Abstract

An oriented hypergraph is an object in the category of incidence hypergraphs equipped with an incidence orientation function that allows for the generalization of graph theoretic concepts to integer matrices through its locally signed graphic substructure. A formal characterization of locally graphic techniques applied to incidence hypergraphs is categorically proven, and the injective envelope is shown to contain the class of uniform hypergraphs — providing a natural extension of an incidence hypergraph to include all incidence matrix positions.

All minors oriented hypergraphic matrix-tree-type and Sachs-coefficient-type theorems are unified for the determinant and permanent of both the oriented hypergraphic Laplacian and adjacency matrices arising from any integer incidence matrix via the multivariable characteristic polynomial and submonic maps into the injective envelope limited by the subobject classifier of the topos. Specializing to bidirected graphs the degree-\(k\) monomials of the Laplacian are shown to be in one-to-one correspondence with \(k\)-inward-arboresences.

Keywords: Laplacian, incidence hypergraph, oriented hypergraph, characteristic polynomial.

2010 MSC: 05C50, 05C65, 05C22, 18A25, 05B20

1. Introduction and Background

1.1. Introduction

Sign graphs are a graph that have a signing function of \(\{+1,-1\}\) on each edge and have their early roots in psychological balance and matroids \([1,16,17,30]\). Incidence orientations of signed graphs were introduced in \([31]\) and then further extended to hypergraphs in \([22,21,28,8]\) where integer matrices could be studied using their locally signed graphic substructure. Spectral eigenvalue properties of oriented hypergraphs have been studied in \([23,25,11]\), while the determinantal and permanental characteristic polynomials of the adjacency and Laplacian matrices of oriented hypergraphs were classified in \([7,27]\), providing a unifying generalization of matrix-tree-type Theorems and Sachs-type Theorems \((29,9,3,6)\) to integer matrices. Alternatives to incidence duality and line graphs were introduced in \([24]\), and their connection to Hadamard matrices was investigated in \([25]\). A categorical foundation for incidence theory was introduced in \([13]\) demonstrating the
deficiencies of other graph-like categories [4, 10, 18], culminating with a characterization of (directed) graph exponentials as homomorphisms in the category of incidence structures — a categorical description is critical for study of (hyper)graph homomorphisms.

We demonstrate that the intersection graph connection to Hadamard matrices in [25] is the injective closure in the category of incidence hypergraphs. This provides a generalization of the oriented hypergraphic determinantal and permanental characteristic polynomials of the adjacency and Laplacian matrices of any integer matrix from [7, Theorem 4.2.1] to all minors via the multivariate characteristic polynomial. Moreover, this is accomplished using the finest possible collection of locally graphic substructures in the injective closure, which provides a natural bounds for the maximum/minimum value of each coefficient. The simple category-theoretic techniques introduced also improve upon the results in [27] by not requiring any additional edges to be introduced, and instead expand all existing edges to create a uniform hypergraph, which can subsequently be compared to the original incidence hypergraph via the subobject classifier. Traditional graph-theoretic or set-system hypergraphic approaches fail due to a lack of subobject classifiers and injective envelopes that do not represent matrix algebra; the injective envelopes are complete graphs and simplicial sets, respectively (see [13, 15, 14]). The work in [13] is expanded by proving that hypergraph “uniformity” is an injective property in the category of incidence hypergraphs. Moreover, the subobject classifier is constructed to provide a characterization of power-objects. The existence of a subobject classifier confirms the validity of the “locally signed graphic” approach. For the category of incidence hypergraphs we characterize (1) the partial morphism representer, (2) the subobject classifier, (3) subobjects, (4) the power-object, (5) injectivity, (6) essential monomorphisms, and (7) the injective envelope, where the injective envelope of an incidence-simple hypergraph is the minimal uniform hypergraph that contains it.

Incidence orientation is then introduced before making use of the underlying injective envelope to produce unifying all minors matrix-tree-type and Sachs-coefficient-type characterization theorems for integer matrices through their corresponding sub-hypergraphic structure, generalizing [7, Theorem 4.2.1]. This is accomplished by producing a coefficient characterization of the multivariate total-minor determinantal and permanental polynomials for both the adjacency and Laplacian matrices. These coefficients are shown to correspond to signed sums of subobjects in the injective envelope which can also be used to provide bounds on the coefficients of characteristic polynomials, also generalizing [27]. Moreover, Tutte’s $k$-arborescence Theorem is a trivial generalization of these results via the single-element boolean sublattices associated to each degree-$k$ monomial — this is a strengthening of the results in [27] which shows the single-element activation classes for each for degree-1 monomials are in one-to-one correspondence with Tutte’s Matrix-Tree Theorem.

1.2. Incidence Hypergraphs

An incidence hypergraph is a quintuple $G = (\hat{V}, \hat{E}, I, \varsigma_G, \omega_G)$ consisting of a set of vertices $\hat{V}$, a set of edges $\hat{E}$, a set of incidences $I$, and two incidence maps $\varsigma_G : I(G) \to \hat{V}(G)$, and $\omega_G : I(G) \to \hat{E}(G)$. The notation is borrowed from [13], where the set decorations are used to represent the functors of a given category; for
example, $\tilde{V}(G)$ is the set of vertices of an incidence hypergraph, while $\tilde{V}(G)$ is the set of vertices of a quiver — these are different functors into $\mathbf{Set}$.

Formally, an incidence hypergraph (from [13, p. 17]) is defined as follows: Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the finite category

$$0 \overset{y}{\leftarrow} 2 \overset{z}{\rightarrow} 1$$

and the category of incidence hypergraphs is $\mathfrak{R} := \mathbf{Set}^\mathcal{D}$ with evaluation functors $\mathbf{Set} \xrightarrow{\tilde{V}} \mathfrak{R} \xrightarrow{E} \mathbf{Set}$ at 0, 1, and 2, respectively. An object $G$ of $\mathfrak{R}$ consists of the following: a set $\tilde{V}(G)$, a set $\tilde{E}(G)$, a set $I(G)$, a function $\varsigma_G : I(G) \rightarrow \tilde{V}(G)$, and a function $\omega_G : I(G) \rightarrow \tilde{E}(G)$. Note that the incidence function $\iota_G : I(G) \rightarrow \tilde{V}(G) \times \tilde{E}(G)$ used in [7, 27] is uniquely determined by the diagram below, where $\pi_{\tilde{V}(G)}$ and $\pi_{\tilde{E}(G)}$ are the canonical projections.

![Diagram of incidence hypergraphs](image)

Figure 1: Example objects in the category of incidence hypergraphs: a $K_3$ graph regarded as an incidence structure and a single 3-edge.

A directed path of length $n/2$ is a non-repeating sequence

$$\overrightarrow{P}_{n/2} = (a_0, i_1, a_1, i_2, a_2, i_3, a_3, \ldots, a_n-1, i_n, a_n)$$

of vertices, edges, and incidences, where $\{a_k\}$ is an alternating sequence of vertices and edges, and $i_j$ is an incidence between $a_{j-1}$ and $a_j$. The tail of a path is $a_0$ and the head of a path is $a_n$. A directed weak walk of $G$ is the image of an incidence-preserving map of a directed path into $G$. A backstep of $G$ is a non-incidence-monic map of $\overrightarrow{P}_1$ into $G$; a loop of $G$ is an incidence-monic map of $\overrightarrow{P}_1$ into $G$ that is not vertex-monic; and a directed adjacency of $G$ is a map of $\overrightarrow{P}_1$ into $G$ that is incidence-monic. Observe that loops are considered adjacencies while backsteps are not, and can respectively be regarded as orientable and non-orientable 1-cycles. A contributor of $G$ is an incidence preserving map from a disjoint union of $\overrightarrow{P}_1$’s with tail $t$ and head $h$ into $G$ defined by $c : \bigsqcup_{v \in V} \overrightarrow{P}_1 \rightarrow G$ such that $c(t_v) = v$ and $\{c(h_v) \mid v \in V\} = V$. Let $\mathcal{C}(G)$ denote the set of contributors. A strong contributor is an incidence-monic contributor. Let $\mathcal{S}(G)$ denote the set of strong contributors. Two contributors that correspond to the same permutation are called permutomorphic.
1.3. Oriented Hypergraphs

Let \( G = (V, E, I, \varsigma, \omega) \) be an incidence hypergraph. An orientation of an incidence hypergraph \( G \) is a signing function \( \sigma : I \rightarrow \{+1, -1\} \). The sign of a weak walk \( W \) is

\[
\text{sgn}(W) = (-1)^{|W/2|} \prod_{h=1}^{|W/2|} \sigma(i_h),
\]

which is equivalent to taking the product of the signed adjacencies if \( W \) is a vertex-walk. Extroverted/introverted adjacencies are negative while two incidences that compatibly traverse an adjacency are positive; see [12, 30, 31] for bidirected graphs as orientations of signed graphs.

