

A QUADRATIC ESTIMATION FOR THE KÜHNEL CONJECTURE ON EMBEDDINGS

S. DZHENZHER AND A. SKOPENKOV

ABSTRACT. The classical Heawood inequality states that if the complete graph K_n on n vertices is embeddable into the sphere with g handles, then $g \geq \frac{(n-3)(n-4)}{12}$. A higher-dimensional analogue of the Heawood inequality is the Kühnel conjecture. In a simplified form it states that *for every integer $k > 0$ there is $c_k > 0$ such that if the union of k -faces of n -simplex embeds into the connected sum of g copies of the Cartesian product $S^k \times S^k$ of two k -dimensional spheres, then $g \geq c_k n^{k+1}$* . For $k > 1$ only linear estimates were known. We present a quadratic estimate $g \geq c_k n^2$. The proof is based on beautiful and fruitful interplay between geometric topology, combinatorics and linear algebra.

MSC 2020: 57Q35, 15B99, 68R99, 55N45.

Keywords: Kühnel conjecture on embeddings, Heawood inequality, embedding, homology group, join of complexes, rank of matrix

CONTENTS

1. Introduction and main result	1
Main result	1
Relation to known results	3
Topological and linear algebraic parts	5
Embeddability modulo 2	7
Idea of proof and corollaries	8
2. Proofs of Theorem 1.5 and Lemma 1.7	9
Proof of Theorem 1.5 (Low Rank)	9
Proof of Lemma 1.7 (Non-triviality)	10
3. Appendix: proof of Theorem 1.5 (Low Rank) for $k = 1$	13
4. Appendix: simplicial embeddings and non-triviality	16
References	21

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULT

Main result. The classical Heawood inequality states that if the complete graph K_n on n vertices is embeddable into the sphere with g handles, then

$$g \geq \frac{(n-3)(n-4)}{12}.$$

Denote by

- Δ_n^k the union of k -dimensional faces of n -dimensional simplex;

We are grateful to R. Fulek, E. Kogan, R. Karasev, S. Melikhov, R. Nikkuni, and S. Zhilina for useful discussions.

- S_g the connected sum of g copies of the Cartesian product $S^k \times S^k$ of two k -dimensional spheres.

A higher-dimensional analogue of the Heawood inequality is the Kühnel conjecture on embeddings [Ku94, Conjecture B], cf. Remark 1.3.a. In a simplified form it states that *for every integer $k > 0$ there is $c_k > 0$ such that if Δ_n^k embeds into S_g , then*

$$g \geq c_k n^{k+1}.$$

We present the following quadratic estimate.

Notation and conventions. From now on we shorten ‘ s -dimensional’ to just ‘ s ’.

In this text a manifold may have non-empty boundary.

For a simple accessible to non-specialists definition of a homology group $H_k(\cdot; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ see [IF, §2], [Sk20, §6, §10]. For a $2k$ -manifold M let

$$\beta_k(M) := \dim H_k(M; \mathbb{Z}_2).$$

(This is called the k -th mod 2 Betti number of M . Observe that $\beta_1(S_g) = 2g$.)

In this text references to remarks could be ignored for the first reading.

Unless otherwise specified, we work in the piecewise linear (PL) category, which we omit from statements, definitions and proofs; we consider only PL manifolds and maps. The analogues of our results are correct for topological embeddings (Remark 1.3.b), for almost embeddings (defined and discussed in Remark 1.3.c), and for \mathbb{Z}_2 -embeddings (defined before Theorem 1.8 (Embeddability mod 2)).

Theorem 1.1 (Skeleton). *If Δ_n^k embeds into a $2k$ -manifold M , then*

$$\beta_k(M) \gtrsim \frac{n^2}{2^k(k+1)^2} \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

(more precisely, $\geq \frac{(n-4k-2)^2}{2^k(k+1)^2}$ for $n \geq 5k+3$).

Denote $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Let $[n]^{*k+1}$ be the k -complex with vertex set $[k+1] \times [n]$, in which every $k+1$ vertices from different lines span a k -face. For $k=1$ this is the complete bipartite graph $K_{n,n}$. For geometric interpretation see [Ma03, Proposition 4.2.4].

Theorem 1.2 (Joinpower). *If $[n]^{*k+1}$ embeds into a $2k$ -manifold M , then*

$$\beta_k(M) \gtrsim \frac{n^2}{2^k} \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

(more precisely, $\geq \frac{(n-3)^2}{2^k}$ for $n \geq 4$).

Theorem 1.1 (Skeleton) follows from Theorem 1.2 (Joinpower) because¹ $\Delta_n^k \supset [s]^{*k+1}$ for some $s \geq \frac{n-k+1}{k+1}$.

¹Observe that vice versa $K = [n] * \left[\binom{n}{2}\right] * \dots * \left[\binom{n}{k+1}\right]$ contains a subdivision of Δ_n^k (where K is a complex with set $1 \times [n] \sqcup 2 \times \left[\binom{n}{2}\right] \sqcup \dots \sqcup (k+1) \times \left[\binom{n}{k+1}\right]$ of vertices; its k -faces are $\{(i, a_i)\}_{i \in [k+1]}$ for $a_i \in \left[\binom{n}{i}\right]$). In order to prove this take a baricentric subdivision of Δ_n^k . Then every vertex (i, a_i) of K corresponds to the barycenter of some i -face of Δ_n^k .

Relation to known results. For a $2k$ -manifold M into which Δ_n^k can be embedded the linear estimate $\beta_k(M) \geq \frac{n-2k-1}{k+1}$ is proved in [PT19] (after a weaker linear estimate of [GMP+]); see [KS21] for a simpler exposition.

For $k = 1$ Theorem 1.1 (Skeleton) (and the linear estimates above) follows from the Heawood inequality at the beginning of §1; Theorem 1.2 (Joinpower) is also due to Heawood. The usual proof of the Heawood inequality via Euler inequality does not work for $k > 1$.

Remark 1.3. (a) **The Kühnel conjecture on embeddings** [Ku94, Conjecture B] states that if Δ_n^k embeds into a $(k-1)$ -connected closed $2k$ -manifold M , then

$$\binom{2k+1}{k+1} |\chi(M) - 2| \geq \binom{n-k-1}{k+1}.$$

Different authors have considered stronger conjectures, in which M is not $(k-1)$ -connected, and $|\chi(M) - 2|$ is replaced either by $\beta_k(M)$ [GMP+, PT19], or by the k -th rational/integer Betti number

$$b_k(M) := \dim H_k(M; \mathbb{Q}) = \text{rk } H_k(M; \mathbb{Z})$$

[Ad18, Remark 4.9], cf. item (d). We have

- $\beta_1(M) = b_1(M) = 2 - \chi(M)$ for a closed connected 2-manifold M ,
- $\beta_k(M) = b_k(M) = |\chi(M) - 2|$ for a closed $(k-1)$ -connected $2k$ -manifold M , and
- $\beta_k(M) \geq b_k(M)$ by the Universal Coefficients Formula, see e.g. [Sk, Theorem 11.8.1].

(b) In the Kühnel conjecture on embeddings the PL and the topological cases are equivalent for $k \geq 3$ by the PL approximation theorem [Br72, Theorem 1] (in fact, weaker ‘metastable’ versions of this result cited in [Br72] are sufficient).

(c) A map $f: K \rightarrow M$ is called an *almost embedding* if $f\sigma \cap f\tau = \emptyset$ for any vertex-disjoint faces σ, τ . See some motivations in [Sk, Remark 6.7.5]. Clearly, the property of being an almost embedding is preserved under sufficiently small perturbation of the map (as opposed to the property of being an embedding). Thus by approximation of continuous maps with PL maps we observe that

- PL almost embeddability is equivalent to topological almost embeddability;
- topological embeddability implies PL almost embeddability.

For $k \geq 3$ the Kühnel conjecture on embeddings is equivalent to the analogous conjecture on almost embeddings because for $k \geq 3$ almost embeddability of a k -complex to a $2k$ -manifold implies PL embeddability [PT19, Proposition 7].² The analogue of this result for $k = 2$ is false [SSS], and for $k = 1$ is unknown, cf. [FPS] and the references therein.

(d) **The Kühnel conjecture on simplicial embeddings.** If some triangulation of a $2k$ -manifold M has a subcomplex isomorphic to Δ_n^k , then for n large comparative to k

$$\binom{2k+1}{k+1} b_k(M) \geq \binom{n-k-1}{k+1}.$$

(e) Conjecture (d) is stated as a result in [Ad18, Remark 4.9]. That statement has a slightly different form, a typo (‘ n vertices’ should be changed to ‘ $n+1$ vertices’, see (a)), and missing ‘for n large comparative to k ’: ‘... if a complete k -dimensional complex on

²This result, although not explicitly stated in [Ha69], follows by [Ha69, Corollary 4 and its proof], cf. [Ha69, Corollary 6 and the third paragraph after Corollary 5] and [We67, Théorème 3]. This result also follows by the PL analogue [KS21e, Lemma 2.3.4] of piecewise-smooth results from [Jo02]. Observe that this analogue is simpler than [PT19, Theorem 6] used for [PT19, Proposition 7], and is essentially known before [PT19, KS21e] as explained in [KS21e, Remark 2.3.3].

n vertices embeds into M sufficiently tamely (so that it extends to a triangulation of M), then $\binom{n-k-1}{k+1} \leq \binom{2k+1}{k+1} b_k(M)$.³

We write ‘conjecture’ not ‘theorem’ (in (d) and in Remark 4.1.a) because we do not share responsibility for the statements to be correct, see footnote 16.

Conjecture (d) is deduced in Remark 4.1.b from the conjecture of Remark 4.1.a. This deduction is a clarification of ‘*implies at once*’ from [Ad18, Remark 4.9] (which was not clear to us and could be not clear to others); we do not to question K. Adiprasito’s priority for the deduction.

(f) **Conjecture.** *If a simplicial complex PL embeds into a PL manifold M , then the triangulation of the image under the embedding extends to a triangulation of M (i.e. then some triangulation of M has a subcomplex isomorphic to the complex).*

The Kühnel conjecture on PL embeddings (a) for n large comparative to k follows from this conjecture and Conjecture (d). We are grateful to K. Adiprasito, S. Melikhov, P. Patak, B. Sanderson and M. Tancer, e-mail exchange with whom helped us co conclude that this conjecture is open at the moment (and so was open in 2022 when first versions of this paper appeared on arXiv).³

There are complexes PL embeddable into \mathbb{R}^d but not *linearly* embeddable into \mathbb{R}^d (i.e. complexes for which there are no embedding such that the image of any face is a simplex) [vK41, PW]. It would be interesting to know if these complexes K are not *simplicially* embeddable into \mathbb{R}^d (i.e. if there are no triangulations of \mathbb{R}^d having a subcomplex isomorphic to K), thus giving counterexamples to Conjecture (f).

