CATEGORY AND TOPOLOGICAL COMPLEXITY OF THE CONFIGURATION SPACE $F(G \times \mathbb{R}^n, 2)$

CESAR A. IPANAQUE ZAPATA

Abstract. The Lusternik-Schnirelmann category $\text{cat}$ and topological complexity $\text{TC}$ are related homotopy invariants. The topological complexity $\text{TC}$ has applications to the robot motion planning problem. We calculate the Lusternik-Schnirelmann category and topological complexity of the ordered configuration space of two distinct points in the product $G \times \mathbb{R}^n$ and apply the results to the planar and spatial motion of two rigid bodies in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and $\mathbb{R}^3$ respectively.

1. Introduction

Let $X$ be the space of all possible configurations or states of a mechanical system. A motion planning algorithm on $X$ is a function which assigns to any pair of configurations $(A, B) \in X \times X$, an initial state $A$ and a desired state $B$, a continuous motion of the system starting at the initial state $A$ and ending at the desired state $B$. The elementary problem of robotics, the motion planning problem, consists of finding a motion planning algorithm for a given mechanical system. The motion planning algorithm should be continuous, that is, it depends continuously on the pair of points $(A, B)$. Absence of continuity will result in instability of the behavior of the motion planning. Unfortunately, a (global) continuous motion planning algorithm on a space $X$ exists if and only if $X$ is contractible (see [7]). If $X$ is not contractible, then only local continuous motion plans may be found. Informally, the topological complexity, $\text{TC}(X)$ is the minimal number of local continuous motion plans, effective motion planning algorithms, which are needed to construct an algorithm for autonomous motion planning of a system having $X$ as its state space. The design of effective motion planning algorithms is one of the challenges of modern robotics (see, for example Latombe [19] and LaValle [20]).

Investigation of the problem of simultaneous motion planning without collisions for $k$ robots in a topological space $X$ leads one to study the ordered configuration space $F(X, k)$ of $k$ distinct points of a topological space $X$ (see [6]). It is the subset

$$F(X, k) = \{(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in X^k \mid x_i \neq x_j \text{ for } i \neq j\},$$

topologised as a subspace of the Cartesian power $X^k$. This space is used in robotics to control multiple objects simultaneously, trying to avoid collisions between them [9].
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In [24], the author shows that the ordered configuration spaces \( F(M, k) \) of topological manifolds \( M \) are never contractible. Thus, the collision-free simultaneous motion planning problem on a manifold is a major challenge. Indeed, computation of Lusternik-Schnirelmann category \( \text{LS} \) and the topological complexity \( \text{TC} \) of the configuration space \( F(M, k) \) is very difficult. The \( \text{LS} \) category of the configuration space \( F(\mathbb{R}^m, k) \) has been computed by Roth in \([21]\) and \( \text{TC}(F(\mathbb{R}^m, k)) \) for \( m = 2 \) and \( m \) odd was computed by Farber and Yuzvinsky in \([13]\). Farber and Grant \([11]\) extended the results to all dimensions \( m \). Farber et al. \([12]\) determined the topological complexity of \( F(\mathbb{R}^m - Q_r, k) \) for \( m = 2, 3 \). Later González and Grant \([14]\) extended the results to all dimensions \( m \). Cohen and Farber \([2]\) computed the topological complexity of the configuration space \( F(\Sigma_g - Q_r, k) \) of orientable surfaces \( \Sigma_g \). Recently in \([23]\), the author computed the \( \text{LS} \) category and \( \text{TC} \) of the configuration space \( F(\mathbb{C}P^m, 2) \). Many more related results can be found in the recent survey papers \([1]\) and \([10]\).

In this paper we calculate the Lusternik-Schnirelmann category and topological complexity of the ordered configuration space of two distinct points in the product \( G \times \mathbb{R}^n \), where \( G \) is a compact connected Lie group satisfying certain conditions and \( n \) is a natural number (see Theorem 3.9 and Theorem 3.15 respectively).