![Figure 3: Two incidence orientations of the 3-edge graph \( G_2 \) from Figure 1 with \( \sigma_1 \) having all adjacencies negative.](image)

The incidence matrix of an oriented hypergraph \( G \) is the \( V \times E \) matrix \( H_G \) where the \((v, e)\)-entry is the sum of \( \sigma(i) \) for each \( i \in I \) such that \( \varsigma(i) = v \) and \( \omega(i) = e \). The adjacency matrix \( A_G \) of an oriented hypergraph \( G \) is the \( V \times V \) matrix whose \((u, v)\)-entry is the sum of \( \text{sgn}(q(\overline{P}_1)) \) for all incidence monic maps \( q : \overline{P}_1 \rightarrow G \) with \( q(\varsigma(i_1)) = u \) and \( q(\varsigma(i_2)) = v \). The degree matrix of an oriented hypergraph \( G \) is the \( V \times V \) diagonal matrix whose \((v, v)\)-entry is the sum of all non-incidence-monic maps \( p : \overline{P}_1 \rightarrow G \) with \( p(\varsigma(i_1)) = p(\varsigma(i_2)) = v \). The Laplacian matrix of \( G \) is defined as \( \mathbf{L}_G := H_G H_G^T = D_G - A_G \) for all oriented hypergraphs see [21] for the result that the Laplacian is the 1-weak-walk matrix.

The Laplacians of the two oriented hypergraphs in Figure 3 are

\[
\mathbf{L}_{(G_2, \sigma_1)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{L}_{(G_2, \sigma_2)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix},
\]
with $\sigma_1$ corresponding to the signless Laplacian. Since incidence hypergraphs can be regarded as an oriented hypergraph with a constant orientation function, incidence hypergraphs alone naturally model the signless Laplacian, see [27].

Generalizations of Sachs’ Theorem and the permanental polynomial to signed graphs appear in [3], and Theorem 1.3.1 below is from [7, Theorem 4.2.1] and generalizes these results to oriented hypergraphs and integer matrices. Let 

$\chi^D(M, x) = \det(xI - M)$ be the determinant-based characteristic polynomial and $\chi^P(M, x) = \text{perm}(xI - M)$ be the permanent-based characteristic polynomial.

**Theorem 1.3.1** ([7], Theorem 4.2.1). Let $G$ be an oriented hypergraph with adjacency matrix $A_G$ and Laplacian matrix $L_G$, then

1. $\chi^P(A_G, x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\lvert V \rvert} \left( \sum_{c \in \hat{C}_{\leq k}(G)} (-1)^{oc(c) + nc(c)} x^k \right),$

2. $\chi^D(A_G, x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\lvert V \rvert} \left( \sum_{c \in \hat{C}_{\leq k}(G)} (-1)^{pc(c)} x^k \right),$

3. $\chi^P(L_G, x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\lvert V \rvert} \left( \sum_{c \in \hat{C}_{\geq k}(G)} (-1)^{nc(c) + bs(c)} x^k \right),$

4. $\chi^D(L_G, x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\lvert V \rvert} \left( \sum_{c \in \hat{C}_{\geq k}(G)} (-1)^{pc(c) + nc(c) + bs(c)} x^k \right).$

Where $bs(c)$ is the number of backsteps in contributor $c$, $oc(c)/ec(c)/nc(c)/pc(c)$ is the number of odd/even/positive/negative circles in $c$, $\hat{C}_{\leq k}(G)$ is the set of contributors with exactly $k$ backsteps and $k$ removed, and $\hat{C}_{\geq k}(G)$ is the set of contributors with $k$ or more backsteps and $k$ removed.

We improve upon this theorem and prove a multivariate all-minor generalization that unifies Sachs’ theorem and the Matrix-tree theorem to integer incidence matrices through the locally signed graphic contributors of their associated oriented hypergraph. Moreover, we exhibit that these types of theorems are a result of the category of incidence hypergraphs being a topos and tied intimately to the subobject classifier and the injective envelope — leaving open the possibility of having a purely algebraic formulation of matrix-tree-like theorems.

**2. Subobjects & Injective Envelopes**

**2.1. Partial Morphism Representer**

To capture the subobject classifier and injective envelope, the topos structure of $\mathfrak{R}$ will be used heavily as a guide — many results are direct consequences from basic category theory and the direct citations are provided. Since the category of incidence hypergraphs, $\mathfrak{R}$, is a presheaf topos it already has completeness, cocompleteness [5, Corollary I.2.15.4], a subobject classifier [19, Lemma A1.6.6], and partial morphism representers [19, Proposition A2.4.7]. Specifically, the partial morphism representer can be used to identify the
subobject classifier and general injective objects. These constructions are concretely made, as demonstrated below. Limits and colimits are well-known to be component-wise, though the terminal and initial objects are immediately recognized using the adjoints of $I$ from [13, p. 18].

**Definition 2.1.1 (Initial & terminal).** Let $\emptyset_\mathcal{R} := I^*(\emptyset)$ and $1_\mathcal{R} := I^*(\{1\})$. As $I^*$ is cocontinuous and $\emptyset$ is initial in $\mathbf{Set}$, $\emptyset_\mathcal{R}$ is initial in $\mathcal{R}$. As $I^*$ is continuous and $\{1\}$ is terminal in $\mathbf{Set}$, $1_\mathcal{R}$ is terminal in $\mathcal{R}$.

The subobject classifier, and the partial morphism representer by extension, act like the 2-element set $\{0, 1\}$, where 1 serves as “true” and 0 as “false”. General constructions involve sieves [20, p. 37-39] or subfunctors [13, Example III.5.2.5], but the following construction will be set-theoretic. Given an incidence hypergraph $G$, the original structure of $G$ will serve as “true”, and new structure will be added to serve as “false”: a new vertex, a new edge, and new incidences between every vertex and edge. Applying this process to $1_\mathcal{R}$ produces the subobject classifier.

**Definition 2.1.2 (Partial morphism representer construction).** For $G \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{R})$, define an incidence hypergraph $\tilde{G}$ by

- $V(\tilde{G}) := \{(1) \times V(G)\} \cup \{(0, 0)\}$, $E(\tilde{G}) := \{(1) \times E(G)\} \cup \{(0, 0)\}$,
- $I(\tilde{G}) := \{(1) \times I(G)\} \cup \{(0) \times V(G) \times E(\tilde{G})\}$,
- $\varsigma_G(a) := \begin{cases} (1, \varsigma_G(i)), & a = (1, i), \\ (v, a = (0, v, e), & \omega_G(a) := \begin{cases} (1, \omega_G(i)), & a = (1, i), \\ (e, a = (0, v, e). & \end{cases} \end{cases}$

Define $G \xrightarrow{\eta_G} \tilde{G} \in \mathcal{R}$ by $V(\eta_G)(v) := (1, v)$, $E(\eta_G)(e) := (1, e)$, and $I(\eta_G)(i) := (1, i)$. Note that $\eta_G$ is monic by [13, Corollary I.2.15.3].

**Theorem 2.1.3 (Partial morphism representer characterization).** If $K \xleftarrow{\phi} H \xrightarrow{\psi} G \in \mathcal{R}$ satisfies that $\phi$ is monic, there is a unique $K \xrightarrow{\tilde{\psi}} \tilde{G} \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $K \xleftarrow{\phi} H \xrightarrow{\psi} G$ is a pullback of $K \xrightarrow{\tilde{\psi}} \tilde{G} \xleftarrow{\eta_G} G$. Consequently, $\tilde{G}$ equipped with $\eta_G$ is a partial morphism representer of $G$.

**Proof.** Define $K \xrightarrow{\tilde{\psi}} \tilde{G} \in \mathcal{R}$ by

- $V(\tilde{\psi})(v) := \begin{cases} (1, V(\psi)(w)), & v = V(\phi)(w), \\ (0, 0), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$ $E(\tilde{\psi})(e) := \begin{cases} (1, E(\psi)(f)), & e = E(\phi)(f), \\ (0, 0), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$
- $I(\tilde{\psi})(i) := \begin{cases} (1, I(\psi)(j)), & i = I(\phi)(j), \\ (0, V(\tilde{\psi})(\varsigma_K(i), E(\tilde{\psi})(\omega_K(i))), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

As $\phi$ is monic, $\tilde{\psi}$ is well-defined. Routine checks show the pullback condition and uniqueness of $\tilde{\psi}$. \qed

**Corollary 2.1.4 (Functor $\triangledown$).** If $G \xrightarrow{\phi} H \in \mathcal{R}$, then the map $G \xrightarrow{\tilde{\phi}} \tilde{H} \in \mathcal{R}$ is given by

}\end{verbatim}
\[ V(\tilde{\phi})(n, x) := \begin{cases} (1, V(\phi)(x)), & n = 1, \\ (0, 0), & n = 0, \end{cases} \]
\[ E(\tilde{\phi})(n, y) := \begin{cases} (1, E(\phi)(y)), & n = 1, \\ (0, 0), & n = 0, \end{cases} \]
\[ I(\tilde{\phi})(n, z) := \begin{cases} (1, I(\phi)(z)), & n = 1, \\ (0, V(\tilde{\phi})(\varsigma_G(z)), E(\tilde{\phi})(\omega_G(z))), & n = 0. \end{cases} \]

**Corollary 2.1.5 (Subobject classifier).** The incidence hypergraph \( \Omega_R := \mathfrak{I}_R \) equipped with \( t_R := \eta_{1_R} \) is a subobject classifier for \( R \).

