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ABSTRACT. We provide a simpler proof of the hard Lefschetz Theorem for face rings of PL spheres: While the algebraic theory remains the same, we replace the geometric constructions by Pachner’s Theorem. This simplifies the reasoning for an important special case of the main result of the first author in [Adi18], and already implies the McMullen $g$-conjecture for PL spheres, as well as the Grünbaum-Kalai-Sarkaria conjecture.

1. INTRODUCTION

Stanley [Sta80] realized that the hard Lefschetz theorem for rationally smooth toric varieties implies a seminal conjecture of McMullen [McM71] concerning the face numbers of simplicial polytopes. McMullen posed this question more generally for triangulated spheres, and this was only recently resolved by the first author using his biased pairing theory, as well as geometric and topological constructions to avoid topological difficulties. However, between simplicial polytopes and arbitrary triangulated spheres lives the class of PL spheres, and we provide a simpler proof for this case by replacing the geometric construction with a result of Pachner. We obtain:

**Theorem I.** Consider a PL $(d-1)$-sphere or ball $\Delta$, and the associated graded commutative ring $R[\Delta]$. Then there exists an open dense subset of the Artinian reductions $\mathcal{R}$ of $R[\Delta]$ and an open dense subset $L \subset \mathcal{A}^1(\Delta)$, where $\mathcal{A}(\Delta) \in \mathcal{R}$, such that for every $k \leq d/2$, we have the generic Lefschetz property: For every $\mathcal{A}(\Delta) \in \mathcal{R}$ and every $\ell \in L$, we have an isomorphism

$$\mathcal{A}^k(\Delta, \partial \Delta) \xrightarrow{\ell^{d-2k}} \mathcal{A}^{d-k}(\Delta).$$

Not only does this imply the $g$-conjecture for PL spheres, it also implies the marvelous Grünbaum-Kalai-Sarkaria conjecture in geometric topology:

---
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Corollary II. If $\Gamma$ is a simplicial complex of dimension $k$ that allows a PL embedding into $\mathbb{R}^{2k}$ then

$$f_k(\Gamma) \leq (k + 2)f_{k-1}(\Gamma).$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

We refer to [Adi18, KN16] for a discussion of these implications and more. We also note that Karu [Kar19] independently used similar arguments to prove a weak version of the above Lefschetz property.

Acknowledgements: Karim Adiprasito was supported by the European Research Council under the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programme ERC Grant agreement ERC StG 716424 - CASe, the Israel Science Foundation under ISF Grant 1050/16 and the Knut and Alice Wallenberg foundation. Johanna Steinmeyer was supported by the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programme ERC Grant agreement ERC StG 716424 - CASe.

2. Prologue

We follow [Adi18] for the algebraic theory, and collect a few basic principles:

2.1. Rings and modules. If $\Gamma$ is an abstract simplicial complex defined on the ground-set $[n] := \{1, \ldots, n\}$, let $I_{\Gamma} := \langle x^a : \text{supp (a)} \notin \Gamma \rangle$ denote the nonface ideal in $\mathbb{R}[x]$, where $\mathbb{R}[x] = \mathbb{R}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$. Let $\mathbb{R}^*_{\Gamma} := \mathbb{R}[x]/I_{\Gamma}$ denote the face ring of $\Gamma$.

A relative simplicial complex $\Psi = (\Delta, \Gamma)$ is a pair of simplicial complexes $\Delta, \Gamma$ with $\Gamma \subset \Delta$. If $\Psi = (\Delta, \Gamma)$ is a relative simplicial complex, then we can define the relative face module

$$\mathbb{R}^*[\Psi] := I_{\Gamma}/I_{\Delta}$$

and its reduction $\mathbb{R}^*[\Psi]/\Theta \mathbb{R}^*[\Psi]$.

2.2. Coordinates and reductions. We may associate to the vertices of $\Delta$ the coordinates $V_{\Delta} = (v_1, \ldots, v_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times n}$, obtaining a system of linear forms by considering $V_{\Delta}X = \Theta$. Hence, as is standard to do when considering stress spaces, we identify a pair $(\Delta, \Theta)$ with a geometric simplicial complex, that is, a simplicial complex with a map of the vertices to $\mathbb{R}^l$. The differentials given by $V_{\Delta}$ are therefore $V_{\Delta} \nabla$, where $\nabla$ is the gradient.

