the \( \alpha_j \) which acts by orientation-preserving diffeomorphisms on \((S^{d-1})^N\).

(d even) Let \( G_e \) be the subgroup of the group generated by \( \Sigma_N \) the \( \alpha_j \), and the \( \rho_j \) which acts by orientation-preserving diffeomorphisms on \((S^{d-1})^N\).

Thus \( G_o \) is generated by all permutations in \( \Sigma_N \) and two-fold products \( \alpha_j \alpha_k \). Similarly \( G_e \) is generated by all the \( \alpha_j \), even permutations, and products of an odd permutation with a \( \rho_j \).

Let \( \omega \) be a cochain which generates \( H^{d-1}(S^{d-1}; \mathbb{Z}) \) and which is invariant under the antipodal map \( \alpha \) and the reflection \( \rho \).

We now list all the results to be proven in this subsection before giving their proofs:

**Lemma 5.13.** Let \( \omega^{(N)} \) be the class in \( H^{N(d-1)}((S^{d-1})^N; \mathbb{Z}) \) corresponding to the \( N \)-fold product of \( \omega \). Then \( \omega^{(N)} \) represents a nontrivial class in \( H^{N(d-1)}((S^{d-1})^N/G; \mathbb{Z}) \).

Note that \( \omega^{(N)} \) can then be reduced mod \( p \) to a nontrivial class over \( \mathbb{Z}/p \).

**Lemma 5.14.** The maps \( \Phi_{\Gamma_i} : \tilde{X}[\Gamma_i] \to (S^{d-1})^N \) induce a continuous map \( \Phi_{\gamma} : X_\gamma \to (S^{d-1})^N/G \).

A relative version of the pullback \( \Phi_{\gamma}^{*}(\omega^{(N)}) \) is the class to be integrated along the fiber \( F_\gamma \). We will work relative to the following subspace \( \mathcal{R} \), which will have the following desirable properties:

**Definition 5.15.** Let \( \mathcal{R} \subset (S^{d-1})^N/G \) denote the image of \( \partial X_\gamma \) under \( \Phi_{\gamma} \).

**Lemma 5.16.**

1. If \( d \geq 4 \), then \( \mathcal{R} \) is a union of positive-codimension subspaces of \((S^{d-1})^N/G\).
2. If \( d \geq 5 \), then \( \mathcal{R} \) has codimension at least two in \((S^{d-1})^N/G\).

**Lemma 5.16** and the long exact sequence for the pair \(((S^{d-1})^N/G, \mathcal{R})\) immediately imply the main result of this subsection:

**Proposition 5.17.** For \( d \geq 4 \), the maps

\[ H^{N(d-1)}((S^{d-1})^N/G, \mathcal{R}; \mathbb{Z}) \to H^{N(d-1)}((S^{d-1})^N/G; \mathbb{Z}) \]

are surjective. Moreover, for \( d \geq 5 \), these maps are isomorphisms. \( \Box \)
This proposition guarantees that for \( d \geq 4 \), \( \omega^{(N)} \) has a preimage in the relative cohomology \( H^{N(d-1)}((S^{d-1})^N/G; \mathbb{R}; \mathbb{Z}) \), which by abuse of notation we will also call \( \omega^{(N)} \). It moreover ensures that for \( d \geq 5 \), this relative class is uniquely determined for a fixed generator of the top cohomology of the sphere. This relative cohomology class \( \omega^{(N)} \) is the class that we will integrate over the fiber, but in cellular cohomology rather than in de Rham cohomology.

We now return to the proofs of the lemmas stated above.

**Proof of Lemma 5.13** Consider the quotient \((S^{d-1})^N/G\). It is well known that if a space \( Y \) has an action of a group \( G \), then for any field \( k \) of characteristic zero, \( H^*(Y/G; k) \) maps isomorphically onto the \( G \)-invariant subspace \( (H^*(Y; k))^G \) [2, Chapter III]. Thus, since \( G \) preserves orientation, the top cohomology \( H^{N(d-1)}((S^{d-1})^N/G; k) \) is one-dimensional, generated by the class of the \( N \)-fold product of the preimage of a generator of \( H^{d-1}(S^{d-1}; k) \). Then by the universal coefficient theorem, the free part of \( H^{N(d-1)}((S^{d-1})^N/G; \mathbb{Z}) \) is one-dimensional, generated by \( \omega^{(N)} \). \( \square \)

**Proof of Lemma 5.14** We check that the identifications of faces by gluing, folding, and collapsing respect the map \( \Phi_{\Gamma_i} \) up to the action of \( G \).

The fact that the gluing of principal faces of \( \bar{X}[\Gamma_j] \) and \( \bar{X}[\Gamma_j] \) respects the maps \( \Phi_{\Gamma_i} \) and \( \Phi_{\Gamma_j} \) in this way was established in part (2) of Lemma 5.3 [where we use our chosen reflection \( \rho \) in the case of even \( d \) to attain an orientation-reversing diffeomorphism of the principal faces such that the spherical maps agree up to orientation-preserving diffeomorphism]. The same property was established in Lemma 5.5 for the folding of principal faces with orientation-reversing diffeomorphisms.

For an involution \( \iota \) of a hidden face of \( \bar{X}[\Gamma_j] \), \( \Phi_{\Gamma_i}(x) \) and \( \Phi_{ \bar{X}[\Gamma_j]}(\iota(x)) \) differ by a transposition two factors of \( S^{d-1} \) and an antipodal map on both of these factors. For odd \( d \), this map is orientation-preserving, hence an element of \( G_e \). For even \( d \), it reverses orientation, but in this parity we folded hidden faces by \( \rho \circ \iota \) rather than \( \iota \), so again \( \Phi_{\Gamma_i}(x) \) and \( \Phi_{\Gamma_j}(\iota(x)) \) differ by an orientation-preserving diffeomorphism, i.e. an element of \( G_e \).