2.2. **Subobjects**

With \( \Omega_R \) constructed, it can be used to identify and characterize subobjects of an incidence hypergraph \( G \) as morphisms from \( G \) to \( \Omega_R \) or, equivalently, as global elements of the exponential \( \Omega_R^G \). Notably, global elements of an incidence hypergraph correspond to the incidences themselves.

**Lemma 2.2.1 (Global elements).** For \( G \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{R}) \), the global elements of \( G \) correspond to the elements of \( I(G) \).

**Proof.** From [13, p. 18], note that \( \mathfrak{I}_R = I^*([\{1\}) = I^*([\{1\}) \). Thus,

\[ \mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{I}_R, G) = \mathfrak{R}(I^*([\{1\}), G) \cong \text{Set}([\{1\}, I(G)) \cong I(G). \]

\[ \Box \]

On the other hand, one has the natural notion of “subhypergraph,” which is defined formally in accordance with “subgraph” and “subdigraph” [2, Definitions 1.3.1 & 2.2.3.1].

**Definition 2.2.2 (Subhypergraph).** Given an incidence hypergraph \( G \), a subhypergraph of \( G \) is an incidence hypergraph \( K \) such that the following conditions hold:

- \( V(K) \subseteq V(G), E(K) \subseteq E(G), I(K) \subseteq I(G), \)
- \( \varsigma_K(i) = \varsigma_G(i), \omega_K(i) = \omega_G(i) \) for all \( i \in I(K). \)

The canonical inclusion \( K \overset{i_K}{\longrightarrow} G \in \mathfrak{R} \) is such that \( V(i_K), E(i_K), \) and \( I(i_K) \) are the set-theoretic inclusions.
To facilitate the connection between maps into $\Omega_R$ and subhypergraphs, the following notion of generation is lifted from abstract algebra. Recall that a subgroup can be generated from a collection of elements within a group. For incidence hypergraphs, one can generate the least subhypergraph containing a collection of components within an existing incidence hypergraph.

**Definition 2.2.3 (Generated subhypergraph).** Given $G \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{R})$, let $S_1 \subseteq \bar{V}(G)$, $S_2 \subseteq \bar{E}(G)$, and $T \subseteq I(G)$. Let $S_1 \xrightarrow{j_1} \bar{V}(G)$, $S_2 \xrightarrow{j_2} \bar{E}(G)$, $T \xrightarrow{k} I(G)$ be the inclusion maps. There are unique $\hat{V}(S_1) \xrightarrow{j_1} G$, $\hat{E}(S_2) \xrightarrow{j_2} G$, $I^\circ(T) \xrightarrow{k} G$ such that $\hat{V}(j_1) = j_1$, $\hat{E}(j_2) = j_2$, $I(k) = k$. Let $\varpi_n$ be the canonical inclusions into $\hat{V}(S_1) \amalg \hat{E}(S_2) \amalg I^\circ(T)$ for $n = 1, 2, 3$. There is a unique $\hat{V}(S_1) \amalg \hat{E}(S_2) \amalg I^\circ(T) \xrightarrow{\phi} G$ such that $\phi \circ \varpi_1 = \hat{j}_1$, $\phi \circ \varpi_2 = \hat{j}_2$, and $\phi \circ \varpi_3 = \hat{k}$. Define the subhypergraph $\text{Gen}_G(S_1, S_2, T)$ of $G$ by

- $\hat{V}(\text{Gen}_G(S_1, S_2, T)) := \text{ran}(\hat{V}(\phi))$,
- $\hat{E}(\text{Gen}_G(S_1, S_2, T)) := \text{ran}(\hat{E}(\phi))$,
- $I(\text{Gen}_G(S_1, S_2, T)) := \text{ran}(I(\phi))$.

Please note that when generating a subgroup from a subset of a group, all products of the generating elements arise through the generation process. Likewise for incidence hypergraphs, an incidence used for generation of a subhypergraph forces its corresponding vertex and edge to arise.

**Proposition 2.2.4 (Structure of generated subhypergraph).** Given $G \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{R})$, let $S_1 \subseteq \bar{V}(G)$, $S_2 \subseteq \bar{E}(G)$, and $T \subseteq I(G)$. Then, one has

- $\hat{V}(\text{Gen}_G(S_1, S_2, T)) = S_1 \cup \mathcal{P}(\varsigma_G)(T)$,
- $\hat{E}(\text{Gen}_G(S_1, S_2, T)) = S_2 \cup \mathcal{P}(\omega_G)(T)$,
- $I(\text{Gen}_G(S_1, S_2, T)) = T$.

**Proof.** Peeling away the universal constructions, the vertex set arises from the following calculation.

\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{V}(\text{Gen}_G(S_1, S_2, T)) &= \text{ran}(\hat{V}(\phi)) = \mathcal{P}\hat{V}(\phi)(\{1\} \times S_1) \cup \emptyset \cup \mathcal{P}\hat{V}(\phi)(\{3\} \times T) \\
&= \mathcal{P}\hat{V}(\phi \circ \varpi_1)(S_1) \cup \mathcal{P}\hat{V}(\phi \circ \varpi_3)(T) = \mathcal{P}(\hat{j}_1)(S_1) \cup \mathcal{P}(\hat{k})(T) \\
&= \mathcal{P}(j_1)(S_1) \cup \mathcal{P}(\hat{k})(T) = S_1 \cup \mathcal{P}(\hat{k} \circ I(T))(T) = S_1 \cup \mathcal{P}(\varsigma_G \circ I(\hat{k}))(T) \\
&= S_1 \cup \mathcal{P}(\varsigma_G \circ k)(T) = S_1 \cup \mathcal{P}(\varsigma_G)(T)
\end{align*}
\]

Similar calculations yield the edge and incidence sets. \hfill \Box

With this notion of generation in hand, the intuitional notion of “subhypergraph” captures the subobjects in $\mathcal{R}$ via the unique characteristic map into $\Omega_R$. 
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Theorem 2.2.5 (Subobject characterization). For \( G \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{R}) \), the subobjects of \( G \) correspond precisely to subhypergraphs of \( G \).

**Proof.** By [2, Proposition III.5.1.6], the subobjects of \( G \) correspond bijectively to the elements of the following set:

\[
I\left(\Omega^{\mathcal{R}}_G\right) \cong \mathcal{R}\left(\mathcal{R}, \Omega^{\mathcal{R}}_G\right) \cong \mathcal{R}\left(\prod \mathcal{R}, \Omega^{\mathcal{R}}_G\right) \cong \mathcal{R}(G, \Omega^{\mathcal{R}}_G).
\]

Let \( \mathcal{S} := \{ K \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{R}) : K \text{ is a subhypergraph of } G \} \). Given \( K \in \mathcal{S} \), then \( \iota_K \) is monic, so there is a unique \( G \xrightarrow{\chi_K} \Omega^{\mathcal{R}}_G \to \mathcal{R} \) such that \( G \xleftarrow{\iota_K} K \xrightarrow{1_K} \Omega^{\mathcal{R}}_G \) is a pullback of \( G \xrightarrow{\chi_K} \Omega^{\mathcal{R}}_G \xrightarrow{\iota} \mathcal{R} \). Define \( \Phi : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{R}(G, \Omega^{\mathcal{R}}_G) \) by \( \Phi(K) := \chi_K \).