Conversely, the canonical stress spaces and reduced face rings, respectively, of a geometric simplicial complex are those induced by the linear system of parameters given by the geometric realization. The stress space or face ring of a (relative) geometric simplicial complex $\Psi$ is considered with respect to its natural system of parameters induced
by the coordinates, that is,
\[ A^\ast[\Psi] := \mathbb{R}^\ast[\Psi]/\Theta R^\ast[\Psi]. \]

A geometric simplicial complex in \( \mathbb{R}^d \) is **proper** if the image of every \( k \)-face, with \( k < d \), linearly spans a subspace of dimension \( k + 1 \). A sequence of linear forms is a (partial) linear system of parameters if the associated coordinatization is proper. For the results of our paper, we always think of every simplicial complex as geometric and proper, that is, as coming with a proper coordinatization in a vector space over \( \mathbb{R} \), and shall generally assume \((d - 1)\)-dimensional complexes to be realized in \( \mathbb{R}^d \) unless otherwise stated, so that the associated collection of coordinatizing linear forms is a linear system of parameters. Unless otherwise stated, a \((d - 1)\)-complex will be assumed to be realized in \( \mathbb{R}^d \), so that the associated system of linear system is a linear system of parameters.

2.3. **Two cone lemmas.** A crucial ingredient for the inductive structure is given by pullbacks to prime divisors. Recall that the **star** and **link** of a face \( \sigma \) in \( \Delta \) are the subcomplexes

\[ \text{st}_\sigma \Delta := \{ \tau : \exists \tau' \supset \tau, \sigma \subset \tau' \in \Delta \} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{lk}_\sigma \Delta := \{ \tau \setminus \sigma : \sigma \subset \tau \in \Delta \}. \]

For geometric simplicial complexes \( \Delta \), we shall think of the star of a face as a geometric subcomplex of \( \Delta \), and the link of a face \( \sigma \) as the geometric simplicial complex obtained by the orthogonal projection to \( \text{span}(\sigma)^\perp \). Let us denote the **deletion** of \( \sigma \) by \( \Delta - \sigma \), the maximal subcomplex of \( \Delta \) that does not contain \( \sigma \). Let

\[ \text{st}^\circ_\sigma \Delta := (\text{st}_\sigma \Delta, \text{st}_\sigma \Delta - \sigma). \]

We have the following two elementary lemmas.

**Lemma 2.1** ([Adi18, Lemma 3.2]). For any vertex \( v \in \Delta \), where \( \Delta \) is a geometric simplicial complex in \( \mathbb{R}^d \), and for any integer \( k \), we have an isomorphism

\[ A^k(\text{lk}_v \Delta) \cong A^k(\text{st}_v \Delta). \]

**Lemma 2.2** ([Adi18, Lemma 3.3]). In the situation of the first cone lemma and \( \Delta \) in \( \mathbb{R}^d \) we have a natural isomorphism

\[ A^k(\text{st}_v \Delta) \xrightarrow{x_v} A^{k+1}(\text{st}^\circ_v \Delta). \]

3. **Proof of the main theorem**

The proof of the generic Lefschetz theorem is mostly a combination of well-known results, as well as some of the easier lemmas of [Adi18].
3.1. **Biased pairing theory.** We now give a rundown of some of the basic results of biased pairing theory, as far as it is necessary for this paper. Consider a triangulated \((d-1)\)-ball or sphere \(\Delta\) in \(\mathbb{R}^d\). We say that it satisfies the **biased pairing property** (with respect to its boundary) if the map
\[
\mathcal{A}^k(\Delta, \partial \Delta) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^d(\Delta)
\]
is an injection for all degrees \(k \leq \frac{d}{2}\). This is automatic for spheres by Poincaré duality [Gra84].

