

Irreducible components of sets of points in the plane that satisfy distance conditions

Niels Lubbes, Mehdi Makhul, Josef Schicho, Audie Warren

March 4, 2024

Abstract

For a given graph whose edges are labeled with general real numbers, we consider the set of functions from the vertex set into the Euclidean plane such that the distance between the images of neighbouring vertices is equal to the corresponding edge label. This set of functions can be expressed as the zero set of quadratic polynomials and our main result characterizes the number of complex irreducible components of this zero set in terms of combinatorial properties of the graph. In case the complex components are three-dimensional, then the graph is minimally rigid and the component number is a well-known invariant from rigidity theory. If the components are four-dimensional, then they correspond to one-dimensional coupler curves of flexible planar mechanisms. As an application, we characterize the degree of irreducible components of such coupler curves combinatorially.

Keywords: sets of points in the plane, minimally rigid graphs, rigidity theory, number of realizations, general edge length assignment, counting irreducible components, coupler curves, mechanical linkages, calligraphs

MSC Class: 52C25, 70B15, 51K05, 51F99

1 Introduction

In Figure 1, we see an example of a graph with vertex set $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and each edge $\{i, j\}$ has some “edge length assignment” $\lambda_{\{i,j\}}$. We assign to each vertex i a point (x_i, y_i) in the plane such that

$$(x_i - x_j)^2 + (y_i - y_j)^2 = \lambda_{\{i,j\}}.$$

The complex zero set of these quadratic polynomials consists of four 3-dimensional components. Indeed, if we additionally set $(x_1, y_1) = (0, 0)$ and $(x_2, y_2) = (1, 0)$, then this system of quadratic equations has four solutions. In other words, the graph admits up to rotations and translations four “ λ -compatible realizations” into the plane. We shall make these concepts precise in §2, but for now notice that a representative of each component is illustrated in Figure 1.




Figure 1: A λ -compatible realization of the graph is up to translations and rotations equivalent to one of four representatives.

The graph in Figure 1 is an example of a “minimally rigid graph” whose “number of realizations” equals four. Such minimally rigid graphs can be characterized in terms of the number of vertices and edges of subgraphs [18, 22]. The number of realizations of a minimally rigid graph with n vertices is, over the complex numbers, the same for almost all edge length assignments, and is therefore a graph invariant [17]. This number is at most $\binom{2n-4}{n-2} \approx 4^n$ [4] and can be recovered from the graph in terms of a purely combinatorial algorithm [5]. However, the number of *real* realizations (drawings in \mathbb{R}^2) does depend on the choice of edge length assignment and remains an open problem [17, §8].

If we remove an edge from a minimally rigid graph with general choice of edge length assignment λ , then we expect that the resulting graph admits up to translations and rotations a 1-dimensional choice of λ -compatible realizations. In Figure 2, we illustrate two realizations of such a graph, where the edge $\{1, 0\}$ was removed.




Figure 2: The 1-dimensional set of realizations consists of two irreducible components that are isomorphic to the red and blue components of the coupler curve of the vertex 0.

The blue and red curves represent all realizations of the vertex 0 with the conditions $(x_1, y_1) = (0, 0)$ and $(x_2, y_2) = (1, 0)$. In this example, almost all realizations of the vertices $\{0, 1, 2\}$ uniquely determines the realizations of the remaining vertices.

Therefore, the set of all λ -compatible realizations has two irreducible components. The blue and red curves are projections of these two components onto the realizations of the vertex 0.

We recover this number of components in a combinatorial manner as follows. First, we decompose the graph into a union of minimally rigid subgraphs that are not contained in a bigger minimally rigid subgraph. In Figure 2, these “max-tight subgraphs” are the triangle $\{0, 3, 4\}$, and the edges $\{1, 2\}$, $\{1, 3\}$ and $\{2, 4\}$. The number of realizations of the triangle is 2 and each of the three edges has realization number 1. Our main result, namely Theorem I, now implies that the number of irreducible components of the set of λ -compatible realizations is equal to the product of the number of realizations of the max-tight subgraphs: $2 \cdot 1 \cdot 1 \cdot 1 = 2$. Note that in this article, we count the components over the complex numbers. The number of real connected components remains an open problem (see Remark 31).

We may think of the vertices in Figure 2 as revolute joints and after we pin down the vertices 1 and 2, the graph moves as the vertex 0 traverses the red “coupler curve” component. A key observation is that the corresponding realizations of the triangle $\{0, 3, 4\}$ are all equivalent up to rotations and translations. Corollary I implies that the converse holds as well: two λ -compatible realizations belong to the same component if and only if each of the max-tight subgraphs are equivalent up to rotations and translations. Corollary II characterizes the degrees of the components of coupler curves and addresses [12, Conjecture 2 and Open problem 3].

If we remove more than one edge from some minimally rigid graph, then the irreducible components of the set of compatible realizations has higher dimension. Corollary III shows that the degree and geometric genera of each component has to be the same.

State of the art

The investigation of rigid structures can be traced back to James Clerk Maxwell [21] and there is currently again a considerable interest in rigidity theory due its applications in robotics, architecture, molecular biology and sensor network localization. We refer to [28] and [3, Introduction] for further references to such applications.

Realizations of minimally rigid graphs have been studied in Euclidean spaces and spheres of arbitrary dimension. Theoretical and algorithmic aspects of the number of realizations have been investigated in [5, 9, 12, 17, 23]. Of particular interest

are the globally rigid graphs, namely graphs that up to rotations, translations and reflections admit a unique realization [6, 10]. Bounds on the number of realizations have been investigated in [2–4, 8, 13, 27]. We remark that for carefully chosen edge lengths minimally rigid graphs may admit infinitely many realizations [24].

Graphs that admit a 1-dimensional set of realization for some choice of edge lengths are special cases of mechanical linkages with revolute joints. Their origins can be traced back to at least 1785, when James Watt used such a linkage for his steam engine. Moving graphs remain of interest to engineers and their coupler curves have been studied extensively [16]. In [12] we provide bounds on degrees and geometric genera of coupler curves of mechanical linkages in terms of numbers of realizations (see also [29] and [4, Figure 5]). We improve these bounds in Corollary II.

Overview and table of contents

In §2, we present the assertions of the main result Theorem I and Corollary I. We show in §3 that Theorem I is implied by the irreducibility of certain fiber products associated to graphs that have not too many edges (the proof of a key lemma is deferred to Appendix A). In §4, we prove Theorem I and Corollary I by showing that these fiber products are irreducible via induction on the number of vertices. This concludes the main content of this article. In the remaining §5 and Appendix B, we present applications of our main results, namely Corollaries II and III. In particular, we combinatorially characterize the number of irreducible components of coupler curves of planar mechanisms and their degrees. We conclude with a short discussion on the real connected components of sets of realizations.

1	Introduction	1
2	Statements of the main results	5
3	Pairs of realizations as a fiber product	8
4	Associated fiber squares are irreducible	14
5	Application to coupler curves of calligraphs	26
	Appendices	30
A	The fiber product lemma	30
B	Invariants of components of fibers	33
	Acknowledgements	35
	References	35

2 Statements of the main results

In this section, we state our main results Theorem I and Corollary I, whose proof will be concluded in §4. For an overview of the proof, see the introductions of §3 and §4.

Terminology needed for main results

Suppose that $P: X \rightarrow \{\text{True}, \text{False}\}$ is a predicate about some variety X . We say that P holds for a *general* point if the set $\{x \in X : P(x) = \text{False}\}$ is contained in a lower dimensional subvariety of X .

The *squared distance function* $d: \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is defined as

$$d(x, y) = (x_1 - y_1)^2 + (x_2 - y_2)^2.$$

The *transformation group* T is defined as the set of maps

$$\mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2, \quad (x_1, x_2) \mapsto (c x_1 - s x_2 + u, s x_1 + c x_2 + v)$$

such that $c, s, u, v \in \mathbb{C}$ and $c^2 + s^2 = 1$. We refer to elements of T as *transformations*.

Notice that transformations such that $c, s, u, v \in \mathbb{R}$ define the subgroup $\text{SE}(2) \subset T$ of directed isometries of \mathbb{R}^2 . Indeed, for all $t \in T$,

$$d(x, y) = d(t(x), t(y)).$$

In this article a *graph* $G = (V, E)$ with *vertex set* V and *edge set* E is a simple undirected finite graph. We call $G' \subset G$ a subgraph if $V' \subset V$ and $E' \subset E$, where the subset operators \subset and \subseteq are considered the same.

If X and Y are sets, then Y^X denotes the set of functions $X \rightarrow Y$ and for all $f \in Y^X$ and $x \in X$, we denote the evaluation $f(x)$ by f_x . By abuse of notation, we denote

$$\mathbb{C}^{2V} := (\mathbb{C}^2)^V.$$

We shall refer to elements of \mathbb{C}^{2V} and \mathbb{C}^E as *realizations* and *edge length assignments*, respectively. The *edge map* of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{E}_G: \mathbb{C}^{2V} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^E, \quad r \mapsto (\{u, v\} \mapsto d(r_u, r_v)).$$

The *set of λ -compatible realizations* of G for $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^E$ is defined as the fiber

$$\mathcal{E}_G^{-1}(\lambda) = \{r \in \mathbb{C}^{2V} : d(r_u, r_v) = \lambda(\{u, v\}) \text{ for all } \{u, v\} \in E\}.$$

If $E = \emptyset$, then $\mathcal{E}_G^{-1}(\mathbb{C}^\emptyset) = \mathbb{C}^{2V}$. The *component number* $c(G, \lambda)$ for G with respect to $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^E$ is defined as the number of irreducible components of $\mathcal{E}_G^{-1}(\lambda)$.

We denote by $\mathcal{E}_G^{-1}(\lambda)/T$ the orbit set, where the transformation group T acts on the set of realizations \mathbb{C}^{2V} as follows:

$$T \times \mathbb{C}^{2V} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{2V}, \quad (t, r) \mapsto t \circ r.$$

We call a graph G *minimally rigid* if there exists nonzero $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that for general $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^E$,

$$c(G) := |\mathcal{E}_G^{-1}(\lambda)/T| = n.$$

We refer to $c(G)$ as the *number of realizations* of G . We remark that if G is minimally rigid, then for general $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^E$ each irreducible component of $\mathcal{E}_G^{-1}(\lambda)$ is a T -orbit and thus

$$c(G) = c(G, \lambda).$$

Following the dictionary in [19], we call a graph G *sparse* if all its subgraphs (V', E') such that $|V'| \geq 2$ satisfy

$$|E'| \leq 2|V'| - 3.$$

We call a graph $G = (V, E)$ *tight* if it is sparse and either $|V| = 1$ or $|E| = 2|V| - 3$.