Say \( K, L \in \mathcal{S} \) satisfy that \( \Phi(K) = \Phi(L) \). Then, \( \chi_K = \chi_L \), so both \( G \xleftarrow{\iota_K} K \xrightarrow{1_K} \Omega^{\mathcal{R}}_G \) and \( G \xleftarrow{\iota_L} L \xrightarrow{1_L} \Omega^{\mathcal{R}}_G \) are pullbacks of \( G \xrightarrow{\chi_K = \chi_L} \Omega^{\mathcal{R}}_G \xrightarrow{\iota} \mathcal{R} \). There is a unique isomorphism \( L \xrightarrow{\alpha} K \in \mathcal{R} \) such that \( \iota_K \circ \alpha = \iota_L \) and \( 1_K \circ \alpha = 1_L \). For \( v \in \tilde{V}(L) \), one has

\[
\tilde{V}(L)(v) = \tilde{V}(\iota_L)(\tilde{V}(\alpha)(v)) = \tilde{V}(\alpha)(v) \in \tilde{V}(K),
\]

showing \( \tilde{V}(L) \subseteq \tilde{V}(K) \). A dual argument shows equality. Likewise, one has \( \tilde{E}(L) = \tilde{E}(K) \) and \( I(L) = I(K) \), giving \( L = K \).

Let \( \chi \in \mathcal{R}(G, \Omega^{\mathcal{R}}_G) \). Define \( K := \text{Gen}_G(\tilde{V}(\chi)^{-1}(1,1), \tilde{E}(\chi)^{-1}(1,1), I(\chi)^{-1}(1,1)) \). Then, \( K \in \mathcal{S} \), and a calculation shows that \( \Phi(K) = \chi \).

As incidences of \( \Omega^{\mathcal{R}}_G \) correspond to subhypergraphs of \( G \), a moment is taken to complete the representation of this “power hypergraph”. While the power hypergraph can be represented in terms of homomorphisms [3, Definition 3.43], the following representation immediately and intuitively connects to notions of power objects and subobjects. Observe that this power hypergraph is contravariant and is deeply connected to the preimage operation of sets.

**Definition 2.2.6 (Power hypergraph).** Given \( G \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{R}) \), define the incidence hypergraph \( \text{Pwr}(G) \) by

- \( \tilde{V} \text{Pwr}(G) := \mathcal{P}\tilde{V}(G), \quad \tilde{E} \text{Pwr}(G) := \mathcal{P}\tilde{E}(G) \),

- \( I \text{Pwr}(G) := \{ K \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{R}) : K \text{ is a subhypergraph of } G \} \),

- \( \phi_{\text{Pwr}(G)}(K) := \tilde{V}(K), \quad \omega_{\text{Pwr}(G)}(K) := \tilde{E}(K) \).

Define \( G \prod_{\text{Pwr}(G)} \overset{\text{elem}_G}{\longrightarrow} \Omega^{\mathcal{R}}_G \in \mathcal{R} \) by

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{V}(\text{elem}_G)(v, S) & = \begin{cases} (1,1), & v \in S, \\ (0,0), & v \notin S \end{cases}, \quad \tilde{E}(\text{elem}_G)(e, T) = \begin{cases} (1,1), & e \in T, \\ (0,0), & e \notin T \end{cases}, \\
\tilde{I}(\text{elem}_G)(i, K) & = \begin{cases} (1,1), & i \in I(K), \\ (0,1,1), & i \notin I(K), \phi_G(i) \in \tilde{V}(K), \omega_G(i) \in \tilde{E}(K), \\ (0,1,1), & \phi_G(i) \notin \tilde{V}(K), \omega_G(i) \notin \tilde{E}(K), \\ (0,0,0), & \phi_G(i) \in \tilde{V}(K), \omega_G(i) \notin \tilde{E}(K), \\ (0,0,0), & \phi_G(i) \notin \tilde{V}(K), \omega_G(i) \notin \tilde{E}(K). \end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]
Theorem 2.2.7 (Power characterization). Given $G \prod K \xrightarrow{\phi} \Omega_R \in \mathcal{R}$, there is a unique map $K \xrightarrow{\hat{\phi}} \text{Pwr}(G) \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $\text{elem}_G \circ (G \prod \hat{\phi}) = \phi$.

Proof. For $i \in I(K)$, let $T_i := \{ j \in I(G) : I(\phi)(j, i) = (1, 1) \}$ and define $K \xrightarrow{\hat{\phi}} \text{Pwr}(G) \in \mathcal{R}$ by

- $\hat{V}(\hat{\phi})(v) := \{ w \in \hat{V}(G) : \hat{V}(\phi)(w, v) = (1, 1) \}$,
- $\hat{E}(\hat{\phi})(e) := \{ f \in \hat{E}(G) : \hat{E}(\phi)(f, e) = (1, 1) \}$,
- $I(\hat{\phi})(i) := \text{Gen}_G (\hat{V}(\hat{\phi})(\varsigma_K(i)), \hat{E}(\hat{\phi})(\omega_K(i)), T_i)$.

The proof of the composition condition and uniqueness are routine.

Corollary 2.2.8 (Power map). Let $G \xrightarrow{\phi} H \in \mathcal{R}$. The power map $\text{Pwr}(H) \xrightarrow{\text{Pwr}(\phi)} \text{Pwr}(G) \in \mathcal{R}$ is given by

- $V\text{Pwr}(\phi)(S) = \hat{V}(\phi)^{-1}(S)$, $E\text{Pwr}(\phi)(T) = \hat{E}(\phi)^{-1}(T)$,
- $I\text{Pwr}(\phi)(K) = \text{Gen}_G (\hat{V}(\phi)^{-1}(\hat{V}(K)), \hat{E}(\phi)^{-1}(\hat{E}(K)), I(\phi)^{-1}(I(K)))$.

2.3. Injectivity

Using $\square$, the injective objects of $\mathcal{R}$ can be identified. Much like [14 Proposition 3.2.1], an incidence hypergraph is injective essentially when every edge is incident to every vertex. For clarity, the following notation is introduced to refer to the set of incidences between a specified vertex and edge.

Definition 2.3.1. For $G \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{R})$, $v \in \hat{V}(G)$, $e \in \hat{E}(G)$, define $\text{inc}_G(v, e) := \varsigma_G^{-1}(v) \cap \omega_G^{-1}(e)$.

Proposition 2.3.2 (Injective incidence hypergraphs). An incidence hypergraph $G$ is injective with respect to monomorphisms in $\mathcal{R}$ if and only if the following conditions hold:

1. $\hat{V}(G) \neq \emptyset$; $\hat{E}(G) \neq \emptyset$;
2. $\text{inc}_G(v, e) \neq \emptyset$ for all $v \in \hat{V}(G)$ and $e \in \hat{E}(G)$.

Proof. $(\Rightarrow)$ As $\eta_G$ is monic and $G$ is injective, there is $\tilde{G} \xrightarrow{\psi} G \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $\psi \circ \eta_G = \text{id}_G$.

A calculation shows the following for $v \in \hat{V}(G)$ and $e \in \hat{E}(G)$: $\hat{V}(\psi)(0, 0) \in \hat{V}(G)$, $\hat{E}(\psi)(0, 0) \in \hat{E}(G)$, and $I(\psi)(0, (1, v), (1, e)) \in \text{inc}_G(v, e)$.

$(\Leftarrow)$ Fix $u_0 \in \hat{V}(G)$, $g_0 \in \hat{E}(G)$, and $k_{v,e} \in \text{inc}_G(v, e)$ for $v \in \hat{V}(G)$ and $e \in \hat{E}(G)$. Define $\tilde{G} \xrightarrow{\psi} G \in \mathcal{R}$ by
Proposition 2.3.3 (Essential monic). An incidence hypergraph monomorphism \( \eta \) is essential if and only if the following conditions hold:

1. if none already exist. By this characterization, \( \eta \) will only be essential in the trivial case when \( G = \emptyset \).

**Proposition 2.3.3 (Essential monic).** An incidence hypergraph monomorphism \( G \xrightarrow{\phi} H \in \mathcal{R} \) is essential if and only if the following conditions hold:

1. if \( \tilde{V}(G) \neq \emptyset \), then \( \tilde{V}(\phi) \) is bijective;
2. if \( \tilde{V}(G) = \emptyset \), then \( \operatorname{card}(\tilde{V}(H)) \leq 1 \);
3. if \( \tilde{E}(G) \neq \emptyset \), then \( \tilde{E}(\phi) \) is bijective;
4. if \( \tilde{E}(G) = \emptyset \), then \( \operatorname{card}(\tilde{E}(H)) \leq 1 \);
5. if \( v \in \tilde{V}(G) \) and \( e \in \tilde{E}(G) \) satisfy \( \operatorname{inc}_G(v,e) \neq \emptyset \), then

\[
\mathcal{P}I(\phi)(\operatorname{inc}_G(v,e)) = \operatorname{inc}_H(\tilde{V}(\phi)(v),\tilde{E}(\phi)(e)) ;
\]
6. if \( x \in \tilde{V}(H) \) and \( y \in \tilde{E}(H) \) satisfy

\[
((\varsigma_H \circ I(\phi))(i), (\omega_H \circ I(\phi))(i)) \neq (x,y)
\]

for all \( i \in I(G) \), then \( \operatorname{card}(\operatorname{inc}_H(x,y)) \leq 1 \).