This is a weaker form of the **Hall-Laman relations** (with respect to its boundary), which we say apply if with respect to some \(\ell\) in \(\mathbb{R}^1(\Delta)\)
\[
\mathcal{A}^k(\Delta, \partial \Delta) \cdot \ell^{d-2k} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{d-2k}(\Delta)
\]
is an isomorphism for all \(k \leq \frac{d}{2}\). This map is naturally factored as
\[
\mathcal{A}^k(\Delta, \partial \Delta) \cdot \ell^{d-2k} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{d-2k}(\Delta, \partial \Delta) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{d-2k}(\Delta).
\]

We now note that the proof this essentially reduced to the **middle case** when
\[
k = \frac{d}{2}.
\]

Before we do that, we recall a fundamental lemma:

**Lemma 3.1** ([Adi18, Lemma 5.6]). A PL homeomorphism \(\varphi : \Delta \rightarrow \Delta'\) of balls \(\Delta, \Delta'\) in \(\mathbb{R}^d\) that restricts to the identity on a the boundary preserves the pairing property. That is, \(\Delta\) satisfies the biased pairing property if and only if \(\Delta'\) does.

3.2. **Reduction to the middle.** To this end, assume we wish to prove the Hall-Laman relations for a pair \((\Delta, \partial \Delta)\), where \(\Delta\) is a simplicial \((d-1)\)-sphere or ball. Let \(\text{cone} \Delta\) denote the cone over \(\Delta\) with apex \(n\), realized in \(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}\). Let \(\pi\) denote the projection along \(n\), and let \(\vartheta = h \cdot x\), where \(h\) is the vector of coordinates of the individual vertices in coordinate direction \(n\).

**Lemma 3.2** ([Adi18, Lemma 7.6]). Considering cone \(\Sigma\) realized in \(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}\), and \(k < \frac{d}{2}\), the following two are equivalent:

1. The Hall-Laman relations for cone \(\Delta\) with respect to \(x_n\) and in degree \(k + 1\).
2. The Hall-Laman relations for \(\pi \Delta\) with respect to \(\vartheta\).

Note that if \(2(k+1) = d+1\), then it is not necessary to specify a map in the first statement, which reduces entirely to biased duality.
Proof. We may assume without loss of generality that $\vartheta = x_n$ in $\mathcal{A}^{d-k}(\text{cone} \Delta)$. Consider then the diagram

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{A}^k(\pi \Delta, \partial \pi \Delta) & \xrightarrow{\cdot \hat{\vartheta}^{d-2k}} & \mathcal{A}^{d-k}(\pi \Delta) \\
\downarrow{\sim} & & \downarrow{\sim} \\
\mathcal{A}^{k+1}(\text{cone} \Delta, \partial \text{cone} \Delta) & \xrightarrow{x_n^{d-2k-1}} & \mathcal{A}^{d-k}(\text{cone} \Delta)
\end{array}
$$

Where the first vertical map is defined by the composition of cone lemmas

$$
\mathcal{A}^k(\pi \Delta, \pi \partial \Delta) \cong \mathcal{A}^k(\text{cone} \Delta, \text{cone} \partial \Delta) \xrightarrow{x_n} \mathcal{A}^{k+1}(\text{cone} \Delta, \partial \text{cone} \Delta),
$$

and the second vertical map is simply the cone lemma. An isomorphism on the top is then equivalent to an isomorphism of the bottom map. □

Hence, we can reduce the Hall-Laman relations in their entirety to biased pairing property.

3.3. Suspensions. We would now like to the biased Pairing property for a ball $\Delta$ of dimension $d - 1$ in degree $k$, where $2k \leq d$. As we shall see, this can be simplified by passing to suspensions.

Consider $\Delta$ realized in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Consider the suspension $\text{susp} \Delta$ of $\Delta$, realized in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, with suspension points $n$ and $s$ that lie on a line through the origin.

**Lemma 3.3.** $\Delta$ satisfies the biased pairing property in degree $k$ and $k - 1$ if $\text{susp} \Delta$ satisfies the biased pairing property in degree $k$.

Conversely, if $\Delta$ satisfies the biased pairing property in degree $k$ and $k - 1$, then $\text{susp} \Delta$ satisfies the biased pairing property in degree $k$.