2. Preliminary results

**Remark 2.1.** Let \( k \geq 1 \). If \( G \) is a topological group, then it is well-known that the configuration space \( F(G, k + 1) \) is homeomorphic to the product

\[
G \times F(G - \{e\}, k),
\]

under the homeomorphism \((g_0, g_1, \ldots, g_k) \mapsto (g_0, g_1g_0^{-1}, \ldots, g_kg_0^{-1})\) with its inverse \((g_0, g_1, \ldots, g_k) \mapsto (g_0, g_1g_0, \ldots, g_kg_0)\). Here \( e \) denotes the identity element of the group \( G \).

**Definition 2.1.** The *Lusternik-Schnirelmann category* (\( \text{LS} \) category) or category of a topological space \( X \), denoted \( \text{cat}(X) \), is the least integer \( m \) such that \( X \) can be covered with \( m \) open sets, which are all contractible within \( X \).

We use a definition of category which is one greater than that given in \([8]\). For example, the category of a contractible space is one.

**Example 2.2.** If \( Z = S^{m_1} \vee \cdots \vee S^{m_n} \) is a wedge of spheres \( S^{m_i} \), then

\[
\text{cat}(Z) = 2.
\]

Farber \([7]\) defined a numerical invariant \( \text{TC}(X) \). Let \( PX \) denote the space of all continuous paths \( \gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow X \) in \( X \) and \( \pi : PX \rightarrow X \times X \) denote the map associating to any path \( \gamma \in PX \) the pair of its initial and end points \( \pi(\gamma) = (\gamma(0), \gamma(1)) \). Equip the path space \( PX \) with the compact-open topology.

**Definition 2.2.** \([7]\) The *topological complexity* of a path-connected space \( X \), denoted by \( \text{TC}(X) \), is the least integer \( m \) such that the Cartesian product \( X \times X \) can be covered with \( m \) open subsets \( U_i \),

\[
X \times X = U_1 \cup U_2 \cup \cdots \cup U_m,
\]

such that for any \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, m \) there exists a continuous local section \( s_i : U_i \rightarrow PX \) of \( \pi \), that is, \( \pi \circ s_i = \text{id} \) over \( U_i \). If no such \( m \) exists we will set \( \text{TC}(X) = \infty \).
Remark 2.3. We recall that $\text{TC}(G) = \text{cat}(G)$ for any connected Lie group $G$ (see [3], Lemma 8.2).

Next we give the definition of monoidal topological complexity, again one greater than that given in [4].

**Definition 2.3.** [4] The monoidal topological complexity of a path-connected space $X$, denoted by $\text{TC}^M(X)$, is the least integer $m$ such that the Cartesian product $X \times X$ can be covered with $m$ open subsets $U_i$, $X \times X = U_1 \cup U_2 \cup \cdots \cup U_m$, such that for any $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$ there exists a continuous local section $s_i : U_i \rightarrow PX$ of $\pi$, that is, $\pi \circ s_i = \text{id}$ over $U_i$, and if $(x, x) \in U_i$ then $s_i(x, x)(t) = x, \forall t \in [0, 1]$. If no such $m$ exists, we set $\text{TC}^M(X) = \infty$. The motion planning algorithm $s$ is called the reserved motion planning algorithm.

**Remark 2.4.** One of the basic properties of $\text{cat}(X)$ and $\text{TC}(X)$ is their homotopy invariance ([3], Theorem 1.30; [7], Theorem 3). In contrast, $\text{TC}^M$ is not a homotopy invariant in general (see [15]). From ([3], Theorem 2.1), if $X$ is a finite CW complex, $\text{TC}(X) \leq \text{TC}^M(X) \leq \text{TC}(X) + 1$.