**Proof.** (\( \Leftarrow \)) Say \( H \xrightarrow{\alpha} K \in \mathcal{R} \) satisfies that \( \alpha \circ \phi \) is monic. Then, all of \( \tilde{V}(\alpha) \circ \tilde{V}(\phi) \), \( \tilde{E}(\alpha) \circ \tilde{E}(\phi) \), and \( I(\alpha) \circ I(\phi) \) are one-to-one.

If \( \tilde{V}(G) = \emptyset \), then \( \operatorname{card}(\tilde{V}(H)) \leq 1 \), so \( \tilde{V}(\alpha) \) is automatically one-to-one. If \( \tilde{V}(G) \neq \emptyset \), \( \tilde{V}(\alpha) \) is one-to-one as \( \tilde{V}(\phi) \) is bijective. By a similar argument, \( \tilde{E}(\alpha) \) is also one-to-one.

Say \( i, j \in I(H) \) satisfy that \( I(\alpha)(i) = I(\alpha)(j) \). Let \( v := \varsigma_H(i) \) and \( e := \omega_H(i) \). A calculation shows that

\[
\tilde{V}(\alpha)(v) = \tilde{V}(\alpha)(\varsigma_H(j)) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{E}(\alpha)(e) = \tilde{E}(\alpha)(\omega_H(j)) .
\]

As \( \tilde{V}(\alpha) \) and \( \tilde{E}(\alpha) \) are one-to-one, \( v = \varsigma_H(j) \) and \( e = \omega_H(j) \), giving \( i, j \in \operatorname{inc}_H(v,e) \). If there is \( k \in I(G) \) such that \( i = I(\phi)(k) \), then a calculation shows

\[
v = \tilde{V}(\phi)(\varsigma_G(k)) , \quad \text{and} \quad e = \tilde{E}(\phi)(\omega_G(k)) ,
\]

- \( \tilde{V}(\psi)(w) := \begin{cases} v, & w = (1,v), \\
u_0, & w = (0,0), \end{cases} \quad \tilde{E}(\psi)(f) := \begin{cases} e, & f = (1,e), \\
g_0, & f = (0,0), \end{cases} \)
- \( I(\psi)(j) := \begin{cases} i, & j = (1,i), \\
k_{(\tilde{V}(\psi) \circ \varsigma_G)(j), (\tilde{E}(\psi) \circ \omega_G)(j)}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \)
which gives that
\[ j \in \text{inc}_H \left( \vec{V}(\phi) (\zeta_G(k)), \vec{E}(\phi) (\omega_G(k)) \right) = \mathcal{P} I(\phi) (\text{inc}_G (\zeta_G(k), \omega_G(k))). \]

Then, there is \( l \in I(G) \) such that \( I(\phi)(l) = j \), so
\[ I(\alpha \circ \phi)(k) = I(\alpha)(i) = I(\alpha)(j) = I(\alpha \circ \phi)(l). \]

As \( I(\alpha \circ \phi) \) is one-to-one, \( k = l \), giving \( i = j \).

Say \( i \neq I(\phi)(k) \) for all \( k \in I(G) \). If there was \( k \in I(G) \) such that \( ((\zeta_H \circ I(\phi))(k), (\omega_H \circ I(\phi))(k)) = (v, e) \), then a calculation shows
\[ i \in \text{inc}_H ((\zeta_H \circ I(\phi))(k), (\omega_H \circ I(\phi))(k)) = \mathcal{P} I(\phi) (\text{inc}_G (\zeta_G(k), \omega_G(k))), \]
contradicting that \( i \neq I(\phi)(k) \) for all \( k \in I(G) \). Thus, \( ((\zeta_H \circ I(\phi))(k), (\omega_H \circ I(\phi))(k)) \neq (v, e) \) for all \( k \in I(G) \). Thus, \( \text{card}((i, j)) \leq \text{card}(\text{inc}_H(v, e)) \leq 1 \), so \( i = j \). Therefore, \( I(\alpha) \) is one-to-one.

\((-\Leftarrow)-\) In each case, an appropriate \( H \xrightarrow{\alpha} K \in \mathfrak{R} \) is constructed such that \( \alpha \circ \phi \) is monic, but \( \alpha \) is not monic.

1. Choose \( w \in \vec{V}(G) \) and \( z \in \vec{V}(H) \setminus \text{ran}(\vec{V}(\phi)) \). Let \( \sim \) be the equivalence relation on \( \vec{V}(H) \) that associates \( \vec{V}(\phi)(w) \) and \( z \), and is equality otherwise. Let \( q : \vec{V}(H) \to \vec{V}(H)/\sim \) be the quotient map, \( K := (\vec{V}(H)/\sim, \vec{E}(H), I(H), q \circ \zeta_H, \omega_H) \), and \( \alpha := (q, \text{id}_{\vec{E}(H)}, \text{id}_{I(H)}) \).

2. Assume \( \vec{V}(G) = \emptyset \) and \( \text{card}(\vec{V}(H)) \geq 2 \). Let \( x, y \in \vec{V}(H) \) satisfy that \( x \neq y \). Let \( \sim \) be the equivalence relation on \( \vec{V}(H) \) that associates \( x \) and \( y \), and is equality otherwise. Let \( q : \vec{V}(H) \to \vec{V}(H)/\sim \) be the quotient map, \( K := (\vec{V}(H)/\sim, \vec{E}(H), I(H), q \circ \zeta_H, \omega_H) \), and \( \alpha := (q, \text{id}_{\vec{E}(H)}, \text{id}_{I(H)}) \).

3. This case is dual to case 1.

4. This case is dual to case 2.

5. Assume there are \( v \in \vec{V}(G) \), \( e \in \vec{E}(G) \), \( j \in \text{inc}_G(v, e) \), and \( z \in \text{inc}_H(\vec{V}(\phi)(v), \vec{E}(\phi)(e)) \setminus \mathcal{P} I(\phi) (\text{inc}_G(v, e)) \). Let \( \sim \) be the equivalence relation on \( I(H) \) that associates \( j \) and \( z \), and is equality otherwise. Let \( q : I(H) \to I(H)/ \sim \) be the quotient map. Define \( \zeta_K : I(H)/\sim \to \vec{V}(H) \) and \( \omega_K : I(H)/\sim \to \vec{E}(H) \) by \( \zeta_K(q(i)) = \zeta_H(i) \) and \( \omega_K(q(i)) := \omega_H(i) \), which are well-defined by a quick calculation. Let \( K := (\vec{V}(H), \vec{E}(H), I(H)/\sim, \zeta_K, \omega_K) \) and \( \alpha := (id_{\vec{V}(H)}, id_{\vec{E}(H)}, q) \).

6. Assume that \( x \in \vec{V}(H) \) and \( z \in \vec{E}(H) \) satisfy that \( (x, z) \neq (\zeta_H \circ I(\phi))(i), (\omega_H \circ I(\phi))(i)) \) for all \( i \in I(G) \), but \( \text{card}(\text{inc}_H(x, z)) \geq 2 \). Let \( g, h \in \text{inc}_H(x, z) \) satisfy that \( g \neq h \). Let \( \sim \) be the equivalence relation on \( I(H) \) that associates \( q \) and \( h \), and is equality otherwise. Let \( q : I(H) \to I(H)/ \sim \) be the quotient map. Define \( \zeta_K : I(H)/\sim \to \vec{V}(H) \) and \( \omega_K : I(H)/\sim \to \vec{E}(H) \) by \( \zeta_K(q(i)) := \zeta_H(i) \) and \( \omega_K(q(i)) := \omega_H(i) \), which are well-defined by a quick calculation. Let \( K := (\vec{V}(H), \vec{E}(H), I(H)/\sim, \zeta_K, \omega_K) \) and \( \alpha := (id_{\vec{V}(H)}, id_{\vec{E}(H)}, q) \).

\[ \square \]

**Corollary 2.3.4 (Essential \( \eta_G \)).** For \( G \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{R}) \), \( \eta_G \) is essential if and only if \( G = \emptyset_{\mathfrak{R}} \).

12
Proof. $(\Leftarrow)$ A quick check of the conditions in Proposition 2.3.3 proves this case.

$(\Rightarrow)$ If $\tilde{V}(G) \neq \emptyset$, then $\tilde{V}(\eta_G)$ is not bijective. Dually, if $\tilde{E}(G) \neq \emptyset$, then $\tilde{E}(\eta_G)$ is not bijective. □

Consequently, the construction of $\tilde{G}$ will be streamlined, much like [14, Definition 3.3.3], only adding what is necessary to satisfy the criteria for injectivity. Equivalently, this construction uniquely isolates the least injective subhypergraph of $\tilde{G}$ containing the image of $G$.