The following theorem of Pollaczek-Geiringer [22] and independently Laman [18] characterizes minimally rigid graphs in combinatorial terms.

Theorem A (Geiringer, Laman).

A graph G is minimally rigid if and only if G is tight.

We call a subgraph $G' \subset G$ *max-tight* if it is tight and there exists no tight subgraph G'' such that $G' \subsetneq G'' \subset G$.

We call $\{G_i\}_{i \in I} = \{(V_i, E_i)\}_{i \in I}$ a *max-tight decomposition* for a graph $G = (V, E)$ if $G_i \subset G$ is a max-tight subgraph for all $i \in I$, $V = \cup_{i \in I} V_i$, $E = \cup_{i \in I} E_i$ and $E_i \cap E_j = \emptyset$ for all different $i, j \in I$.

Main results and examples

Our main result is that the component number of a sparse graph with respect to a general edge length assignment is equal to the product of the numbers of realizations of its max-tight subgraphs.

Theorem I. *If $G = (V, E)$ is a sparse graph and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^E$ a general edge length assignment, then there exists a unique max-tight decomposition $\{G_i\}_{i \in I}$ for G and*

$$c(G, \lambda) = \prod_{i \in I} c(G_i).$$

We remark that if G is not sparse and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^E$ a general edge length assignment, then $c(G, \lambda) = 0$ as a straightforward consequence of Theorem A.

If λ is a general edge length assignment of a graph G , then any pair of λ -compatible realizations of G belong to same component of the set of λ -compatible realizations

if and only if for each max-tight $G' \subset G$ the induced pair of realizations of G' are equal up to composition with transformations.

Corollary I. *If $G = (V, E)$ is a sparse graph, $\{G_i\}_{i \in I} = \{(V_i, E_i)\}_{i \in I}$ its max-tight decomposition and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^E$ a general edge length assignment, then the following are equivalent for all λ -compatible realizations r and s in $\mathcal{E}_G^{-1}(\lambda)$:*

- (i) *The realizations r and s belong to the same irreducible component of $\mathcal{E}_G^{-1}(\lambda)$.*
- (ii) *For all $i \in I$ there exists a transformation $t \in T$ such that $t \circ r|_{V_i} = s|_{V_i}$.*
- (iii) *For all $i \in I$, the restricted realizations $r|_{V_i}$ and $s|_{V_i}$ belong to the same irreducible component of $\mathcal{E}_{G_i}^{-1}(\lambda|_{E_i})$.*

We give some examples to explain the main theorem.

Example 1. Suppose that G is the graph in Figure 3.




Figure 3: *A sparse graph with 8 max-tight subgraphs and component number 16.*

Let us determine its component number $c(G, \lambda)$ for general edge length assignment λ . We observe that G is sparse. Let G_1 and G_2 be the max-tight subgraphs that are spanned by the vertices $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and $\{0, 8, 9, 6\}$, respectively. The remaining six max-tight subgraphs G_3, \dots, G_8 of G correspond to the edges $\{1, 7\}$, $\{7, 8\}$, $\{7, 5\}$, $\{5, 3\}$, $\{5, 6\}$ and $\{6, 4\}$. Hence, $\{G_1, \dots, G_8\}$ is a max-tight decomposition for G . Recall from Figure 1 that the numbers of realizations $c(G_1)$ and $c(G_2)$ are both equal to 4. For the remaining subgraphs, we have $c(G_3) = \dots = c(G_8) = 1$. We now conclude from Theorem I that $c(G, \lambda) = c(G_1) \cdots c(G_8) = 16$. \triangleleft

Example 2. Let G be the graph in Figure 4, which is obtained by removing the edge $\{1, 0\}$ from the complete bipartite $K_{3,3}$ graph. Each max-tight subgraph of G consists of an edge and thus its component number $c(G, \lambda)$ for general edge length assignment λ is equal to 1. \triangleleft




Figure 4: *A sparse graph with component number 1.*

3 Pairs of realizations as a fiber product

In this section, we construct for a sparse graph $G = (V, E)$ a certain fiber product $P(G)$ whose elements correspond to pairs of realizations of G such that for each max-tight subgraph of G their induced pair of realizations are equal up to composition with transformations.

For example, if G is as in Figure 2, then we require for a real element of $P(G)$ that the induced pair of realizations of the max-tight triangle $\{0, 3, 4\}$ are related by a directed isometry (and thus a transformation). Notice that the two realizations depicted in Figure 2 do not define an element of $P(G)$ since the triangles are related by a reflection (which is not a transformation).

Suppose we are given a realization of the graph G together with a transformation assigned to each of its max-tight subgraphs. The “subgraph map” \mathcal{S}_G assigns to this data a compatible realization of each max-tight subgraph. For example, the two realizations in Figure 2 belong roughly speaking to different fibers of \mathcal{S}_G . The set $P(G)$ is contained in the fiber product associated to the map \mathcal{S}_G .

The edge map \mathcal{E}_G fits together with the subgraph map \mathcal{S}_G into a certain commutative diagram and the number of components of the general fiber of \mathcal{E}_G is equal to the product of these “fiber component numbers” for \mathcal{S}_G and all the edge maps associated to the max-tight subgraphs of G . Our main result Theorem I is equivalent to the fiber component number of \mathcal{S}_G to be equal to one which in turn is equivalent to the fiber product $P(G)$ being irreducible. The irreducibility of $P(G)$ will be established in the next section §4.

Let us proceed with making the concepts in the above section overview precise.

Suppose that X and Y are (not necessarily irreducible) varieties. We call a rational map $f: X \dashrightarrow Y$ between varieties a *morphism* if it is everywhere defined and write $f: X \rightarrow Y$. We call a morphism f *dominant* if its image $f(X)$ is Zariski dense in Y . If Y is irreducible, then we define the *fiber component number* $c(f)$ as the number

of irreducible components of $f^{-1}(y)$ for general $y \in Y$.

Lemma 3. *Suppose that $G = (V, E)$ is a graph.*

(a) *The graph G is sparse if and only if its edge map \mathcal{E}_G is dominant.*

(b) *If G is sparse, then for general edge length assignment $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^E$,*

$$c(G, \lambda) = c(\mathcal{E}_G).$$

If G is also tight, then $c(G) = c(\mathcal{E}_G)$.

(c) *If G is sparse, then it admits a unique max-tight decomposition $\{(V_i, E_i)\}_{i \in I}$.*

Proof. (a) By definition, a sparse graph is either tight or obtained by removing edges from some tight graph and thus this assertion is a direct consequence of Theorem A.

(b) Since \mathcal{E}_G is dominant by Assertion (a) and \mathbb{C}^E is irreducible, the fiber component number of \mathcal{E}_G is well-defined as it is the number of components of the “generic fiber” (see [20, Definition 1.5 in Chapter 3]).

(c) This assertion follows from the fact that if two tight graphs have a common edge, then their union is again tight. \square

A *tight decomposition* for a graph $G = (V, E)$ is defined as

$$\Omega := \{G_i\}_{i \in I} = \{(V_i, E_i)\}_{i \in I}$$

such that $G_i \subset G$ is a tight subgraph for all $i \in I$, $V = \cup_{i \in I} V_i$, $E = \cup_{i \in I} E_i$ and $E_i \cap E_j = \emptyset$ for all different $i, j \in I$.

The *subgraph map* associated to the tight decomposition Ω is defined as

$$\mathcal{S}_\Omega: \mathbb{C}^{2V} \times T^I \rightarrow \prod_{i \in I} \mathbb{C}^{2V_i}, \quad (r, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto (\mathbf{t}_i \circ r|_{V_i})_{i \in I}.$$

If G is sparse and Ω its max-tight decomposition, then we write

$$\mathcal{S}_G := \mathcal{S}_\Omega.$$

Indeed, the max-tight decomposition of a sparse graph is unique by Lemma 3(c).

A subgraph map fits together with an edge map into the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{C}^{2V} \times T^I & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{S}_\Omega} & \prod_{i \in I} \mathbb{C}^{2V_i} \\ \pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathcal{P}_G = \prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{E}_{G_i} \\ \mathbb{C}^{2V} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{E}_G} \mathbb{C}^E \xrightarrow{\mu \cong} & \prod_{i \in I} \mathbb{C}^{E_i} \end{array} \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{P}_G((r^i)_{i \in I}) = (\mathcal{E}_{G_i}(r^i))_{i \in I}$ is a product of edge maps, $\mu(\lambda) = (\lambda|_{E_i})_{i \in I}$ is an isomorphism and $\pi(r, \mathbf{t}) = r$ is the projection to the first component.

Lemma 4. *If $G = (V, E)$ is a sparse graph with tight decomposition*

$$\Omega = \{G_i\}_{i \in I} = \{(V_i, E_i)\}_{i \in I},$$

then the diagram at (1) commutes.

Proof. Since $E_i \cap E_j = \emptyset$ for all different $i, j \in I$, we find that μ is an isomorphism. Applying transformations to realizations of each of the tight subgraphs of G does not change the squared distances. We deduce that the diagram commutes. \square

Lemma 5. *Suppose that $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a continuous map between the topological spaces X and Y and let \mathbb{G} be a connected topological group. If f is \mathbb{G} -equivariant with respect to continuous and fixed-point free group actions*

$$\cdot: \mathbb{G} \times X \rightarrow X \quad \text{and} \quad \cdot: \mathbb{G} \times Y \rightarrow Y,$$

then the number of connected components of $f^{-1}(y)$ is equal to the number of connected components of $f^{-1}(\{g \cdot y : g \in \mathbb{G}\})$ for all $y \in Y$.

Proof. Let $\mathbb{G} \cdot y := \{g \cdot y : g \in \mathbb{G}\}$ and let $\{C_i\}_{i \in I}, \{B_j\}_{j \in J}$ be pairwise different connected components such that

$$f^{-1}(y) = \cup_{i \in I} C_i \quad \text{and} \quad f^{-1}(\mathbb{G} \cdot y) = \cup_{j \in J} B_j.$$

We need to show that $|I| = |J|$. Notice that $f^{-1}(y) \subset f^{-1}(\mathbb{G} \cdot y)$ and thus for all $i \in I$ there exists $j \in J$ such that

$$C_i \subset f^{-1}(y) \cap B_j.$$

Now suppose by contradiction that there exists different $a, b \in I$ and $k \in J$ such that $C_a, C_b \subset B_k$. In this case, there exists a continuous path $p: [0, 1] \rightarrow B_k$ such that $p(0) \in C_a$ and $p(1) \in C_b$. By assumption $f(B_k) \subset \mathbb{G} \cdot y$ and \mathbb{G} acts fixed-point free on Y . Hence, there exists a unique continuous path $g: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{G}$ such that

- $(f \circ p)(t) = g(t) \cdot y$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$, and
- $g(0) = g(1)$ is the identity in \mathbb{G} .