**Example 2.5.** $\text{TC}(S^m) = \text{TC}^M(S^m)$ for any $m \geq 1$ ([4], Corollary 2.6). Furthermore, $\text{TC}(G) = \text{TC}^M(G)$ for any connected Lie group $G$ ([4], Lemma 2.7).

Let $K$ be a field. The singular cohomology $H^*(X; K) := H^*(X)$ is a graded $K$–algebra with multiplication

$\cup : H^*(X) \otimes H^*(X) \rightarrow H^*(X)$

given by the cup-product. The tensor product $H^*(X) \otimes H^*(X)$ is also a graded $K$–algebra with the multiplication

$$(u_1 \otimes v_1) \cdot (u_2 \otimes v_2) := (-1)^{\deg(v_1) \deg(u_2)} u_1 u_2 \otimes v_1 v_2,$$

where $\deg(v_1)$ and $\deg(u_2)$ denote the degrees of cohomology classes $v_1$ and $u_2$ respectively. The cup-product $\cup$ is a homomorphism of $K$–algebras.

**Definition 2.4.** ([7], Definition 6) The kernel of homomorphism $\cup$ is the ideal of the zero-divisors of $H^*(X)$. The zero-divisors-cup-length of $H^*(X)$, denoted $\text{zcl}(H^*(X))$, is the length of the longest nontrivial product in the ideal of the zero-divisors of $H^*(X)$.

**Proposition 2.6.** (1) ([3], Theorem 1.5) If $R$ is a commutative ring with unit and $X$ is a topological space, then

$$1 + \text{cup}_R(X) \leq \text{cat}(X),$$

where $\text{cup}_R(X)$ is the least integer $n$ such that all $(n+1)$–fold cup products vanish in the reduced cohomology $\tilde{H}^*(X; R)$.

(2) If $K$ is a field and $X$ be a path-connected topological space, then

$$1 + \text{zcl}_K(X) \leq \text{TC}(X).$$

It is easy to verify that the cup-length and the zero-divisor cup-length have the properties listed below.
Lemma 2.7. Let $\mathbb{K}$ be a field and $X, Y$ be topological spaces. Then

1. If $H^k(Y; \mathbb{K})$ is a finite dimensional $\mathbb{K}$-vector space for all $k \geq 0$, then
   $$cup_k(X \times Y) = cup_k(X) + cup_k(Y);$$
2. If $X, Y$ is CW complexes, then
   $$cup_k(X \vee Y) = \max\{cup_k(X), cup_k(Y)\}.$$

   Furthermore, $zcl_k(X \vee Y) \geq \max\{zcl_k(X), zcl_k(Y)\}$.

3. Main Results

We first recall some lemmas. We denote by $Int(M)$ the interior of the manifold $M$.

Lemma 3.1. Let $M$ be a connected $m$-dimensional smooth manifold (with or without boundary). Let $D_1, \ldots, D_k \subseteq Int(M)$ be subsets homeomorphic to an $m$-dimensional ball $D^m = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \|x\| \leq 1\}$ such that each $D_i$ has a neighborhood $V_i \subseteq Int(M)$, where $D_i \subseteq V_i$ and $V_i$ is also homeomorphic to $D^m$ and $V_i \cap V_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$. Let $p_1, \ldots, p_k$ be the centers of $D_1, \ldots, D_k$, respectively. Then the complement $M - \bigcup_{i=1}^k D_i$ is homeomorphic to $M - \{p_1, \ldots, p_k\}$.

For $m \geq 0$, let $Q_m \subseteq Int(M)$ be a finite subset of $m$ points in $Int(M)$.

Lemma 3.2. [22] Let $M$ be a connected and compact smooth manifold with nonempty boundary. Then for each $k \geq 1$, the inclusion map $i : Int(M) - Q_m \hookrightarrow M - Q_m$ induces homotopy equivalences in the configuration space $F(M - Q_m, k)$, that is, the map

$$F(i, k) : F(Int(M) - Q_m, k) \rightarrow F(M - Q_m, k)$$

$$(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \mapsto (x_1, \ldots, x_k)$$

is a homotopy equivalence. Furthermore, there is a $\Sigma_k$-equivariant deformation retraction of $F(M - Q_m, k)$ onto $F(Int(M) - Q_m, k)$.