Finally, the two types of collapses in Section 5.5 respect \( \Phi_{\Gamma_i} \) on the nose, since the relative rates of approach along the segment are inconsequential to the map \( \Phi_{\Gamma_i} \). \( \square \)

**Proof of Lemma 5.16** We check the statement for each of the types of faces listed in Section 5.7.

First, for a principal face \( \mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, e) \) such that \( \Gamma_i/e \) has a multiple edge, the image of \( \Phi_{\Gamma_i} \) in \( (S^{d-1})^N/G \) is contained in the image (under the quotient by \( G \)) of some diagonal in \( (S^{d-1})^N \). Hence its codimension is positive and in fact at least two for \( d \geq 3 \).

Now we consider the remaining faces, first addressing statement (1) and returning to statement (2) at the end of the argument. Since \( G \) is finite and each face of \( X \) is just a face of some \( X[\Gamma_i] \), it suffices to show that the images under the original spherical maps \( \Phi_i \) have positive codimension in \( (S^{d-1})^N \). Now each face of \( X[\Gamma_i] \) corresponds to a biconnected subgraph of \( \Sigma \). There are two possibilities according to whether or not \( \infty \) is in this subgraph. If it is, this face corresponds to \( \Sigma \Gamma' \) for a connected \( \Gamma' \subset \Gamma_i \). If it is not, then the face corresponds to a biconnected \( \Gamma' \subset \Gamma_i \). The faces at infinity are precisely the faces in Cases II and IV below, and the remaining hidden faces are addressed by Cases I and III below. These arguments use the descriptions of faces in terms of screens given in Section 3.3 in just the case of codimension 1.

**Case I:** Let \( \mathcal{S}((\Gamma_i, \Gamma') \) be a face of \( X[\Gamma_i] \) corresponding to a biconnected \( \Gamma' \subset \Gamma_i \), with \( \infty \) not involved in the collision; suppose also that there are no segment vertices in \( \Gamma' \). Then \( \mathcal{S}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma') \) is a bundle over \( X[\Gamma_i/\Gamma'] \) with fiber which we denote \( \mathcal{C}_{\Gamma'}(\mathbb{R}^d) \). This fiber is \( \mathcal{C}_{\Gamma'}(\mathbb{R}^d)/(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+) \), a space of configurations modulo translation and scaling, which can be thought of as a space of infinitesimal configurations. In the case where there are no segment vertices in \( \Gamma' \), the standard framing on \( \mathbb{R}^d \)
can be used to trivialize this bundle. Then the map
\[ \mathcal{G}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma') \longrightarrow (S^{d-1})^E(\Gamma_i) \]
\[ X[\Gamma_i/\Gamma'] \times \overline{C}_V[\mathbb{R}^d] \longrightarrow (S^{d-1})^E(\Gamma_i/\Gamma') \times (S^{d-1})^E(\Gamma') \]
factors as a product, and it suffices to show that the map \( \overline{C}_V[\mathbb{R}^d] \rightarrow (S^{d-1})^E(\Gamma') \) has positive codimension. If \( s \) is the number of (free) vertices in \( \Gamma' \), then the dimension of the domain is \( ds - d - 1 \), and (by the valence conditions in Definition 5.10)
\[ (d - 1)|E(\Gamma')| - (ds - d - 1) \geq (d - 1) \frac{3s}{2} - (ds - d - 1) = \frac{1}{2}(d - 3)(s + 2) + 4 > 0. \]
This finishes the case of a collision of free vertices, away from infinity.

**Case II**: Next consider the case of \( \mathcal{G}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma') \) corresponding to biconnected \( \Sigma \Gamma' \subset \Sigma \Gamma_i \), and with no segment vertices in \( \Gamma' \). Such an \( \mathcal{G}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma') \) is also given by a product bundle \( X[\Gamma_i \setminus \Gamma'] \times \overline{C}_{\Sigma \Gamma'}[\mathbb{R}^d] \).

To see this, note first that the base is the subspace of \( X[\Gamma_i/\Gamma'] \) where the basepoint of \( \Gamma_i/\Gamma' \) is fixed at \( \infty \in S^d \). Note also that the fiber describes all collisions of points in \( \Gamma' \) with \( \infty \in S^d \). Once again, we can factor the map
\[ \mathcal{G}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma') \longrightarrow (S^{d-1})^E(\Gamma_i) \]
\[ X[\Gamma_i \setminus \Gamma'] \times \overline{C}_{\Sigma \Gamma'}[\mathbb{R}^d] \longrightarrow (S^{d-1})^E(\Gamma_i \setminus \Gamma') \times (S^{d-1})^E(\Gamma') \]
as a product, and it suffices to show that \( \overline{C}_{\Sigma \Gamma'}[\mathbb{R}^d] \rightarrow (S^{d-1})^E(\Gamma') \) has positive codimension. If \( s \) is the number of (free) vertices in \( \Gamma' \), then the dimension of the domain of the latter map is \( d(s + 1) - d - 1 = ds - 1 \), and
\[ (d - 1)|E(\Gamma')| - (ds - 1) \geq (d - 1) \frac{3s}{2} - (ds - 1) = \frac{1}{2}(d - 3)s + 1 > 0. \]