Due to f being \mathbb{G} -equivariant, there exists a continuous path $h: [0, 1] \rightarrow f^{-1}(y)$ that is defined as $h(t) = g(t)^{-1} \cdot p(t)$. Because $h(0) \in C_a$ and $h(1) \in C_b$, we find that $C_a = C_b$ and thus arrive at a contradiction. We conclude that there exists a bijection $\varphi: I \rightarrow J$ such that $C_i = f^{-1}(y) \cap B_{\varphi(i)}$ for all $i \in I$. \square

Lemma 6. *If G is a sparse graph with max-tight decomposition $\{G_i\}_{i \in I}$, then the fiber component number of the edge map for G is equal to*

$$c(\mathcal{E}_G) = c(\mathcal{S}_G) \cdot \prod_{i \in I} c(\mathcal{E}_{G_i}).$$

Proof. Notice that subgraph maps are dominant and recall from Lemma 3(a) that edge maps of sparse graphs are dominant as well. Hence, the fiber component

numbers are well-defined for \mathcal{E}_G , \mathcal{S}_G , \mathcal{P}_G and \mathcal{E}_{G_i} for all $i \in I$. It follows from Sard's theorem that the general fiber is smooth and thus a component is connected if and only if it is irreducible. Because the transformation group T is connected and the fibers of edge maps associated to tight graphs are T -orbits, it follows that the general fiber of \mathcal{P}_G has cardinality

$$c(\mathcal{P}_G) = \prod_{i \in I} c(\mathcal{E}_{G_i}).$$

We claim that $c(\mathcal{P}_G \circ \mathcal{S}_G) = c(\mathcal{P}_G) \cdot c(\mathcal{S}_G)$. In general, this is not true for dominant morphisms. For example, if $f: \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ and $g: \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ are defined as $f(x, y) := (x^2, y)$ and $g(x, y) := y$, then $1 = c(g \circ f) \neq c(f) \cdot c(g) = 2$. Now, let us set

$$G =: (V, E), \quad \{G_i\}_{i \in I} =: \{(V_i, E_i)\}_{i \in I}, \quad X := \mathbb{C}^{2V} \times T^I, \quad Y := \prod_{i \in I} \mathbb{C}^{2V_i}, \quad \mathbb{G} := T^I.$$

Notice that \mathbb{G} is a connected topological group with group operation

$$\mathbf{u} \circ \mathbf{t} := (\mathbf{u}_i \circ \mathbf{t}_i)_{i \in I}.$$

We consider the group actions

$$\mathbb{G} \times X \rightarrow X, \quad (\mathbf{u}, (r, \mathbf{t})) \mapsto (r, \mathbf{u} \circ \mathbf{t}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{G} \times Y \rightarrow Y, \quad (\mathbf{u}, (r^i)_{i \in I}) \mapsto (\mathbf{u}_i \circ r^i)_{i \in I}.$$

If $E = \emptyset$, then the main assertion holds as a straightforward consequence of the definitions. In the remainder of the proof, we assume $E \neq \emptyset$ so that \mathbb{G} acts fixed-point free on both X and Y . Since the subgraph map $\mathcal{S}_G: X \rightarrow Y$ is \mathbb{G} -equivariant and the fibers of \mathcal{P}_G are \mathbb{G} -orbits, it follows from Lemma 5 that

$$c(\mathcal{P}_G \circ \mathcal{S}_G) = c(\mathcal{P}_G) \cdot c(\mathcal{S}_G).$$

Since the image of a connected component via π is again connected and μ is an isomorphism, we find that

$$c(\mathcal{E}_G) = c(\mu \circ \mathcal{E}_G \circ \pi).$$

We know from Lemma 4 that the diagram at (1) commutes and thus

$$c(\mu \circ \mathcal{E}_G \circ \pi) = c(\mathcal{P}_G \circ \mathcal{S}_G).$$

We conclude that $c(\mathcal{E}_G) = c(\mathcal{P}_G) \cdot c(\mathcal{S}_G)$ as was to be shown. \square

The set of embeddings $U_V \subset \mathbb{C}^{2V}$ for vertex set V is defined as the set of realizations $r \in \mathbb{C}^{2V}$ such that for all sparse graphs $G' = (V', E')$ such that $V' \subset V$, the Jacobian matrix of the edge map $\mathcal{E}_{G'}$ has rank $2|V'| - 3$ at $r|_{V'}$.

Remark 7. A half times the Jacobian matrix of an edge map \mathcal{E}_G is known as the *rigidity matrix* (see [26, §1.3.2 and §18.1]). \triangleleft

Lemma 8 (set of embeddings). *Suppose that V is a vertex set.*

(a) *The set of embeddings U_V is a Zariski open in \mathbb{C}^{2V} .*

- (b) If $\Omega = \{G_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a tight decomposition of a sparse graph $G = (V, E)$, then the restricted subgraph map $\mathcal{S}_\Omega|_{U_V \times T^I}$ is a submersion between the complex manifolds $U_V \times T^I$ and $\mathcal{S}_\Omega(U_V \times T^I)$.
- (c) If $r \in U_V$ is a realization and $u, v, w \in V$ are pairwise different vertices, then the points $r_u, r_v, r_w \in \mathbb{C}^2$ are not collinear.

Proof. (a) The set of realizations $r \in \mathbb{C}^{2V}$ such that the Jacobian matrix of an edge map has lower rank at r can be expressed in terms of the vanishing of finitely many determinants of submatrices. Since there are finitely many graphs whose vertex set is contained in V , we find that U_V is Zariski open.

(b) As a direct consequence of the definitions, we have

$$\mathcal{S}_\Omega(U_V \times T^I) \subset \prod_{i \in I} U_{V_i},$$

where $U_{V_i} \subset \mathbb{C}^{2V_i}$ is a set of embeddings for all $i \in I$. Let $\mathfrak{T}(\cdot)$ denote the tangent space. It is straightforward to see that if X, Y are complex manifolds, then

$$\mathfrak{T}(X \times Y) \cong \mathfrak{T}(X) \times \mathfrak{T}(Y).$$

Thus, by taking the total derivatives of the maps in the diagram at (1), we obtain the following diagram of linear maps between tangent spaces, where

$$\begin{array}{ccc} g := \mathcal{S}_\Omega|_{U_V \times T^I}, & f := \mathcal{E}_G|_{U_V}, & f_i := \mathcal{E}_{G_i}|_{U_{V_i}}, & F := \prod_{i \in I} f_i, & p_i := \mathbf{t}_i \circ r|_{V_i} : \\ \mathfrak{T}_r(U_V) \times \prod_{i \in I} \mathfrak{T}_{\mathbf{t}_i}(T) & \xrightarrow{dg} & \prod_{i \in I} \mathfrak{T}_{p_i}(U_{V_i}) \\ \downarrow d\pi & & \downarrow dF = \prod_{i \in I} df_i \\ \mathfrak{T}_r(U_V) & \xrightarrow{df} & \mathfrak{T}_{f(r)}(\mathbb{C}^E) & \xrightarrow{=} & \prod_{i \in I} \mathfrak{T}_{f_i(p_i)}(\mathbb{C}^{E_i}) \end{array}$$

It follows from Lemma 4 that the above diagram commutes. Notice that the total derivatives df and dF are surjective by the definitions of sets of embeddings and G being sparse. We would like to show that dg is surjective as well. Suppose that $\gamma \in \prod_{i \in I} \mathfrak{T}_{p_i}(U_{V_i})$. There exists $\alpha \in \mathfrak{T}_r(U_V)$ such that $df(\alpha) = dF(\gamma)$. Hence, $dg(\alpha, \mathbf{0}) - \gamma$ is in the kernel of dF , where $\mathbf{0}$ corresponds to a tuple of $|I|$ zero vectors.

Claim 1. *If $h: U_{V_i} \times T \rightarrow U_{V_i}$ sends (r, t) to $t \circ r$, then for all $i \in I$,*

$$dh(\{0\} \times \mathfrak{T}_{\mathbf{t}_i}(T)) = \ker df_i.$$

Notice that $p_i \in U_{V_i} \subset \mathbb{C}^{2V_i}$ is a realization. An element in the tangent space $\mathfrak{T}_{p_i}(U_{V_i})$ assigns to each of the points in $P := \{(p_i)_v\}_{v \in V_i} \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ a vector in \mathbb{C}^2 . If an element in $\mathfrak{T}_{p_i}(U_{V_i})$ assigns to each point in P the velocity vector of some transformation $t \in T$, then it must be in the kernel of df_i (see [26, §18.1]). Since $\dim T = 3$, we find that $\dim \ker df_i \geq 3$. The kernel of df_i corresponds to the kernel of Jacobian matrix of

\mathcal{E}_{G_i} at p_i and since p_i is contained in the set of embeddings U_{V_i} , this Jacobian matrix has rank $2|V_i| - 3$. It follows that each element in $\ker df_i \subset \mathfrak{T}_{p_i}(U_{V_i})$ comes from transformation in T , which is equivalent to the statement of Claim 1. For more details we refer to [26, §1.3.2 and Theorem 18.4], where it is explained that the kernel of the “rigidity matrix” (corresponding to $\ker df_i$) of an “infinitesimally rigid framework” (corresponding to (G, p_i)), does not contain “infinitesimal motions”.

It follows from Claim 1 that

$$dg\left(\{0\} \times \prod_{i \in I} \mathfrak{T}_{\mathbf{t}_i}(T)\right) = \ker dF.$$

Hence, there exists $\beta \in \prod_{i \in I} \mathfrak{T}_{\mathbf{t}_i}(T)$ such that $dg(0, \beta) = dg(\alpha, \mathbf{0}) - \gamma$, which implies that $\gamma = dg(\alpha, \beta)$. We conclude that g is a submersion as was to be shown.

(c) If G' is a triangle with vertices $V' = \{u, v, w\} \subset V$ and $s \in \mathbb{C}^{2V}$ a realization such that $s_u, s_v, s_w \in \mathbb{C}^2$ are collinear, then the Jacobian matrix of the edge map $\mathcal{E}_{G'}$ has rank strictly less than $2|V'| - 3$ at $s|_{V'} \in \mathbb{C}^{2V'}$ and thus $s \notin U_V$ (see [26, 18.1]). \square

Remark 9. Alternatively, we could define the set of embeddings U_V as the set of realizations in \mathbb{C}^{2V} that satisfy both Lemmas 8(b) and 8(c). A similar proof as for Lemma 8(a) would show that $U_V \subset \mathbb{C}^{2V}$ is Zariski open. \triangleleft

We call an algebraic variety *irreducible* if it is not the union of two Zariski closed sets. We call a subset of a variety *irreducible* if and only if its Zariski closure is irreducible.

