

SYMMETRIC CROSSCUTS AND TROPICAL MODULI

DOMINIC BUNNETT AND MICHAEL JOSWIG

ABSTRACT. We investigate geometric embeddings among several classes of stacky fans and algorithms, e.g., to compute their homology. Interesting cases arise from moduli spaces of tropical curves. Specifically, we study the embedding of the moduli of tropical honeycomb curves into the moduli of all tropical K_4 -curves.

1. INTRODUCTION

The rich world of abstract concepts in modern algebraic geometry features algebraic stacks as a device for describing moduli spaces; see [19] for an introduction to the subject. In exploring moduli spaces in the more combinatorial setting of tropical geometry, Brannetti, Melo and Viviani [5], and later Chan [8], developed the concept of a *stacky fan*, which is a polyhedral fan modulo groups which operate locally on the cones of the fan. In a recent breakthrough, Chan, Gelatius and Payne disproved long standing conjectures about the cohomology of moduli spaces of algebraic curves via the stacky fan moduli space of tropical curves [9]. Our contribution is a combinatorial and algorithmic analysis of stacky fans, with a focus on polyhedral embeddings.

Like in classical algebraic geometry, tropical geometry can be studied with or without coordinates. For an individual tropical curve the relationship between these two approaches is fairly well understood. What makes this more involved than for ordinary algebraic curves is the fundamental lack of symmetry in tropical geometry. This is hardly surprising as the arithmetic underlying tropical geometry comes from a semiring. Consequently it is not easy to say how the set of the tropical plane curves sits in the moduli space of all tropical curves. Our goal is to develop the methods which are necessary to answer this question. As an application, in Theorem 5.4, we describe the embedding of the moduli of tropical honeycomb curves into the moduli of all tropical K_4 -curves.

2. STACKY FANS AND THEIR EMBEDDINGS

To set the stage we begin by reviewing the definition of a stacky fan from [8, Definition 3.2]. A stacky fan is built from finite quotients of polyhedral cones. The subtleties in the definition have two sources: (1) the compatibility requirements among the groups operating on distinct cones and (2) the role of the integer lattice in the ambient spaces containing the cones.

M. Joswig has been supported by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (EXC 2046: “MATH+”, SFB-TRR 195: “Symbolic Tools in Mathematics and their Application”, and GRK 2434: “Facets of Complexity”).

Let $X_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{m_1}, \dots, X_k \subset \mathbb{R}^{m_k}$ be full-dimensional rational closed polyhedral cones. In particular, $m_i = \dim X_i$. As usual we abbreviate $[k] = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. For each $i \in [k]$, let G_i be a subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}_{m_i}(\mathbb{Z})$ which fixes X_i setwise and let X_i/G_i be the topological quotient. Denote A° the interior of a topological space A . We will be interested in X_i°/G_i , the quotient of the interior of X_i by the group action.

Suppose that we have a topological space X and, for each $i \in [k]$, a continuous map

$$\alpha_i : X_i \longrightarrow X .$$

We write $C_i^\circ = \alpha_i(X_i^\circ)$ and $C_i = \alpha_i(X_i)$ for each i . The space X is a *stacky fan* with cells $\{C_i\}$ if the following properties hold for each index i :

- (SF1) The restriction of α_i to X_i° onto C_i° is the topological quotient.
- (SF2) We have an equality of sets

$$X = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^k C_i^\circ .$$

- (SF3) For each cone X_i and for each face F of X_i we have $\alpha_i(F) = C_\ell$ for some ℓ . Furthermore, $\dim F = m_\ell$, and there is an \mathbb{R} -invertible linear map $L : \mathrm{span}\langle F \rangle \cong \mathbb{R}^{m_\ell} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m_\ell}$ such that

- $L(F) = X_\ell$,
- $L(\mathrm{span}\langle F \rangle \cap \mathbb{Z}^{m_\ell}) = \mathbb{Z}^{m_\ell}$, and
- the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F_i & \xrightarrow{\alpha_i} & C_\ell \\ & \searrow L & \uparrow \alpha_\ell \\ & & X_\ell . \end{array}$$

The cell C_ℓ is called a *stacky face* of C_i .

- (SF4) For each pair i, j ,

$$C_i \cap C_j = C_{\ell_1}^\circ \sqcup \dots \sqcup C_{\ell_t}^\circ ,$$

where $C_{\ell_1}^\circ, \dots, C_{\ell_t}^\circ$ are the (open) common stacky faces of C_i and C_j .

The stacky face relation imposes a partial ordering on the set of stacky faces. A cone X_i is *maximal* if the corresponding stacky face $C_i = \alpha(X_i)$ is a maximal element in that poset. The *dimension* of X is $d := \max\{m_i \mid i \in [k]\}$, and this coincides with the maximum taken over the maximal cones. Occasionally, we write $f_\ell = |\{i \in [k] \mid m_i = \ell\}|$, and $f(X) = (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_d)$, the *face vector* of X .

While we will need the above definition in this general form, the following special case is particularly relevant. A stacky fan X with cells $\{C_i\}$, where $i \in [k]$, is *simplicial* if additionally, for all $i \in [k]$:

- (SF5) $X_i = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m_i}$ is an orthant, and
- (SF6) G_i is a subgroup of the symmetric group $\mathrm{Sym}(m_i)$ acting on the unit vectors of \mathbb{R}^{m_i} .