Lemma 3.3. Let $M$ be a connected $m$-dimensional smooth manifold having a nonempty boundary $\partial M$. Let $D \subseteq M$ be a subset homeomorphic to an $m$-dimensional ball $D^m = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \|x\| \leq 1\}$, lying in the interior of $M$ and such that the boundary $\partial D$ is piecewise smooth. Then the complement $M - D$ is homotopy equivalent to the wedge $M \vee S^{m-1}$.

Remark 3.4. Lemma 3.3 is not true if $\partial M = \emptyset$ (for example, if $M = S^1 \times S^1$ the torus).

Lemma 3.5. Let $m, n \geq 1$. If $M$ is a compact, connected $m$-dimensional smooth manifold without boundary and $x_0 \in M \times \mathbb{R}^n$, then the complement $M \times \mathbb{R}^n - \{x_0\}$ is homotopy equivalent to the wedge $M \vee S^{m+n-1}$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.2 the complement $M \times \mathbb{R}^n - \{x_0\}$ is homotopy equivalent to the complement $M \times \mathbb{D}^n - \{x_0\}$ (here we recall that $x_0 \in Int(M \times \mathbb{D}^n)$). Let $D \subseteq M \times \mathbb{D}^n$ be a subset homeomorphic to an $(m + n)$-dimensional ball $\mathbb{D}^{m+n} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{m+n} \mid \|x\| \leq 1\}$, lying in the interior of $M \times \mathbb{D}^n$ and such that the boundary $\partial D$ is piecewise smooth. $x_0 \in D$ is the centre and $D$ has a neighbourhood $V \subseteq Int(M \times \mathbb{D}^n)$ with $D \subseteq V$, where $V$ is also homeomorphic to $\mathbb{D}^{m+n}$. By Lemma
the complement $M \times \mathbb{D}^n - \{x_0\}$ is homeomorphic to $M \times \mathbb{D}^n - D$. Moreover, by Lemma 3.3 the complement $M \times \mathbb{D}^n - D$ is homotopy equivalent to the wedge $(M \times \mathbb{D}^n) \vee S^{m+n-1}$ and it is homotopy equivalent to $M \vee S^{m+n-1}$. Therefore, the complement $M \times \mathbb{R}^n - \{x_0\}$ is homotopy equivalent to the wedge $M \vee S^{m+n-1}$. □

**Proposition 3.6.** Let $G$ be a connected, compact Lie group, $m = \dim(G) \geq 1$ and $n \geq 1$. Then the configuration space $F(G \times \mathbb{R}^n, 2)$ has the homotopy type of the product $G \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Moreover, $cat(G \times \mathbb{R}^n, 2)$ is a homotopy invariant of $G\times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$.)

**Proof.** $F(G \times \mathbb{R}^n, 2)$ is homotopy equivalent to $G \times (G \vee \mathbb{R}^{n-1})$. Thus, we have the following theorem.

**Lemma 3.7.** Let $\mathbb{K}$ be a field and $G$ a connected, compact Lie group with $\text{cup}_G(G) \geq 1$. Then

$$1 + 2\text{cup}_G(G) \leq \text{cat}(F(G \times \mathbb{R}^n, 2)) \leq 2\text{cat}(G) - 1, \text{ for any } n \geq 1.$$

**Proof.** The category $\text{cat}(X)$ is a homotopy invariant of $X$, so by Proposition 3.6 $\text{cat}(F(G \times \mathbb{R}^n, 2)) = \text{cat}(G \times (G \vee \mathbb{R}^{n-1}))$. On the other hand, by ([16], proposition 2.3), $\text{cat}(X \times Y) \leq \text{cat}(X) + \text{cat}(Y) - 1$. Thus

$$\text{cat}(F(G \times \mathbb{R}^n, 2)) \leq \text{cat}(G) + \text{cat}(G \vee \mathbb{R}^{n-1}) - 1.$$