Lemma 10 (fiber product). *Suppose that $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a dominant morphism between Zariski open sets of smooth irreducible varieties and let*

$$X \times_f X := \{(p, q) \in X^2 : f(p) = f(q)\}.$$

(a) *If f is a submersion, then the fiber product $X \times_f X$ is a complex manifold and*

$$\dim X \times_f X = 2 \dim X - \dim Y.$$

(b) *If $X \times_f X$ is irreducible, then general fiber of f is irreducible.*

Proof. See Appendix A. \square

If $G = (V, E)$ is a graph with tight decomposition $\Omega := \{(V_i, E_i)\}_{i \in I}$, then its *fiber square* is defined as

$$P(\Omega) := \left\{ (r, \mathbf{t}; s, \mathbf{u}) \in (U_V \times T^I)^2 : \mathcal{S}_\Omega(r, \mathbf{t}) = \mathcal{S}_\Omega(s, \mathbf{u}) \right\}.$$

If G is sparse and Ω a max-tight decomposition, then we write $P(G)$ instead of $P(\Omega)$.

We remark that our definition of “fiber square” deviates from the literature, where this notion instead refers to the diagram associated to a fiber product.

Lemma 11. *If G is a sparse graph such that its fiber square $P(G)$ is irreducible, then the fiber component number of the edge map \mathcal{S}_G is equal to $c(\mathcal{S}_G) = 1$.*

Proof. Recall from Lemma 8(a) that $U_V \subset \mathbb{C}^{2V}$ is a Zariski open set. It now follows from Lemma 10(b) that the general fiber of $\mathcal{S}_G|_{U_V \times T^I}$ is irreducible. Hence, the general fiber of \mathcal{S}_G is irreducible as well. \square

Proposition 12. *If $G = (V, E)$ is a sparse graph with max-tight decomposition $\{G_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $P(G)$ is irreducible, then for general edge length assignment $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^E$,*

$$c(G, \lambda) = \prod_{i \in I} c(G_i).$$

Proof. We know from Lemma 3(b) and Lemma 6 that

$$c(G, \lambda) = c(\mathcal{E}_G) = c(\mathcal{S}_G) \cdot \prod_{i \in I} c(\mathcal{E}_{G_i}) = c(\mathcal{S}_G) \cdot \prod_{i \in I} c(G_i).$$

If $P(G)$ is irreducible, then $c(\mathcal{S}_G) = 1$ by Lemma 11. \square

4 Associated fiber squares are irreducible

In this section, we prove by induction that the fiber square $P(G)$ associated to a sparse graph G is irreducible. For the induction step, we construct a new sparse graph G^m that has one vertex less than G and show that if $P(G^m)$ is irreducible, then $P(G)$ must be irreducible as well. To prove the induction step, we construct a “comparison map” $P(G) \rightarrow P(G^m)$ and analyze the irreducibility and dimension of each of its fibers. For the induction basis, we observe that $P(G)$ is irreducible if G has one vertex. We conclude this section with a proof for Theorem I and Corollary I by applying Proposition 12 from the previous section.

Remark 13. Suppose that $G = (V, E)$ is a sparse graph and let G' be the graph that is obtained from G by removing the vertex $v \in V$. For an initial understanding, let us assume that each max-tight subgraph of the sparse graph G' is either

- a max-tight subgraph of G , or a max-tight subgraph of G minus the vertex v .

In this case, we obtain a canonical map from the fiber square of G to the fiber square of G' by restricting the realization components to the vertex set $V' := V \setminus \{v\}$. In other words, the comparison map sends $(r, \mathbf{t}; s, \mathbf{u})$ to $(r|_{V'}, \mathbf{t}; s|_{V'}, \mathbf{u})$. In the formal definition of the comparison map below, we will also include the case that the above

assumption does not hold. In the more general setting, we may need to add an additional edge to G' . \triangleleft

Let $G = (V, E)$ and $G' = (V', E')$ be graphs. We denote by $E[v]$ the set of edges in E that contain the vertex $v \in V$. The degree of a vertex $v \in V$ is defined as the cardinality of $E[v]$. If $v \notin V$, then $E[v] := \emptyset$.

We call G a 0 -extension of G' with respect to vertex v_0 if

$$(V, E) = (V' \cup \{v_0\}, E' \cup \{\{v_0, v_i\} : i \in \{1, 2\}\}),$$

where $v_0 \notin V'$ and $v_1, v_2 \in V'$ are distinct vertices (see Figure 5 left).

We call G a 1 -extension of G' with respect to vertex v_0 and edge $\{v_2, v_3\}$ if

$$(V, E) = (V' \cup \{v_0\}, E' \cup \{\{v_0, v_i\} : i \in \{1, 2, 3\}\} \setminus \{\{v_2, v_3\}\}),$$

where $v_0 \notin V'$, $v_1, v_2, v_3 \in V'$ are pairwise distinct vertices and $\{v_2, v_3\} \in E'$ is an edge (see Figure 5 right).

We remark that 0 - and 1 -extensions are also known as ‘‘Henneberg moves’’ [26].




Figure 5: The left/right graph G is a $0/1$ -extension of the graph G' .

Suppose that $G = (V, E)$ be a sparse graph with max-tight decomposition

$$\{G_i\}_{i \in I} = \{(V_i, E_i)\}_{i \in I}.$$

A *marking* for G is a defined as a function $\mathbf{m} \in V^Z$ such that

- $\mathbf{m}: Z \rightarrow V$ is injective, $Z \in \{\{0\}, \{0, 1\}, \{0, 1, 2\}, \{0, 1, 2, 3\}\}$ and $|V| > 1$,
- $E[\mathbf{m}_0] = \{\{\mathbf{m}_0, \mathbf{m}_z\} : z \in Z \setminus \{0\}\}$, and
- if $|Z| = 4$ and $\mathbf{m}(Z) \subset V_i$ for some $i \in I$, then G_i is a 1 -extension of a tight graph with respect to \mathbf{m}_0 and edge $\{\mathbf{m}_2, \mathbf{m}_3\}$.

Suppose that $\mathbf{m} \in V^Z$ is a marking for G . For all $i \in I$, we define

$$V_i^{\mathbf{m}} := V_i \setminus \mathbf{m}_0,$$

$$E_i^{\mathbf{m}} := \begin{cases} E_i \setminus E_i[\mathbf{m}_0] \cup \{\{\mathbf{m}_2, \mathbf{m}_3\}\} & \text{if } |Z| = 4 \text{ and } \mathbf{m}(Z) \subset V_i \text{ for some } i \in I, \text{ or} \\ E_i \setminus E_i[\mathbf{m}_0] & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We set

$$I^{\mathbf{m}} := \{i \in I : V_i \neq \{\mathbf{m}_0\} \text{ and } |E_i[\mathbf{m}_0]| \neq 1\}.$$

For all $i \in I^{\mathbf{m}}$, we define

$$G_i^{\mathbf{m}} := (V_i^{\mathbf{m}}, E_i^{\mathbf{m}}).$$

The *reduced graph* associated to the marking \mathbf{m} is defined as

$$G^{\mathbf{m}} = (V^{\mathbf{m}}, E^{\mathbf{m}}) := \bigcup_{i \in I^{\mathbf{m}}} G_i^{\mathbf{m}}.$$

If $G^{\mathbf{m}}$ is sparse with max-tight decomposition $\{G_i^{\mathbf{m}}\}_{i \in I^{\mathbf{m}}}$, then the *comparison map* associated to the marking \mathbf{m} is (if it exists) defined as

$$\mathcal{C}_{G, \mathbf{m}} : P(G) \rightarrow P(G^{\mathbf{m}}), \quad (r, \mathbf{t}; s, \mathbf{u}) \mapsto (r|_{V^{\mathbf{m}}}, \mathbf{t}|_{I^{\mathbf{m}}}; s|_{V^{\mathbf{m}}}, \mathbf{u}|_{I^{\mathbf{m}}}).$$

Lemma 14. *If $G = (V, E)$ is a sparse graph such that $|V| > 1$, then there exists a marking $\mathbf{m} \in V^Z$ such that*

- *its reduced graph $G^{\mathbf{m}}$ is sparse with max-tight decomposition $\{G_i^{\mathbf{m}}\}_{i \in I^{\mathbf{m}}}$, and*
- *its comparison map $\mathcal{C}_{G, \mathbf{m}} : P(G) \rightarrow P(G^{\mathbf{m}})$ exists.*

Proof. A 0- or 1-extension of a tight graph is again tight. Moreover, any tight graph can be obtained from an edge by applying subsequently 0- and/or 1-extensions (see [15, 18] or alternatively [26, Theorem 19.2]). Hence, for all tight graphs there exists a marking. The sparse graph G is a subgraph of a tight graph and a marking \mathbf{m} for this tight graph is also a marking for G as a direct consequence of the definitions.

Suppose that $i \in I^{\mathbf{m}}$ so that $V_i \neq \{\mathbf{m}_0\}$ and $|E_i[\mathbf{m}_0]| \neq 1$ by definition of $I^{\mathbf{m}}$. We make a case distinction on $|E_i[\mathbf{m}_0]|$.

First, suppose that $|E_i[\mathbf{m}_0]| = 0$. In this case, $\mathbf{m}_0 \notin V_i$, so that $G_i^{\mathbf{m}} = G_i$ is a max-tight subgraph of $G^{\mathbf{m}}$.

Next, suppose that $|E_i[\mathbf{m}_0]| = 2$. In this case G_i is a 0-extension of $G_i^{\mathbf{m}}$. Since $|E_i| - 2 = 2(|V_i| - 1) - 3$, we have $|E_i^{\mathbf{m}}| = 2|V_i^{\mathbf{m}}| - 3$ so that $G_i^{\mathbf{m}}$ is tight. It follows that $G_i^{\mathbf{m}}$ is a max-tight subgraph of $G^{\mathbf{m}}$.

Finally, suppose that $|E_i[\mathbf{m}_0]| = 3$. By the definition of markings, we find that G_i is a 1-extension of the tight graph $G_i^{\mathbf{m}}$ with respect to \mathbf{m}_0 and the edge $\{\mathbf{m}_2, \mathbf{m}_3\}$. It follows that $G_i^{\mathbf{m}}$ is a max-tight subgraph of $G^{\mathbf{m}}$.