**Case III**: Let \( \mathcal{G}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma') \) be a hidden face not involving infinity, but with \( \Gamma' \) having \( r > 0 \) segment vertices, as well as \( s \) free vertices. Then this face is a bundle over \( X[\Gamma_i/\Gamma'] \) whose fiber we denote \( \overline{T}[\Gamma] \). A point in the base \( X[\Gamma_i/\Gamma'] \) is a link \( L \) together with a configuration of the vertices of \( \Gamma_i/\Gamma' \) in \( \mathbb{R}^d \); let \( p \in \mathbb{R}^d \) be the location of the basepoint of \( \Gamma_i/\Gamma' \). Then \( \overline{T}[\Gamma_i] \) is the subspace of \( C_V[T_p\mathbb{R}^d] \) where the segment vertices are constrained to lie on the line \( T_pL \), modulo positive scaling and translations which preserve \( T_pL \). Now there is a related bundle \( S^{d-1} \times \overline{T}[\Gamma_i] \) with the same fiber \( \overline{T}[\Gamma_i] \) over \( S^{d-1} \). Its total space is given by allowing the (oriented) tangent line \( T_pL \) to vary over all possible directions in \( S^{d-1} \). The space \( \mathcal{G}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma') \) maps to this bundle and, in fact, as a bundle over \( X[\Gamma_i/\Gamma'] \), it is the pullback of this bundle over \( S^{d-1} \) by the unit derivative of \( L \) at the point \( p \). Since the composite \( \mathcal{G}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma') \rightarrow (S^{d-1})^E(\Gamma_i) \rightarrow (S^{d-1})^E(\Gamma') \) factors through \( S^{d-1} \times \overline{T}[\Gamma] \rightarrow (S^{d-1})^E(\Gamma') \), it suffices to show that the image of this latter map has positive codimension. The dimension of the domain is \( (d - 1) + r + ds - 2 = d + r + ds - 3 \), and
\[ (d - 1)|E(\Gamma')| - (d + r + ds - 3) \geq (d - 1) \frac{r + 3s}{2} - (d + r + ds - 3) = \frac{1}{2}(d - 3)(r + s - 2), \]
where the inequality is assured by the collapses in Section 5.5 specifically those in Section 5.5.1. Since \( \mathcal{G}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma') \) is a hidden face (not involving infinity), \( r + s > 2 \). Thus the right-hand side above is positive, provided \( d > 3 \).

**Case IV**: Finally, we consider the case of a collision at \( \infty \) along the link \( L \). So \( \Gamma' \subset \Gamma_i \) has \( r > 0 \) segment vertices and \( s \) free vertices, and \( \Sigma \Gamma_i \) is biconnected. Much like in the case of a face at infinity with no segment vertices, such a face \( \mathcal{G}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma') \) is a product bundle \( X[\Gamma_i \setminus \Gamma'] \times \overline{T}[\Sigma \Gamma'] \).
Here the fiber $F[\Sigma \Gamma']$ is a quotient of the subspace of $C_{\Sigma \Gamma'}[T_{\infty}S^d]$ where $\infty \in \Sigma \Gamma'$ is fixed, and where the segment vertices are constrained to lie on the subset $T_{\infty}L$; the quotient is by positive scaling. Thus the dimension of $C_{\Sigma \Gamma'}[T_{\infty}S^d]$ is $r + ds - 1$. Now the map $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma') \to (S^{d-1})^E(\Gamma')$ factors through $F[\Sigma \Gamma'] \to (S^{d-1})^E(\Gamma')$. We check that the image of the latter map has positive codimension. In fact, since the domain has dimension $r + ds - 1$, this codimension is at least

$$(d-1)|E(\Gamma')| - (r + ds - 1) \geq (d-1)\frac{r + 3s}{2} - (r + ds - 1) = \frac{1}{2}(d-3)(r+s) + 1 > 0.$$ 

This proves statement (1).

For statement (2), we have already shown that the codimension is (an integer) greater than 1 in every case except Case III. In this case, $d \geq 5$ ensures that the codimension is at least 2, provided that the total number $r + s$ of vertices colliding is at least 4. But the possibility that $r + s = 3$ is ruled out because in $\Gamma'$, every segment vertex has an incident edge (by Section 5.5), every free vertex has valence at least 3 (by Section 5.4), and multiple edges are not allowed (by Section 5.1.1). □

Notice that the proof of statement (1) above, Case (III), is the only place in our whole construction where we really need to require that $d > 3$.

Note also that for $d = 4$, the proof of statement (2) fails. In fact, it fails for the face corresponding to the collision of all the vertices in the second graph in expression (6) for $d = 4$, as noted in [7, Remark A.12].

6. The Main Result

Having done most of the required work in the previous two Sections, we have almost established our main result. We will now state it and give what remains of its proof. Subsequently, we will provide some examples and consequences.

6.1. Proof of the main result. We first briefly digress for a lemma needed for fiberwise integration over $\mathbb{Z}$ via the Serre spectral sequence, as explained in Section 2.3.

Lemma 6.1. The action of $\pi_1(L^d_m)$ on the fiber $F[\Gamma]$ is trivial.

Proof. For the bundle $X[\Gamma] \to L^d_m$, the monodromy on $H^*(F[\Gamma])$ can be described as follows. A loop in the base is an isotopy of a link, which by the isotopy extension theorem (see for example [11]) extends to an isotopy (in fact a diffeotopy) of the ambient $\mathbb{R}^d$. This induces a diffeotopy of $G_{\Gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, which restricts to a diffeotopy of $F(\Gamma)$, and hence of $F[\Gamma]$ as well. The diffeotopy is a path from the identity to some diffeomorphism of $F[\Gamma]$, which we want to show induces the identity map on cohomology. But this follows from its being homotopic to the identity map on $F[\Gamma]$. □

We now recall the key ingredients for our main result. Recall the map $\Phi_\gamma : X_\gamma \to (S^{d-1})^N/G$, where $G$ is $G_o$ (respectively $G_e$) for $d$ odd (respectively $d$ even), each of which acts by orientation-preserving diffeomorphisms. Recall that $\mathcal{R}$ is the image of the degenerate locus $\partial X_\gamma$ under $\Phi_\gamma$, and that we have a map of pairs: $\Phi_\gamma : (X_\gamma, \partial X_\gamma) \to ((S^{d-1})^N/G, \mathcal{R})$. Proposition 5.17 guarantees the existence of a class $\omega^{(N)} \in H^{N(d-1)}((S^{d-1})^N/G, \mathcal{R})$ which maps to a generator of $H^{N(d-1)}((S^{d-1})^N)$. Explicitly, we can take $\omega^{(N)}$ to be the $N$-fold symmetric product of a $G$-invariant cochain which vanishes on the (positive-codimension) degenerate locus $\mathcal{R}$.