(g) For a short description of references on embeddability of k -complexes into $2k$ -manifolds see [KS21e, Remark 1.1.1.b]. There are algebraic criteria for such embeddability, due to Harris-Krushkal-Johnson-Paták-Tancer-Kogan-Skopenkov, see [KS21e, §1] and the references therein. Theorem 1.1 (and Theorem 1.2) is non-trivial in spite of the existence of

³Thus the Kühnel conjecture on PL embeddings (a) is not proved in (or does not easily follow from) the unpublished paper [Ad18] (even assuming that Conjecture (d) is a theorem proved in [Ad18]). This contradicts a referee report we received (but is confirmed by [PT19, Proposition 7, Theorem 1]). In [Ad18] the Kühnel conjecture is mentioned only in [Ad18, Section 1.6, (1)] (which concerns a different Kühnel conjecture [Ku94, Conjecture C]), and in [Ad18, Remark 4.9] (which claims (d) but not (f); see also footnote 17).

At the end of Remark 1.1 from [Ad18] one reads: ‘*The case of arbitrary topological embeddings therefore remains open*’. This phrase possibly mislead a referee of our paper, because even the case of arbitrary PL embeddings remains open (indeed, that Remark 1.1 concerns ‘*embeddings as subcomplexes*’ not PL embeddings; see also footnote 16).

In order to avoid confusion, here we present our April 14, 2024 letter to K. Adiprasito.

Dear Karim,

We wish you all the best for proving Conjecture 4.1.a (for $2k$ -manifolds M non-embeddable into \mathbb{R}^{2k+1}) and Conjecture 1.3.f from our paper attached. This would be an outstanding result of yours, because this would imply the Kühnel conjecture on embeddings (except topological embeddings for $k=2$). We would be glad to refer in our paper to arXiv update of [Ad18], or to a new arXiv paper. We encourage you to put your paper on arXiv whenever you feel your text is ready for praise and for criticism.

In our opinion, making a claim for Conjecture 1.3.f upon the text you sent us on April 6, 2024 will jeopardize your reputation. You will presumably realize this by critical reading of your text, so there is no need to send you our specific critical remarks (also, your letter does not ask for them). However, we would be glad to present critical remarks to (or praise) any text publicly available on arXiv, and relevant to our paper. ArXiv publication (which could never be completely removed) allows one to bear responsibility for a claim, which is necessary for development of mathematics. So in order to avoid confusion, unfortunately we would have to delete without reading your letters making a claim for Conjecture 1.3.f. But we would feel obliged to publicly react to an arXiv update of [Ad18], or to a new arXiv paper making such a claim.

Best wishes, Arkadiy, Slava.

these criteria and Remark 1.9.b. The criterion of [KS21e] shows that such embeddability is closely related to the low rank matrix completion problem [FK19, KS21e] (and thus to the Netflix problem from machine learning). This is the problem of minimizing the rank of a matrix, of whose entries some are fixed, and the other can be changed (see [DGN+] for an introduction accessible to students). Our proof of Theorem 1.2 (Joinpower) is also related to this problem. We study a more general problem, in which instead of knowing specific matrix elements, we know linear relations on such elements. We estimate the minimal rank of matrices with such relations (Theorem 1.5).

(h) Our attempts to improve Theorem 1.1 (Skeleton) lead us to a guess that the Kühnel conjecture $g \geq c_k n^{k+1}$ is incorrect. For a disproof, the paper [SS23] could be useful.

(i) Obstructions to embeddability constructed in this paper are presumably complete, see [SS23, Conjecture 1.6.b]. If so, then (dis)proof of the Kühnel conjecture on embeddings would require algebraic technique very different from the one used for simplicial embeddings, see (d,e).

The Heawood inequality has the following equivalent restatement: *if the sphere with g handles has a triangulation on n vertices, then $g \geq \frac{(n-3)(n-4)}{12}$* . The following generalization is the Kühnel conjecture on triangulations: *if a closed $2k$ -manifold M has a triangulation on $n+1$ vertices, then the opposite to the inequality of Remark 1.3.a holds* [Ku94, Conjecture C], [Ku95, Conjecture B]. This is proved in [NS09, Theorem 4.4 and inequality (11) before].

For a related Kühnel conjecture on triangulations see [Ku95, Conjecture C]. The latter conjecture implies that *if there is an embedding $\Delta_n^k \rightarrow M$ extendable to a triangulation of M without adding new vertices, then the opposite to the inequality of Remark 1.3.a holds*. (Indeed, then M embeds into Δ_n^n , so [Ku94, Conjecture C] can be applied.) This is a version of the Kühnel conjecture on embeddings under the stronger restriction, and with the opposite inequality in the conclusion.

For yet another Kühnel conjectures on polyhedral $2k$ -submanifolds of \mathbb{R}^n see [Ku94, Conjecture A], [Ku95, Conjecture A].

Topological and linear algebraic parts. Our theoretical achievement allowing to prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 is to fit what we can prove in topology to what is sufficient for algebra. Thus our main idea is the notion of an (n, k) -matrix, whose definition is postponed until after Remark 1.6. Before we introduce the definition, we show how it works. Theorem 1.2 (Joinpower) is implied by the following Theorems 1.4 (Embeddability) and 1.5 (Low Rank). Thus the proof is split into two independent parts.

Theorem 1.4 (Embeddability). *If $[n]^{*k+1}$ embeds into a $2k$ -manifold M , then there is an (n, k) -matrix of rank at most $\beta_k(M)$.*

Theorem 1.5 (Low Rank; proved in §2). *For $n \geq 4$ the rank of any (n, k) -matrix is at least $(n-3)^2/2^k$.*

Denote by \cap_M the mod 2 algebraic intersection of k -cycles on a $2k$ -manifold M ; for a simple accessible to non-specialists definition see [IF, §2], [Sk20, §10], [KS21e, §1.2].

Denote by \oplus the mod 2 sum of sets.

Remark 1.6. Here we motivate by low-dimensional examples the definition of an $(n, 1)$ -matrix (to be introduced later), and Theorem 1.4 (Embeddability).

Let M be a 2-manifold, and $f: [n]^{*2} = K_{n,n} \rightarrow M$ a map. For $a \in [n]$ let a, a' be vertices of $K_{n,n}$ from different parts. For 2-element subsets $P_1 = \{a, b\}$ and $P_2 = \{u, v\}$ of $[n]$

denote by $P = P_1 * P_2 := au'bv'$ the (set of edges of the) cycle of length 4 in $K_{n,n}$. For such cycles P, Q denote

$$A_{P,Q} = A(f)_{P,Q} := f(P) \cap_M f(Q) \in \mathbb{Z}_2.$$

The obtained square matrix A is symmetric. The matrix A is the Gram matrix (with respect to \cap_M) of some homology classes in $H_1(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Hence $\dim H_1(M; \mathbb{Z}_2) \geq \text{rk } A$.

If f is an embedding then the following properties hold for any cycles $P, Q \subset K_{n,n}$ of length 4 (for additivity it is not required that f is an embedding):

(*independence*) $A_{P,Q} = 0$ if P and Q are vertex-disjoint;

(*additivity*) $A_{P,Q} = A_{X,Q} + A_{Y,Q}$ if⁴ $X, Y \subset K_{n,n}$ are cycles of length 4 and $P = X \oplus Y$;

(*non-triviality*) if $\{P, Q\}, \{P', Q'\}$ are the two different unordered pairs of cycles of length 4 in $K_{3,3} \subset K_{n,n}$ such that $P \cap Q = P' \cap Q'$ is the edge $11'$, then $SA := A_{P,Q} + A_{P',Q'} = 1$; in other words,

$$SA = A_{\{1,2\}*\{1,2\}, \{1,3\}*\{1,3\}} + A_{\{1,2\}*\{1,3\}, \{1,3\}*\{1,2\}} = A_{11'22', 11'33'} + A_{11'23', 11'32'} = 1.$$

Independence and additivity clearly follow from properties of the mod 2 algebraic intersection of 1-cycles. Non-triviality is a reformulation of [FK19, Lemma 17], and is a version of the following result:

for any general position map of $K_{3,3}$ in the plane there is an odd number of intersection points of images of vertex-disjoint edges (cf. [KS21, Remark 1.3]).

This result is proved in [vK32, Satz 5] (for more general case; see an alternative proof as proof of Lemma 4.2), and is rediscovered in the Kleitman 1976 paper cited in [FK19, §5].

A symmetric, independent, additive, non-trivial matrix, whose rows correspond to cycles of length 4 in $K_{n,n}$, is called an $(n, 1)$ -matrix.

Now we move on to the definition of an (n, k) -matrix.

A **k -octahedron** is the set of k -faces of a subcomplex (of $[n]^{*k+1}$) isomorphic⁵ to $[2]^{*k+1} \cong S^k$. For 2-element subsets $P_1, \dots, P_{k+1} \subset [n]$ such a subcomplex

$$P = P(P_1, \dots, P_{k+1}) = P_1 * \dots * P_{k+1}$$

is defined by the set $1 \times P_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup (k+1) \times P_{k+1}$ of its vertices. Its k -faces $a_1 * \dots * a_{k+1}$, $a_i \in P_i$, are spanned by vertices (i, a_i) .

Here and below we consider only matrices with entries in \mathbb{Z}_2 . The matrices are square, unless otherwise specified.

For a $2k$ -manifold M , a map $f: [n]^{*k+1} \rightarrow M$, and k -octahedra P, Q denote

$$A(f)_{P,Q} := f(P) \cap_M f(Q) \in \mathbb{Z}_2.$$

The obtained matrix $A(f)$ is symmetric. If f is an embedding then the matrix $A(f)$ has the following three properties (which define an (n, k) -matrix; for additivity it is not even required that f is an embedding).

Let A be a symmetric matrix whose rows and whose columns correspond to all k -octahedra.⁶

⁴The condition $P = X \oplus Y$ in additivity means that there is $i \in [2]$ such that $P_i = X_i \oplus Y_i$ and $P_{3-i} = X_{3-i} = Y_{3-i}$. Additivity holds, for example, for the cycles $X = [2] * \{u, v\}$, $Y = [2] * \{u, w\}$ and $P = [2] * \{v, w\}$.

⁵A k -octahedron is uniquely defined by a *parallelepiped* $P_1 \times \dots \times P_{k+1} \subset [n]^{k+1}$. So below one may work with parallelepipeds instead of k -octahedra. This is more convenient for formal statements (because parallelepipeds are simpler than k -octahedra), but less convenient for topological motivations. Everything that is said on the language of k -octahedra can be said on the dual language of parallelepipeds.

⁶Such matrix is a block matrix of size $\binom{n}{2}$, where each block is a block matrix of size $\binom{n}{2}$, etc.

The matrix A is said to be **independent** if for any k -octahedra P, Q

$$A_{P,Q} = 0 \text{ if } P \text{ and } Q \text{ are vertex-disjoint.}$$

It is obvious that $A(f)$ is independent.

The matrix A is said to be **additive** if for any k -octahedra P, Q

$$A_{P,Q} = A_{X,Q} + A_{Y,Q} \text{ if } P = X \oplus Y \text{ for some } k\text{-octahedra } X, Y.$$

The additivity⁷ of $A(f)$ holds since the mod 2 intersection \cap_M distributes over the mod 2 summation of k -cycles on M .

We shorten $\{1\}^{*k+1}$ to 1^{*k+1} .