The permutation action on the unit vectors uniquely extends to a \mathbb{Z} -linear action on each cone. To avoid cumbersome notation we employ the usual

cycle notation to describe the corresponding linear groups and their actions. Our groups always act on the left.

Stacky fans built from pointed cones with finite group actions are Hausdorff spaces; see, e.g., [21, Proposition 3.6]. In particular, this includes simplicial stacky fans. This also follows from [11, Corollary 2.1.13] as simplicial stacky fans are “ideal stacky fans” in the sense of loc. cit. Stacky fans form a subclass of “generalised cone complexes” which were introduced in [1]. We work with the slightly restricted definition of stacky fans since this encompasses the applications in which we are interested, and we shall employ the extra structure which it provides.

Remark 2.1. Since each cone contains the origin, a stacky fan is always contractible. Usually, we will be interested in the *link* (of the origin), which is defined as

$$\text{lk}(X) := \bigcup_{i=1}^k \alpha_i(X_i \cap H_i)$$

where $H_i = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i} \mid \sum x_\ell = 1\}$ is the affine hyperplane which intersects the orthant $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m_i}$ in the standard simplex $\Delta^{(m_i-1)}$.

The link of a simplicial stacky fan is a “symmetric Δ -complex” in the sense of [9]. Similarly we can define the link of an arbitrary stacky fan, arriving at a “symmetric CW-complex” in the sense of [2, Definition 2.1]. In general, these spaces have non-trivial topology.

Example 2.2. Consider two 3-dimensional simplicial cones $X_1 = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{(x,y,z)}$ and $X_2 = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{(u,v,w)}$ with actions of $G_1 = \text{Sym}\{x, y, z\} \cong \text{Sym}(3)$ and $G_2 = \langle (u \ v) \rangle \cong \text{Sym}(2)$. Both quotient spaces

$$X_1/G_1 \quad \text{and} \quad X_2/G_2$$

can be identified with their respective fundamental domains. We then glue the face of X_2 which was folded in half by G_2 to any face of X_1 ; note that $\text{Sym}(3)$ acts transitively on the set of facets of X_1 . Denote the resulting space by X . This is well defined since the restriction of the actions to these faces agree. See Figure 1 for a description of the cells and a picture of X . In this case, the link of X is also contractible. Its face vector reads $(2, 2, 2)$.

The main purpose of this article is to study polyhedral subloci of a stacky fan, $(X, \{X_i/G_i\})$. To this end we give an embedded version of the above definition. In order to keep the technicalities to a bare minimum we restrict our attention to the case where X is simplicial. This will reflect the situation of the moduli of planar tropical curves as in [6].

Definition 2.3. Suppose that for each $i \in [k]$ we have a polyhedral fan $P_i \subset X_i$ consisting of rational polyhedral cones P_i^j such that

- (E1) Each P_i is G_i -invariant. That is, the action of G_i on X_i permutes the cells of P_i .
- (E2) For each cell $P_i^j \in P_i$ lying in a stacky face of C_i , i.e., $\alpha_i(P_i^j) \subset C_\ell$, there exists j' such that

$$\alpha_i(P_i^j) = \alpha_\ell(P_\ell^{j'}) \ .$$




FIGURE 1. Cells and the link of the simplicial stacky fan X from Example 2.2.

We call $P = \bigcup_i \alpha_i(P_i)$ an *embedded stacky fan*. For brevity we write $P \subset X$.

Trivial examples of embedded stacky fans arise as restrictions to subsets of cones $\bigcup_{i \in I} X_i$ for any $I \subset [k]$.

Lemma 2.4. *An embedded stacky fan, with the induced group actions on the cells of the fans P_i , satisfies the axioms (SF1) through (SF4) of a stacky fan. Moreover, embedded stacky fans are Hausdorff spaces.*

Proof. For each orbit of cells $(G_i \cdot P_i^j)$, choose one representative, these representatives form the cells of the stacky fan structure on P . Then the group acting on each cell is given by the stabiliser $\text{Stab}_{G_i}(P_i^j)$. The axioms (SF1) and (SF2) follow immediately; the axioms (SF3) and (SF4) are a consequence of (E2). As simplicial stacky fans are Hausdorff spaces, an embedded stacky fan, which forms a closed subspace, is Hausdorff too. \square

We need the following technical result, which is standard. A short proof is indicated for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a polyhedral cone. Suppose that $\{C_i\}$ is a finite collection of cones contained in C . Then there exists a subdivision \tilde{C} of C such that each C_i is the union of cells of \tilde{C} .*

Proof. Consider a description of C and each C_i by inequalities and equalities. Combining all the resulting hyperplanes yields an arrangement, and we can take \tilde{C} to be the chamber complex. \square

The G_i -sweep of the polyhedral fan $P_i \subset X_i$ is the set

$$G_i \cdot P_i = \bigcup_{g \in G_i} g \cdot P_i ,$$

which is a finite union of polyhedral fans. It follows from Lemma 2.5 that the G_i -sweep of P_i admits a refinement as a polyhedral fan.

Example 2.6. Let $X_1 = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^6$ with coordinates x, y, z, u, v, w . Consider the group $G_1 \subset \text{Sym}(6)$ generated by the permutations $(u z)(v y)$ and $(w x)$.