To state the theorem, we need to know the dimension of the fiber $F_\gamma$ of the bundle $X_\gamma \to L^d_m$. Note that by construction its dimension is the dimension of $F[\Gamma_i]$ for $\Gamma_i$ with the maximum number of edges $N$ among graphs appearing in $\gamma$. From the definition of defect $k$ and order $n$, one can calculate that this dimension is $(3-d)n - k + N(d-1)$.

Theorem 6.2. Let $\gamma = \sum_i c_i \Gamma_i$ be an integer-valued, minimal graph cocycle in $L^D^{k,n}$. For $d > 3$, let

$$\int_{[F_\gamma, \partial F_\gamma]} : H^{N(d-1)}(X_\gamma, \partial X_\gamma; \mathbb{Z}) \to H^{(d-3)n+k}(L^d_m; \mathbb{Z})$$

...
be the fiberwise integration map induced by the Serre spectral sequence, as explained in Section 2.4. Then the class \( \int_{[F, \partial F]} \Phi^*_\gamma(\omega^{(N)}) \) is \( \sum_i c_i \Gamma_i \), the sum of configuration space integrals associated to \( \gamma \). Moreover, for defect \( k = 0 \), the cohomology of the graph complex injects into \( H^*(\mathcal{L}_{m}; \mathbb{Z}) \).

Thus we realize the configuration space integral cohomology classes over \( \mathbb{Z} \).

**Proof.** The main work needed was constructing the glued space \( X_\gamma \) and ensuring it satisfies certain important properties, thus enabling us to state the theorem. We now summarize these important properties. We ensured that the fiber \( F_\gamma \) has a fundamental class relative to its boundary \( \partial F_\gamma \) (Lemma 5.11). This established the existence of the right-hand map above induced by the Serre spectral sequence. We needed Lemmas 5.14 and 5.16 to obtain the map \( \Phi_\gamma \) as a map of pairs \( (X_\gamma, \partial X_\gamma) \to ((S^{d-1})^N/G, \mathcal{R}) \) with \( \mathcal{R} \) of positive codimension. This provided the existence of \( \Phi^*_\gamma(\omega^{(N)}) \) in the statement. We can now deduce the theorem from the following basic points:

1. The sum of integrals over a collection of spaces is the integral over the disjoint union of spaces.
2. We can pass from the disjoint union to a quotient after gluings and folding of boundary faces.
3. Fiberwise integration can be realized via the Serre spectral sequence, provided the fiber has a fundamental class.

This holds true even in the case of fibers with boundary, provided the forms to be integrated vanish on the boundary.

Point (1) is elementary. Point (2) can be shown by exhausting the glued-and-folded space by smooth subspaces with complement of arbitrarily small measure. Point (3) is the statement of Lemma 2.12 combined with Proposition 5.11. The last statement about nontriviality in defect 0 follows from the rest of the Theorem and the injectivity in cohomology of the configuration space integral classes in defect 0 [7].

**Remarks 6.3.** We now consider the dependence of the resulting cohomology class \( \int_{[F, \partial F]} \Phi^*_\gamma(\omega^{(N)}) \) on the choices made in constructing the glued bundle \( F_\gamma \to X_\gamma \to \mathcal{L}_{m}^d \):

1. The choice of labelings of the \( \Gamma_i \) representing \( \gamma \) do not affect the diffeomorphism types of the pieces, but the homeomorphism type of \( F_\gamma \) may depend on the choice of principal face gluings. This latter dependence does not however affect the resulting cohomology class in our construction, at least for \( d \) odd: in any case it agrees with the integral of differential forms, which does not depend on the labelings of the graphs [7, Theorem 4.2].
2. For \( d = 4 \), as in Proposition 5.17, there is also a choice of preimage of \( \omega^{(N)} \) in the cohomology of \( S^{N(d-1)} \) relative to the degenerate locus, and different choices may produce different cohomology classes via the fiber integration map. For \( d \geq 5 \), there is no such choice, except perhaps the choice of generator of the top cohomology of the sphere.

### 6.2. Basic examples.

**Example 6.4** (The order-2 cocycle). Consider the cocycle of order 2 for \( d \) odd from Example 4.6. This (signed) sum of two graphs corresponds to two (oriented) configuration spaces \( X \) and \( Y \), where \( Y \) has the orientation opposite from the canonical one coming from the vertex labels. There are three pairs of principal faces glued to each other, and each gluing identifies a face of \( X \) with a face of \( Y \). We thus obtain a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-valued cohomology class in the space of long knots in \( \mathbb{R}^d \), \( d \) odd. Our construction in this example is similar to that of Polyak and Viro [27]. The main difference is that they make a glued space involving 6 copies of each of \( X \) and \( Y \), whereas we take only one copy of each because our spherical map \( \Phi_\gamma \) lands in a symmetric product of spheres. Although their construction is for long knots in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \), rather than \( \mathbb{R}^d \), \( d > 3 \), our construction for this example is otherwise the same (cf. Remark 5.3). We may also consider the cocycle (8) for \( d \) even.
Example 6.5 (The triple linking number for long links). For long links of 3 components in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d$ odd, there is a cocycle of defect 0 and order 2:

This cocycle gives rise via integration (and hence via our construction) to the Milnor triple linking number for long links. Our present construction in the case of this cocycle yields the same glued space as in our previous work [16], after correcting that previous work for some sign errors. Namely, we glue together four spaces $T, L, M, R$ corresponding to the four terms above. The space $T$ has three principal faces, with each one glued to the principal face of $L, M$, or $R$. There are no hidden faces with involution, so the remaining codimension-1 faces are just part of the degenerate locus.

We could write down further examples, coming from higher-order cocycles in defect 0. For example, there is a cocycle of order 3 and defect 0 [7, Section 5.1, Figure 3]. Clearing denominators gives an integral cocycle, with six terms, so there are copies of six types of spaces glued together.