The matrix A is said to be **non-trivial** if $SA = 1$, where SA is the sum of $A_{P,Q}$ over all unordered pairs $\{P, Q\}$ of k -octahedra from $[3]^{*k+1}$ such that $P \cap Q = 1^{*k+1}$.

As an example we give explicit formulas for SA (which are not used later). Denote $\bar{x} := \{1, x\}$ for $x \in \{2, 3\}$. Then

$$SA = A_{\{1,2\}, \{1,3\}} = A_{\bar{2}, \bar{3}}, \quad k = 0;$$

$$SA = A_{\bar{2} * \bar{2}, \bar{3} * \bar{3}} + A_{\bar{2} * \bar{3}, \bar{3} * \bar{2}}, \quad k = 1;$$

$$SA = A_{\bar{2} * \bar{2} * \bar{2}, \bar{3} * \bar{3} * \bar{3}} + A_{\bar{2} * \bar{3} * \bar{2}, \bar{3} * \bar{2} * \bar{3}} + A_{\bar{3} * \bar{2} * \bar{2}, \bar{2} * \bar{3} * \bar{3}} + A_{\bar{2} * \bar{2} * \bar{3}, \bar{3} * \bar{3} * \bar{2}}, \quad k = 2.$$

Lemma 1.7 (Non-triviality; proved in §2). *For any embedding $f: [n]^{*k+1} \rightarrow M$ to a $2k$ -manifold M the matrix $A(f)$ is non-trivial.*

A symmetric, independent, additive, non-trivial matrix is called an (n, k) -**matrix**.

Now the reader can read the proof of Theorem 1.5 (Low Rank) at the beginning of §2.

Proof of Theorem 1.4 modulo Lemma 1.7. Take any embedding $f: [n]^{*k+1} \rightarrow M$. The matrix $A(f)$ is the Gram matrix (with respect to \cap_M) of some homology classes in $H_k(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Hence $\text{rk } A(f) \leq \beta_k(M)$ by the following well-known result.

Let v_1, v_2, \dots, v_r be vectors in a linear space V over \mathbb{Z}_2 with a bilinear symmetric product. Then the rank of the Gram matrix of v_1, v_2, \dots, v_r does not exceed $\dim V$.

The matrix $A(f)$ is an (n, k) -matrix by Lemma 1.7 (Non-triviality). \square

Embeddability modulo 2. Our topological results (Theorems 1.1, 1.2 and 1.4) are correct under the weaker assumption of \mathbb{Z}_2 -embeddability (defined below). This holds by the following stronger version of Theorem 1.4 (Embeddability). (For a proof of non- \mathbb{Z}_2 -embeddability of graphs to 2-manifolds the Euler inequality does not work, as opposed to non-embeddability; methods of [FK19] do work.)

Denote by $h|_X$ the restriction of a map h to a set X .

Let M be a $2k$ -manifold, and K be a k -complex.

A map $f: K \rightarrow M$ is called a *general position map* if

- any vertex-disjoint faces the sum of whose dimensions is less than $2k$ have disjoint images,
- the restriction of f to any k -face has a finite set of self-intersection points,
- for any vertex-disjoint k -faces σ, τ
 - the set $f(\sigma) \cap f(\tau)$ is finite and is disjoint with self-intersections of $f|_\sigma$ and $f|_\tau$,

⁷The condition $P = X \oplus Y$ in additivity holds, for example, for k -octahedra X, Y such that $X_j = Y_j$ for $j \neq i$, and $|X_i \cap Y_i| = 1$, for some $i \in [k+1]$. Then $P = X_1 * \dots * X_{i-1} * (X_i \oplus Y_i) * X_{i+1} * \dots * X_{k+1}$. Presumably there are no other octahedra such that $P = X \oplus Y$.

- for any point from $f(\sigma) \cap f(\tau)$, and some small $(2k-1)$ -sphere S centered at this point, the intersections $S \cap f(\sigma)$ and $S \cap f(\tau)$ are $(k-1)$ -spheres having linking number ± 1 in S .

A general position map $f: K \rightarrow M$ is called a \mathbb{Z}_2 -embedding if $|f\sigma \cap f\tau|$ is even for any vertex-disjoint faces σ, τ .

Clearly, any almost embedding is a \mathbb{Z}_2 -embedding. Observe that \mathbb{Z}_2 -embeddability of k -complexes in \mathbb{R}^{2k} -manifolds does not imply almost embeddability (equivalent to PL embeddability for $k \geq 3$), even for $k \geq 3$ [Me06, Example 3.6].

Theorem 1.8 (Embeddability mod 2). *Let M be a closed $2k$ -manifold. Let Ω_M be*

- *the identity matrix of size $\beta_k(M)$ if there is $x \in H_k(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ such that $x \cap_M x = 1$, and*
- *the direct sum of $\beta_k(M)/2$ hyperbolic matrices $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, otherwise (it is known that $\beta_k(M)$ is even in the ‘otherwise’ case for closed manifolds).*

*If $[n]^{*k+1}$ has an almost embedding (or even a \mathbb{Z}_2 -embedding) to M , then there is an $\beta_k(M) \times \binom{n}{2}^{k+1}$ -matrix Y such that $Y^T \Omega_M Y$ is an (n, k) -matrix.*

Proof. Let $f: [n]^{*k+1} \rightarrow M$ be a \mathbb{Z}_2 -embedding. By [IF, Theorem 6.1] we may take a basis in $H_k(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ in which the matrix of \cap_M is Ω_M . Take as Y the $\beta_k(M) \times \binom{n}{2}^{k+1}$ -matrix whose columns are coordinates of k -octahedra in this basis. Then $Y^T \Omega_M Y = A(f)$. The matrix $A(f)$ is an (n, k) -matrix because

- the additivity is already proved after the definition;
- the independence holds since for any vertex-disjoint k -octahedra P, Q

$$A(f)_{P,Q} = fP \cap_M fQ = \sum_{(\sigma,\tau) \in P \times Q} |f\sigma \cap f\tau|_2 = 0;$$

- our proof of Lemma 1.7 (Non-triviality) works under the weaker assumption that f is a \mathbb{Z}_2 -embedding.

□

A converse is proved in [SS23]. It allows to reduce the modulo 2 Kühnel conjecture on embeddings to a purely algebraic problem.

Idea of proof and corollaries.

Remark 1.9 (Idea of proof and its relation to known proofs). (a) Our proof of Theorem 1.2 (Joinpower) is a higher-dimensional generalization of the case $k = 1$ proved in [FK19] (under the weaker assumption of \mathbb{Z}_2 -embeddability).

In particular, Theorems 1.4 and 1.8 (and thus the analogue of Lemma 1.7 (Non-triviality) for \mathbb{Z}_2 -embeddings) for $k = 1$ are implicitly proved in [FK19]. Theorem 1.5 (Low Rank) for $k = 1$ is also implicitly proved in [FK19, §4]. Neither of these results is explicitly stated in [FK19], so we present in §3 a detailed and well-structured proof of Theorem 1.5 (Low Rank) for $k = 1$.

Our explicit statements for $k = 1$ illustrate our new ideas which work for higher dimensions. We did not succeed in generalizing to higher dimensions Lemma 3.4 (Independence), which implicitly appeared in [FK19, §5]. So we observe that the additivity and the independence

- for $k = 1$ imply the property obtained in Lemma 3.4 (Independence), and
- are kept throughout our induction on k (see Lemma 2.1).

(b) Lemma 1.7 and Theorems 1.4 and 1.8 could be deduced using Lemma 2.3 (Combinatorial) from [KS21e, Lemma 2.3.1], see the deduction in Remark 4.3. The independence and the additivity of Theorems 1.4 and 1.8 are trivial (and so are easier than the deduction). We present in §2 a direct proof of Lemma 1.7, because such a proof is not very much longer than Remark 4.3, and because the paper [KS21e] is unpublished.

Lemma 1.7 (and the independence) is the analogue of [PT19, Proposition 16.C2 (and 16.C1)], [KS21, Lemma 1.5] for $[n]^{*k+1}$ instead of Δ_{2k+2}^k .

Lemma 1.7 for $k = 1$ is known [FK19, Lemma 17] (cf. the last paragraphs of Remark 1.6). The case $k = 1$ is easily reduced to a result on linking of points on the circle. For higher dimensions the corresponding linking results are cumbersome, see Remark 4.6, so we use a different approach.

Remark 1.10 (Corollaries). (a) Corollaries of Theorem 1.1 (or rather of its stronger form for \mathbb{Z}_2 -embeddings) are improved Radon type and (the following) Helly type results [PT19, Theorem 2 and Corollary 3] for set systems in $2k$ -manifolds.

Let M be a $2k$ -manifold and $r \geq (k+1)2^{k-1}\sqrt{\beta_k(M)} + 4k + 4$. Take a finite family of subsets of M such that

- *the intersection of any proper subfamily is either empty or k -connected;*
- *the intersection of any r -element subfamily is nonempty.*

Then the intersection of all members of the family is nonempty.

Deduction of this result from Theorem 1.1 (Skeleton) is analogous to deduction of [PT19, Theorem 2 and Corollary 3] from the linear estimate [PT19, Theorem 1].

(b) Theorem 1.1 (Skeleton) in a standard way gives lower estimation of *crossing number* of Δ_n^k . Given a general position map $\Delta_n^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2k}$ with minimal number of crossings, one eliminates any crossing by adding handle $S^k \times S^k$. So the crossing number of Δ_n^k is equal to the number of added handles, which is at least $\frac{n^2}{2^k(k+1)^2}$ by Theorem 1.1 (Skeleton).

2. PROOFS OF THEOREM 1.5 AND LEMMA 1.7

In order to grasp the main idea the reader may first check the following proofs for $k = 2$.

Proof of Theorem 1.5 (Low Rank). Proof of Theorem 1.5 is by induction. The base $k = 1$ is proved implicitly in [FK19, §4] and explicitly in §3 (for idea of the proof see Remark 1.9.a).

Denote by

$$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\binom{n}{2}^{k+1} \times \binom{n}{2}^{k+1}}$$

the set of matrices whose rows and columns are numerated by k -octahedra in $[n]^{*k+1}$.

Take any $A \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{\binom{n}{2}^{k+1} \times \binom{n}{2}^{k+1}}$. For each 2-element subsets $U, V \subset [n]$ define the k -coordinate block

$$A_{U,V} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{\binom{n}{2}^k \times \binom{n}{2}^k} \quad \text{by} \quad (A_{U,V})_{P,Q} := A_{U*P, V*Q} \quad \text{for } (k-1)\text{-octahedra } P, Q.$$

Denote $\bar{x} := \{1, x\}$ for $x > 1$.

Lemma 2.1 (Heredity; proved below). *Suppose that $n \geq 4$, $k \geq 1$ and A is an (n, k) -matrix. Then $A_{\bar{2}, \bar{3}} + A_{\bar{3}, \bar{2}}$ is an $(n, k-1)$ -matrix.*

Inductive step $k - 1 \rightarrow k$ in the proof of Theorem 1.5. Take an (n, k) -matrix A , and set $Z := A_{\bar{2}, \bar{3}} + A_{\bar{3}, \bar{2}}$. Then

$$\operatorname{rk} A \geq \frac{1}{2} (\operatorname{rk} A_{\bar{2}, \bar{3}} + \operatorname{rk} A_{\bar{3}, \bar{2}}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{rk} Z \geq \frac{(n-3)^2}{2^k}, \quad \text{where}$$

- the first inequality holds since $\operatorname{rk} A \geq \operatorname{rk} A_{U,V}$ for any U, V ,
- the second inequality holds by subadditivity of rank,
- the third inequality holds by Lemma 2.1 and the induction hypothesis applied to Z .