Then consider the locus in X_1 defined by

$$w \leq x \leq 2w \ ,$$

which is a simplicial cone. Let $P_1 \subset X_1$ be its G_1 -sweep. Explicitly

$$P_1 = \{(x, y, \dots, w) \in X_1 \mid w \leq x \leq 2w\} \cup \{(x, y, \dots, w) \in X_1 \mid x \leq w \leq 2x\} \ ,$$

which is again a simplicial cone. We have $\alpha_1 : X_1 \rightarrow X = X_1/G_1$ and $P = \alpha_1(P_1)$. Then $P \subset X$ defines an embedded stacky fan.

3. BARYCENTRIC SUBDIVISIONS AND SYMMETRIC REFINEMENTS

Suppose that X is a simplicial stacky fan with cells given by $\alpha_i : X_i \rightarrow X_i/G_i \subset X$ for $i \in [k]$. A fundamental domain of the natural action of $\text{Sym}(m_i)$ on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m_i}$, up to closure, is the cone

$$(1) \quad \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m_i} \mid x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \dots \leq x_{m_i} \right\} \ ,$$

which is a chamber of the braid arrangement, which we write as \mathcal{B}_{m_i} . As before we may intersect the orthant $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m_i}$ with the hyperplane H_i to obtain the simplex $\Delta^{(m_i-1)}$, and in this way (1) corresponds to a facet of the barycentric subdivision.

Observation 3.1. For a simplicial stacky fan the groups G_i are subgroups of symmetric groups, whence fundamental domains in the link, up to closure, can be formed as unions of facets of the barycentric subdivision of $\Delta^{(m_i-1)}$.

For each $i \in [k]$ choose a fundamental domain $D_i \subset X_i$ for the G_i -action. Then, by Observation 3.1, we may assume that the closure $\overline{D_i}$ is a union of maximal cells in the barycentric subdivision of the cone X_i . The restriction

$$\alpha_i : \overline{D_i} \longrightarrow X_i/G_i$$

is surjective. Moreover, the translates $\{g \cdot \overline{D_i} \mid g \in G_i\}$ tile X_i . Intersecting each cone X_i with the braid arrangement \mathcal{B}_{m_i} gives a refined stacky fan structure on the same space X . This is what we call the *barycentric subdivision* of X . See [1, Section 2.3] for this construction in the more general context of generalised cone complexes.

The *polyhedral atlas* of X is the collection of *charts*

$$\{(F, \alpha_F) \mid F \leq X_i, X_i \text{ maximal}\} \ ,$$

where we have a chart for every face F of each cone X_i , and $\alpha_F = \alpha_i|_F : F \rightarrow X$ is the restriction. We can consider the polyhedral atlas as a polyhedral complex by taking the disjoint union of each cell it contains. For instance, the polyhedral atlas of the 3-dimensional stacky fan in Example 2.2 has face vector $(6, 6, 2)$. Our algorithms below, which are polyhedral in nature, will be expressed in terms of the polyhedral atlas.

Furthermore, a *symmetric refinement* of X is a stacky fan structure on X which refines the barycentric subdivision and is invariant under the group actions. Explicitly, we have a refinement of each X_i which in each case refines the braid arrangement and each refinement is G_i -invariant. Since we insist on the braid arrangement condition, the invariance means that the group action permutes the cells of the refinement. Note that a symmetric refinement returns a polyhedral atlas for a stacky fan structure.

Remark 3.2. Consider an embedded stacky fan $P \subset X$, and suppose that $P_i^j \in P_i$ is contained in some barycentric subdivision cell. Then it is necessarily contained inside some fundamental domain for the G_i -action; cf. Observation 3.1. Thus the restriction

$$\alpha_i : P_i^j \cap X_i^\circ \longrightarrow X$$

is a homeomorphism onto its image.

We are now in a position to prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose that $P \subset X$ is an embedded stacky fan. Then there exist symmetric refinements \hat{X} and \hat{P} of X and P , respectively, such that $\hat{P} \subset \hat{X}$ is a subcomplex.*

Proof. First, for each $P_i \subset X_i$, refine each cell of P_i by the barycentric subdivision of X_i . We denote the barycentric subdivision \tilde{X} . Then each $P_i \subset X_i$ splits into polyhedral fans contained in each cell of the barycentric subdivision.

Pick a cone X_i and pick from the barycentric subdivision \tilde{X}_i one maximal dimensional cell. We denote this cell $\beta \in \tilde{X}_i$ and call it the *base*. Consider the dual graph $\Gamma(\tilde{X})$. Then β is a node in this graph.

A path between two nodes $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Gamma(\tilde{X})$ in the dual graph defines a projectivity in the sense of [14]. This extends to an affine isomorphism $\gamma : \sigma_1 \rightarrow \sigma_2$ by successive reflections along common facets. Since the barycentric subdivision is balanced, the affine isomorphism does not depend on the path connecting σ_1 and σ_2 ; cf. [14, Proposition 6].

Now, for each node $\sigma \in \Gamma(\tilde{X})$, choose a path to β and denote the resulting affine isomorphism $\gamma_\sigma : \sigma \rightarrow \beta$. Let P_σ be the restriction of P to σ ; this is a polyhedral fan with σ as its support. Then consider the family of fans

$$\{\gamma_\sigma(P_\sigma) \mid \sigma \in \Gamma(\tilde{X})\} \subset \beta .$$

We call the common refinement of β which results from Lemma 2.5 the *first overlay*, and map it back to each cell σ via γ_σ^{-1} . Consequently, each maximal cell in the barycentric subdivision of X_i is subdivided by a symmetric copy of the first overlay.