Recall that in general, defect-0 cocycles are precisely cocycles of (uni)trivalent diagrams. These correspond to finite-type invariants of knots and links, by the “Fundamental Theorem of Finite-Type Invariants.” (In Bar-Natan’s paper [1], defect-0 graph cocycles appear as functionals on the quotient of trivalent diagrams by the STU relation.) We may combine our construction and the nontriviality in defect 0 (as mentioned in Theorem 6.2) to yield the following result. The analogue for closed links and embeddings of $\coprod_m S^1$ also holds, since our methods are easily adapted to that setting.

**Corollary 6.6.** For each $\mathbb{Z}$-valued finite-type invariant of $m$-component long links, $m \geq 1$, we have a nontrivial integer-valued cohomology class in $\mathcal{L}^d_m$ for any $d > 3$ odd. □

**Example 6.7.** Sakai found a cocycle of defect 1 in the graph complex for long knots in odd-dimensional Euclidean space, and he used configuration space integrals to produce real-valued cohomology classes in $\text{Emb}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)$ for $d$ odd. This cocycle has nine terms (with coefficients $\pm 1, \pm 2$), so we refer the reader to [28, Figure 10] for the precise expression. Our construction produces $\mathbb{Z}$-valued cohomology classes in embedding spaces out of this cocycle, just as for defect-0 cocycles.

**Example 6.8.** Longoni found the following defect-1, order-3 cocycle in the space of closed knots in even-dimensional Euclidean space [22]:

$$ \omega = \omega_1 + 2\omega_2 := $$

By readily adapting our methods from long links to closed links, we get from this cocycle a $\mathbb{Z}$-valued cohomology class in $\text{Emb}(S^1, \mathbb{R}^d)$, $d$ even.

These errors were due to an incorrect identification between the Lie orientation and the “integration orientation,” i.e., the vertex-labelings and edge-orientations. See [18] for more details on this identification.
7. Towards nontrivial torsion classes

We now sketch how we may find nontrivial torsion classes using our construction. The key ingredients are generalizing work of Pelatt and Sinha and using torsion cohomology classes in the graph complex found by Turchin. We summarize the salient points of both authors’ work below.

7.1. Turchin’s calculations in the cohomology of graph complexes. In [37, Appendix B], Turchin determined the cohomology of the graph cochain complex $\mathcal{L}D^{k,n}$ for long knots, over $\mathbb{Z}$, up to order $n = 5$ and for all possible defects $k$ for these orders. Among these groups are the following ones containing torsion:

- For $d$ even: $H^*(\mathcal{L}D^{2,4}) \cong \mathbb{Z}/10$  
  
- For $d$ odd: $H^*(\mathcal{L}D^{2,4}) \cong \mathbb{Z}/2$

- $H^*(\mathcal{L}D^{1,4}) \cong \mathbb{Z}/2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}/2$

- $H^*(\mathcal{L}D^{2,5}) \cong \mathbb{Z}/2$

Turchin represents cocycles in $\mathcal{L}D^{k,n}$ by chord diagrams (with $n$ chords and $2n - k$ segment vertices). One can prove however that this complex of chord diagrams agrees with our complex in cohomology; the map between them is given by remembering only the chord diagram terms. Thus our construction produces torsion classes in $H^*(\text{Emb}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d); \mathbb{Z})$ out of these graph cohomology classes.

**Conjecture 7.1.** The generators of the groups above survive as nontrivial classes in $H^*(\text{Emb}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d))$ under our construction.

The validity of the conjecture is suggested not only by the injectivity of our construction in defect 0 in our main theorem, but also by the collapse at $E^2$ of the Vassiliev spectral sequence over $\mathbb{Q}$ for knots in $\mathbb{R}^d, d \geq 4$, proven by Lambrechts, Turchin, and Volić [20]. That is, the above conjecture would generalize their result for all non-torsion classes to include also several torsion classes. Furthermore, one may ask whether the Vassiliev spectral sequence collapses at $E^2$ over $\mathbb{Z}$ or $\mathbb{Z}/p$, and we hope the methods sketched below may lead towards an answer.

At present, a proof of this conjecture is hindered by the lack of explicit formulae for a full graph cocycle $\gamma$ representing a class as above, or even just the chord diagram terms of $\gamma$. The next two subsections will suggest how we could detect nontriviality, if we had either explicit formulae for graph cocycles or a broad framework for constructing dual homology classes. We intend to pursue both in future work.

7.2. Pelatt and Sinha’s homology class in the space of knots. Pelatt and Sinha constructed nontrivial homology classes over $\mathbb{Z}$ in spaces of long knots in $\mathbb{R}^d$ for $d$ even [24]. Their methods apply in either parity. In fact, their work only uses $d$ even in that it studies the particular graph cocycle of Longoni mentioned above in Example [68]. Pelatt and Sinha constructed a dual homology class in the space of long knots from the bracket expression

$$\beta_1 + \beta_2 := \{[x_1, x_4], x_3][x_2, x_5] + [x_1, x_4][x_2, x_5], x_3\},$$

which by work of Sinha [32] corresponds to a cycle in the homology Vassiliev spectral sequence. They define two families $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$ of resolutions of singular knots, with singularities prescribed by each $\beta_i$. A factor in $\beta_i$ with $k$ terms $x_j$ in nested brackets corresponds to a $k$-fold self-intersection. Thus each $\mathcal{M}_i$ comes from a singular knot with one triple-point and one double-point. Systematically gluing together the boundaries of the $\mathcal{M}_i$ yields a homology class $[\mathcal{M}] \in H^*(\text{Emb}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d))$. The configuration space integral $\int \omega$ of $\omega$ is then paired with $[\mathcal{M}]$, and a nonzero result establishes the nontriviality of $[\mathcal{M}]$ (and $\int \omega$). The fact that $\int \omega, [\mathcal{M}] \neq 0$ is proven by checking that the non-chord-diagram term $\int \omega_1$ vanishes on all of $\mathcal{M}_i$, while $\int \omega_2$ incurs a nonzero contribution only from the piece $\mathcal{M}_1$ corresponding to $\beta_1$, which prescribes exactly the singularity data detected by
The calculation of the pairing, though written via integrals in [24], relies only on a signed count of preimages and is thus amenable to detecting torsion classes.