□

Proposition 2.2 (One-coordinate swap). *Suppose that $A \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{\binom{n}{2}^{k+1} \times \binom{n}{2}^{k+1}}$ is independent and additive. Suppose that two k -octahedra $P = P_1 * \dots * P_{k+1}$ and $Q = Q_1 * \dots * Q_{k+1}$ ‘have only one common vertex’, i.e. for some $i \in [k+1]$ we have $|P_i \cap Q_i| = 1$, and for any $j \neq i$ we have $P_j \cap Q_j = \emptyset$. Then $A_{P,Q} = A_{P',Q}$ for any k -octahedron $P' = P_1 * \dots * P_{i-1} * P'_i * P_{i+1} * \dots * P_{k+1}$ such that⁸ $P'_i \cap Q_i = P_i \cap Q_i$.*

Proof. For $P = P'$ this is a tautology. Otherwise the proposition follows since

$$A_{P,Q} = A_{P',Q} + A_{P \oplus P',Q} = A_{P',Q}, \quad \text{where}$$

- the first equality holds by the additivity of A ,
- the second equality holds by the independence of A , since the k -octahedra Q and $P \oplus P' = P_1 * \dots * P_{i-1} * (P_i \oplus P'_i) * P_{i+1} * \dots * P_{k+1}$ are vertex-disjoint.

□

Proof of Lemma 2.1. The additivity holds for $Z := A_{\bar{2}, \bar{3}} + A_{\bar{3}, \bar{2}}$ since it holds for $A_{\bar{2}, \bar{3}}$ and $A_{\bar{3}, \bar{2}}$.

The independence⁹ holds for Z and $n \geq 4$, since for vertex-disjoint $(k-1)$ -octahedra P, Q

$$A_{\bar{2}*P, \bar{3}*Q} = A_{\bar{4}*P, \bar{3}*Q} = A_{\bar{4}*P, \bar{2}*Q} = A_{\bar{3}*P, \bar{2}*Q},$$

where each equality holds by Proposition 2.2.

Since A is symmetric, we have $A_{\bar{2}*P, \bar{3}*Q} = A_{\bar{3}*Q, \bar{2}*P}$, i.e. $A_{\bar{3}, \bar{2}} = A_{\bar{2}, \bar{3}}^T$. Hence $Z = A_{\bar{2}, \bar{3}} + A_{\bar{2}, \bar{3}}^T$ is symmetric.

For any $l \in \{k-1, k\}$ denote by G_l the set of unordered pairs of l -octahedra from $[3]^{*l+1}$ whose intersection is 1^{*l+1} . The non-triviality holds for Z since

$$SZ = SA_{\bar{2}, \bar{3}} + SA_{\bar{3}, \bar{2}} = \sum_{\{P, Q\} \in G_{k-1}} (A_{\bar{2}*P, \bar{3}*Q} + A_{\bar{3}*P, \bar{2}*Q}) = \sum_{\{P', Q'\} \in G_k} A_{P', Q'} = 1,$$

where the last equality is the non-triviality of A .

□

Proof of Lemma 1.7 (Non-triviality). Denote by $|X|_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_2$ the parity of the number of elements in a finite set X .

Proof of Lemma 1.7. Recall that $\operatorname{Int} M$ is the interior of M . Denote by ∂x the boundary of x , where x is either a k -face or a $2k$ -ball. We may assume that $n = 3$.

The join [Ma03, §4.2] of s complexes is $(s-2)$ -connected [Ma03, Proposition 4.4.3]. So $[3]^{*k+1}$ is $(k-1)$ -connected. Let $L := ([3]^{*k+1})^{(k-1)}$ be the union of all those faces of $[3]^{*k+1}$ whose dimension is less than k . Then $f|_L$ is null-homotopic. Hence by the Borsuk

⁸One may say, P' shares with Q the same common vertex $P_i \cap Q_i$, and intersects P by the cone over common $(k-1)$ -octahedron.

⁹The independence does not hold for blocks $A_{\bar{2}, \bar{3}}$ and $A_{\bar{3}, \bar{2}}$ alone, only for their sum.

Homotopy Extension Theorem¹⁰ f is homotopic to a map $f'': [3]^{*k+1} \rightarrow M$ such that $f''L$ is a point. Take a $2k$ -ball $B \subset \text{Int } M$ such that $B \cap f''[3]^{*k+1} = f''L \in \partial B$. Then f'' (and so f) is homotopic to a general position map $f': [3]^{*k+1} \rightarrow M - \text{Int } B$ such that $f'L \subset \partial B$. By general position we may assume that $f'|_L$ is an embedding.¹¹

Define the map $g: [3]^{*k+1} \rightarrow B$ to be f' on L , and to be the cone map over $f'|_{\partial\sigma}$ with a vertex in $\text{Int } B$ on every k -face σ of $[3]^{*k+1}$. By proper choosing these vertices we may assume that g is a general position map. Then

$$\begin{aligned} SA(f) &\stackrel{(1)}{=} SA(f') \stackrel{(2)}{=} \sum_{\{P,Q\} \in G_k} f'P \cap_M f'Q \stackrel{(3)}{=} \sum_{\{P,Q\} \in G_k} (f'P \cup gP) \cap_M (f'Q \cup gQ) \stackrel{(4)}{=} \\ &\sum_{\{P,Q\} \in G_k} \sum_{\{\alpha,\beta\} \in [P \times Q]} (f'\alpha \cup g\alpha) \cap_M (f'\beta \cup g\beta) \stackrel{(5)}{=} \sum_{\{\alpha,\beta\} \in H} (f'\alpha \cup g\alpha) \cap_M (f'\beta \cup g\beta) \stackrel{(6)}{=} \\ &\sum_{\{\alpha,\beta\} \in H} |(f'\alpha \cup g\alpha) \cap (f'\beta \cup g\beta)|_2 \stackrel{(7)}{=} \sum_{\{\alpha,\beta\} \in H} (|f'\alpha \cap f'\beta|_2 + |g\alpha \cap g\beta|_2) \stackrel{(8)}{=} \sum_{\{\alpha,\beta\} \in H} |g\alpha \cap g\beta|_2 \stackrel{(9)}{=} 1. \end{aligned}$$

Here

- equality (1) holds since $SA(f)$ is independent of homotopy of f ;
- G_k is the set of unordered pairs of k -octahedra from $[3]^{*k+1}$ whose intersection is 1^{*k+1} ;
- equality (2) is the definition of $SA(f')$;
- equality (3) holds since gP and gQ are null-homologous;
- $[P \times Q]$ is the set¹² of pairs $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ formed by k -faces α, β of $[3]^{*k+1}$ such that either $\alpha \in P$ and $\beta \in Q$, or vice versa (note that $\alpha = \beta = 1^{*k+1}$ is possible);
- equality (4) holds since for any P, Q such that $\{P, Q\} \in G_k$ the formula $(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto \{\alpha, \beta\}$ gives the bijection $P \times Q \rightarrow [P \times Q]$;
- H is the set of all unordered pairs of vertex-disjoint k -faces of $[3]^{*k+1}$;
- equality (5) holds since $H = \bigoplus_{\{P,Q\} \in G_k} [P \times Q]$, which is reformulation of Lemma 2.3

(Combinatorial) below;

- equality (6) holds by definition of \cap_M since f', g are general position maps;
- equality (7) holds since $f'\alpha \cap g\beta = \emptyset$ for vertex-disjoint α, β ; this holds since $f'[3]^{*k+1} \subset M - \text{Int } B$, $g[3]^{*k+1} \subset B$, $f'|_L = g|_L$, and g is a general position map;
- equality (9) is the result of van Kampen [vK32, Satz 5] (see Lemma 4.2).

It remains to prove equality (8). For a general position map $h: [3]^{*k+1} \rightarrow M$ the *van Kampen number*

$$v(h) := \sum_{\{\alpha,\beta\} \in H} |h\alpha \cap h\beta|_2$$

is the parity of the number of all pairs $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ of vertex-disjoint k -faces of $[3]^{*k+1}$ such that $|h\alpha \cap h\beta|_2 = 1$. Then (8) holds since

$$v(f') = v(f) = 0.$$

¹⁰This theorem [FF89, §5.5] states that if (K, L) is a polyhedral pair, $Z \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, $F: L \times I \rightarrow Z$ is a homotopy, and $g: K \rightarrow Z$ is a map such that $g|_L = F|_{L \times 0}$, then F extends to a homotopy $G: K \times I \rightarrow Z$ such that $g = G|_{K \times 0}$.

¹¹Observe that f' is not necessarily an embedding or a \mathbb{Z}_2 -embedding. This argument is analogous to [PT19, Lemma 12], [KS21e, §2.3, beginning of proof of Lemma 2.3.1].

¹²Note that $[P \times Q]$ is the image of the torus $P \times Q$ under the projection to the quotient of $[3]^{*k+1} \times [3]^{*k+1}$ under the symmetry exchanging factors.

Here the second equality holds since f is an embedding. Let us present a fairly standard argument for the first equality.

For a general position map $h: [3]^{*k+1} \rightarrow M$ the *intersection cocycle* $\nu(h) \subset H$ is the set of all pairs $\{\sigma, \tau\}$ such that $|h\sigma \cap h\tau|_2 = 1$; so $v(h) = |\nu(h)|_2$. For vertex-disjoint $(k-1)$ -face e and k -face α the *elementary coboundary* of (α, e) is the set of all unordered pairs $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ of vertex-disjoint k -faces such that $e \subset \beta$. Since f' is homotopic to f , by [KS21e, Lemma 2.3.2] of van Kampen-Shapiro-Johnson, $\nu(f)$ and $\nu(f')$ are *cohomologous*, i.e. $\nu(f) \oplus \nu(f')$ is the mod 2 sum of some elementary coboundaries. For any $(k-1)$ -face $e = e_1 * \dots * e_{k+1}$ of $[3]^{*k+1}$ there is a unique $t(e) \in [k+1]$ such that $e_{t(e)} = \emptyset$. For a k -face α and a $(k-1)$ -face e the elementary coboundary of (α, e) consists of pairs $\{\alpha, \beta = \beta_1 * \dots * \beta_{k+1}\}$ such that $\beta_{t(e)} \neq \alpha_{t(e)}$ and $\beta_j = \alpha_j$ for every $j \neq t(e)$. Hence any elementary coboundary consists of two elements. Since the size of any elementary coboundary is even, $|\nu(f) \oplus \nu(f')|_2 = 0$. Hence $|\nu(f)|_2 = |\nu(f')|_2$. \square

Lemma 2.3 (Combinatorial). *The following two sets¹³ are equal:*

- the set of all ordered pairs (σ, τ) of vertex-disjoint k -faces of $[3]^{*k+1}$;
- the mod 2 sum of products $P \times Q$ over all ordered pairs (P, Q) of k -octahedra from $[3]^{*k+1}$ whose intersection is 1^{*k+1} .