Now pick two cones such that X_j is a stacky face of X_i ; both are subdivided by their first overlays. Their preimages in the polyhedral atlas may intersect in a nontrivial face, and the induced subdivisions from the two first overlays may differ. In that face apply Lemma 2.5 to the common face and extend the common refinement to X_i and X_j , by refining further. Doing this for all pairs of cones gives the *second overlay*. This is what we take as \hat{X} , and this contains a subcomplex with P as its support; call that \hat{P} . \square

Remark 3.4. Notice that the proof of Theorem 3.3 is constructive. That algorithm has been implemented in `polymake` [13], employing the recent addition of hyperplane arrangements by Kastner and Panizzut [16].

Our overall goal is to provide a description of the embedding of a stacky fan into some simplicial stacky fan which is precise enough to allow to compute, e.g., the homology of the pair of the links of these spaces. Conceptually, Theorem 3.3 does the job already since it allows to extract the cellular

boundary matrices. In practice, this may be cumbersome and also prone to error, for the orientation information needs to be tracked carefully. It is computationally more convenient to stick with simplicial stacky fans, if possible; then the orientation is induced by a total ordering on the rays. One obvious solution is to triangulate the fans involved. The next two lemmas are again known.

Lemma 3.5. *Any polyhedral fan admits a triangulation, i.e., a refinement by a simplicial fan.*

Proof. Collect all the rays of the fan, and impose a linear order, O . Triangulate each cone C by placing the rays of C according to the order induced by O ; see [12, Lemma 4.3.2]. This gives a triangulation of the entire fan as the induced triangulation on any face is again the placing triangulation with respect to the induced ordering. \square

Lemma 3.6. *Let $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a polyhedral cone. Suppose that $\{C_i\}$ is a finite collection of cones contained in C . Then there exists a triangulation \tilde{C} of C such that each C_i is the union of simplicial cones in \tilde{C} .*

Proof. This follows from Lemma 2.5 and Lemma 3.5. \square

By combining all of the above we arrive at the following.

Corollary 3.7. *Suppose that $P \subset X$ is an embedded stacky fan. Then there exist symmetric triangulations \hat{X} and \hat{P} of X and P , respectively, such that $\hat{P} \subset \hat{X}$ is a subfan.*

The price to pay for this brute-force approach is the large number of cells to be expected from the triangulation procedure. In the next section we shall introduce a different idea.

4. SYMMETRIC CROSSCUTS

In this section we pass from cones to polytopes and from fans to polyhedral complexes, by dehomogenisation. On the level of stacky fans this means that we deal with their links instead. This is the natural setting for studying topological aspects. We start out by reviewing a standard construction from combinatorial topology.

Let Σ be a polytopal complex, i.e., a polyhedral complex where each cell is bounded. Its set of vertices $V = \Sigma_0$ is finite. The abstract simplicial complex

$$(2) \quad \Gamma(\Sigma) = \{C_0 \mid C \text{ cell of } \Sigma\} \subset 2^V$$

with vertex set V is the *crosscut complex* of Σ ; here $C_0 \subset V$ is the set of vertices of C . In general, $\Gamma(\Sigma)$ is not pure.

Proposition 4.1 (Crosscut Theorem [20, Theorem 3], [4, Theorem 10.8]). *The crosscut complex $\Gamma(\Sigma)$ and the polytopal complex Σ are homotopy equivalent.*

While the crosscut theorem holds in greater generality, the above special case suits our purposes. Our next goal is a version for stacky fans.

Suppose that $P \subset X$ is an embedded stacky fan. We denote the link by $\text{lk}(P) \subset \text{lk}(X)$. We describe how to construct a symmetric Δ -complex which is homotopy equivalent to $\text{lk}(P)$. In view of Observation 3.1 we will always assume that each cell of $P_i \subset X_i$ lies in one cell of the barycentric subdivision.

We consider the polyhedral atlas $\{(F_i^j, \alpha_i^j) \mid F_i^j \subset X_i, X_i \text{ maximal}\}$ of X , where the link of each cone F_i^j is a polytope contained in the link of X_i , which is a simplex. Since P is a stacky fan in its own right, it also has a polyhedral atlas $\{(E_i^j, \beta_i^j) \mid E_i^j \subset P_i, P_i \text{ maximal}\}$, and each polytope $\text{lk}(E_i^j)$ is contained in some polytope $\text{lk}(F)$, with F an element in the polyhedral atlas of X . Each $\text{lk}(P_i)$ is a polytopal complex, and so its crosscut complex $\Gamma(\text{lk}(P_i))$ is a simplicial complex. By Theorem 3.3 we may assume that P_i is a subcomplex of \hat{X}_i , where \hat{X}_i is a polyhedral subdivision of X_i .

Since the polytopal complex $\text{lk}(P_i)$ is G_i -invariant, we have a well-defined action of G_i on the set of vertices of $\text{lk}(P_i)$. Denote the topological quotient

$$(3) \quad \Gamma_{G_i}(P_i) := \Gamma(\text{lk}(P_i)) / G_i .$$

Theorem 4.2. *We assume that each cell of $P_i \subset X_i$ lies in one cell of the barycentric subdivision, and P_i is a subcomplex of a subdivision \hat{X}_i of X_i . Then $\{\Gamma_{G_i}(P_i)\}$ forms a symmetric Δ -complex which is homotopy equivalent to the link of P .*

Proof. The action of G_i on P_i induces an action on the crosscut complex $\Gamma(\text{lk}(P_i))$ which permutes the simplices. We denote such a simplex Δ_i^j if it agrees with $\Gamma(\text{lk}(E_i^j))$; in that case $\text{lk}(E_i^j)$ is the image of Δ_i^j under a linear projection, γ_i^j , whose restriction to the vertices is a bijection. For each simplex Δ_i^j , the map $\beta_i^j \circ \gamma_i^j : \Delta_i^j \rightarrow P$ is the composition of the linear projection and the topological quotient.