We have established that $\{G_i^{\mathbf{m}}\}_{i \in I^{\mathbf{m}}}$ is a max-tight decomposition for $G^{\mathbf{m}}$ so that $G^{\mathbf{m}}$ is sparse and the fiber square $P(G^{\mathbf{m}})$ is well-defined. By the definition of the set of

embeddings U_V and since $V^{\mathfrak{m}} \subset V$, we find that $\{r|_{V^{\mathfrak{m}}} : r \in U_V\} \subset U_{V^{\mathfrak{m}}}$. Hence, the comparison map $\mathcal{C}_{G,\mathfrak{m}}$ is also well-defined. \square

Remark 15. Suppose that $G = (V, E)$ is a sparse graph with marking $\mathfrak{m} \in V^Z$. In order to show that $P(G)$ is irreducible, we want to show that the hypothesis of Lemma 16 below holds if f is equal to the comparison map $\mathcal{C}_{G,\mathfrak{m}}$. \triangleleft

Lemma 16. *Suppose that $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a morphism between Zariski dense subsets of varieties such that X is equidimensional and Y is irreducible. If for general $y \in Y$,*

- $\dim f^{-1}(y) = \dim X - \dim Y$,
- $f^{-1}(y)$ is irreducible, and
- $\dim \{z \in Y : \dim f^{-1}(z) = \dim X - \dim Y + c\} < \dim Y - c$ for all $c \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$,

then X is irreducible.

Proof. It follows from the theorem on fiber dimension [25, §I.6.3, Theorem 7] applied to the surjective morphism $f: X \rightarrow f(X)$ and the assumption on the dimension of the general fiber of f that $\dim f(X) = \dim Y$ and thus f is dominant. Since X has finitely many irreducible components, there exists a component $X_0 \subset X$ such that $\dim f(X_0) = \dim Y$. Now suppose by contradiction that there exists an irreducible component $X_1 \subset X$ different from X_0 . By assumption, the fiber $f^{-1}(y)$ is irreducible for general $y \in f(X_0)$ and thus $f^{-1}(y) \subset X_0$. Hence, $\dim f(X_1) = \dim Y - c$ for some $c > 0$. Notice that $\dim X = \dim X_0 = \dim X_1$ as X is equidimensional. We again apply the fiber dimension theorem [25, §I.6.3, Theorem 7] to the restricted map $f|_{X_1}$, and find that for general $z \in f(X_1)$,

$$\dim f^{-1}(z) = \dim X - (\dim Y - c).$$

We arrived at a contradiction as $\dim f(X_1) = \dim Y - c$ and

$$\dim f(X_1) \leq \dim \{z \in Y : \dim f^{-1}(z) = \dim X - \dim Y + c\} < \dim Y - c.$$

We established that $X = X_0$ and thus X is irreducible. \square

Remark 17. In order to analyze the irreducibility and dimension of the fibers of the comparison map, we first address in Lemma 18 below the following sub-problem. Suppose that $W \subset \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $p, q \in (\mathbb{C}^2)^W$ is a pair of realizations such that $\{p_w\}_{w \in W} \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ is not collinear. We would like to determine the irreducibility and dimension of the set of pairs of realizations $r, s \in (\mathbb{C}^2)^{W \cup \{0\}}$ such that $r|_W = p$, $s|_W = q$ and $d(r_0, r_w) = d(s_0, s_w)$ for all $w \in W$. If $1, 2 \in W$, then we are also interested in the case that additionally the triangles spanned by $\{r_0, r_1, r_2\}$ and

$\{s_0, s_1, s_2\}$ are related by some transformation in T (and thus are not reflections of each other). \triangleleft

Lemma 18. *Suppose that $W \subset \{1, 2, 3\}$ and let $P := \{p_w\}_{w \in W}$ and $Q := \{q_w\}_{w \in W}$ be finite sets of points in \mathbb{C}^2 such that P is not collinear. Let*

$$\Lambda := \{\{v, w\} \subset W : d(p_v, p_w) = d(q_v, q_w) \text{ and } v \neq w\},$$

$$\Gamma := \{(p_0, q_0) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2 : d(p_0, p_w) = d(q_0, q_w) \text{ for all } w \in W\},$$

$$\Gamma' := \{(p_0, q_0) \in \Gamma : t(p_0) = q_0, t(p_1) = q_1 \text{ and } t(p_2) = q_2 \text{ for some } t \in T\}.$$

(a) *If $W = \emptyset$, then Γ is irreducible and $\dim \Gamma = 4$.*

(b) *If $W = \{1\}$, then Γ is irreducible and $\dim \Gamma = 3$.*

(c) *If $W = \{1, 2\}$ and $\Lambda = \{\{1, 2\}\}$, then Γ' is irreducible and*

$$\dim \Gamma = \dim \Gamma' = 2.$$

(d) *If $W = \{1, 2\}$ and $\Lambda = \emptyset$, then Γ is irreducible and $\dim \Gamma = 2$.*

(e) *If $W = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $\Lambda = \{\{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}\}$, then Γ' is irreducible and*

$$\dim \Gamma = \dim \Gamma' = 2.$$

(f) *If $W = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $\Lambda = \{\{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}\}$, then Γ' is irreducible and*

$$\dim \Gamma = \dim \Gamma' = 1.$$

(g) *If $W = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $\Lambda = \{\{1, 2\}\}$, then Γ' is irreducible and*

$$\dim \Gamma = \dim \Gamma' = 1.$$

(h) *If $W = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $\Lambda = \emptyset$, then Γ is irreducible and $\dim \Gamma = 1$.*

Proof. (a) We have $\Gamma = \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2$ as a direct consequence of the definitions.

If $1 \in W$, then we define

$$D := \{t \in T : p_1 = t(q_1)\}.$$

We observe that D is irreducible and of dimension 1 as its elements are the composition of a complex translation with a complex rotation centered around p_1 .

(b) The map $D \times \mathbb{C}^2 \dashrightarrow \Gamma$ that sends (t, p_0) to $(p_0, t^{-1}(p_0))$ is birational. Indeed, we can recover (t, p_0) uniquely from $(p_0, q_0) \in \Gamma$ and (p_1, q_1) if $\{p_0, q_0, p_1\}$ are pairwise distinct since by definition $p_0 = t(q_0)$ and $p_1 = t(q_1)$. Hence, Γ is irreducible and $\dim \Gamma = \dim D \times \mathbb{C}^2 = 3$.

For the remainder of the proof, we assume that $1, 2 \in W$. Let $t_* : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ denote

the reflection along the line spanned by $p_1, p_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ and

$$\Gamma_* := \{(p_0, q_0) \in \Gamma : (t_* \circ t)(p_0) = q_0, t(p_1) = q_1 \text{ and } t(p_2) = q_2 \text{ for some } t \in T\}.$$

We observe that $\Gamma = \Gamma' \cup \Gamma_*$ and thus $\dim \Gamma = \dim \Gamma'$.

(c),(e) As P is not collinear there exists a unique transformation $t \in T$ such that $p_w = t(q_w)$ for all $w \in W$. Hence, the map $\mathbb{C}^2 \dashrightarrow \Gamma'$ that sends p_0 to $(p_0, t^{-1}(p_0))$ is birational, which implies that Γ' is irreducible and $\dim \Gamma' = 2$.

The *symmetry line* between different $a, b \in \mathbb{C}^2$ is defined as

$$L_{a,b} := \{m \in \mathbb{C}^2 : d(m, a) = d(m, b)\}.$$

(d) For all $t \in D$, we have $p_2 \neq t(q_2)$ since $p_1 = t(q_1)$ and $\{1, 2\} \notin \Lambda$. Hence, there exists a birational map $\ell_t: \mathbb{C} \dashrightarrow L_{p_2, t(q_2)}$ that depends algebraically on the parameter $t \in D$. Now suppose that $(p_0, q_0) \in \Gamma$. There exists a unique $t \in D$ such that $p_0 = t(q_0)$. Moreover, there exists a unique $x \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $p_0 = \ell_t(x)$ since the map ℓ_t is birational and

$$d(p_0, p_2) = d(q_0, q_2) = d(t^{-1}(p_0), q_2) = d(p_0, t(q_2)).$$

Hence, the following map is birational:

$$D \times \mathbb{C} \dashrightarrow \Gamma, \quad (t, x) \mapsto (\ell_t(x), (t^{-1} \circ \ell_t)(x)).$$

This implies that Γ is irreducible and $\dim \Gamma = \dim D \times \mathbb{C} = 2$.

(f),(g) As P is not collinear, we have $p_1 \neq p_2$. Since $\{1, 2\} \in \Lambda$, there exists a unique $t \in D$ such that $p_2 = t(q_2)$. Since $p_1 = t(q_1)$ and $\{1, 3\} \notin \Lambda$, we have $p_3 \neq t(q_3)$ and thus $L_{p_3, t(q_3)}$ is a line. Hence, there exists a birational map

$$\ell: \mathbb{C} \dashrightarrow L_{p_3, t(q_3)}.$$

Now suppose that $(p_0, q_0) \in \Gamma'$ and notice that $p_0 = t(q_0)$. Since ℓ is birational and

$$d(p_0, p_3) = d(q_0, q_3) = d(t^{-1}(p_0), q_3) = d(p_0, t(q_3)),$$

there exists a unique $x \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $p_0 = \ell(x)$. We established that the following map is birational:

$$\mathbb{C} \dashrightarrow \Gamma', \quad x \mapsto (\ell(x), (t^{-1} \circ \ell)(x)).$$

This implies that Γ' is irreducible and $\dim \Gamma' = \dim \Gamma = 1$.