### 7.3. A “toy model” example for nontrivial 2-torsion

We now present an example of a torsion cocycle, which is of lower order than the Longoni cocycle. We cannot quite as of yet realize it in the space of knots, as we explain below, but it serves to further illustrate how we may prove our nontriviality conjecture. Consider the following graph $\Gamma$ of order 2 and defect 1, which, as suggested by Turchin’s calculations, is a cocycle in a related but different graph complex, for the space $\text{Emb}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)$ of (long) embeddings modulo immersions, i.e. $\text{Emb}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d) := \text{hofib}(\text{Emb}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d) \to \text{Imm}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d))$.

The differential applied to the sum of the three order-2, defect-0 chord diagrams (with appropriate signs) yields $2\Gamma$, so $\Gamma$ generates a subgroup isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}/2$ in the cohomology of the graph complex for $\text{Emb}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)$. The graph $\Gamma$ is however not closed in the graph complex $LD^{\ast,*}$ for $\text{Emb}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)$.

Our construction does not immediately apply to $\text{Emb}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)$. Indeed, if one views an element in this homotopy fiber as an embedding together with a path through immersions to the standard unknot, the evaluation map in the pullback square (3) is not well defined.

Nonetheless, if we imagine that we could produce a cohomology class $\int \Gamma$ out of $\Gamma$, we would pair it with a homology class corresponding to the bracket expression $\beta := \langle [x_3, x_1], x_2 \rangle$. In fact, one can check that $\beta$ is a cycle, under the differential $d_1$ given in [24] Section 2.

We would construct a homology class $[M_\beta]$ out of a family of embeddings $M_\beta$, by starting with an immersion $f$ with one triple-point, where the three strands involved have linearly independent tangent vectors. Resolving the triple-point by pushing off one strand in all possible directions gives an $S^{d-2}$ family of knots with one-double point, except at four points in $S^{d-2}$, where the knot has two double-points. The four points can be partitioned into pairs according to the singularity data: one pair has the chord diagram $X$ from [8], while the other has a “2-striped rainbow” (i.e. chords joining points 1 and 4 and points 2 and 3). (This requires an appropriate choice of which of the three strands to move when resolving the triple-point, namely the “middle” strand in terms of the order in the domain $\mathbb{R}$ of $f$.) The resolutions of the extra double point can thus be glued pairwise. The remaining double-point in all of the diagrams can be resolved via an $S^{d-3}$ family of embeddings. The overall result is a family of knots $M_\beta$ parametrized by a manifold with no boundary, which thus represents a homology class $[M_\beta]$. Its dimension is $(d - 2) + (d - 3) = 2d - 5$.

We would finally check that $\langle \int \Gamma, [M_\beta] \rangle = \pm 1$. Indeed, $\int \Gamma$ counts preimages under the Gauss map $\Phi_\Gamma$, as in [34], and $M_\beta$ is constructed to have exactly one such preimage.

If this construction were possible, it would yield a class $[M_\beta] \in H^{2d-5}(\text{Emb}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d))$ for even $d \geq 4$. Since $\text{Emb}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d) \simeq \text{Emb}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d) \times \Omega^2 S^{d-1}$ [31 Proposition 5.17] and since $\Gamma$ is not a cocycle in the complex for $\text{Emb}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)$ itself, one might ask if (the linear dual to) $[M_\beta]$ comes from $\pi_2d-3(S^{d-1})$ via the Hurewicz map. That is, after relabeling, is it related to $\pi_2d-3(S^j)$ for $j \geq 3$ odd? Notably, $\pi_2j-1(S^j)$ has 2-torsion (in fact a $\mathbb{Z}/2$ summand) for every odd $j \geq 3$ at least up to $j = 19$ [35].

We plan to approach Conjecture [7,4] in future work, both via explicit formulae for torsion classes in low dimensions, as well as in the general setting of the Vassiliev spectral sequence over $\mathbb{Z}$ or $\mathbb{Z}/p$. Our construction provides cohomology classes in spaces of links for all graph cohomology classes.
8. Further generalizations over \( \mathbb{Z}/p \)

We present a further generalization of our main result to mod-\( p \) classes. We let \( p \) be prime, and we consider mod-\( p \) cocycles \( \gamma \). That is, the graph cochain complex can be defined over \( \mathbb{Z}/p \), with \( \mathbb{Z}/p \)-vector spaces generated by graphs, and a differential given by edge contractions with the same signs as over \( \mathbb{Z} \), but of course reduced modulo \( p \). (In Theorem 6.2 we considered only graph cocycles over \( \mathbb{Z} \).) Every nontrivial cocycle over \( \mathbb{Z} \) reduces to a nontrivial cocycle over \( \mathbb{Z}/p \), but there are other cocycles over \( \mathbb{Z}/p \). In fact, see Example 8.2 below for \( p = 2 \) for such a cocycle.

We make some brief comments on the case of odd \( p \) (Section 8.2), but we mostly focus on \( p = 2 \) (Section 8.1). In Section 8.3 we consider the classical case of ambient dimension \( d = 3 \). Our methods for recovering known nontrivial classes over \( \mathbb{Z} \) break down in that case, but we can still construct classes over \( \mathbb{Z}/2 \) for \( d = 3 \).