To glue the $\Gamma_{G_i}(P_i)$ together we look to how the P_i intersect in X . Consider two cells $E_{i_1}^{j_1} \subset X_{i_1}$ and $E_{i_2}^{j_2} \subset X_{i_2}$ of the polyhedral atlas. If $\beta_{i_1}(E_{i_1}^{j_1}) \cap \beta_{i_2}(E_{i_2}^{j_2}) \neq \emptyset$, then both $E_{i_1}^{j_1}$ and $E_{i_2}^{j_2}$ lie on the boundary of X_{i_1} and X_{i_2} respectively.

Then $\alpha_{i_1}(X_{i_1}) \cap \alpha_{i_2}(X_{i_2}) \subset X$ is non-empty, and this intersection consists of a union of stacky faces. By Remark 3.2 both α_{i_1} and α_{i_2} are homeomorphisms when restricted to each $E_{i_1}^{j_1}$ and $E_{i_2}^{j_2}$. So we conclude that

$$\beta_{i_1}(E_{i_1}^{j_1}) \cap \beta_{i_2}(E_{i_2}^{j_2}) \subset C_k ,$$

lies in a single stacky face. Then applying Definition 2.3 we have an $E_k^\ell \subset X_k$ whose image in X is precisely this intersection. Moreover, E_k^ℓ is naturally identified with a face of both $E_{i_1}^{j_1}$ and $E_{i_2}^{j_2}$.

Thus we can glue the simplices lying over $\text{lk}(E_{i_1}^{j_1})$ and $\text{lk}(E_{i_2}^{j_2})$ via the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \Delta_{i_1}^{j_1} & \longleftarrow & \Delta_k^\ell & \longrightarrow & \Delta_{i_2}^{j_2} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{lk}(E_{i_1}^{j_1}) & \longleftarrow & \text{lk}(E_k^\ell) & \longrightarrow & \text{lk}(E_{i_2}^{j_2}) \end{array}$$

We denote the resulting symmetric Δ -complex $\Gamma(P)$.

Consider the maps $\alpha_i : X_i \rightarrow X$. As in Remark 3.2, for every cell of P the map

$$\alpha_i|_{P_i^j} : P_i^j \longrightarrow X$$

is a homeomorphism onto its image. In particular, the restriction to the link is a homeomorphism. Denote $U_i^j = \alpha_i(\text{lk}(P_i^j))$. Then $\{U_i^j\}_{i,j}$ is a cover of $\text{lk}(P)$ by closed balls, intersecting in closed balls. From this set we choose a subset which still covers $\text{lk}(P)$ with no redundancies $\{U_1, \dots, U_m\}$ and denote $\{V_1, \dots, V_m\}$ the corresponding simplices in $\Gamma(P)$. The V_ℓ cover $\Gamma(P)$. Then each U_ℓ and V_ℓ is contractible and has the same intersection pattern. Thus the nerves $\mathcal{N}(U_\ell) \simeq \mathcal{N}(V_\ell)$ are homotopic. The claim now follows from the Nerve theorem [4, Theorem 10.7]. \square

We call the symmetric Δ -complex $\Gamma(P)$, whose cells are defined in (3), the *symmetric crosscut complex* of $\text{lk}(P)$.

Remark 4.3. The above construction suggests that we could also approach the topology of embedded stacky fans via intersection complexes. However, in order to study the actual embedding we keep the stacky structure of the ambient stacky fan.

We will use the following direct consequence of Theorem 4.2. Notice that, if P_i is a subcomplex of a subdivision \hat{X}_i of X_i , then $\Gamma(P) \rightarrow \Gamma(\hat{X})$ is an embedding of symmetric Δ -complexes.

Corollary 4.4. *Suppose that $P \subset X$ is an embedded stacky fan such that the conditions of Theorem 4.2 are satisfied. Then the induced maps on homology are the same*

$$(H_*(\text{lk}(P), \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H_*(\text{lk}(X), \mathbb{Z})) = \left(H_*(\Gamma(P), \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H_*(\Gamma(\hat{X}), \mathbb{Z}) \right) .$$

5. TROPICAL CURVES

Research on tropical curves started with Mikhalkin [18] who gave a combinatorial formula for the number of plane algebraic curves of given degree d and geometric genus g through $3d - 1 + g$ points in general position; this allows, e.g., for computing Gromov–Witten invariants of \mathbb{P}^2 . Mikhalkin’s idea was to transfer this problem to the analogous task in the tropical setting [18, Theorem 1]. In general, a smooth tropical curve of genus g is a trivalent metric graph on $2g - 2$ nodes with $3g - 3$ edges, which satisfies a certain “balancing condition”. The moduli of such curves are the lengths of these $3g - 3$ edges. Via this coordinatisation the tropical curves of fixed genus form a stacky fan, and the link corresponds to those curves whose total edge lengths is fixed to, say, one.