Lemma 2.3 can be deduced from [KS21e, Proposition 2.5.4d], but we present a simpler direct proof below. The analogue of Lemma 2.3 for Δ_{2k+2}^k instead of $[3]^{*k+1}$ is the main idea of [PT19, Lemma 20], and is implicit in [PT19, proof of Lemma 20]; cf. [KS21, Proposition 2.2].

Proof of Lemma 2.3. It suffices to prove that

- (A) for any vertex-disjoint k -faces $\alpha, \beta \in [3]^{*k+1}$ there is exactly one ordered pair (P, Q) of k -octahedra from $[3]^{*k+1}$ such that $P \cap Q = 1^{*k+1}$ and $(\alpha, \beta) \in P \times Q$; and
- (B) for any k -faces $\alpha, \beta \in [3]^{*k+1}$ sharing a common vertex there is an even number of ordered pairs (P, Q) of k -octahedra from $[3]^{*k+1}$ such that $P \cap Q = 1^{*k+1}$ and $(\alpha, \beta) \in P \times Q$.

Proof of (A). Take any k -octahedra P, Q from $[3]^{*k+1}$ such that $P \cap Q = 1^{*k+1}$, $\alpha \in P$ and $\beta \in Q$. Take any $i \in [k+1]$. Let σ be the k -face of P opposite to 1^{*k+1} , and τ be the k -face of Q opposite to 1^{*k+1} .

Suppose that $\alpha_i \neq 1$. Since $\alpha \in P$, it follows that $\sigma_i = \alpha_i$. Since $P \cap Q = 1^{*k+1}$, we have $\tau_i = 5 - \sigma_i = 5 - \alpha_i$.

Suppose that $\alpha_i = 1$. Then $\beta_i \neq 1$. Hence $\tau_i = \beta_i$ and $\sigma_i = 5 - \beta_i$ analogously to the previous paragraph.

Hence the i -th coordinates σ_i and τ_i are uniquely defined for each $i \in [k+1]$. Thus there is exactly one pair (P, Q) from the statement of (A).

Proof of (B). Since α and β share a common vertex, we may assume that $\alpha_1 = \beta_1$ (the other cases are analogous).

Suppose that $\alpha_1 \neq 1$. Take any k -octahedra P, Q from $[3]^{*k+1}$ such that $P \cap Q = 1^{*k+1}$. Let σ be the k -face of P opposite to 1^{*k+1} , and τ be the k -face of Q opposite to 1^{*k+1} .

¹³On the dual language of parallelepipeds Lemma 2.3 states that the following two sets are equal:

- the set of all ordered pairs of vectors in $[3]^{k+1}$ such that the vectors have no equal components;
- the mod 2 sum of products $P \times Q$ over all ordered pairs (P, Q) of parallelepipeds whose intersection is $1^{\times k+1}$.

Since σ, τ are vertex-disjoint, we have $\sigma_1 \neq \tau_1$. Hence either $\sigma_1 \neq \alpha_1$ or $\tau_1 \neq \beta_1$. Then either $\alpha \notin P$ or $\beta \notin Q$. Thus $(\alpha, \beta) \notin P \times Q$.

Suppose that $\alpha_1 = 1$. For every k -octahedron $R = \overline{r_1} * \overline{r_2} * \dots * \overline{r_{k+1}} \subset [3]^{*k+1}$ denote $R' := \overline{5-r_1} * \overline{r_2} * \dots * \overline{r_{k+1}}$. Clearly, $(R')' = R$, and if $P \cap Q = 1^{*k+1}$, so $P' \cap Q' = 1^{*k+1}$. Thus the pairs (P, Q) from (B) split into couples corresponding to ‘opposite’ pairs (P, Q) and (P', Q') . Since $\alpha_1 = 1$, the k -face α is contained either in both P and P' or in none. Analogously for β . Then for every couple $\{(P, Q), (P', Q')\}$ the pair (α, β) is contained either in both $P \times Q$ and $P' \times Q'$ or in none. This implies (B). \square

3. APPENDIX: PROOF OF THEOREM 1.5 (LOW RANK) FOR $k = 1$

Here and below rows and columns of matrices are not necessarily numerated by octahedra (as opposed to §1,2).

For a (block) matrix X whose rows are numerated by $[\ell] \times [m]$, and any $i, j \in [\ell]$ define the $m \times m$ -block $X_{i,j}$ by $(X_{i,j})_{a,b} := X_{(i,a)(j,b)}$.

Denote by 0_m the zero $m \times m$ -matrix, and by J_m the $m \times m$ -matrix consisting of units.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose N is a matrix whose rows are numerated by $[\ell] \times [m]$, such that for every $i, j \in [\ell]$*

$$\begin{cases} N_{i,j} = 0_m, & i \leq j, \\ N_{i,j} \in \{0_m, J_m\}, & i > j. \end{cases}$$

Then $\text{rk } N \leq \ell - 1$.

Proof. Define the matrix F of size ℓ so that $F_{i,j} = 0$ if and only if $N_{i,j} = 0_m$. Clearly, $F_{i,j} = 0$ if $i \leq j$. Then the first row of F consists of zeros. Thus $\text{rk } N = \text{rk } F \leq \ell - 1$. \square

A matrix Y with \mathbb{Z}_2 -entries is said to be **tournament** if $Y_{a,b} + Y_{b,a} = 1$ for all $a \neq b$. In other words, Y is a tournament matrix if $Y + Y^T$ is the inversed identity matrix, i.e. the sum of the identity matrix and J_m , where m is the number of rows of Y .

Lemma 3.2 (Tournament; [Ca91, Theorem 1]). *The rank of a tournament $m \times m$ -matrix is at least $\frac{m-1}{2}$.*

Proof. For a tournament $m \times m$ -matrix Y

$$\text{rk } Y = \frac{\text{rk } Y + \text{rk } Y^T}{2} \geq \frac{\text{rk}(Y + Y^T)}{2} = \frac{\text{rk}(I_m + J_m)}{2} \geq \frac{\text{rk } I_m - \text{rk } J_m}{2} = \frac{m-1}{2},$$

where

- I_m is the identity matrix,
- the inequalities hold by subadditivity of rank,
- the middle equality holds since Y is a tournament matrix, so $Y + Y^T = I_m + J_m$. \square

Recall that

$$[m_1] \sqcup [m_2] \sqcup \dots \sqcup [m_\ell] = 1 \times [m_1] \sqcup 2 \times [m_2] \sqcup \dots \sqcup \ell \times [m_\ell],$$

so that the disjoint union of ℓ copies of $[m]$ is $[\ell] \times [m]$.

Take a (block) matrix X whose rows are numerated by $[m_1] \sqcup \dots \sqcup [m_\ell]$.

For $i, j \in [\ell]$ define the $m_i \times m_j$ -block $X_{i,j}$ by $(X_{i,j})_{a,b} := X_{(i,a)(j,b)}$.

The matrix X is said to be **tournament-like** if for every $i \in [\ell]$ the diagonal block $X_{i,i}$ is a tournament matrix.

The matrix X is said to be **diagonal-like** if it is obtained by removing some rows and columns symmetric to the rows, from a block matrix \tilde{X} with the following properties:

- its rows are numerated by $[\ell] \times [m]$,
- $m \geq m_i$ for every $i \in [\ell]$,
- the under-diagonal block $\tilde{X}_{i,j}$ is a diagonal matrix for every $i, j \in [\ell]$, $i > j$.

Lemma 3.3 (Diagonal-Tournament). *The rank of any tournament-like diagonal-like matrix of size $m_1 + \dots + m_\ell$ is at least¹⁴ $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{m_i - 1}{2}$.*

Proof. The simple case when there are no units in the under-diagonal blocks follows by Lemma 3.2 because all under-diagonal blocks are zero matrices.

The proof is by induction on $m_1 + \dots + m_\ell$. The base follows by the above simple case. Let us prove the inductive step in the case when there is a unit in the union of under-diagonal blocks. Denote by D the given matrix. Arrange the rows and the columns of D lexicographically¹⁵. Let (i, a) be the lexicographically maximal (i.e. the lowest) row whose intersection with the union of under-diagonal blocks of D is non-zero. Let (j, b) be the lexicographically minimal (i.e. the leftmost) column whose intersection with the row (i, a) is non-zero. Formally, (i, a) is the lexicographically maximal row such that there is

$$(j, b) \text{ for which } i > j, \quad D_{(i,a)(j,b)} = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad D_{(i,a)(j',b')} = 0 \quad \text{for all } (j', b') < (j, b).$$

(Note that by the choice of the row, $D_{(i',a')(j,b)} = 0$ for all $(i', a') > (i, a)$.)

Let D' be the matrix obtained from D by adding the row (i, a) to all other rows whose intersection with the column (j, b) is non-zero. Let D'' be the matrix obtained from D' by adding the column (j, b) to all other columns whose intersection with the row (i, a) is non-zero. In D'' the union of the row (i, a) and the column (j, b) contains only one unit, located at the intersection of these row and column.

Let D''' be the matrix obtained from D'' by removing the rows (i, a) , (j, b) , and the columns (i, a) , (j, b) . Then $D''' \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{([n_1] \sqcup \dots \sqcup [n_\ell])^2}$ for $n_i = m_i - 1$, $n_j = m_j - 1$, and $n_s = m_s$ for $s \notin \{i, j\}$, and D''' is a tournament-like diagonal-like matrix. Then by induction hypothesis

$$\text{rk } D \geq \text{rk } D''' + 1 \geq \sum_{s=1}^{\ell} \frac{n_s - 1}{2} + 1 = \sum_{s=1}^{\ell} \frac{m_s - 1}{2}.$$

□

Recall that $\bar{a} = \{1, a\}$ for $a > 1$.

For $A \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{\binom{n}{2} \times \binom{n}{2}}$ define the matrix

$$B = B(A) \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{[n-1]^2 \times [n-1]^2} \quad \text{by} \quad B_{(i,a)(j,b)} := A_{\overline{i+1*a+1}, \overline{j+1*b+1}}$$

(this notation helps to make a transition from all cycles of length 4 in $K_{n,n}$ to cycles containing the edge $(1, 1')$, and from matrices whose rows and columns are numerated by such cycles to block matrices).

Recall that an *inversed diagonal matrix* is the sum of some diagonal matrix and J_m .

¹⁴Proof of the corresponding Lemma 3.4 in arXiv versions 1 and 2 of this paper contains a minor gap. The gap is easily covered here. The gap is not present in [FK19], it appeared by our not enough careful exposition of that argument.

¹⁵By the lexicographic order we mean that (x, a) is lexicographically less than (y, b) if either $x < y$, or $x = y$ and $a < b$.