(h) For all $t \in D$, we have $p_2 \neq t(q_2)$ and $p_3 \neq t(q_3)$ since $\{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\} \notin \Lambda$ and $p_1 = t(q_1)$. Moreover, $d(p_2, p_3) \neq d(t(q_2), t(q_3)) = d(q_2, q_3)$ since $\{2, 3\} \notin \Lambda$. Therefore, the symmetry lines $L_{p_2, t(q_2)}$ and $L_{p_3, t(q_3)}$ do not coincide so that

$$|L_{p_2, t(q_2)} \cap L_{p_3, t(q_3)}| \leq 1.$$

There exist at most finitely many $t \in D$ such that the lines $L_{p_2, t(q_2)}$ and $L_{p_3, t(q_3)}$ are parallel and thus the map $\ell: D \dashrightarrow \ell(D) \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ that sends t to the unique intersection

point in $L_{p_2, t(q_2)} \cap L_{p_3, t(q_3)}$ is birational. Now suppose that $(p_0, q_0) \in \Gamma$ is general. There exists a unique $t \in D$ such that $p_0 = t(q_0)$. For all $w \in \{2, 3\}$, we require that

$$d(p_0, p_w) = d(q_0, q_w) = d(t^{-1}(p_0), q_w) = d(p_0, t(q_w)).$$

This implies that $p_0 \in L_{p_2, t(q_2)} \cap L_{p_3, t(q_3)}$ and thus $p_0 = \ell(t)$. We established that the following map is birational:

$$D \dashrightarrow \Gamma, \quad t \mapsto (\ell(t), (t^{-1} \circ \ell)(t)).$$

We conclude that Γ is irreducible and $\dim \Gamma = 1$. \square

Lemma 19. *If $G = (V, E)$ is a graph with tight decomposition*

$$\Omega := \{(V_i, E_i)\}_{i \in I},$$

then its fiber square $P(\Omega)$ is a complex manifold of dimension

$$\dim P(\Omega) = 4|V| + 6|I| - 2 \sum_{i \in I} |V_i|.$$

Proof. It follows from Lemmas 8 and 10 that $P(G)$ is complex manifold of dimension $2 \dim(U_V \times T^I) - \dim \prod_{i \in I} \mathbb{C}^{2V_i}$. Since $\dim T = 3$, we find that $\dim P(G)$ is as asserted. \square

Remark 20. Let $G = (V, E)$ is a sparse graph with marking $\mathbf{m} \in V^Z$ such that $(\mathbf{m}_0, \mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2, \mathbf{m}_3) = (0, 1, 2, 3)$ and suppose that a tight subgraph of G that has 2 as one of its vertices contains neither the vertex 1 nor the vertex 3. In this case, there may exist points $(r, \mathbf{t}; s, \mathbf{u})$ in the fiber square $P(G^{\mathbf{m}})$ of the reduced graph $G^{\mathbf{m}}$ whose fibers with respect to the comparison map $\mathcal{C}_{G, \mathbf{m}}: P(G) \rightarrow P(G^{\mathbf{m}})$ has higher dimension than expected. Indeed, if $d(r_1, r_3) = d(s_1, s_3)$ and $d(r_2, r_3) = d(s_2, s_3)$, then Lemma 18(e) suggests that the dimension is one instead of two. Thus, in order to satisfy the hypothesis of Lemma 16, we need to show that the following subset has codimension two in $P(G^{\mathbf{m}})$:

$$\Psi := \{(r, \mathbf{t}; s, \mathbf{u}) \in P(G^{\mathbf{m}}) : d(r_1, r_3) = d(s_1, s_3) \text{ and } d(r_2, r_3) = d(s_2, s_3)\}.$$

For this purpose, we construct the graph G' by adding to $G^{\mathbf{m}}$ the edges $\{1, 3\}$ and $\{2, 3\}$, and show that G' is sparse. Next, we apply the dimension formula for fiber squares at Lemma 19 to both $P(G^{\mathbf{m}})$ and $P(\Omega')$, where Ω' is a certain tight decomposition of G' . As $P(\Omega')$ can be projected onto $\Psi \subset P(G^{\mathbf{m}})$, we show that $\text{codim } \Psi = 2$. The tight-decomposition Ω' is constructed by appending to the unique max-tight decomposition of G the two single-edge graphs consisting of the edge $\{1, 3\}$ or $\{2, 3\}$. Notice that the max-tight decomposition of G' may be trivial (see for example Figure 6). For this reason, we consider fiber squares with respect to tight-decompositions that are not necessarily max-tight. \triangleleft




Figure 6: Three sparse graphs. The max-tight subgraphs of G and G^m consist of single edges. The graph G' is tight and thus its max-tight decomposition is trivial.

Lemma 21. If $G = (V, E)$ be a sparse graph with marking $\mathbf{m} \in V^Z$ such that $(\mathbf{m}_0, \mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2, \mathbf{m}_3) = (0, 1, 2, 3)$ and $\{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\} \not\subseteq V_i^m$ for all $i \in I^m$, then the following subset has codimension two in the fiber square $P(G^m)$:

$$\Psi := \{(r, \mathbf{t}; s, \mathbf{u}) \in P(G^m) : d(r_1, r_3) = d(s_1, s_3) \text{ and } d(r_2, r_3) = d(s_2, s_3)\},$$

where $\{(V_i^m, E_i^m)\}_{i \in I^m}$ is the max-tight decomposition of the reduced graph G^m .

Proof. Since $\{1, 3\} \not\subseteq V_i^m$ for all $i \in I^m$, we find that the graph $(V^m, E^m \cup \{\{1, 3\}\})$ is sparse. Suppose by contradiction that the graph $G' := (V^m, E^m \cup \{\{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}\})$ is not sparse. Then there must exist $j \in I^m$ such that $(V_j^m, E_j^m \cup \{\{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}\})$ is not sparse and becomes tight after we remove the edge $\{2, 3\}$. We arrived at a contradiction as $\{1, 2, 3\} \subset V_j^m$ and thus we established that G' is sparse.

Let $H_{u,v}$ denote the graph consisting of a single edge $\{u, v\}$. We set $I' := I^m \cup \{a, b\}$ for some indices $a, b \notin I^m$. Let $G'_a := H_{1,3}$, $G'_b := H_{2,3}$ and $G'_i := G_i^m$ for all $i \in I^m$. Notice that the sparse graph G' has the following tight decomposition:

$$\Omega' := \{G'_i\}_{i \in I'} = \{(V'_i, E'_i)\}_{i \in I'}.$$

We find that $|V'| - |V^m| = 0$, $|I'| - |I^m| = 2$ and

$$\sum_{i \in I'} |V'_i| - \sum_{i \in I^m} |V_i^m| = |V'_a| + |V'_b| = 4.$$

Thus, the dimension formula at Lemma 19 shows that

$$\dim P(\Omega') - \dim P(G^m) = 4(|V'| - |V^m|) + 6(|I'| - |I^m|) - 2(|V'_a| + |V'_b|) = 4.$$

Since $I^m \subset I'$ by construction, there exists a projection

$$\tau: P(\Omega') \rightarrow P(G^m), \quad (r, \mathbf{t}; s, \mathbf{u}) \mapsto (r, \mathbf{t}|_{I^m}; s, \mathbf{u}|_{I^m}).$$

We would like to determine the dimension of the fiber of the projection τ at a point $(r, \mathbf{t}|_{I^m}; s, \mathbf{u}|_{I^m})$. The transformation tuple $(\mathbf{t}_a, \mathbf{t}_b) \in T^2$ can be arbitrary. The transformation \mathbf{t}_a uniquely determines \mathbf{u}_a , since $\mathbf{t}_a(r_i) = \mathbf{u}_a(s_i)$ for $i \in \{1, 3\}$. Similarly, \mathbf{t}_b uniquely determines \mathbf{u}_b . We deduce that all the fibers of τ have dimension

$2 \dim T = 6$ and thus

$$\dim \tau(P(\Omega')) = \dim P(\Omega') - 6 = \dim P(G^{\mathfrak{m}}) - 2.$$

We find that $\Psi = \tau(P(\Omega'))$ as a straightforward consequence of the definitions and thus we established that $\Psi \subset P(G^{\mathfrak{m}})$ has codimension two. \square

Remark 22. In the following Lemma 23, we characterize the dimensions and irreducibility of the fibers of a comparison map $\mathcal{C}_{G,\mathfrak{m}} : P(G) \rightarrow P(G^{\mathfrak{m}})$. This shows that the hypothesis of Lemma 16 is satisfied and thus we can conclude that if $P(G^{\mathfrak{m}})$ is irreducible, then $P(G)$ must be irreducible as well. \triangleleft

Lemma 23. *Suppose that $G = (V, E)$ is a sparse graph with marking $\mathfrak{m} \in V^Z$ and let $F_y := \mathcal{C}_{G,\mathfrak{m}}^{-1}(y)$ for $y \in P(G^{\mathfrak{m}})$ denote the fiber of the comparison map $\mathcal{C}_{G,\mathfrak{m}}$. Then, for general $p \in P(G^{\mathfrak{m}})$ and all $c \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ the following holds:*

- F_p is irreducible,
- $\dim F_p = \dim P(G) - \dim P(G^{\mathfrak{m}})$, and
- $\dim \{y \in P(G^{\mathfrak{m}}) : \dim F_y = \dim P(G) - \dim P(G^{\mathfrak{m}}) + c\} < \dim P(G^{\mathfrak{m}}) - c$.

Proof. Let $\{(V_i, E_i)\}_{i \in I}$ and $\{(V_i^{\mathfrak{m}}, E_i^{\mathfrak{m}})\}_{i \in I^{\mathfrak{m}}}$ be the max-tight decompositions of the graphs $G = (V, E)$ and $G^{\mathfrak{m}} = (V^{\mathfrak{m}}, E^{\mathfrak{m}})$, respectively. For ease of notation, we assume without loss of generality that $\mathfrak{m}_z = z$ for all $z \in Z$. We consider the following arbitrary but fixed point in $P(G^{\mathfrak{m}})$:

$$y := (\tilde{r}, \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}; \tilde{s}, \tilde{\mathfrak{u}}).$$

In accordance with Lemma 18, we define the following sets that depend on \tilde{r}, \tilde{s} :

$$W := Z \setminus \{0\}, \quad P := \{\tilde{r}_i\}_{i \in W}, \quad Q := \{\tilde{s}_i\}_{i \in W},$$

$$\Lambda := \{\{v, w\} \subset W : d(\tilde{r}_v, \tilde{r}_w) = d(\tilde{s}_v, \tilde{s}_w) \text{ and } v \neq w\},$$

$$\Gamma := \{(r_0, s_0) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2 : d(r_0, \tilde{r}_w) = d(s_0, \tilde{s}_w) \text{ for all } w \in W\},$$

$$\Gamma' := \{(r_0, s_0) \in \Gamma : t(r_0) = s_0, t(\tilde{r}_1) = \tilde{s}_1 \text{ and } t(\tilde{r}_2) = \tilde{s}_2 \text{ for some } t \in T\}.$$

Notice that $P, Q \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ are not collinear by Lemma 8(c) since $\tilde{r}, \tilde{s} \in U_{V^{\mathfrak{m}}}$ by definition.