5.1. Moduli of plane tropical curves. Let \mathcal{C} be a tropical curve which is planar. Then \mathcal{C} is dual to a regular subdivision of its Newton polygon P . The tropical curve \mathcal{C} is *smooth* if that subdivision is a unimodular regular triangulation T . Those tropical curves which are not smooth arise from more general regular subdivisions of P or, equivalently, via degeneration from smooth tropical curves. Each edge of \mathcal{C} receives a well-defined lattice length from T and the coefficients of the tropical polynomial defining \mathcal{C} ; this




FIGURE 2. The five trivalent graphs of genus 3

yields the metric structure. The genus g of \mathcal{C} is the number of interior lattice points of P . The plane tropical curves of genus $g \leq 5$ have been classified by an extensive computation [6]; the list of graphs arising (without edge lengths) has been verified independently [15, Corollary 1]. For an algorithm to decide whether a given tropical curve is planar, see Birkmeyer, Gathmann and Schmitz [3].

We sketch the situation for genus $g \leq 2$, maintaining the notation from [6]. Genus 1 tropical curves are parameterised by the tropical j -invariant [17] which can be seen as a coordinate on

$$\mathbb{M}_1 = \mathbb{M}_1^{\text{pl}} = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} .$$

For $g = 2$, all algebraic curves are hyperelliptic and can be realised as a sextic curve in the weighted projective space $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 3)$. Tropically there are two trivalent graphs of genus 2 with automorphism groups $\text{Sym}(3)$ and $\text{Sym}(2)$ respectively, see [8, Figure 1] for a picture. The stacky fan structure of the moduli space is recovered as two 2-simplices glued together; this is exactly Example 2.2. Then almost all metric graphs of genus 2 are realisable as tropically smooth plane curves. Hence, in the closures, we have

$$\mathbb{M}_2 = \mathbb{M}_2^{\text{pl}} .$$

For the rest of this section we now assume $g = 3$; as before $\text{lk}(\mathbb{M})$ denotes the link of a stacky fan \mathbb{M} . The space $\text{lk}(\mathbb{M}_3)$ was shown to be homotopy equivalent to S^5 in [2, Theorem 1.2]. It consists of five maximal dimensional cells corresponding to the five trivalent graphs of genus 3; see Figure 2. In fact, the union of all cells of $\text{lk}(\mathbb{M}_3)$ other than the cell containing the K_4 -curves, namely $\text{lk}(\mathbb{M}_{K_4})$, is contractible. Subsequently it is shown that $\text{lk}(\mathbb{M}_{K_4})$ is homotopy equivalent to a sphere.

Non-hyperelliptic algebraic genus 3 curves are plane quartics. Analogously, all non-hyperelliptic smooth tropical plane curves of genus 3 are dual to triangulations of the simplex $T_4 = \text{conv}\{(0, 0), (4, 0), (0, 4)\}$. The locus of smooth tropical plane curves was computed in [6] as

$$\mathbb{M}_3^{\text{pl}} = \mathbb{M}_{T_4} \cup \mathbb{M}_{3, \text{hyp}}^{\text{pl}} .$$

Although $\dim \mathbb{M}_{T_4} = \dim \mathbb{M}_3 = 6$, the space \mathbb{M}_3^{pl} is not pure dimensional due to realisable metrics on (111). We present a version of the description of \mathbb{M}_3^{pl} from [6, Theorem 5.1].

Theorem 5.1. *A graph in \mathbb{M}_3 arises from a tropical plane quartic which lies in the closure of the smooth tropical plane quartics if and only if it is one of*

the first four graphs in Figure 2, with edge lengths satisfying the following, up to symmetry:

- (000) is realisable if and only if $\max\{x, y\} \leq u$, $\max\{x, z\} \leq v$ and $\max\{y, z\} \leq w$.
- (020) is realisable if and only if $v \leq u$, $y \leq z$, and $w + \max\{v, y\} \leq x$.
- (111) is realisable if and only if $w < x$ and

($v + w = x$ and $v \leq u$) or ($v + w \leq x \leq v + 3w$ and $v \leq u$) or

($v + 3w \leq x \leq v + 4w$ and $v \leq u \leq 3v/2$) or

($v + 3w \leq x \leq v + 4w$ and $2v = u$) or ($v + 4w \leq x \leq v + 5w$ and $v = u$) .

- (212) is realisable if and only if $w \leq x \leq 2w$.

One interesting feature of this moduli space is that the graph (303) does not appear in \mathbb{M}_3^{pl} ; it cannot be realised in \mathbb{R}^2 , not even as a non-smooth tropical curve.

Remark 5.2. The original statement [6, Theorem 5.1] is about the smooth locus, involving strict inequalities for the moduli. Here we take the closures, to obtain the compactification of the moduli space of smooth planar curves (at least when restricting to the links). We now sketch how to determine which curves are being added in taking the closure. The space \mathbb{M}_{T_4} is decomposed of linear images of the secondary cones of the (up to symmetry) 1278 unimodular triangulations of the 15 lattice points in T_4 ; cf. [6, Proposition 2.2]. An interior point in such a secondary cone actually corresponds to a unimodular (regular) triangulation, whereas points on the boundary yield more general (still regular) subdivisions. Consequently, the closure of the smooth locus in \mathbb{M}_{T_4} comprises of stable tropical curves which are not smooth. Passing from smooth curves to stable curves involves the marking of those interior lattice points which do not occur as the vertices of the dual regular subdivision. The combinatorial details can be read off [8, Figure 4], which shows the poset of the cell decomposition of \mathbb{M}_3 .