Lemma 3.4 (Independence). *Suppose that $n \geq 4$ and $A \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{\binom{n}{2} \times \binom{n}{2}}$ is independent and additive. Take $B = B(A)$. Then for any pairwise distinct $i, j, s \in [n-1]$ the residue $B_{(i,a)(j,b)} + B_{(s,a)(j,b)}$ does not depend on distinct $a, b \in [n-1]$. In other words, the sum $B_{i,j} + B_{s,j}$ of blocks is either a diagonal matrix or an inversed diagonal matrix.*

Proof. For fixed i, j, s denote

$$P(a) := \overline{i+1} * \overline{a+1} \oplus \overline{s+1} * \overline{a+1} = \{i+1, s+1\} * \overline{a+1}$$

and

$$Q(b) := \overline{j+1} * \overline{b+1}.$$

By the additivity,

$$B_{(i,a)(j,b)} + B_{(s,a)(j,b)} = A_{P(a), Q(b)}.$$

The residue $B_{(i,a)(j,b)} + B_{(s,a)(j,b)}$ does not depend on a since for any $a' \in [n-1]$ distinct from a and b

$$A_{P(a), Q(b)} = A_{P(a'), Q(b)}$$

by Proposition 2.2 (One-coordinate swap). Analogously the residue does not depend on b . Now, the residue does not depend on both a and b since $n-1 \geq 3$. \square

Lemma 3.5 (Pre-tournament-like). *Suppose that $n \geq 4$ and A is an $(n, 1)$ -matrix. Then for any $j > 1$ the off-diagonal block $B(A)_{1,j}$ is a tournament matrix.*

Proof. Denote $B := B(A)$. First, let us show that $B_{1,2}$ is a tournament matrix. Take the matrix $Z := A_{\overline{2}, \overline{3}} + A_{\overline{3}, \overline{2}}$, which is an $(n, 0)$ -matrix by Lemma 2.1 (Heredity). By the symmetry of A and Z it suffices to check that $Z_{\overline{x}, \overline{y}} = 1$ for any numbers $1 < x < y$. This follows since

$$Z_{\overline{x}, \overline{y}} = Z_{\overline{2}, \overline{y}} = Z_{\overline{2}, \overline{3}} = 1, \quad \text{where}$$

- each of the first and the second equalities is either a tautology or holds by Proposition 2.2 (One-coordinate swap),
- the last equality is the non-triviality of Z .

Now for any $j > 2$ the matrix $B_{1,2} + B_{1,j}$ is either a diagonal matrix or an inversed diagonal matrix, by the symmetry of B and Lemma 3.4. Then $B_{1,j}$ is a tournament matrix. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.5 for $k = 1$. Take $B = B(A)$. Define the matrix C whose rows are numerated by $[n-2] \times [n-1]$, by $C_{i,j} := B_{i+1, j+1} + B_{1, j+1}$, i.e. C is obtained from B by row addition and taking submatrix. By Lemma 3.4 (Independence), for every $i \neq j$ the block $C_{i,j}$ is either a diagonal matrix or an inversed diagonal matrix. Thus the following formula defines the matrix D of the same block structure as C : for $i, j \in [n-2]$

$$D_{i,j} := \begin{cases} C_{i,j}, & \text{if either } i \leq j \text{ or } C_{i,j} \text{ is a diagonal matrix;} \\ C_{i,j} + J_{n-1}, & \text{if both } i > j \text{ and } C_{i,j} \text{ is an inversed diagonal matrix.} \end{cases}$$

Now the theorem follows since

$$\text{rk } A \geq \text{rk } B \geq \text{rk } C \geq \text{rk } D - \text{rk}(C + D) \geq \frac{(n-2)^2}{2} - (n-3) \geq \frac{(n-3)^2}{2}.$$

Here

- the first and second inequalities follow by definition of B and C , respectively;
- the third inequality holds by subadditivity of rank;
- the last inequality is obvious.

The fourth inequality holds by Lemma 3.3 (Diagonal-Tournament) applied to D , $\ell = n - 2$ and $m_1 = \dots = m_\ell = n - 1$, and Lemma 3.1 applied to $D + C$, $\ell = n - 2$ and $m = n - 1$. It is obvious that the hypotheses of Lemma 3.1 are fulfilled for $D + C$. It remains to prove that the hypotheses of Lemma 3.3 (Diagonal-Tournament) are fulfilled for D .

Clearly, D is diagonal-like. We prove that D is tournament-like as follows. Take any $s \in [n - 2]$. By Lemma 3.5 for $j = s + 1$, the block $B_{1,s+1}$ is a tournament matrix. Since A is symmetric, $B_{s+1,s+1}$ is symmetric. Then $D_{s,s} = C_{s,s} = B_{s+1,s+1} + B_{1,s+1}$ is a tournament matrix. \square

Remark 3.6 (On generalization of linear algebraic properties). During the work with similar linear algebraic properties of (n, k) -matrices (e.g. Proposition 2.2, Lemma 3.4) we got the impression that probably there may be another simple property, which can help with the estimate $c_k n^{k+1}$. However, we did not succeed in obtaining it.

4. APPENDIX: SIMPLICIAL EMBEDDINGS AND NON-TRIVIALITY

Remark 4.1. For a complex Δ denote by $f_j = f_j(\Delta)$ the number of j -faces. Denote $\gamma = \gamma(\Delta) := f_k - (k + 2)f_{k-1}$.

(a) **Conjecture.**¹⁶ For any subcomplex Δ of any triangulation of any PL $2k$ -manifold M we have

$$\binom{2k+1}{k+1} b_k(M) \geq \gamma(\Delta).$$

(b) *Deduction of Conjecture 1.3.d from Conjecture (a).* We have

$$\binom{2k+1}{k+1} b_k(M) \geq \gamma(\Delta_n^k) = \binom{n+1}{k+1} - (k+2) \binom{n+1}{k} \geq \binom{n-k-1}{k+1}.$$

Here the first inequality holds by (a). It remains to prove the last inequality for n large comparative to k . Let $N := n + 1$. Both parts of the equivalent inequality

$$N(N-1) \dots (N-k+1)(N-k-(k+1)(k+2)) \geq (N-k-2)(N-k-2) \dots (N-2k-2)$$

are unitary polynomials in N of degree $k + 1$. For the coefficients of N^k we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + \dots + (k-1) + k + (k+1)(k+2) &= \frac{k(k+1)}{2} + (k+1)(k+2) = \\ &= (k+1) \frac{(k+2) + (2k+2)}{2} = (k+2) + (k+3) + \dots + (2k+2). \end{aligned}$$

For the coefficients of N^{k-1} we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i,j=1}^k ij + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} i(k+1)(k+2) &= \frac{k^2(k+1)^2}{4} + \frac{k(k-1)(k+1)(k+2)}{2} = \\ &= \frac{k+1}{4} (3k^3 - k^2 - 2k) < \frac{k+1}{4} 9k^3 < \frac{(k+1)^2(k+2+2k+2)^2}{4} = \sum_{i,j=k+2}^{2k+2} ij. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

¹⁶ In comments on the proof of this conjecture presented in [Ad18, Remark 4.9] it is not explained how to get rid of the condition that M embeds into \mathbb{R}^{2k+1} . This condition is present in [Ad18, Corollary 4.8], so presumably is used in the proof, so presumably has to be used in the proof of this conjecture.

(c) **Conjecture.**¹⁷ For any subdivision Δ of Δ_n^k we have $\gamma(\Delta) \geq \gamma(\Delta_n^k)$.

Now we discuss the non-triviality.

Recall that for a general position map $g: [3]^{*k+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2k}$ the *van Kampen number* $v(g) \in \mathbb{Z}_2$ is the parity of the number of all unordered pairs $\{\sigma, \tau\}$ of vertex-disjoint k -faces of $[3]^{*k+1}$ such that $|g\sigma \cap g\tau|_2 = 1$.

Lemma 4.2 (van Kampen; [vK32, Satz 5]). *For any general position map $g: [3]^{*k+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2k}$ we have $v(g) = 1$.*

The following proof, except the last paragraph, is alternative to known proofs.¹⁸

Proof of Lemma 4.2. Let $\gamma(t) = (t, \dots, t^{2k})$ be the moment curve in \mathbb{R}^{2k} . Let $g: [3]^{*k+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2k}$ be the linear map such that

$$g(\emptyset^{*i} * a * \emptyset^{*k-i}) = \gamma(a + 3i) \quad \text{for every } i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\} \quad \text{and } a \in [3].$$

It is well known that every at most $2k + 1$ points on γ are affine independent (for proof see e.g. [St24, Lemma 5]). Then g is a general position map. In the following paragraph we prove that $v(g) = 1$.

It is known that for vertex-disjoint k -faces $\sigma = \sigma_1 * \dots * \sigma_{k+1}$ and $\tau = \tau_1 * \dots * \tau_{k+1}$ their images $g\sigma$ and $g\tau$ intersect (at a single point) if and only if the vertices of the images alternate along the moment curve¹⁹. The alternation means that either

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1 < \tau_1 < 3 + \sigma_2 < 3 + \tau_2 < \dots < 3k + \sigma_{k+1} < 3k + \tau_{k+1} \quad \text{or} \\ \tau_1 < \sigma_1 < 3 + \tau_2 < 3 + \sigma_2 < \dots < 3k + \tau_{k+1} < 3k + \sigma_{k+1}. \end{aligned}$$

The alternation is equivalent to ‘either $\sigma_i < \tau_i$ for every $i \in [k + 1]$ or $\sigma_i > \tau_i$ for every $i \in [k + 1]$ ’. Then

$$v(g) = |\{(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{k+1}, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_{k+1}) \in [3]^{2k+2} : \sigma_i < \tau_i \text{ for every } i \in [k + 1]\}|_2 = 1.$$

Here the last equality is proved as follows. For such $(2k+2)$ -tuples $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{k+1}, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_{k+1})$ every pair (σ_i, τ_i) is either $(1, 2)$, or $(1, 3)$, or $(2, 3)$. Then by the Cartesian product rule the number of such $(2k + 2)$ -tuples is $3^{k+1} \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$.

Proof that $v(g) = v(g')$ for any general position maps $g, g': [3]^{*k+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2k}$, repeats the fairly standard part in the last paragraph of the proof of Lemma 1.7 (Non-triviality). \square

Recall that

- H is the set of all unordered pairs of vertex-disjoint k -faces of $[3]^{*k+1}$;
- G_k is the set of unordered pairs of k -octahedra from $[3]^{*k+1}$ whose intersection is 1^{*k+1} ;

¹⁷ The Kühnel conjecture on PL embeddings (Remark 1.3.a) follows from Conjectures (a,c) (analogously to the argument of (b)). However, Conjecture (c) is not clear by the following reasons. The k - and $(k - 1)$ -skeleta of Δ are larger than those of Δ_n^k , so we only have $f_k(\Delta) \geq f_k(\Delta_n^k)$ and $f_{k-1}(\Delta) \geq f_{k-1}(\Delta_n^k)$, which does not imply Conjecture (c). Conjecture (c) is clear when Δ is obtained from Δ_n^k by subdivision of an edge, but this argument does not work for subsequent subdivisions.

¹⁸ The first part of the proof (namely, everything except the last paragraph) is construction of *some* map $g: [3]^{*k+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2k}$ such that $v(g) = 1$. In the original proof van Kampen constructed another such g , splitting vertices on groups of three and placing the groups in different hyperplanes. Another construction of such a map g is given in [Me06, the second paragraph of Example 3.5]: take $n = k$ and $n_i = 0$ for $i \in [k + 1]$; take $*\Delta^{n_i} = 1^{*k+1}$ and $*\partial\Delta^{n_i+1} = [2]^{*k+1}$.