Definition 2.3.5 (Loading). Given an incidence hypergraph $G$, define the loading of $G$ as the incidence hypergraph $L_{\mathfrak{R}}(G)$ constructed as follows:

- $\tilde{V}_{L_{\mathfrak{R}}}(G) := \begin{cases} \tilde{V}(G), & \tilde{V}(G) \neq \emptyset; \\ \{0\}, & \tilde{V}(G) = \emptyset; \end{cases}$, $\tilde{E}_{L_{\mathfrak{R}}}(G) := \begin{cases} \tilde{E}(G), & \tilde{E}(G) \neq \emptyset; \\ \{0\}, & \tilde{E}(G) = \emptyset; \end{cases}$

- $I_{L_{\mathfrak{R}}}(G) := \{(1 \times I(G)) \cup \{(0 \times \{v,e\} : \text{inc}_G(v,e) = \emptyset)\}\}$,

- $\varsigma_{L_{\mathfrak{R}}}(G)(a) := \begin{cases} \varsigma_G(i), & a = (1,i), \\ v, & a = (0,v,e); \end{cases}$, $\omega_{L_{\mathfrak{R}}}(G)(a) := \begin{cases} \omega_G(i), & a = (1,i), \\ e, & a = (0,v,e). \end{cases}$

Likewise, define an incidence hypergraph homomorphism $G \xrightarrow{j_G} L_{\mathfrak{R}}(G) \in \mathfrak{R}$ by $\tilde{V}(j_G)(v) := v$, $\tilde{E}(j_G)(e) := e$, and $I(j_G)(i) := (1,i)$.

Figure 4: The incidence loading of $K_3$ to produce a uniform hypergraph. New incidences appear dashed within each hyperedge, and the vertices are identified along the dashed vertical lines.

Theorem 2.3.6 (Injective envelope). For an incidence hypergraph $G$, $j_G$ is an essential monomorphism, and $L_{\mathfrak{R}}(G)$ is injective with respect to incidence hypergraph monomorphisms. Thus, $L_{\mathfrak{R}}(G)$ equipped with $j_G$ is an injective envelope of $G$. Moreover, $L_{\mathfrak{R}}(G)$ is isomorphic to the unique minimal injective subhypergraph of $\tilde{G}$ containing the image of $G$ under $\eta_G$. 
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PROOF. A quick check shows that \( L_\mathfrak{R}(G) \) satisfies Proposition 2.3.2 and that \( j_G \) satisfies Proposition 2.3.3. As \( \tilde{G} \) is injective and \( j_G \) is monic, there is \( L_\mathfrak{R}(G) \xrightarrow{\psi} \tilde{G} \in \mathfrak{R} \) such that \( \psi \circ j_G = \eta_G \).

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{G} & \xrightarrow{\eta_G} G \\
\| & \xrightarrow{\psi} \mathfrak{R} \\quad \text{Proof.}
\end{align*}
\]

As \( j_G \) is essential monic and \( \eta_G \) is monic, \( \psi \) is monic. Thus, \( L_\mathfrak{R}(G) \) equipped with \( \psi \) is a subobject of \( \tilde{G} \). By Theorem 2.2.5, \( L_\mathfrak{R}(G) \) with \( \psi \) corresponds to a subhypergraph of \( \tilde{G} \) via isomorphism. For \( v \in \tilde{V}(G) \), \( e \in \tilde{E}(G) \), and \( i \in I(G) \), one has

- \( (1, v) = \tilde{V}(\eta_G)(v) = \tilde{V}(\psi \circ j_G)(v) = \tilde{V}(\psi)(\tilde{V}(j_G)(v)) = \tilde{V}(\psi)(\tilde{V}(L_\mathfrak{R}(G))) \),
- \( (1, e) = \tilde{E}(\eta_G)(e) = \tilde{E}(\psi \circ j_G)(e) = \tilde{E}(\psi)(\tilde{E}(j_G)(e)) = \tilde{E}(\psi)(e) \in \tilde{E}(\mathfrak{R}) \),
- \( (1, i) = I(\eta_G)(i) = I(\psi \circ j_G)(i) = I(\psi)(I(j_G)(i)) = I(\psi)(1, i) \in I(\psi)(I(L_\mathfrak{R}(G))) \).

Hence, the image of \( G \) under \( \eta_G \) is contained within the image of \( L_\mathfrak{R}(G) \) under \( \psi \). If \( \tilde{V}(G) = \emptyset \), then

\[
\tilde{V}(\psi)(0) = (0, 0).
\]

Dually, \( \tilde{E}(\psi)(0) = (0, 0) \) if \( \tilde{E}(G) = \emptyset \). If \( v \in \tilde{V}L_\mathfrak{R}(G) \) and \( e \in \tilde{E}L_\mathfrak{R}(G) \) satisfy that \( \text{inc}_G(v, e) = \emptyset \), then

- \( \varsigma_G(I(\psi)(0, v, e)) = \tilde{V}(\psi)(\varsigma_{L_\mathfrak{R}(G)}(0, v, e)) = \tilde{V}(\psi)(v) \),
- \( \omega_G(I(\psi)(0, v, e)) = \tilde{E}(\psi)(\omega_{L_\mathfrak{R}(G)}(0, v, e)) = \tilde{E}(\psi)(e) \).

A calculation shows \( \text{inc}_G(\tilde{V}(\psi)(v), \tilde{E}(\psi)(e)) = \{(0, \tilde{V}(\psi)(v), \tilde{E}(\psi)(e))\} \), which gives that \( I(\psi)(0, v, e) = (0, \tilde{V}(\psi)(v), \tilde{E}(\psi)(e)) \). Thus, \( \psi \) and, consequently, its image are uniquely determined.

\[ \square \]

3. Applications

3.1. General Coefficient Theorems

We demonstrate an oriented hypergraphic generalization of Chaiken’s all-minors matrix-tree theorem to all integer matrices using the injective envelope of the underlying incidence hypergraph. Moreover, the sign-monomial pair in the total minor polynomial generalizes Sachs’ theorem while simultaneously providing insight on the connection between the boolean ideals of graph contributors and Tutte’s arboresence theorem discussed in [27]. Moreover, a natural unifying graph-theoretic, permutation-based, algebraic theorem cannot exist for Laplacians since the category of simple graphs is a quasi-topos with a strong subobject classifier corresponding to \textit{induced} subgraphs, while Laplacian entries require non-monic path maps along the associated incidence structure [21].

Since \( \mathfrak{R} \) possesses a subobject classifier define \( \delta_G(H) \) to be the \( G \)-subobject indicator that is 1 if \( H \) is a subobject of \( G \) and 0 otherwise. The \textit{0-loading of an oriented hypergraph} \( G \) is the oriented hypergraph...
$L^0(G)$ that is obtained by taking the loading of the underlying incidence hypergraph and extending the orientation function $\sigma$ to $\sigma_0$ where $\sigma_0|_{I_0} = 0$, where $I_0$ is the set of newly created incidence in the loading.

Let $ec(c)$, $oc(c)$, $pc(c)$ and $nc(c)$ be the number of even, odd, positive, and negative components in a (sub-)contributor $c$, respectively. While $bs(c)$ denotes the number of backsteps in contributor $c$. It is worth noting that backsteps are technically negative weak walks that do not arise from adjacencies, but we choose to leave the count separate to illustrate the difference between Laplacian and adjacency matrix formulations.

Let $U, W \subseteq V$ such that $U = W$, and consider two total orderings of $U$ and $W$, denoted $u$ and $w$. The map $u_i \rightarrow w_i$ between these total orderings forms the $[u, w]$-equivalence-class of contributors, let $C(G; u, w)$ be the set of contributors in $G$ where $c(u_i) = w_i$. Let $\widehat{C}(G; u, w)$ be the set obtained by removing the $u \rightarrow w$ mappings from $C(G; u, w)$, the elements of $\widehat{C}(G; u, w)$ are called the reduced $[u, w]$-equivalent contributors.

It is important to note some $[u, w]$-equivalency classes may be empty for a given oriented hypergraph $G$, this is rectified in $L^0(G)$ where no class is empty, and the non-zero contributors correspond to the evaluations of the subobject indicator.

![Figure 5: A graph and its loading (0-incidences appear dashed), where the contributor for permutation (1243) only exists in the loading.](image)

Reconstructing a reduced $[u, w]$-equivalent contributor to a contributor, while not unique, always produces a contributor associated to the same permutation.

**Lemma 3.1.1.** For each $c \in \widehat{C}(G; u, w)$, the set of all $\hat{c} \in C(G; u, w)$ formed by reintroducing $u \rightarrow w$ to $c$ are permutomorphic.