Proposition 5.3. *The link of the moduli cell associated to the skeleton (212), $\mathbb{M}_{212}^{\text{pl}} \subset \mathbb{M}_3^{\text{pl}}$, is contractible.*

Proof. In line with Theorem 5.1, consider the coordinates x, y, z, u, v, w on \mathbb{M}_{212} . The automorphism group $G = G_{212}$ is generated by $(u \ z)(v \ y)$ and $(w \ x)$. The link of \mathbb{M}_{212} is the quotient of the 5-dimensional simplex $\Delta = \text{conv}\{x, y, z, u, v, w\}$ by G . Then the locus of planar curves is the image of $\{w \leq x \leq 2w\} \subset \Delta$ under

$$q : \Delta \longrightarrow \Delta/G .$$

The sweep in Δ is hence equal to $\text{conv}\{y, z, u, v, \frac{1}{3}x + \frac{2}{3}w, \frac{2}{3}x + \frac{1}{3}w\}$, which we denote by Δ^{pl} . Thus the linear isomorphism

$$L : \mathbb{R}^6 \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^6$$

$$\begin{aligned} x &\longmapsto \frac{2}{3}x + \frac{1}{3}w \\ w &\longmapsto \frac{1}{3}x + \frac{2}{3}w \end{aligned}$$

is equivariant with respect to the G -action. So we have a homeomorphism $\mathbb{M}_{212}^{\text{pl}} \cong \mathbb{M}_{212}$ and in particular $\Delta^{\text{pl}} \cong \Delta$.

The group G contains the reflection $(w\ x)$, which exchanges a pair of parallel edges in the graph (212). Consequently, [2, Proposition 5.1] implies that $\partial\Delta/G$ is contractible; here the boundary $\partial\Delta$ is a 4-sphere. It then follows that $\text{lk}(\mathbb{M}_{212})$, and hence $\text{lk}(\mathbb{M}_{212}^{\text{pl}})$, is contractible. Furthermore, examining the Torelli diagram [8, Figure 4], we conclude that there exists a deformation retraction

$$\mathbb{M}_3^{\text{pl}} \rightarrow \left(\mathbb{M}_3^{\text{pl}} - \mathbb{M}_{212}^{\text{pl}} \right) ,$$

inducing a deformation retraction on the links. \square

The subsequent section describes the embedding of $\mathbb{M}_{000}^{\text{pl}}$ into \mathbb{M}_3 . The remaining two cells, corresponding to (020) and (111), have a more complicated structure, and this is beyond the scope of this article. In fact, despite an effort with the software `polymake` [13] [16], following the approach of Theorems 3.3 and 4.2, we were unable to determine the precise contribution of the tropical plane curves of type (111) to the stacky fan structure of \mathbb{M}_3^{pl} ; the computation seems to be too large for our current techniques.

5.2. Honeycombs and K_4 -curves. Fix an algebraically closed field K , complete with respect to a nontrivial nonarchimedean valuation. A K_4 -curve is a smooth algebraic curve over K whose Berkovich skeleton is a metric complete graph on 4 vertices; this is the type (000) in Figure 2 and Theorem 5.1. K_4 -curves, their tropicalisations and theta characteristics were the subject of a detailed study [10]. Such a curve \mathfrak{X} admits an embedding $\mathfrak{X} \subset \mathbb{P}_K^2$ as a smooth quartic whose special fibre at $t = 0$ is the union of four lines intersecting generically. The locus in the moduli stacky fan occupies a maximal dimensional cell $\mathbb{M}_{K_4} \subset \mathbb{M}_3$. Let us describe \mathbb{M}_{K_4} explicitly.

Let $X_1 = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^6$ and label the coordinates x, y, z, u, v, w . The group

$$(4) \quad G = \langle (u\ v)(y\ z), (v\ w)(x\ y), (v\ x)(w\ y) \rangle$$

is isomorphic to $\text{Sym}(4)$; yet, as the three generators are double transpositions, G is contained in the alternating group of degree six. Then we have

$$(5) \quad \mathbb{M}_{K_4} = X_1/G .$$

The *honeycomb curves* form the locus in \mathbb{M}_3 of tropically smooth K_4 plane curves. The name is derived from the ‘‘honeycomb triangulations’’; see the Section ‘‘Honeycombs’’ in [6]. By Theorem 5.1, case (000), the locus of honeycomb curves in \mathbb{M}_{K_4} is the polyhedral cone in X_1 defined by

$$\max\{x, y\} \leq u, \quad \max\{x, z\} \leq v \quad \text{and} \quad \max\{y, z\} \leq w .$$

We denote this locus by $P \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^6$ and, abiding by the terminology in [6], call P the *honeycomb cone*. Denote the G -sweep of P by $P' \subset X_1$. By intersecting each of the cones in the sweep we obtain a polyhedral complex, also denoted by P' . Let $q : X_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_{K_4}$ be the topological quotient, then $\mathbb{M}_{K_4}^{\text{pl}} := q(P') \subset \mathbb{M}_{K_4}$ is the honeycomb locus embedded into the moduli space of tropical K_4 curves.

A fundamental domain for $\mathbb{M}_{K_4}^{\text{pl}}$. The facets of the honeycomb cone P are given by hyperplanes of the braid arrangement. So P is a (convex) union of maximal cells of \mathcal{B}_6 . The rays of the braid arrangement correspond to subsets of the rays of the orthant $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^6$, which are labelled u, v, w, x, y, z . For instance, we can take $u \geq v \geq w$ as additional inequalities to obtain a fundamental domain of $\mathbb{M}_{K_4}^{\text{pl}}$ and denote it by D . This comprises one sixth of the honeycomb cone P .