8.1. The case of \( p = 2 \). Suppose \( \gamma = \sum c_i \Gamma_i \) is a cocycle in the graph complex over \( \mathbb{Z}/2 \). That means that every isomorphism class of principal face in the associated union of configuration space bundles \( \coprod \Gamma_i \) appears an even number of times. Topologically, we get a cocycle for the following reason: we can glue these faces in pairs, without regard to orientation, to create a space which, relative to its boundary, still has a fundamental cycle over \( \mathbb{Z}/2 \). As before the remaining faces can be folded, collapsed, or relegated to the degenerate locus which we work relative to. The resulting space \( X_\gamma \) will have a fundamental cycle modulo 2 and will also have well defined map \( \Phi_\gamma \) to a product of spheres.

More precisely, the quotient \( S^{d-1} \to \mathbb{R}P^{d-1} \) induces an isomorphism in cohomology with \( \mathbb{Z}/2 \) coefficients, so we may forget signs and take \( \Phi_\gamma \) to be the induced map \( X_\gamma \to \text{Sym}^N(\mathbb{R}P^{d-1}) \). This obviates the need to keep track of orientations on different graphs in \( \gamma \), as in Section 5. As before, let \( \mathcal{R} \) be the image under \( \Phi_\gamma \) of the remaining faces of \( X_\gamma \), which has codimension at least one and codimension at least two if \( d \geq 5 \), by Proposition 5.17. Let \( \omega^{(N)} \) be a class in \( H^{N(d-1)}(\text{Sym}^N(\mathbb{R}P^{d-1}); \mathcal{R}; \mathbb{Z}/2) \) which maps to a generator of \( H^{N(d-1)}(\text{Sym}^N(\mathbb{R}P^{d-1}); \mathbb{Z}/2) \), as discussed in Section 5.8. By the same reasoning as in Theorem 6.2 this mod-2 construction proves the next Proposition.

Proposition 8.1. Suppose \( d > 3 \). Let \( \gamma \) be a mod-2 graph cocycle in \( \mathcal{L}D^{k,n} \), and let \( X_\gamma, \Phi_\gamma, \mathcal{R} \), and \( \omega^{(N)} \) be as given above. Consider the fiberwise integration map

\[
H^{N(d-1)}(X_\gamma, \partial X_\gamma; \mathbb{Z}/2) \to H^{(d-3)n+k}(\mathcal{L}D^{d}; \mathbb{Z}/2)
\]

induced by the Serre spectral sequence. Then the image of \( \Phi_\gamma^*(\omega^{(N)}) \) under this map is a \( \mathbb{Z}/2 \) cohomology class which, if \( \gamma \) was the reduction of a cocycle over \( \mathbb{Z} \), is the reduction of the configuration space integral class associated to \( \gamma \).

If \( \gamma \) is not the reduction of a cocycle over \( \mathbb{Z} \), then this class does not correspond in any obvious way to a configuration space integral. Notably, there are mod-2 cocycles in the graph complex which are not reductions of integral cocycles:

Example 8.2. In defect 0, there is a graph cocycle of order 5 over \( \mathbb{Z}/2 \) which is not the mod-2 reduction of a cocycle over \( \mathbb{Z} \). This cocycle was found by Dogolazky [8] and further studied by
Stanford [33]. The chord diagram terms in this cocycle are

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 \\
\end{array}
\]

By Proposition 8.1, we can produce out of this cocycle a \( \mathbb{Z}/2 \)-valued cohomology class. To find the explicit expression for the corresponding graph cocycle, one would use the STU relation (repeatedly, for some diagrams) to determine the coefficient for every (uni)trivalent graph on two segments with ten vertices.

Stanford showed that the cocycle described above “integrates” to zero, by considering topological relations that an invariant giving rise to it would have to satisfy. It is possible that the cohomology class resulting from our construction is also zero.

8.2. The case of odd primes \( p \). We could also modify our construction for \( d \) odd over \( \mathbb{Z} \) to work over \( \mathbb{Z}/p \) for any \( p \). In this case, we would identify a principal face with all the other principal faces in its (unoriented) isomorphism class, as in the construction of Kuperberg and Thurston [19]. For \( p \neq 2 \), signs matter, so we keep track of orientations of graphs as we did when working over \( \mathbb{Z} \). As in that case, we arrange for opposite signs on the same type of principal face to correspond to opposite orientations of the corresponding principal faces but the same maps to spheres, up to an even number of antipodal maps. As before, we fold and collapse the appropriate hidden faces, relegating the remaining faces to the degenerate locus. Then for a mod-\( p \) cocycle \( \gamma \), the resulting space has a fundamental cycle (relative to the remaining faces) because the boundary contribution at each glued face will be a multiple of \( p \). A generator of \( H^{N(d-1)}((S^{d-1})^N/G_0, \mathcal{R}; \mathbb{Z}) \) reduces to a nontrivial class with \( \mathbb{Z}/p \) coefficients, and we pull back this class and “integrate” it using the Serre spectral sequence. It may be interesting to apply our construction in connection with mod-\( p \) cycles appearing in work of Turchin [36] and, for the case \( d = 3 \), work of Budney and F. Cohen [6].

8.3. The case of classical knots and links. We now consider the classical case of knots and links in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) and their invariants. Recall that invariants are just degree-0 cohomology classes in the space of links, and that such classes come from the defect-0 part of the graph complex. That is, they come from cocycles of trivalent graphs. Our construction of classes for ambient dimension \( d > 3 \) does not apply directly to \( d = 3 \), but only because of certain boundary faces. Specifically, in the proof of Lemma 5.16 the image under the spherical map \( \Phi_\gamma \) of a face \( \mathcal{G}(\Gamma, \Gamma') \) of some \( X[\Gamma] \) in Case III may be a codimension-zero subspace. We first describe necessary conditions on \( \Gamma' \) for \( \mathcal{G}(\Gamma, \Gamma') \) to be such a problematic face, before proceeding to work with chord diagrams, for which no such faces exist.