¹⁹ For clear exposition see [St24, Lemma 6]; for an earlier reference see [Br73, Theorem] (in [Br73] the statement of the Theorem has undefined A and B , and uses the term ‘the primitive Radon partition’ defined elsewhere).

- for $\{P, Q\} \in G_k$ we denote by $[P \times Q]$ the set of pairs $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ formed by (not necessary distinct) k -faces α, β of $[3]^{*k+1}$ such that either $\alpha \in P$ and $\beta \in Q$, or vice versa.

Remark 4.3 (Deduction of Theorem 1.8 (Embeddability mod 2) from [KS21e]).

(a) [KS21e, Lemma 2.3.1 and footnote 4] *If a $(k-1)$ -connected k -complex K is \mathbb{Z}_2 -embeddable to a $2k$ -manifold M , then there are a collection of k -cycles y_σ in M , parametrized by k -faces of K , and a general position map $g: K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2k}$ such that*

$$y_\sigma \cap_M y_\tau = |g\sigma \cap g\tau|_2 \quad \text{for any vertex-disjoint } k\text{-faces } \sigma, \tau \text{ of } K.$$

(b) *The deduction.* Take y_σ and g from (a). For k -octahedra P, Q define $A_{P,Q} := \sum_{(\sigma,\tau) \in P \times Q} y_\sigma \cap_M y_\tau$. Take a basis in $H_k(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ in which the matrix of \cap_M is Ω_M . Let Y be the $\beta_k(M) \times \binom{n}{2}^{k+1}$ -matrix whose columns are coordinates of y_σ in this basis. Then $A = Y^T \Omega_M Y$. So it remains to prove that A is an (n, k) -matrix. (Cf. [SS23, §2, proof of the ‘if’ part of Theorem 1.4].)

The additivity is obvious.

The independence holds since for vertex-disjoint k -octahedra P, Q we have

$$A_{P,Q} = \sum_{(\sigma,\tau) \in P \times Q} y_\sigma \cap_M y_\tau = |gP \cap gQ|_2 = 0,$$

where the last equality holds by the parity lemma (see e.g. [Sk, Lemma 5.3.4]).

The non-triviality holds since

$$\begin{aligned} SA &= \sum_{\{P,Q\} \in G_k} A_{P,Q} = \sum_{\{P,Q\} \in G_k} \sum_{\{\alpha,\beta\} \in [P \times Q]} y_\alpha \cap_M y_\beta = \\ &= \sum_{\{\alpha,\beta\} \in H} y_\alpha \cap_M y_\beta = \sum_{\{\alpha,\beta\} \in H} |g\alpha \cap g\beta|_2 = 1, \end{aligned}$$

where the third equality holds by Lemma 2.3 (Combinatorial), and the last equality is the result of van Kampen [vK32, Satz 5], see Lemma 4.2 (van Kampen).

(c) Lemma 1.7 (for \mathbb{Z}_2 -embeddings) is deduced from (a) with the following addendum (which is essentially obtained in [KS21e, §2.3]): *if P and Q are k -cycles in K and $f: K \rightarrow M$ is a \mathbb{Z}_2 -embedding, then $A(f)_{P,Q} = \sum_{(\sigma,\tau) \in P \times Q} y_\sigma \cap_M y_\tau$.*

Remark 4.4 (On alternative definition of non-triviality). Under the assumptions that A is symmetric, independent and additive, the following is an equivalent definition of the non-triviality (the equivalence is clear from Lemma 3.5). The matrix A is said to be *non-trivial* if for any complex $K \subset [n]^{*k+1}$ isomorphic to $[3]^{*k+1}$ and any k -face $\alpha \subset K$ the sum $S_{\alpha,K} A = 1$, where $S_{\alpha,K} A$ is the sum of $A_{P,Q}$ over all unordered pairs $\{P, Q\}$ of k -octahedra in $[3]^{*k+1}$ such that $P \cap Q = \alpha$.

The analogue of Lemma 1.7 (Non-triviality) for the new definition is correct because all the proof presented work for any subcomplex of $[n]^{*k+1}$ isomorphic to $[3]^{*k+1}$ and any its k -face.

Below we give an alternative proof of Lemma 1.7 (Non-triviality), which we did not succeed to generalize to \mathbb{Z}_2 -embeddings.

Proposition 4.5 (Intersection formula). *For any embedding $f: [3]^{*k+1} \rightarrow M$ into a $2k$ -manifold M there is a general position map $g: [3]^{*k+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2k}$ such that for any k -octahedra P, Q whose intersection is 1^{*k+1}*

$$fP \cap_M fQ = \sum_{\{\alpha, \beta\} \in [P \times Q]} |g(\alpha - \beta) \cap g(\beta - \alpha)|_2.$$

Proof. Recall that $I = [0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}$.

By ambient isotopy of M we may assume that the image of f is in the interior of M . Since f is an embedding and since $1^{*k+1} \cong I^k$ is collapsible, by [RS72, Corollary 3.27] there is an embedding $i: I^{2k} \rightarrow M$ in general position to f , and such that

$$iI^{2k} \supset f(1^{*k+1}) \quad \text{and} \quad iI^{2k} \cap f(\{2, 3\}^{*k+1}) = \emptyset.$$

Take any general position map

$$g: [3]^{*k+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2k} \quad \text{such that} \quad f^{-1}(iI^{2k}) = g^{-1}(I^{2k}) =: Z \quad \text{and} \quad f|_Z = ig|_Z.$$

Here the property $f|_Z = ig|_Z$ means that $f(x) = ig(x)$ when $f(x) \in iI^{2k}$ (or, equivalently, when $g(x) \in I^{2k}$).

Take any general position map $g': [3]^{*k+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2k}$ such that

$$g|_{g^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^{2k} - I^{2k})} = g'|_{g'^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^{2k} - I^{2k})}$$

(which means that $g^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^{2k} - I^{2k}) = g'^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^{2k} - I^{2k})$, and the restrictions of g and g' to $g^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^{2k} - I^{2k})$ coincide), and

(CGP) g and g' are close, and $(g \sqcup g')|_{g^{-1}(I^{2k})}$ is a general position map.

Then for any k -octahedra P, Q whose intersection is 1^{*k+1}

$$\begin{aligned} fP \cap_M fQ &\stackrel{(4.5.a)}{=} |(igP \cap iI^{2k}) \cap (ig'Q \cap iI^{2k})|_2 \stackrel{(4.5.b)}{=} \\ &|(gP \cap I^{2k}) \cap (g'Q \cap I^{2k})|_2 \stackrel{(4.5.c)}{=} |(gP - I^{2k}) \cap (g'Q - I^{2k})|_2 \stackrel{(4.5.d)}{=} \\ &|(gP - I^{2k}) \cap (gQ - I^{2k})|_2 \stackrel{(4.5.e)}{=} \sum_{\{\alpha, \beta\} \in [P \times Q]} |g(\alpha - \beta) \cap g(\beta - \alpha)|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Let us prove the equalities.

- Equality (4.5.a) is proved as follows. Since $P \cap Q = 1^{*k+1}$, we have $fP \cap fQ \subset iI^{2k}$. This, $f|_Z = ig|_Z$, and (CGP), imply (4.5.a).
- Equality (4.5.b) holds since i is an embedding.
- Equality (4.5.c) holds by the parity lemma (see e.g. [Sk, Lemma 5.3.4]) and since $g|_P \sqcup g'|_Q$ is a general position map. On $g^{-1}(I^{2k})$ this map is in general position by (CGP). On $g^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^{2k} - I^{2k})$ this map is in general position since
 - $g|_{g^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^{2k} - I^{2k})} = g'|_{g'^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^{2k} - I^{2k})}$,
 - g is a general position map,
 - $P \cap Q = 1^{*k+1}$,
 - $iI^{2k} \supset f(1^{*k+1})$ and $iI^{2k} \cap f(\{2, 3\}^{*k+1}) = \emptyset$, and
 - $f|_Z = ig|_Z$.
- Equality (4.5.d) holds since $g|_{g^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^{2k} - I^{2k})} = g'|_{g'^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^{2k} - I^{2k})}$.

- Equality (4.5.e) is proved as follows. For $\{\alpha, \beta\} \in [P \times Q]$ we have $\alpha \cap \beta \subset 1^{*k+1}$. This, $iI^{2k} \supset f(1^{*k+1})$, $iI^{2k} \cap f(\{2, 3\}^{*k+1}) = \emptyset$ and $f|_Z = ig|_Z$ imply

$$(gP - I^{2k}) \cap (gQ - I^{2k}) = \bigsqcup_{\{\alpha, \beta\} \in [P \times Q]} g(\alpha - \beta) \cap g(\beta - \alpha).$$

□

Proof of Lemma 1.7 (Non-triviality). Take a map $g: [3]^{*k+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2k}$ from Proposition 4.5. Then

$$\begin{aligned} SA(f) &\stackrel{(1.7.a)}{=} \sum_{\{P, Q\} \in G_k} fP \cap_M fQ \stackrel{(1.7.b)}{=} \sum_{\{P, Q\} \in G_k} \sum_{\{\alpha, \beta\} \in [P \times Q]} |g(\alpha - \beta) \cap g(\beta - \alpha)|_2 \stackrel{(1.7.c)}{=} \\ &\sum_{\{\alpha, \beta\} \in H} |g(\alpha - \beta) \cap g(\beta - \alpha)|_2 \stackrel{(1.7.d)}{=} \sum_{\{\alpha, \beta\} \in H} |g\alpha \cap g\beta|_2 \stackrel{(1.7.e)}{=} 1. \end{aligned}$$

Here

- equality (1.7.a) is the definition of $SA(f)$;
- equality (1.7.b) holds by Proposition 4.5;
- equality (1.7.c) holds by Lemma 2.3 (Combinatorial);
- equality (1.7.d) holds since α, β are vertex-disjoint;
- equality (1.7.e) is the result of van Kampen [vK32, Satz 5] (see Lemma 4.2).

□

Remark 4.6 (Relation to intrinsic linking results). (a) Non-embeddability of Δ_{2k+2}^k into \mathbb{R}^{2k} is related to a congruence analogous to $SA(f) = 1$ [PT19, Proposition 16.ii], [KS21, §1, non-triviality], and to an intrinsic linking result for $(k-1)$ -complexes in \mathbb{R}^{2k-1} [KS21, Theorem 1.6.odd] (see also [KS21, proof of Lemma 1.5]). Non-embeddability of K_5^k into \mathbb{R}^{2k} is related to an intrinsic linking result for $(k-1)$ -complexes in \mathbb{R}^{2k-1} [Sk03]. Analogously, the proof of (well-known) non-embeddability of $[3]^{*k+1}$ in \mathbb{R}^{2k} given by Lemma 4.2 (van Kampen) is related to the congruence $SA(f) = 1$, and to certain intrinsic linking result for a $(k-1)$ -complex in \mathbb{R}^{2k-1} . For $k = 2$ this is a result on a graph in \mathbb{R}^3 ; see items (b,c,d) below.