The fundamental domain D is a six-dimensional pointed cone with f -vector $(11, 31, 39, 25, 8)$. Its eleven rays are

$$u, uv, uvw, uvwx, uvwz, uvwyz, uvwxz, uvwxy, \mathbf{1} ,$$

where $\mathbf{1} = uvwxyz$. The link of D is a 5-polytope, with the same combinatorics, and for which we use the same notation. That polytope is a pyramid with apex u ; the graph of D is shown in Figure 3. The base is a 4-polytope with f -vector $(10, 21, 18, 7)$. It decomposes into a prism with the two parallel facets

$$(6) \quad uv, uvw, \underline{uvwz}, \underline{uvwyz} \quad \text{and} \quad uvx, uvwx, \underline{uvwxz}, \underline{uvwxy}, \mathbf{1} .$$

Each of the latter is an Egyptian pyramid with apex uv and uvx , respectively.

Notice that the pyramid, with apex u , over each of the parallel Egyptian pyramids (6) corresponds to the union of two flags of length five in 5-dimensional simplex with vertices u, v, w, x, y, z . In each such flag exactly one of the underlined vertices occurs. It follows that D admits a triangulation into eight maximal cells of the barycentric subdivision corresponding to the maximal flags

$$\begin{aligned} u, uv, uvw, uvwz, uvwyz, \mathbf{1} & \quad u, uv, uvw, uvwy, uvwyz, \mathbf{1} \\ u, uv, uvx, uvwx, uvwxz, \mathbf{1} & \quad u, uv, uvx, uvwx, uvwxy, \mathbf{1} \\ u, uv, uvw, uvwx, uvwxy, \mathbf{1} & \quad u, uv, uvw, uvwx, uvwxz, \mathbf{1} \\ u, uv, uvw, uvwz, uvwxz, \mathbf{1} & \quad u, uv, uvw, uvwy, uvwxy, \mathbf{1} \end{aligned}$$

This necessitates that the 24 copies of D in the honeycomb sweep cover $24 \cdot 8 = 192$ maximal cells of the barycentric subdivision. This gives $192/720 = 4/15$ of the total volume, which agrees with [6, Corollary 5.2].

The stacky fan of genus 3 honeycomb curves. The stacky fan $\mathbb{M}_{K_4}^{\text{pl}}$ is obtained from D by gluing some faces together in a way dictated by the group action. In order to understand how they intersect, we take two faces of the same dimension and check whether the orbits intersect. The following is derived from a `polymake` [13] computation which can be found at [7].

Theorem 5.4. *The stacky fan $\mathbb{M}_{K_4}^{\text{pl}}$ of tropical honeycomb curves has face vector $(7, 18, 25, 21, 8)$, and its link has trivial homology.*

This is based on Theorem 3.3. As the fundamental domain D is formed from chambers of the braid arrangement, the first and second overlays are trivial to compute in this case. Applying the same procedure to the entire moduli cone \mathbb{M}_{K_4} , yields the homology of the 5-sphere; this agrees with [2, Theorem 1.2]. To conclude, and in view of the known results for genus $g = 1, 2$ and our partial results for $g = 3$, we ask the following.

- [11] CHAN, M., MELO, M., AND VIVIANI, F. Tropical Teichmüller and Siegel spaces. In *Algebraic and combinatorial aspects of tropical geometry*, vol. 589 of *Contemp. Math.* Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2013, pp. 45–85.
- [12] DE LOERA, J. A., RAMBAU, J., AND SANTOS, F. *Triangulations*, vol. 25 of *Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010. Structures for algorithms and applications.
- [13] GAWRILOW, E., AND JOSWIG, M. `polymake`: a framework for analyzing convex polytopes. In *Polytopes—combinatorics and computation (Oberwolfach, 1997)*, vol. 29 of *DMV Sem.* Birkhäuser, Basel, 2000, pp. 43–73.
- [14] JOSWIG, M. Projectivities in simplicial complexes and colorings of simple polytopes. *Math. Z.* *240*, 2 (2002), 243–259.
- [15] JOSWIG, M., AND TEWARI, A. K. Forbidden patterns in tropical plane curves. *Beiträge Algebra Geom.* (2020). Published online: 19 August 2020.
- [16] KASTNER, L., AND PANIZZUT, M. Hyperplane arrangements in `polymake`. In *Mathematical software – ICMS 2020* (2020), A. M. Bigatti, J. Carette, J. H. Davenport, M. Joswig, and T. de Wolff, Eds., vol. 12097 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 232–240.
- [17] KATZ, E., MARKWIG, H., AND MARKWIG, T. The tropical j -invariant. *LMS J. Comput. Math.* *12* (2009), 275–294.
- [18] MIKHALKIN, G. Enumerative tropical algebraic geometry in \mathbb{R}^2 . *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* *18*, 2 (2005), 313–377.
- [19] OLSSON, M. *Algebraic spaces and stacks*, vol. 62 of *American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2016.
- [20] ROTA, G.-C. On the foundations of combinatorial theory. I. Theory of Möbius functions. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete* *2* (1964), 340–368 (1964).
- [21] TOM DIECK, T. *Transformation groups*, vol. 8 of *De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics*. de Gruyter, 1987.

TU BERLIN, CHAIR OF DISCRETE MATHEMATICS/GEOMETRY
Email address: {bunnett, joswig}@math.tu-berlin.de