Proof. The projection $\text{susp} \Delta \to \Delta$ induces splittings

$$
\mathcal{A}^k(\text{susp} \Delta, \partial \text{susp} \Delta) \cong \mathcal{A}^k(\Delta, \partial \Delta) \oplus \mathcal{A}^k(\text{st}_n \text{susp} \Delta, \text{st}_n \partial \text{susp} \Delta)
$$

and

$$
\mathcal{A}^k(\text{susp} \Delta) \cong \mathcal{A}^k(\Delta) \oplus \mathcal{A}^k(\text{st}_n^* \text{susp} \Delta)
$$

For the first claim, consider the embeddings of $\mathcal{A}^k(\Delta, \partial \Delta)$ (resp. $\mathcal{A}^k(\Delta)$) into the modules $\mathcal{A}^k(\text{susp} \Delta, \partial \text{susp} \Delta)$ (resp. $\mathcal{A}^k(\text{susp} \Delta)$), and the commutative diagram

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{A}^k(\Delta, \partial \Delta) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{A}^k(\Delta) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathcal{A}^k(\text{susp} \Delta, \partial \text{susp} \Delta) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{A}^k(\text{susp} \Delta)
\end{array}
$$
to obtain the desired in degree $k$, and embed into the second part of the decomposition for degree $k - 1$.

For the second claim, notice that by the cone lemmas, we have

$$\mathcal{A}^{k-1}(\Delta, \partial \Delta) \cong \mathcal{A}^k(st_n^0 \text{susp } \Delta, st_n^0 \partial \text{susp } \Delta)$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}^{k-1}(\Delta) \cong \mathcal{A}^k(st_n^0 \text{susp } \Delta) \qed$$

It should be noted that the character placement was very important here: the argument only works with these specific coordinates for the suspension. We will use this lemma as follows:

**Corollary 3.4.** $\Delta$ satisfies the biased pairing property in degree $k$ if $\text{susp } \Delta$ satisfies the Hall-Laman relations in degree $k$ (with respect to some linear form $\ell$)

3.4. **Flips and deletions.** From now on, we specifically restrict to PL spheres and balls, that is, simplicial complexes PL homeomorphic to the boundary of a simplex, or the simplex itself.

Recall that the deletion $\Delta - v$ of a vertex $v$ from a simplicial complex $\Delta$ is the largest subcomplex of $\Delta$ not containing $v$.

Recall: A pure simplicial $d$-complex is **vertex decomposable** if it is a simplex or there exists a vertex whose link is vertex decomposable of dimension $d - 1$ and its deletion is vertex decomposable of dimension $d$, see [BP79]. The following is a basic result of PL topology.

**Lemma 3.5** (Pachner [Pac87]). Every PL sphere is the boundary of some vertex decomposable ball $\Delta$.

We finally recall the most basic form of the perturbation principle.

**Lemma 3.6** ([Adi18, Lemma 6.1]). Consider a ball $\Delta$ of even dimension $2k = d - 1$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Consider $v$ a vertex in $\partial \Delta$ so that $\Delta - v$ is a ball of the same dimension.

Assume that

1. $\Delta - v$ satisfies the Hall-Laman relations in degree $k$ and
2. $\mathcal{A}^k(\text{lk}_v \partial \Delta) = 0$.

Then $\Delta$ satisfies the Hall-Laman relations in degree $k$. 

Proof. We use the following principle: Given linear maps 
\[ \alpha, \beta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y} \]
of two vector spaces \( \mathcal{X} \) and \( \mathcal{Y} \) over \( \mathbb{R} \), assume
\[ \beta(\ker \alpha) \cap \text{im} \alpha = 0 \subset \mathcal{Y}. \]
Then a generic linear combination \( \alpha'' + \beta \) of \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) has kernel
\[ \ker(\alpha'' + \beta) = \ker \alpha \cap \ker \beta. \]
We want to apply this principle to the spaces
\[ \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{A}_k(\Delta, \partial \Delta) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\Delta), \]
With the maps \( \alpha = x_v \) and \( \beta \) the isomorphism between \( \mathcal{A}_k(\Delta - v, \partial \Delta - v) \) and \( \mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\Delta - v) \) that exists by condition (1). Condition (2) guarantees that the kernel of \( x_v \) is precisely \( \mathcal{A}_k(\Delta - v, \partial \Delta - v) \), and the claim follows. \( \square \)