Furthermore, $\text{cat}(X \vee Y) = \max\{\text{cat}(X), \text{cat}(Y)\}$ and so

$$\text{cat}(F(G \times \mathbb{R}^n, 2)) \leq 2\text{cat}(G) - 1.$$

By Proposition 2.6 $\text{cat}(F(G \times \mathbb{R}^n, 2)) \geq \text{cup}_G(G \times (G \vee \mathbb{R}^{n-1}))) + 1$. Therefore, by Lemma 2.7 $\text{cat}(F(G \times \mathbb{R}^n, 2)) \geq 1 + 2\text{cup}_G(G)$, as required. □

**Remark 3.8.** Let $G$ be a Lie group, as mentioned in Lemma 3.7. Then $\text{cat}(G) = \text{cup}_G(G) + 1$ if and only if $1 + 2\text{cup}_G(G) = \text{cat}(F(G \times \mathbb{R}^n, 2)) = 2\text{cat}(G) - 1$.

Thus, we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.9.** Let $\mathbb{K}$ be a field and let $G$ be a connected, compact Lie group such that $\text{cup}_G(G) \geq 1$ and $\text{cat}(G) = \text{cup}_G(G) + 1$. Then

$$\text{cat}(F(G \times \mathbb{R}^n, 2)) = 2\text{cat}(G) - 1, \text{ for any } n \geq 1.$$

Furthermore, $\text{cat}(F(G \times \mathbb{R}^n, 2)) = \text{cup}_G(F(G \times \mathbb{R}^n, 2)) + 1$.

**Example 3.10.** Since $\text{cat}(SO(m)) = \text{cup}_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(SO(m)) + 1$, for $m = 2, 3, 4, \ldots, 10$ (see [16], [17]),

$$\text{cat}(F(SO(m) \times \mathbb{R}^n, 2)) = 2\text{cat}(SO(m)) - 1, \text{ for } m = 2, 3, 4, \ldots, 10.$$

3.1. **Topological complexity of wedges.** In general, there is no formula known to compute the topological complexity $\text{TC}(X \vee Y)$. However, Dranishnikov and Sadykov [5] proved the following statement.

**Lemma 3.11.** ([5], Theorem 6) Let $d = \max\{\dim X, \dim Y\}$ for connected CW-complexes $X$ and $Y$. Suppose that $\max\{\text{TC}(X), \text{TC}(Y), \text{cat}(X \times Y)\} \geq d + 2$. Then

$$\text{TC}(X \vee Y) = \max\{\text{TC}(X), \text{TC}(Y), \text{cat}(X \times Y)\}.$$
Suppose $X = G$ is a connected noncontractible Lie group and $Y = S^m$ are such that $\dim(G) < m$ and $\text{cat}(G \times S^m) = \text{cat}(G) + 1$. Then we cannot use Lemma 3.11 since $\max\{\text{TC}(G), \text{TC}(S^m), \text{cat}(G \times S^m)\} = \text{cat}(G) + 1 \leq \dim(G) + 2 < m + 2$. However, using Dranishnikov’s method from [4, Theorem 3.6], we will prove the following result.

**Proposition 3.12.** Suppose that $X$ be a connected finite CW complex such that $\text{cat}(X) = \text{TC}(X) = \text{TC}^M(X)$ and $\text{cat}(X \times S^m) = \text{cat}(X) + 1$. (The last condition holds, for example, if $X$ satisfies Ganea’s conjecture). Then

$$\text{TC}(X \vee S^m) = \text{TC}(X) + 1.$$  

Furthermore, $\text{TC}(X \vee S^m) = \text{TC}^M(X \vee S^m) = \max\{\text{TC}(X), \text{TC}(S^m), \text{cat}(X \times S^m)\}$.