(b) Let G be the graph with the vertex set $\mathbb{Z}_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$ and edges joining the following pairs of vertices:

$$(i, j)(i+1, j) \quad \text{and,} \quad \text{for } i = 0, 2, \quad (i+1, 0)(i+1, 1), \quad (i, 1)(i, 2), \quad (i+1, 2)(i, 0).$$

Let S_j be the induced subgraph on vertices (i, j) , $i \in \mathbb{Z}_4$. Clearly, S_j is a cycle of length 4.

An *octahedral cycle of length 6* in G is any of the following 8 cycles for $i = 0, 2$ and $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 = \pm 1$:

$$(i, 0) (i + \varepsilon_1, 0) (i + \varepsilon_1, 1) (i + \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2, 1) (i + \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2, 2) (i + 1, 2).$$

The two cycles for fixed $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2$ and different i are called *involutional*. Clearly, involutional cycles are disjoint.

Take the (octahedral) cycles

$$T_1 := (0, 0)(1, 2)(2, 2)(3, 2)(2, 0)(3, 0),$$

$$T_2 := (3, 1)(2, 1)(1, 1)(1, 0)(2, 0)(3, 0),$$

$$T_3 := (2, 2)(3, 2)(0, 2)(0, 1)(3, 1)(2, 1).$$

Clearly, $T_j \cap S_j = \emptyset$.

(c) *Assertion.* [Ni] Suppose that $f: G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ is an embedding. Then the sum of the three pairwise linking numbers of $f(S_j)$ and $f(T_j)$, $j = 1, 2, 3$, and the four linking numbers of involutive octahedral cycles, is odd.

This follows from [Sa81]. Indeed, in the graph G , by contracting three edges $(0, 0)(1, 2)$, $(0, 2)(0, 1)$ and $(1, 1)(1, 0)$, we obtain a proper minor of G isomorphic to the graph G_9 in the Petersen family [Sa81]. (Further, certain ΔY -move yields the Petersen graph P_{10} .) All disjoint cycle pairs of G_9 consist of six $(4, 5)$ -cycle pairs and exactly one $(3, 6)$ -cycle pair. It is known that for every embedding $G_9 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ the sum of the linking numbers over all of the constituent 2-component links is odd [Sa81]. Three of the six $(4, 5)$ -cycle pairs and exactly one $(3, 6)$ -cycle pair of G_9 correspond to the four involutive octahedral cycle pairs of G . The three remaining $(4, 5)$ -cycle pairs of G_9 correspond to pairs S_j, T_j of G . Thus the assertion follows.

(d) The following holds both by (c) (see (e)) and by our proof of Lemma 1.7 (see (f)). Suppose that $f: G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ is an embedding such that the images $f(S_1), f(S_2), f(S_3)$ lie in pairwise disjoint 3-balls, and the image of any edge outside $S_1 \sqcup S_2 \sqcup S_3$ is disjoint with one of the three balls. Then the sum of the four linking coefficients of involutive octahedral cycles is odd.

(e) [Ni] Denote by $B_j \supset f(S_j)$ the mutually disjoint 3-balls. Then for $f(S_1 \cup T_1)$, two edges $f((3, 2)(2, 2))$ and $f((0, 0)(1, 2))$ miss B_1 , and the other edges of $f(T_1)$ also miss B_1 because they are contained in B_2 and B_3 . Thus the linking number of $f(S_1)$ and $f(T_1)$ is zero. Analogously the linking number of $f(S_j)$ and $f(T_j)$ is zero for each $j = 2, 3$. This implies (d).

(f) Take the following representation of G . Vertices of G correspond to edges $a * b * c$ of $[3]^*{}^3$, where among a, b, c there is exactly one ‘3’, and there is exactly one \emptyset . We denote such a vertex by abc . Edges of G correspond to faces $3 * b * c$ or $3 * 3 * c$ of $[3]^*{}^3$, and three times as many symmetric faces (i.e. faces obtained by changing the place of ‘3’s). So edges are $3b\emptyset, 3\emptyset c$ (*short edges*), $3\emptyset c, \emptyset 3c$ (*long edges*), and symmetric edges.

There are three cycles S_1, S_2, S_3 of length four obtained by changing the place of ‘3’ from the cycle $32\emptyset, 3\emptyset 2, 31\emptyset, 3\emptyset 1$ of short edges. For each $c \in [2]$ there are three edges obtained by changing the place of c in the long edge $3\emptyset c, \emptyset 3c$.

An *octahedral cycle of length 6* is the cycle $3b\emptyset, 3\emptyset c, \emptyset 3c, a3\emptyset, a\emptyset 3, \emptyset b3$, where $a, b, c \in [2]$. This is $*(a * b * c) \cap g^{-1}(\partial I^{2k})$. Take the involution on G defined by interchanging 1 and 2. Then the eight octahedral cycles split into pairs of involutive cycles, and involutive octahedral cycles are disjoint.

Now (d) follows by transforming the left-hand side of (4.5.e) analogously to [KS21, (2)] in the proof of Lemma 1.5].

REFERENCES

- [Ad18] *K. Adiprasito*, Combinatorial Lefschetz theorems beyond positivity, arXiv:1812.10454.
- [Br72] *J. L. Bryant*, Approximating embeddings of polyhedra in codimension 3, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 170 (1972) 85–95.
- [Br73] *M. Breen*, Primitive Radon partitions for cyclic polytopes. Israel Journal of Mathematics 15, 156–157 (1973).
- [Ca91] * *D. de Caen*, The ranks of tournament matrices, Amer. Math. Monthly, 98:9 (1991) 829–831.
- [DGN+] * Low rank matrix completion, presented by S. Dzhemzher, T. Garaev, O. Nikitenko, A. Petukhov, A. Skopenkov, A. Voropaev, <https://www.mccme.ru/circles/oim/netflix.pdf>
- [FF89] * *A. T. Fomenko and D. B. Fuchs*, Homotopical Topology, Springer, 2016.
- [FK19] *R. Fulek, J. Kynčl*, \mathbb{Z}_2 -genus of graphs and minimum rank of partial symmetric matrices, 35th Intern. Symp. on Comp. Geom. (SoCG 2019), Article No. 39; pp. 39:1–39:16,

- <https://drops.dagstuhl.de/opus/volltexte/2019/10443/pdf/LIPIcs-SoCG-2019-39.pdf>. We refer to numbering in arXiv version: arXiv:1903.08637.
- [FPS] *R. Fulek, M.J. Pelsmayer and M. Schaefer*. Strong Hanani-Tutte for the Torus, arXiv:2009.01683.
- [GMP+] *X. Goaoc, I. Mabillard, P. Paták, Z. Patáková, M. Tancer, U. Wagner*, On Generalized Heawood Inequalities for Manifolds: a van Kampen–Flores-type Nonembeddability Result, *Israel J. Math.*, 222(2) (2017) 841–866. arXiv:1610.09063.
- [Ha69] *L. S. Harris*, Intersections and embeddings of polyhedra, *Topology* 8 (1969) 1–26.
- [IF] * http://www.map.mpim-bonn.mpg.de/Intersection_form
- [Jo02] *C. M. Johnson*. An obstruction to embedding a simplicial n -complex into a $2n$ -manifold, *Topology Appl.* 122:3 (2002) 581–591.
- [KS21] * *E. Kogan and A. Skopenkov*. A short exposition of the Patak-Tancer theorem on non-embeddability of k -complexes in $2k$ -manifolds, arXiv:2106.14010.
- [KS21e] *E. Kogan and A. Skopenkov*. Embeddings of k -complexes in $2k$ -manifolds and minimum rank of partial symmetric matrices, submitted, arXiv:2112.06636.
- [Ku94] *W. Kühnel*. Manifolds in the skeletons of convex polytopes, tightness, and generalized Heawood inequalities. In *Polytopes: abstract, convex and computational* (Scarborough, ON, 1993), volume 440 of *NATO Adv. Sci. Inst. Ser. C Math. Phys. Sci.*, pp. 241–247. Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1994.
- [Ku95] * *W. Kühnel*, Tight Polyhedral Submanifolds and Tight Triangulations, *Lecture Notes in Math.* 1612, Springer, 1995.
- [Ma03] * *J. Matoušek*. Using the Borsuk-Ulam theorem: Lectures on topological methods in combinatorics and geometry. Springer Verlag, 2008.
- [Me06] *S. A. Melikhov*, The van Kampen obstruction and its relatives, *Proc. Steklov Inst. Math* 266 (2009), 142–176 (= *Trudy MIAN* 266 (2009), 149–183), arXiv:math/0612082.
- [Ni] *R. Nikkuni*, Private communication.
- [NS09] *I. Novik and E. Swartz*, Socles of Buchsbaum modules, complexes and posets, *Adv. Math.* 222 (2009), 2059–2084. arXiv:0711.0783.
- [PT19] *P. Paták and M. Tancer*. Embeddings of k -complexes into $2k$ -manifolds. *Discr. Comp. Geom.* arXiv:1904.02404.
- [PW] *I. Pak, S. Wilson*, Geometric realizations of polyhedral complexes, <http://www.math.ucla.edu/~pak/papers/Fary-full31.pdf>.
- [RS72] * *C. P. Rourke and B. J. Sanderson*, Introduction to Piecewise-Linear Topology, *Ergebn. der Math.* 69, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1972.
- [Sa81] *H. Sachs*. On spatial representation of finite graphs, in: *Finite and infinite sets* (Eger, 1981), 649–662, *Colloq. Math. Soc. Janos Bolyai*, 37, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984.
- [Sk03] *M. Skopenkov*, Embedding products of graphs into Euclidean spaces, *Fund. Math.* 179 (2003), 191–198, arXiv:0808.1199.
- [Sk20] * *A. Skopenkov*, Algebraic Topology From Geometric Standpoint (in Russian), MCCME, Moscow, 2020 (2nd edition). Part of the book: <http://www.mccme.ru/circles/oim/obstruct.pdf>. Part of the English translation: <https://www.mccme.ru/circles/oim/obstructeng.pdf>.
- [Sk] * *A. Skopenkov*. Algebraic Topology From Algorithmic Standpoint, draft of a book, mostly in Russian, <http://www.mccme.ru/circles/oim/algorg.pdf>.
- [SS23] *A. Skopenkov and O. Styrť*, Embeddability of join powers and minimal rank of partial matrices, arXiv:2305.06339.
- [SSS] *J. Segal, A. Skopenkov and S. Spieř*. Embeddings of polyhedra in \mathbb{R}^m and the deleted product obstruction, *Topol. Appl.*, 85 (1998), 225–234.
- [St24] *M. Starkov*, An example of an ‘unlinked’ set of $2k + 3$ points in $2k$ -space, arXiv:2402.09002.
- [vK32] *E. R. van Kampen*, Komplexe in euklidischen Räumen, *Abh. Math. Sem. Hamburg*, 9 (1933) 72–78; Berichtigung dazu, 152–153.
- [vK41] *E. R. van Kampen*, Remark on the address of S. S. Cairns, in *Lectures in Topology*, 311–313, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, MI, 1941.
- [We67] *C. Weber*. Plongements de polyèdres dans le domaine metastable, *Comment. Math. Helv.* 42 (1967), 1–27.

Books, surveys and expository papers in this list are marked by the stars.