Note that if \( \pi \) is a projection of \( \mathbb{R}^d/v \) to a hyperplane, and \( h \) is the coordinate with respect to that projection, \( \vartheta = h \cdot x \) the associated linear form, then the last condition is equivalent to the Lefschetz property in degree \( k-1 \):
\[ \mathcal{A}^{k-1}(\pi \text{lk}_v \partial \Delta) \stackrel{d}{\rightarrow} \mathcal{A}^k(\pi \text{lk}_v \partial \Delta) \]
to be an isomorphism is necessary and sufficient for the second condition of the preceding lemma to hold.

3.5. Conclusion. Now that everything has been prepared, we only have to combine.

By Lemma 3.2, Lemma 3.1 and Pachner’s lemma, we have to prove the middle biased pairing property for vertex-decomposable balls \( \Delta \) of odd dimension \( 2k - 1 \). Proving the Hall Laman relations directly for \( \Delta \) is tricky, as the perturbation lemma demands that the boundary of the disk removed, i.e., \( \mathcal{A}_k(\text{lk}_v \partial \Delta) \), satisfies a form of the Lefschetz theorem as detailed above. This sphere however is not vertex decomposable, so the induction is not closed.

However, suspension saves us: following the suspension lemma, we need to prove the Hall-Laman relations for the \( d = 2k \)-ball \( \text{susp} \Delta \) in \( \mathbb{R}^{2k+1} \), which is easily seen to be vertex-decomposable as well.

We can now apply Lemma 3.6 iteratively to prove the Hall-Laman relations, identical to the proof of [Adi18, Theorem 6.3].

This reduces to proving the Lefschetz theorem for the \( (d-2) \)-sphere \( \text{susp} \text{lk}_v \partial \Delta \) in degree \( k - 1 \). But \( \text{lk}_v, \partial \Delta \) in turn is a \( (d-3) \)-sphere. Repeating this argument, we are
reduced to proving the Lefschetz theorem for the double suspension of a \((d - 4)\)-sphere. Once again, and we need the triple suspension of a \((d - 5)\)-sphere and so on. Ultimately, we are reduced to a pure suspension, or equivalently, the cross-polytopal spheres. As the name reveals, these are boundaries of polytopes, and we are done using the classical Lefschetz theorem for simplicial polytopes. This concludes the proof of Theorem I. □

4. EPILOGUE

We could actually go further, and prove the hard Lefschetz theorem for general triangulated spheres in much the same way, by finding a manifold that it is the boundary to, and then decomposing the same step by step along vertex deletions. It is not necessary to restrict to deletions that always leave balls left: it is enough to restrict to decompositions along sequences of vertex deletions so that the pure part of the remainder is always a pure manifold of the same dimension (and not necessarily a ball). This can be executed in the category of rational manifolds, following which one can prove the Hard Lefschetz theorem for the associated sphere: The idea is to define an arbitrary (discrete) Morse function on the manifold, and then construct the desired decomposition along vertex deletions as a handlebody decomposition along the same. The key lemma obtained is:

**Lemma 4.1.** Every triangulated rational manifold allows for a decomposition allows, after some refinement, a decomposition into closed balls (more accurately, stars of vertices) \(D_i\) such that any two disks intersect only in the boundary, and the union of any initial segment of disks is a rational manifold itself.

This is the notion of railways introduced in [Adi18], and therefore leads down a rabbit-hole that quickly gets as convoluted as the original argument.

Indeed, as observed in [Adi18], it is not necessary for the sphere to bound a disk for this to work; it is enough to consider it as boundary of a rational manifold. This opens up the possibility to prove also the Hard Lefschetz for face rings of general rational and orientable manifolds.

Finally, as remarked in [Adi18], there is no reason to restrict to characteristic 0 in this discussion, and the methods work just as well over any infinite field.
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