**Proof.** It is well known that $\text{cat}(X \times S^m) \leq \text{TC}(X \vee S^m)$ and so $\text{TC}(X) + 1 \leq \text{TC}(X \vee S^m)$. So it is sufficient to show $\text{TC}(X \vee S^m) \leq \text{TC}(X) + 1$. Indeed, by (4, Theorem 3.6), $\text{TC}(X \vee S^m) \leq \text{TC}^M(X \vee S^m) = \text{TC}^M(X) + \text{TC}^M(S^m) - 1$. For $m$ odd, we note here $\text{TC}^M(S^m) = \text{TC}(S^m) = 2$ and thus $\text{TC}(X \vee S^m) \leq \text{TC}(X) + 1$.

Assume now that $m$ is even. Let us show that then $\text{TC}^M(X \vee S^m) \leq \text{TC}^M(X) + 1$. We will use Dranishnikov’s construction from [4]. As shown in (4, Theorem 8), a reserved motion planning algorithm on $S^m$ with open cover is given by:

$$\begin{align*}
\tilde{V}_0 &= \{(A, B) \in S^m \times S^m : A \neq B\} \\
\tilde{V}_1 &= \{(A, B) \in S^m \times S^m : A \neq B \text{ and } B \neq B_0\} \\
\tilde{V}_2 &= \{S^m - C\} \times \{S^m - C\}
\end{align*}$$

for some $B_0 \in S^m$ and $C \in S^m$ with $C$ distinct from $B_0$ and $-B_0$. We note that $\tilde{V}_2 \cap (C \times S^m) = \emptyset$ and $\tilde{V}_2 \cap (S^m \times C) = \emptyset$. Let $\text{TC}^M(X) = n + 1$. Then there is a reserved motion planning algorithm on $X \times X$ with open cover $\tilde{U}_0, \ldots, \tilde{U}_n$. By [4] there is an open $(n + 1)$--cover $\tilde{U}_0, \ldots, \tilde{U}_n, \tilde{U}_{n+2}$ of $X \times X$ by sets strictly deformable to the diagonal and there are strict deformations

$$D_X^k : \tilde{U}_k \times I \to X \times X$$

of $\tilde{U}_k$ to $\Delta X$ that preserve the faces $X \times x_0$ and $x_0 \times X$. Similarly, there is an open 3--cover $\tilde{V}_0, \ldots, \tilde{V}_2, \ldots, \tilde{V}_{n+2}$ of $S^m \times S^m$ and there are strict deformations $D_0^k$ of $\tilde{V}_k$ in $S^m \times S^m$ to the diagonal $\Delta S^m$ that preserve faces $C \times S^m$ and $S^m \times C$. Set

$$U_k = \tilde{U}_k \cap (X \times x_0), \ V_k = \tilde{V}_k \cap (C \times S^m), \text{ for } k = 0, \ldots, n + 2.$$  

Note that $U_0, \ldots, U_{n+2}$ is an $(n + 1)$--cover of $X \times x_0 = X$ and $V_0, \ldots, V_{n+2}$ is a 3--cover of $C \times S^m = S^m$. Let $W_k = U_k \times V_k$. By [4], $W_0, \ldots, W_{n+2}$ is an open cover of $X \times S^m$. Note that $W_2 = \emptyset$, because $\tilde{V}_2 \cap (C \times S^m) = \emptyset$. We eliminate the empty set $W_2$ and gave a new enumeration so that $W_0, \ldots, W_{n+1}$ is an open cover of $X \times S^m$ with all the sets $W_k$ nonempty.