By construction, \( \Gamma' \) is biconnected, and since \( \Gamma' \) is not principal, \( |V(\Gamma')| \geq 3 \). Furthermore, the valence of every vertex in \( \Gamma' \) is three (for otherwise, \( \mathcal{G}(\Gamma, \Gamma') \) has already been folded or collapsed to higher codimension). Similarly, because of the collapses we performed, \( \Gamma' \) must be a graph which remains connected after removing all the segments. Thus \( \Gamma' \) must be a whole connected component of the graph \( U(\Gamma) \) which is the result of forgetting the segments of \( \Gamma \). Furthermore, since a face corresponds to a collision of the vertices in the subgraph indexing it, \( \Gamma' \) must have segment vertices on only one segment. Finally, note that such a component \( \Gamma'' \) cannot be crossed by another component \( \Gamma''' \) of \( \Gamma \), for then vertices in \( \Gamma''' \) would have to be involved in the collision. (That is, we cannot have segment vertices \( i, j, k \) with \( i, k \in V(\Gamma') \), \( j \in V(\Gamma'') \) and \( j \) lying between \( i \) and \( k \).) The vanishing or cancellation arguments given above cover all faces except those which satisfy the above conditions.
Remark 8.3. In some special cases, there are ad hoc arguments to deal with such faces. For example, for the type-2 cocycle $\gamma$ in Example 6.4, the face of the tripod diagram where all 4 points collide is a codimension-1 face of $X_{\gamma}$, and the argument in the proof of Lemma 5.16 does not guarantee that its image under $\Phi_{\gamma}$ has positive codimension. However, on this face, the three segment vertices are collinear, so the three vectors in the image of $\Phi_{\gamma}$ are coplanar. Hence the image under $\Phi_{\gamma}$ of this face (which is part of the degenerate locus) indeed has positive codimension.

We will see next that if $\Gamma$ is a chord diagram, then there are no problematic faces $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma, \Gamma')$. Working modulo 2 then allows us to glue principal faces of a space $X[\Gamma]$ to other principal faces of the same space, or to themselves, and still obtain a fundamental class. For example, if the underlying unoriented graph of $\Gamma$ admits an involution, then one could glue principal faces pairwise using the involution. (Over $\mathbb{Z}$, the identifications would not be orientation-reversing, but this is not a problem over $\mathbb{Z}/2$.) This gluing would also respect the spherical map $\Phi_{\Gamma}$ to $\text{Sym}^N(\mathbb{R}P^2)$. In particular, for closed knots, many chord diagrams $\Gamma$ admit an involution which reverses the orientation of the circle. In fact, to our knowledge, it is unknown whether finite-type invariants distinguish a knot from the same knot with the reversed orientation. Since we are unaware of any theorems guaranteeing such involution, we choose a different (and even simpler) method to glue principal faces of $X[\Gamma]$ modulo 2.

Proposition 8.4. For any chord diagram $\Gamma$ there is an associated $\mathbb{Z}/2$-valued link invariant from the configuration space associated to $\Gamma$.

Proof. Let $\Gamma$ be a chord diagram, and consider the bundle $X[\Gamma] \to \mathcal{L}_d$. We will fold all the non-degenerate faces of the fiber $F[\Gamma]$. We may assume that the vertices of $\Gamma$ are labeled in the order given by the orientations of the segments (and the order of the segments). We fold each principal face using the transposition $x_i \leftrightarrow x_{i+1}$ on $C_{2n}(L)$. (Note that this fails over $\mathbb{Z}$ because even though this folding reverses orientation, the images of identified points under $\Phi_{\Gamma}$ differ by a single antipodal map.) Working over $\mathbb{Z}/2$, we take $\Phi_{\Gamma}$ to be the map to $\mathbb{R}P^2$ induced by the quotient $S^2 \to \mathbb{R}P^2$, which is respected by the folding described. We fold the hidden faces with involution, as in Section 5.4. As in Section 5.5.2, we collapse each hidden face of a subgraph whose underlying unitrivalent graph $U(\Gamma)$ is disconnected. Since $\Gamma$ is a chord diagram, every remaining hidden face (not involving $\infty$) is such a face (cf. [34, p. 35]).

Let $F_{\Gamma}$ be the result of these identifications, and let $\partial F_{\Gamma}$ be the remaining boundary, which consists of only faces at infinity. The spherical map $\Phi_{\Gamma}$ from $F_{\Gamma}$ is well defined as a map to $\text{Sym}^N(\mathbb{R}P^2)$, where $N$ is the number of edges of $\Gamma$. The arguments of Lemma 5.16 show the image $\mathcal{R}$ of $\partial F_{\Gamma}$ under $\Phi_{\Gamma}$ is of positive codimension. Indeed, the only Cases to consider are II and IV, where the arguments apply even when $d = 3$. We take a generator $\omega^{(N)}$ of $H^{2N}(\text{Sym}^N(\mathbb{R}P^2), \mathcal{R}; \mathbb{Z}/2)$ and pair $\Phi_{\Gamma}^*(\omega^{(N)})$ with the fundamental class $[F_{\gamma}, \partial F_{\gamma}]$, producing a link invariant. \qed

We conclude by conjecturing that finite-type knot/link invariants over $\mathbb{Z}/2$ can be expressed as these above classes for chord diagrams $\Gamma$, or at least linear combinations of them. More specifically, we conjecture that this method can be used to establish a formula for each finite-type invariant involving only the chord diagrams (and possibly even just one of the chord diagrams) that appear in the corresponding trivalent graph cocycle. In that case, our methods should establish simple counting formulae for these invariants over $\mathbb{Z}/2$, similar to the arrow diagram formulae of Goussarov, Polyak, and Viro [9, 26] but without any arrows or signs. Polyak and Viro establish such a formula by configuration spaces for the type-2 invariant [27]. The rough idea for all finite-type invariants appears in the tinkertoy diagrams of D. Thurston [34], though a complete exposition in this general case has not appeared, to our knowledge. We believe that a thorough treatment would be possible over $\mathbb{Z}/2$. Note that even the mod-2 values of finite-type invariants can be useful. For example, the mod-2 values of the first four finite-type invariants separate the four simplest nontrivial knots, as shown in the Table in [33].
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