Let $X$ be the $V \times V$ matrix whose $ij$-entry is $x_{ij}$. Let $\chi^D(M, x) = \det(X - M)$ be the determinant-based multivariable characteristic polynomial and $\chi^P(M, x) = \text{perm}(X - M)$ be the permanent-based multivariable characteristic polynomial.

**Theorem 3.1.2 (Total-minor Polynomial).** Let $G$ be an oriented hypergraph with adjacency matrix $A_G$ and Laplacian matrix $L_G$, then
1. \( \chi^P(A_G, x) = \sum_{[u,w]} \left( \sum_{s \in S(L^P(G), u, w)} (-1)^{oc(s) + nc(s)} \right) \prod_i x_{u_i, w_i} \),

2. \( \chi^D(A_G, x) = \sum_{[u,w]} \left( \sum_{s \in S(L^D(G), u, w)} (-1)^{oc(s) + nc(s)} \right) \prod_i x_{u_i, w_i} \),

3. \( \chi^P(L_G, x) = \sum_{[u,w]} \left( \sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}(L^P(G), u, w)} (-1)^{nc(c) + bs(c)} \right) \prod_i x_{u_i, w_i} \),

4. \( \chi^D(L_G, x) = \sum_{[u,w]} \left( \sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}(L^D(G), u, w)} (-1)^{oc(c) + nc(c) + bs(c)} \right) \prod_i x_{u_i, w_i} \).

**Proof.** The first half of the proof is an adaptation of the author’s work in [1] Theorem 4.2.1, before utilizing the injective closure and the zero-loading of the incidence hypergraph.

Let \( p : \overrightarrow{P}_1 \rightarrow G \), and let \( q \) denote an incidence-monic map from \( \overrightarrow{P}_1 \rightarrow G \). For a given permutation \( \pi \in S_v \), let \( \mathcal{P}_\pi = \{ p | p(t) = v \text{ and } p(h) = \pi(v) \} \), and \( \mathcal{Q}_\pi \) be defined similarly for incidence monic maps.

**Proof of 1.** For a given permutation \( \pi \) and vertex \( v \) let \( \alpha : v \rightarrow \left( x_{v, \pi(v)} - \sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}_\pi} \text{sgn}(q(\overrightarrow{P}_1)) \right) \) be the function that chooses either the variable or the value at coordinate \( (v, \pi(v)) \). Let \( A_\pi \) be the set of all \( \alpha \) for a given \( \pi \).

Thus, \( \chi^P(A_G, x) \) can be written as

\[
\chi^P(A_G, x) = \text{perm}(X - A_G) = \sum_{\pi \in S_v} \prod_{v \in V} \sum_{\alpha \in A_\pi} \alpha(v).
\]

Distributing we get

\[
= \sum_{\pi \in S_v} \sum_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}_\pi} \prod_{v \in V} \beta(v),
\]

where \( \mathcal{B}_\pi \) is the set of all functions \( \beta : V \rightarrow \left( x_{v, \pi(v)} - \sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}_\pi} \text{sgn}(q(\overrightarrow{P}_1)) \right) \). This can be recognized as passing to the Set exponential. For each \( \beta \in \mathcal{B}_\pi \) let \( U_\beta \subseteq V \) be the set of vertices mapped to an \( x_{v, \pi(v)} \).

This gives:

\[
= \sum_{\pi \in S_v} \sum_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}_\pi} \left[ \prod_{v \in U_\beta} \beta(v) \prod_{u \in U_\beta} x_{u, \pi(u)} \right].
\]

Evaluating \( \beta(v) \) we have:

\[
= \sum_{\pi \in S_v} \sum_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}_\pi} \left[ \left( \prod_{u \in U_\beta} \sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}_\pi} -\text{sgn}(q(\overrightarrow{P}_1)) \right) \prod_{u \in U_\beta} x_{u, \pi(u)} \right].
\]
Where $Q_\pi(G|U_\beta)$ is the set of maps $q$ whose tail-set is $U_\beta$ and head-set is $\pi(U_\beta)$. Distributing again produces:

$$
= \sum_{\pi \in S_V} \sum_{U \subseteq V} \left[ \sum_{s \in S_\pi(G|U)} \left( \prod_{u \in U} \sigma(s(i_u)) \sigma(s(j_u)) \right) \right] \prod_{u \in U} x_{u, \pi(u)},
$$

where $S_\pi(G|U)$ is the restricted set of strong contributors that correspond to permutation $\pi$ with tails at $U$.

Now pass to the injective envelope of the underlying incidence hypergraph and extend the incidence orientation function $\sigma$ to $\sigma_L$ such that $\sigma_L(i) = \sigma(i)$ for all $i \in I(G)$ and the new incidence orientations are assigned arbitrary. Using the $G$-subobject indicator $\delta_G$ the sum can be rewritten as:

$$
= \sum_{\pi \in S_V} \sum_{U \subseteq V} \left[ \sum_{s \in S_\pi(L(G))} \delta_G(s|U) \cdot (-1)^{oc(s) + nc(s)} \right] \prod_{u \in U} x_{u, \pi(u)}.
$$

The product of signs is evaluated by first factoring out a negative for each adjacency producing a value of $(-1)^{nc(s)}$, and then factoring out a negative for each negative adjacency producing a value of $(-1)^{nc(s)}$ — leaving behind only $+1$’s for all adjacencies, and reducing to a count of subcontributors of the underlying incidence hypergraph,

$$
= \sum_{\pi \in S_V} \sum_{U \subseteq V} \left[ \sum_{s \in S_\pi(L(G))} \delta_G(s|U) \cdot (-1)^{oc(s) + nc(s)} \right] \prod_{u \in U} x_{u, \pi(u)}.
$$

Resolving $\delta_G$ and letting $w_i = \pi(u_i)$, we pass to the 0-loading $L^0(G)$ of the oriented hypergraph and combine the first two sums.

$$
= \sum_{[u,w]} \left( \sum_{s \in S(L^0(G):u,w)} (-1)^{oc(s) + nc(s)} \right) \prod_i x_{u_i, w_i}.
$$

**Proof of 2.** Proceeding as in part 1 with the inclusion of the sign of the permutation we get

$$
\chi^D(A_G, x) = \det(X - A_G)
= \sum_{\pi \in S_V} \epsilon(\pi) \sum_{U \subseteq V} \left[ \sum_{s \in S_\pi(L(G))} \delta_G(s|U) \cdot (-1)^{oc(s) + nc(s)} \right] \prod_{u \in U} x_{u, \pi(u)}.
$$

Using the fact that the sign of a permutation is equal to $(-1)^{cc(\pi)}$, where $cc(\pi)$ is the number of even algebraic cycles in $\pi$, and each contributor is associated to a unique permutation we have

$$
= \sum_{\pi \in S_V} \sum_{U \subseteq V} \left[ \sum_{s \in S_\pi(L(G))} (-1)^{cc(s)} \cdot \delta_G(s|U) \cdot (-1)^{oc(s) + nc(s)} \right] \prod_{u \in U} x_{u, \pi(u)}.
$$

Again, resolve $\delta_G$ but this time observe that the $(-1)^{oc(s) + nc(s)}$ values are for subcontributors where $U \rightarrow \pi(U)$ is removed, while the value $(-1)^{cc(s)}$ remains unchanged as it is determined by a permutation. Let $s$ be any maximal contributor obtained by extending the subcontributor $s$ by $U \rightarrow \pi(U)$, all such contributors are permutomorphic by Lemma 3.1.1

$$
= \sum_{[u,w]} \left( \sum_{s \in S(L^0(G):u,w)} (-1)^{cc(s) + oc(s) + nc(s)} \right) \prod_i x_{u_i, w_i}.
$$
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Proofs of 3. and 4. The proofs for the Laplacian are similar with the following modifications: (1) switch from incidence-monic maps $Q_π$ to arbitrary maps $P_π$ to allow backsteps and sum over contributors instead of strong contributors; (2) since $L_G = DG - AG$ there is no need to factor out a $-1$ for each adjacency, and instead factor out a $-1$ for each backstep.

3.1.1. Examples

Example 1: The graph $G_1$ from Figure 1 has $\text{det}(xI - L) = x^3 - 6x^2 + 9x$, and $\text{perm}(xI - A) = x^3 + 3x - 2$. The 16 contributors for $G_1$ appear on the left of Figure 2, two of which are strong contributors, namely the two 3-cycles. The adjacency matrix constant is $-2$ as there are two strong contributors that have no isolated vertices, both with odd parity, and neither negative, each producing a value of $(-1)^{0+1}$. Moreover, the largest magnitude the constant could be is 2 as there are two strong contributors. Furthermore, the maximum magnitude for the Laplacian constant is 16, the number of contributors. The actual Laplacian constant term is 0 as the contributors fall into alternating signed Boolean lattices and sum to 0; see [27] for more details.