By Symmetry, we can obtain an open cover $W_0', \ldots, W_{n+1}'$ of $S^m \times X$ with all the sets $W_k'$ nonempty. Set

$$O_k = W_k \cup W_k' \cup \tilde{U}_k \cup \tilde{V}_k, \text{ for } k = 0, \ldots, n + 1,$$

and note that $\{O_k\}$ covers $(X \vee S^m) \times (X \vee S^m)$. Note that the set

$$C = X \vee S^m \vee X \vee S^m$$

defines a partition of $(X \vee S^m) \times (X \vee S^m)$ into four pieces: $X \times X, X \times S^m, S^m \times X$, and $S^m \times S^m$. By Dranishnikov’s construction, there are deformations $T_k : W_k \times I \to$
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describes all planar motions of a rigid body in the 2--dimensional space \( \mathbb{R}^2 \). Thus, we are interested in the configuration space of \( k \) distinct points in the product \( S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \) which describes all planar motions of \( k \) robots in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) and allows the bodies to occupy the same point in the plane (as long as their orientations are different).

The following Lemma generalises Lemma 10.2 given by Michael Farber in [8].

The following Lemma generalises Lemma 10.2 given by Michael Farber in [8].

Theorem 3.15. Let \( \mathbb{K} \) be a field and \( G \) an \( m \)--dimensional connected, compact Lie group \((m \geq 1)\) and \( n \geq 1\), such that \( \text{cat}(G \times S^{m+n-1}) = \text{cat}(G) + 1 \) (for example, if \( G \) satisfies Ganea’s conjecture) and \( \text{TC}(G) = zcl_\mathbb{K}(G) + 1 \). Then

\[
\text{TC}(F(G \times \mathbb{R}^n, 2)) = 2\text{TC}(G) = 2\text{cat}(G).
\]

Furthermore, \( \text{TC}(F(G \times \mathbb{R}^n, 2)) = zcl_\mathbb{K}(F(G \times \mathbb{R}^n, 2)) + 1 \).

Proof. Since \( \text{TC}(X) \) is a homotopy invariant of \( X \), it follows from Proposition 3.6 that \( \text{TC}(F(G \times \mathbb{R}^n, 2)) = \text{TC}(G \times (G \vee \mathbb{S}^{m+n-1})) \). Next, \( \text{TC}(G \vee \mathbb{S}^{m+n-1}) = \text{TC}(G) + 1 \) by Example 3.13. By Lemma 2.7, \( \text{TC}(G \vee \mathbb{S}^{m+n-1}) = zcl_\mathbb{K}(G \vee \mathbb{S}^{m+n-1}) + 1 \) and so, by Lemma 3.14, \( \text{TC}(F(G \times \mathbb{R}^n, 2)) = 2\text{TC}(G) \).

4. APPLICATIONS

4.1. Planar motion. The space \( SO(2) \times \mathbb{R}^2 \), which is homeomorphic to \( S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \), describes all planar motions of a rigid body in the 2--dimensional space \( \mathbb{R}^2 \). Thus, we are interested in the configuration space of \( k \) distinct points in the product \( S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \) which describes all planar motions of \( k \) robots in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) and allows the bodies to occupy the same point in the plane (as long as their orientations are different).

The following Lemma generalises Lemma 10.2 given by Michael Farber in [8].

Lemma 4.1. Let \( Z = \mathbb{S}^{m_1} \vee \cdots \vee \mathbb{S}^{m_n} \) denote the wedge of spheres \( S^{m_i} \). Then,

\[
\text{TC}(Z) = \begin{cases} 
2, & \text{if } n = 1 \text{ and } m_1 \text{ is odd;} \\
3, & \text{if either } n > 1 \text{ or some } m_i \text{ is even.}
\end{cases}
\]
Proof. The case \( n = 1 \) and \( m_1 \) is odd, is well known (see [7], Theorem 8). On the other hand,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(4.1)} & \quad \text{TC}(Z) \leq 2\text{cat}(Z) - 1 \\
\text{(4.2)} & \quad = 2 \cdot 2 - 1 \\
& \quad = 3,
\end{align*}
\]

where (4.1) follows from ([7], Theorem 5) and (4.2) follows from Example 2.2.

Case 1: some \( m_i \) is even. We have

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(4.3)} & \quad 3 = \text{TC}(S^{m_i}) \\
\text{(4.4)} & \quad \leq \text{TC}(Z) \\
& \quad \leq 3,
\end{align*}
\]

where (4.3) follows from ([7], Theorem 8) and (4.4) follows from ([4], Theorem 3.6). Thus \( \text{TC}(Z) = 3 \).

Case 2: \( n \geq 2 \). We have,

\[
\begin{align*}
3 & = \text{cat}(S^{m_1} \times S^{m_2}) \\
& \leq \text{TC}(Z) \\
& \leq 3,
\end{align*}
\]

where (4.5) follows from ([7], Theorem 3.6). Thus \( \text{TC}(Z) = 3 \). \( \square \)

Proposition 4.2. For \( n \geq 1 \),

\[
\text{TC}(F(S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^n, 2)) = 4.
\]

Proof. We give two proofs of the proposition. For the first, note that from Lemma 4.4, \( \text{TC}(S^{m_1} \lor S^{m_2}) = \text{zd}_Q(S^{m_1} \lor S^{m_2}) + 1 = 3 \). For the second use Theorem 3.15. \( \square \)

Remark 4.3. There are two reasons for studying these particular configuration spaces.

- First, the ordered configuration space \( F(S^1 \times \mathbb{R}, 2) \) describes the simultaneous movement of two particles, without collisions, on the cylinder \( S^1 \times \mathbb{R} \) (see left-hand side of Figure 1). The ordered configuration space \( F(S^1 \times \mathbb{D}^2, 2) \), which is homotopy equivalent to \( F(S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^2, 2) \), describes the simultaneous movement of two particles, without collisions, on the solid torus \( S^1 \times \mathbb{D}^2 \) (see right-hand side of Figure 1).

- Second, the space \( S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \) describes movements of a rigid body, with a fixed point but under the influence of gravity, in the 3-dimensional space \( \mathbb{R}^3 \). In this situation, the circle \( S^1 \) consists of rotations about the direction of gravity.

Remark 4.4. We can compare Proposition 4.2 with the topological complexity of the Cartesian product \( (S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^n)^2 \), which is homotopy equivalent to the product \( S^1 \times S^1 \). By Lemma 3.14 (or [7], Theorem 13) we easily obtain

\[
\text{TC}((S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^n)^2) = 3.
\]

Thus, on \( S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^n \), the complexity of the collision-free motion planning problem for two robots is more complicated than the complexity of the similar problem when the robots are allowed to collide.
4.2. **Spatial motion.** The space $SO(3) \times \mathbb{R}^3$, which is homeomorphic to $\mathbb{RP}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3$, describes all spatial motions of a rigid body in the 3--dimensional space $\mathbb{R}^3$. Thus, we are interested in the configuration space of $k$ distinct points in the product $\mathbb{RP}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3$ which describes all spatial motions of $k$ robots in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and allows the bodies to occupy the same point in space (as long as their orientations are different).

**Proposition 4.5.** For $n \geq 1$,
\[
TC(F(\mathbb{RP}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^n, 2)) = 8.
\]

**Proof.** The proposition follows immediately from Theorem 3.15. \hfill $\square$

**Remark 4.6.** We can compare Proposition 4.5 with the topological complexity of the Cartesian product $(\mathbb{RP}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^n)^2$, which is homotopy equivalent to the product $\mathbb{RP}^3 \times \mathbb{RP}^3$. By Lemma 3.14,
\[
TC((\mathbb{RP}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^n)^2) = 7.
\]

Thus, on $\mathbb{RP}^3 \times \mathbb{RP}^n$, the complexity of the collision-free motion planning problem for two robots is more complicated than the complexity of the similar problem when the robots are allowed to collide.
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