Example 2: If we expand the calculation to determine $\chi^P(A_{G_1}, x)$, the constant term will still be produced by the two 3-cycle strong contributors, however, in $\chi^P(A_{G_1}, x)$, the subcontributors also contribute additional monomials shown in Figure 6.

Thus, $\chi^P(A_{G_1}, x)$ would contain the following expression resulting from the strong contributor resulting from permutation (123):

$$x_{12}x_{23}x_{31} - x_{12}x_{23} - x_{12}x_{31} - x_{23}x_{31} + x_{12} + x_{23} + x_{31} - 1$$
where the coefficients are determined by the formula $(-1)^{oc(s)} + nc(s)$ for each subcontributor. Here, there are no negative edges, so the sign is determined by the odd parity only. Note, that in the determinant case the value $(-1)^{c(s)}$ is determined by the maximal strong contributor corresponding to the constant coefficient. Since Figure 6 contains all the restrictions of the strong subcontributors, the maximum magnitude of the coefficients of the adjacency matrix of a signed $K_3$ are 1 for the monomials listed, with the exception of 2 for the constant.

**Example 3:** Consider the oriented hypergraph $(G_2, \sigma_2)$ from Figure 3 with contributors listed on the right of Figure 2. We have

$$
\chi^D(\mathbf{L}(G_2, \sigma_2), \mathbf{x}) = \det (\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{L}(G_2, \sigma_2)) = \det \begin{bmatrix}
x_{11} - 1 & x_{12} - 1 & x_{13} + 1 \\
x_{21} - 1 & x_{22} - 1 & x_{23} + 1 \\
x_{31} + 1 & x_{32} + 1 & x_{33} - 1
\end{bmatrix}
$$

$$
= x_{11}x_{22}x_{33} - x_{11}x_{23}x_{32} - x_{13}x_{22}x_{31} - x_{12}x_{21}x_{33} + x_{12}x_{23}x_{31} + x_{13}x_{21}x_{32} \\
- x_{11}x_{22} - x_{11}x_{23} - x_{11}x_{32} - x_{13}x_{22} - x_{13}x_{23} - x_{22}x_{31} - x_{23}x_{31} - x_{33}x_{32} \\
+ x_{12}x_{21} + x_{13}x_{21} + x_{12}x_{23} + x_{12}x_{31} + x_{13}x_{31} + x_{21}x_{32} + x_{23}x_{32} + x_{12}x_{33} + x_{12}x_{33}
$$

where the constant and linear terms all have coefficient zero.

### 3.2. Local k-arborescences and coefficient bounds

Building on the work in [27], we group contributors of bidirected graphs into Boolean activation classes, and show the single-element classes for a given degree-$k$ monomial are in one-to-one correspondence with Tutte’s $k$-arborescences. Moreover, the remaining elements in the activation class provide an upper bound on absolute value of the coefficient for the associated monomial.

First we collect the relevant definitions from [27]. A pre-contributor of $G$ is an incidence preserving function $p : \coprod_{v \in V} \overrightarrow{P}_1 \to G$ with $p(t_v) = v$. For a pre-contributor $p$ with $p(t_v) \neq p(h_v)$, define packing a directed adjacency of a pre-contributor $p$ into a backstep at vertex $v$ to be a pre-contributor $p_v$ such that $p_v = p$ for all $u \in V \setminus v$, and for vertex $v$

$$
p((\overrightarrow{P}_1)_v) = (v, i, e, j, w), i \neq j,
$$

and $p_v((\overrightarrow{P}_1)_v) = (v, i, e, i, v)$.

Thus, the head-incidence and head-vertex of adjacency $p((\overrightarrow{P}_1)_v)$ are identified to the tail-incidence and tail-vertex. Unpacking a backstep of a pre-contributor $p$ into an adjacency out of vertex $v$ is a pre-contributor $p^v$ defined analogously where, for vertex $v$ the head-incidence and head-vertex of backstep $p((\overrightarrow{P}_1)_v)$ are identified to the unique incidence and vertex that would complete the adjacency in bidirected graph $G$.

Activating a circle of contributor $c$ is a minimal sequence of unpackings that results in a new contributor, and define the activation partial order $\leq_a$ where $c \leq_a d$ if $d$ is formed by a sequence of activations starting with $c$. This induces the activation equivalence relation $\sim_a$ where $c \sim_a d$ if $c \leq_a d$ or $d \leq_a c$, and the elements...
of $\mathcal{C}(G)/\sim_a$ are called the activation classes of $G$. Let $\mathcal{A}(u;w;G)$ denote the $[u,w]$-equivalent elements in activation class $\mathcal{A}$, and let $\hat{\mathcal{A}}(u;w;G)$ be the elements of $\mathcal{A}(u;w;G)$ with the adjacency or backstep from $u_i$ to $w_i$ is removed for each $i$.

**Lemma 3.2.1 ([27], Lemma 3.6).** For a bidirected graph $G$, all activation classes of $G$ are Boolean lattices.

**Lemma 3.2.2 ([27], Theorem 3.11).** The elements of $\mathcal{A}(u;w;G)$ form a sub-Boolean lattice of $\mathcal{A}$ determined by sequential order ideals.

**Lemma 3.2.3 ([27], Lemma 4.5).** If $G$ is a bidirected graph, then the set of elements in all single-element $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{a0}(u;w;G')$ is unpacking equivalent to the set of spanning trees of $G$. Where $G'$ is the injective envelope of $G$ in the category of graphs (i.e. the completion of the underlying graph).

The total minor polynomials can be used to extend the results of Lemma 3.2.3

**Theorem 3.2.4.** In a bidirected graph $G$ the set of all elements in single-element $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{a0}(u;w;L(G))$ is unpacking equivalent to $k$-arborescences. Moreover, the $i^{th}$ component in the arborescence has sink $u_i$, and the vertices of each component are determined by the linking induced by $c^{-1}$ between all $u_i \in U \cap \overline{W} \to \overline{U}$ or unpack into a vertex of a linking component.

**Proof.** Let $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{a0}(u;w;L(G))$ contain a single element contributor, call it $c$. If $c$ contains a circle, then there would be a $(u,w)$-equivalent contributor $d$ with $d \sim_a c$ such that there is a sequence of unpackings that activates into $c$, and $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{a0}(u;w;L(G))$ would contain more than one element. Moreover, $c$ cannot have any circle that can be activated, or there would be $(u,w)$-equivalent contributor $d'$ with $c \sim_a d'$, and $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{a0}(u;w;L(G))$ would contain more than one element.

Additionally, since the single-element of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{a0}(u;w;L(G))$ is a non-zero contributor in $L(G)$, the corresponding totally unpacked pre-contribution $p$ exists in $G$. Thus, $p$ is circle-free with exactly $|V|$ vertices and $|V| - k$ edges, so it is a $k$-arborescence.

By the Linking Lemma every $U \to W$ matching has an induced linking in the opposite direction. Let $u_i \in U$. If $u_i \notin \overline{W}$, then both the entrant and salient edges are missing at $u_i$, and $u_i$ is isolated before unpacking. If $u_i \in \overline{W}$, then only the salient edge is missing at $u_i$. Since all remaining vertices can only posses backsteps that unpack towards a vertex in the connected component containing a $u_i$, each $u_i$ is the sink of an inward-arborescence. Additionally, all vertices either are in the induced linking or unpack into one of the components.

#### 3.2.1. Example

**Example 4:** To determine the coefficient for $x_{12}x_{23}$ in $\chi_D(L_G, x)$ for the graph (i.e. all edges positive) in Figure 5 observe that the set $U = \{1, 2\}$ corresponding to all first subscript entries and the set $W = \{2, 3\}$ corresponding to all second subscript entries. The $[(1,2),(2,3)]$-equivalent contributors, their non-zero
reduced contributors, and the unpacking into an inward arborescence appear in Figure 7. Each component in each arborescence has an element of $U$ as a sink as well as the corresponding linking in the reduced contributor. The remaining backsteps unpack into the linkings; hence, towards the sinks.

![Diagram](Diagram.png)

Figure 7: The three $[(1, 2), (2, 3)]$-equivalent contributors, their reduced subcontributor in $G$ with linking, and the unpacked inward arborescence rooted at $v_1$.

The signing function for the Laplacian determinant is $(-1)^{cc(c)+nc(c)+bs(c)}$, where $\text{sgn}(c_1) = \text{sgn}(c_2) = (-1)^{0+0+1} = -1$ while $\text{sgn}(c_3) = (-1)^{1+0+0} = -1$, thus the coefficient of $x_{12}x_{23}$ in $\chi^D(L_G, x)$ is $-3$. Similarly, the coefficient of $x_{12}x_{23}$ in $\chi^P(L_G, x)$ is $-1$ using the signing function $(-1)^{nc(c)+bs(c)}$. 
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