We define

$$M := \{\{u, v\} \subset W : u \neq v \text{ and } u, v \in V_i^{\mathfrak{m}} \text{ for some } i \in I^{\mathfrak{m}}\}.$$

As a direct consequence of the definitions, we have

$$M \subset \Lambda \subset \{\{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}\}.$$

Notice that if $M = \{\{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}\}$, then $0, 1, 2, 3 \in V_i^{\mathfrak{m}}$ for some $i \in I^{\mathfrak{m}}$. If $\{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\} \in M$, then $0, 1, 2, 3 \in V_i$ for some $i \in I$, which implies that without loss

of generality $\{2, 3\} \in M$ by the definition of reduced graphs. Hence, up to relabeling of vertices, exactly one of the following cases holds:

Case 1. $W = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $M = \emptyset$.

Case 2. $W = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $M = \{\{1, 2\}\}$.

Case 3. $W = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $M = \{\{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}\}$.

Case 4. $W = \{1, 2\}$ and $M \subset \{\{1, 2\}\}$.

Case 5. $W \subset \{1\}$ and $M = \emptyset$.

As a direct consequence of the definitions, we have

$$F_y \subset \{(r, \mathbf{t}; s, \mathbf{u}) \in P(G) : (r_0, s_0) \in \Gamma\}.$$

If $\{1, 2\} \in M$, then the realizations $r, s \in \mathbb{C}^{2V}$ send the vertices $\{0, 1, 2\}$ to a pair of triangles in \mathbb{C}^2 that are related by some transformation $t \in T$. Therefore,

$$F_y \subset \{(r, \mathbf{t}; s, \mathbf{u}) \in P(G) : (r_0, s_0) \in \Gamma''\},$$

where

$$\Gamma'' := \begin{cases} \Gamma' & \text{if } \{1, 2\} \in M, \text{ and} \\ \Gamma & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If y is general, then $M = \Lambda$ as a straightforward consequence of the definitions. We prove the main assertion by applying Lemmas 18 and 21 to each case separately.

- **Case 1:** $W = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $M = \emptyset$. In this case, $V = V^m \cup \{0\}$ and $I = I^m \cup \{a, b, c\}$ such that $G_a = H_{0,1}$, $G_b = H_{0,2}$, $G_c = H_{0,3}$, where $H_{u,v}$ denotes the graph consisting of the edge $\{u, v\}$. It follows from Lemma 19 that

$$\dim P(G) - \dim P(G^m) = 4(|V| - |V^m|) + 6(|I| - |I^m|) - 2\left(\sum_{i \in I} |V_i| - \sum_{i \in I^m} |V_i^m|\right) = 10.$$

Suppose that $(r, \mathbf{t}; s, \mathbf{u}) \in F_y$ so that

$$y = (r|_{V^m}, \mathbf{t}|_{I^m}; s|_{V^m}, \mathbf{u}|_{I^m}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{t}_i \circ r|_{V_i} = \mathbf{u}_i \circ s|_{V_i} \text{ for all } i \in \{a, b, c\}.$$

For all $i \in \{a, b, c\}$, the transformation \mathbf{u}_i is uniquely determined by \mathbf{t}_i and y . This implies that the data consisting of $(r_0, s_0; \mathbf{t}_a, \mathbf{t}_b, \mathbf{t}_c) \in \Gamma'' \times T^3$ together with y recovers uniquely the point $(r, \mathbf{t}; s, \mathbf{u})$ in the fiber F_y . We established that the following function is injective

$$\varphi: F_y \hookrightarrow \Gamma'' \times T^3, \quad (r, \mathbf{t}; s, \mathbf{u}) \mapsto (r_0, s_0; \mathbf{t}_a, \mathbf{t}_b, \mathbf{t}_c).$$

First suppose that y is general so that $M = \Lambda = \emptyset$. It follows from Lemma 18 that Γ'' is irreducible and $\dim \Gamma'' = 1$. Since $\dim \Gamma'' \times T^3 = 10$ and $\dim F_y = \dim \varphi(F_y)$, we find that $\dim F_y \leq 10$. As y is general, we have $\dim F_y \geq$

$\dim P(G) - \dim P(G^{\mathbf{m}}) = 10$ and thus

$$\dim F_y = \dim P(G) - \dim P(G^{\mathbf{m}}) = 10.$$

This implies that $\varphi(F_y) \subset \Gamma'' \times T^3$ is Zariski dense in the irreducible set $\Gamma'' \times T^3$ and thus the fiber F_y is irreducible.

Next, we assume that $\dim F_y = \dim P(G) - \dim P(G^{\mathbf{m}}) + c = 10 + c$ for some $c \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. We may assume up to relabeling vertices that Λ is equal to either \emptyset , $\{\{1, 2\}\}$, $\{\{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}\}$ or $\{\{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}\}$. Hence, it follows from Lemma 18 that $\dim \Gamma'' \in \{1, 2\}$ (although Γ'' may be reducible). Since $10 \leq \dim \Gamma'' \times T^3 \leq 11$ and $c > 0$, we observe that $\dim F_y = \dim \varphi(F_y) = 11$, $\dim \Gamma'' = 2$ and $c = 1$. Since $\dim \Gamma'' = 2$ it follows from Lemma 18 that $\Lambda = \{\{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}\}$. Notice that $\{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\} \notin M$ and thus it follows from Lemma 21 that

$$\dim \{y \in P(G^{\mathbf{m}}) : \dim F_y = 11\} \leq \dim P(G^{\mathbf{m}}) - 2 < \dim P(G^{\mathbf{m}}) - c.$$

Therefore, the main assertion holds for this case.

The remaining four cases are similar and left to the reader. For Case 2, we have $\dim P(G) - \dim P(G^{\mathbf{m}}) = 4$, $\dim \Gamma'' \in \{1, 2\}$, $\dim F_y = \dim \Gamma'' + \dim T$,

$$\Lambda \in \left\{ \{\{1, 2\}\}, \{\{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}\}, \{\{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}\} \right\}$$

and $\dim \{y \in P(G^{\mathbf{m}}) : \dim F_y = 5\} \leq \dim P(G^{\mathbf{m}}) - 2$. For Case 3, Case 4 and Case 5, $\dim F_y = \dim P(G) - \dim P(G^{\mathbf{m}})$ for all $y \in P(G^{\mathbf{m}})$. In all cases, F_y is irreducible for general $y \in P(G^{\mathbf{m}})$. \square

Lemma 24 (induction step). *If $G = (V, E)$ is a sparse graph with marking $\mathbf{m} \in V^Z$ such that $P(G^{\mathbf{m}})$ is irreducible, then $P(G)$ is irreducible.*

Proof. By Lemma 14, there exists a comparison map $\mathcal{C}_{G, \mathbf{m}} : P(G) \rightarrow P(G^{\mathbf{m}})$, which is by definition a morphism between Zariski dense subsets of varieties. By assumption, $P(G^{\mathbf{m}})$ is irreducible and we know from Lemma 19 that $P(G)$ is a complex manifold and thus equidimensional. It now follows from Lemma 23 that the hypothesis of Lemma 16 is satisfied and thus $P(G)$ must be irreducible. \square

Proposition 25. *If G is a sparse graph, then $P(G)$ is irreducible.*

Proof. We prove by induction on $|V|$ that $P(G)$ is irreducible, where $G = (V, E)$.

Induction basis: $|V| = 1$. In this case $P(G) \cong (U_V \times T)^2$ and thus $P(G)$ is irreducible.

Induction step: $|V| > 1$. By Lemma 14, there exists a marking $\mathbf{m} \in V^Z$ such that its reduced graph $G^{\mathbf{m}} = (V^{\mathbf{m}}, E^{\mathbf{m}})$ is sparse. Since $|V^{\mathbf{m}}| < |V|$, we find that the fiber

square $P(G^m)$ is irreducible by the induction hypothesis and thus $P(G)$ must be irreducible by the induction step: Lemma 24. \square

Proof of Theorem I. By Lemma 3(c), the sparse graph G admits a unique max-tight decomposition. It follows from Proposition 25 that $P(G)$ is irreducible and thus the proof is concluded by Proposition 12. \square

Lemma 26. *If $G = (V, E)$ is a sparse graph with max-tight decomposition $\{G_i\}_{i \in I}$, then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *The two realizations $r, s \in \mathbb{C}^{2V}$ lie in the same irreducible component C of the fiber $\mathcal{E}_G^{-1}(\lambda)$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^E$.*
- (ii) *There exists $\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{u} \in T^I$ such that $(r, \mathbf{t}), (s, \mathbf{u}) \in \mathbb{C}^{2V} \times T^I$ lie in the same irreducible component of a fiber of \mathcal{S}_G .*

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii). Recall from Lemma 4 that the diagram at (1) commutes. It follows that $\pi^{-1}(C) \subset (\mu^{-1} \circ \mathcal{P}_G \circ \mathcal{S}_G)^{-1}(\lambda)$ and thus $(r, \mathbf{t}), (s, \mathbf{u}) \in \pi^{-1}(C)$ for all $\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{u} \in T^I$. Since C and T^I are irreducible, we conclude that $\pi^{-1}(C)$ must be an irreducible component of a fiber of \mathcal{S}_G .

(ii) \Rightarrow (i). There exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^E$ such that (r, \mathbf{t}) and (s, \mathbf{u}) lie in an irreducible component D of the fiber $(\mu^{-1} \circ \mathcal{P}_G \circ \mathcal{S}_G)^{-1}(\lambda)$. Because the diagram at (1) commutes, we deduce that the λ -compatible realizations r and s lie in the subset $\pi(D)$ of the fiber $\mathcal{E}_G^{-1}(\lambda)$. Since D is irreducible, we conclude that the projected component $\pi(D)$ must be irreducible as well. \square

Proof of Corollary I. (i) \Rightarrow (ii). It follows from Lemma 26 that there exists $\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{u} \in T^I$ such that (r, \mathbf{t}) and (s, \mathbf{u}) belong to an irreducible component of a fiber of the subgraph map \mathcal{S}_G . By definition of the subgraph map, we find that $\mathbf{t}_i \circ r|_{V_i} = \mathbf{u}_i \circ s|_{V_i}$ for all $i \in I$. This implies that for all $i \in I$, we have $t \circ r|_{V_i} = s|_{V_i}$ with $t := \mathbf{u}_i^{-1} \circ \mathbf{t}_i$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i). The assumption that there exists $t \in T$ such that $t \circ r|_{V_i} = s|_{V_i}$ for all $i \in I$ is, by the definition of the subgraph map \mathcal{S}_G and generality of the edge length assignment λ , equivalent to the assertion that there exists $\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{u} \in T^I$ such that (r, \mathbf{t}) and (s, \mathbf{u}) lie in a general fiber of \mathcal{S}_G . It follows from Proposition 25 that $P(G)$ is irreducible and thus by Lemma 11 the general fiber of \mathcal{S}_G is irreducible. We now conclude from Lemma 26 that the λ -compatible realizations r and s belong to the same irreducible component of the fiber $\mathcal{E}_G^{-1}(\lambda)$.

(ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii). The max-tight subgraph G_i is for all $i \in I$ minimally rigid by Theorem A and thus two realizations $r|_{V_i}$ and $s|_{V_i}$ belong to the same irreducible component of $\mathcal{E}_{G_i}^{-1}(\lambda|_{E_i})$ if and only if these realizations are equal up to composition with some transformation $t \in T$. \square

5 Application to coupler curves of calligraphs

In this section, we consider so called “calligraphs” that for general edge length assignment and up to transformations admit a 1-dimensional set of compatible realizations. At Corollary II, we characterize invariants of the irreducible components of “coupler curves” of calligraphs, namely curves that are defined by realizations of some distinguished vertex. This corollary depends on Proposition 38(b) in Appendix B. We conclude this section with a short example for real connected components of sets of compatible realizations.

Before we state Corollary II, let us first recall some definitions from [12].

A *calligraph* is defined as a graph $G = (V, E)$ with edge $\{1, 2\} \in E$ and vertex $0 \in V$ such that either $(V, E \cup \{\{1, 0\}\})$ or $(V, E \cup \{\{2, 0\}\})$ is tight.

The graphs L , R and C_v in Figure 7 are for all $v \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 3}$ calligraphs and play a special role. The graphs in Figures 2 to 4 are all examples of calligraphs.




Figure 7: Three basic calligraphs, where $v \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 3}$.

A *calligraphic split* of a graph G is defined as a pair (G_1, G_2) of calligraphs $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$ and $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$ such that

$$G = G_1 \cup G_2, \quad V_1 \cap V_2 = \{0, 1, 2\} \quad \text{and} \quad E_1 \cap E_2 = \{\{1, 2\}\}.$$

We define the bilinear map $_ \cdot _ : \mathbb{Z}^3 \times \mathbb{Z}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ as

$$(a_1, b_1, c_1) \cdot (a_2, b_2, c_2) = 2(a_1 a_2 - b_1 b_2 - c_1 c_2).$$

A *class* for calligraphs is a function that assigns to each calligraph G an element $[G]$ of \mathbb{Z}^3 such that the following two axioms are fulfilled.

- A1. $[L] = (1, 1, 0)$, $[R] = (1, 0, 1)$ and $[C_v] = (2, 0, 0)$ for all $v \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 3}$.
- A2. If (G_1, G_2) is a calligraphic split, then $c(G_1 \cup G_2) = [G_1] \cdot [G_2]$.

By [12, Theorem I] the class for calligraphs exists and is unique (see [9, Theorem 2.6] for its spherical counterpart). Classes of calligraphs can be computed using [12, Algorithm 1] and its software implementation [11].

Example 27. Let us consider the graphs H , C_5 and $G = H \cup C_5$ in Figure 8 and observe that (H, C_5) is a calligraphic split for G . We have $[H] = (6, 2, 2)$, $[C_5] = (2, 0, 0)$ and thus $c(G) = [H] \cdot [C_5] = 24$ by A2. \triangleleft




Figure 8: (H, C_5) is a calligraphic split for G .

Suppose that $G = (V, E)$ is a calligraph. Its *set of normed edge length assignments* is defined as $\Omega_G := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^E : \lambda_{\{1,2\}} = 1\}$. The *coupler curve* of G with respect to normed edge length assignment $\lambda \in \Omega_G$ is defined as

$$\text{CouplerCurve}(G, \lambda) := \{r_0 \in \mathbb{C}^2 : r \in \mathcal{E}_G^{-1}(\lambda), r_1 = (0, 0) \text{ and } r_2 = (1, 0)\}.$$

The *coupler multiplicity* of G is defined as

$$m(G) := |\{r \in \mathcal{E}_G^{-1}(\lambda) : r_0 = p, r_1 = (0, 0) \text{ and } r_2 = (1, 0)\}|,$$

where both $\lambda \in \Omega_G$ and $p \in \text{CouplerCurve}(G, \lambda)$ are general. The coupler multiplicity is well-defined by [12, Lemma 16] and only depends on the graph.

We call a calligraph $G = (V, E)$ *thin* if the following two properties are satisfied, where $H = (V, E \cup \{\{1, 0\}, \{2, 0\}\})$:

- If $|V| > 3$ and we remove any edge from the graph H , then the resulting graph is tight.
- If we remove any two of vertices from the graph H , then the resulting graph remains connected.

We remark that the notion of “thin” is closely related to “generic global rigidity” (see [6, Corollary 1.7] and [12, Lemma 17]).

Example 28. The left calligraph in Figure 9 is thin and has coupler multiplicity 1. The right calligraph in Figure 9 has coupler multiplicity 2, since for each realization of the vertex 0, there are two realizations of the vertex 3. Notice that the right

calligraph $G = (V, E)$ is not thin. Indeed, if we remove the vertices 1 and 2 from the graph $(V, E \cup \{\{1, 0\}, \{2, 0\}\})$, then the resulting graph is not connected and consists of the isolated vertices 0 and 3. \triangleleft




Figure 9: The left and right calligraphs have coupler multiplicities 1 and 2, respectively. The left calligraph is thin and the right calligraph is not thin.

If $C \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ is an irreducible curve, then we denote by $\text{Sing } C$ its *singular locus*. Recall from Appendix B that $g(C)$ denotes the geometric genus of C . The following corollary addresses [12, Conjecture 2 and Open problem 3].

Corollary II. Suppose that $G = (V, E)$ is a calligraph with class $[G] = (a, b, c)$ and max-tight decomposition $\{G_i\}_{i \in I}$, and let

$$k := \prod_{i \in I} c(G_i).$$

If G is thin and $\lambda \in \Omega_G$ a general edge length assignment, then G has coupler multiplicity $m(G) = 1$ and there exist k different irreducible curves $C_1, \dots, C_k \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ such that

$$\text{CouplerCurve}(G, \lambda) = C_1 \cup \dots \cup C_k \quad \text{and} \quad \deg C_1 = \dots = \deg C_k = 2a/k.$$

Moreover, if $\alpha := (a/k, b/k, c/k)$, then for all $1 \leq i, j \leq k$,

$$g(C_i) = g(C_j) \leq \frac{1}{2} \alpha \cdot (\alpha - (2, 1, 1)) + 1 - |\text{Sing } C_i|.$$

Proof. Since $\lambda \in \Omega_G$ is general, we know from Theorem I that

$$\mathcal{E}_G^{-1}(\lambda) = U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_k,$$

where U_1, \dots, U_k are pairwise different irreducible components. Let

$$H := \{r \in \mathbb{C}^{2V} : r_1 = (0, 0), r_2 = (1, 0)\} \quad \text{and} \quad F := \mathcal{E}_G^{-1}(\lambda) \cap H.$$

The transformation group T acts on each component U_i which implies that

$$F = F_1 \cup \dots \cup F_k,$$

where $F_i := U_i \cap H$ is an irreducible component for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. Let the projection $\rho: \mathbb{C}^{2V} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ send the realization r to the point r_0 . We observe that

$$\rho(F) = \text{CouplerCurve}(G, \lambda),$$

and thus $\rho(F_1), \dots, \rho(F_k)$ are the irreducible components of $\text{CouplerCurve}(G, \lambda)$. Because G is a thin calligraph, it follows from [12, Corollary I(P2)] that the coupler

multiplicity $m(G)$ is equal to 1 (see also [12, Lemma 16]). This implies that $\rho|_F$ is birational. By Proposition 38(b) in Appendix B applied to the edge map \mathcal{E}_G restricted to the subset H and the projection ρ , it follows that $\deg \rho(F_i) = \deg \rho(F_j)$ and $g(\rho(F_i)) = g(\rho(F_j))$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq k$. The proof is now concluded by [12, Corollary I(P6)]. \square

Example 29. Suppose that G is the graph in Figure 3 and recall from Example 1 that G has max-tight decomposition $\{G_1, \dots, G_8\}$ such that $c(G_1) = c(G_2) = 4$ and $c(G_3) = \dots = c(G_8) = 1$. We apply [11, 12, Algorithm 1] to compute its class

$$[G] = (272, 0, 0).$$

We observe that G is a thin calligraph and thus it follows from Corollary II that for some general edge length assignment λ its $\text{CouplerCurve}(G, \lambda)$ consist of 16 irreducible components. Each component has degree 34 and geometric genus at most 256, since $(272/16, 0/16, 0/16) = (17, 0, 0)$ and $\frac{1}{2}(17, 0, 0) \cdot (15, -1, -1) + 1 = 256$. \triangleleft

Example 30. Suppose that G is the graph in Figure 4 and recall from Example 2 that each of its max-tight subgraphs $G' \subset G$ is an edge so that $c(G') = 1$. We apply [11, 12, Algorithm 1] to compute its class

$$[G] = (11, 3, 3).$$

Since G is a thin calligraph, it follows from Corollary II that, for some general edge length assignment λ , its $\text{CouplerCurve}(G, \lambda)$ is irreducible of degree 22 and its geometric genus is at most $88 = \frac{1}{2}(11, 3, 3) \cdot (9, 2, 2) + 1$. \triangleleft

Remark 31 (real connected components). In this article, we count the number of irreducible components of a set of compatible realizations over the complex numbers. The number of real connected components remains an open problem. One difficulty is that there does not exist a Zariski open set of edge length assignments such that for each element in this set the number of real components is the same.

For example, let us consider the graph in Figure 10 and the two different edge length assignments for this graph. In both the left and right case each realization of the vertex 0 lies on a circle, where we assume that vertices 1 and 2 are realized as the points $(0, 0)$ and $(1, 0)$, respectively. By Theorem I, the number of complex irreducible components is equal to 1.

Each realization of the vertex 0 corresponds to two realizations of the graph as we can reflect vertex 3 along the line containing the realizations of the vertices 0 and 2. However, for the left case in Figure 10 the vertex 3 admits two real realizations if



Figure 10: *The set of compatible realizations for the left and right edge length assignments consists of two and one real connected component, respectively.*

and only if the realization of the vertex 0 lies on either the red or blue circular arc. Hence, the complex irreducible component contains two real connected components. Moreover, the set of edge length assignments such that the number of real connected components is 2 is Zariski dense in the set of all edge length assignments.

If we increase the length of the edges $\{0, 3\}$ and $\{2, 3\}$ as in right case of Figure 10, then the number of real connected components equals 1. Notice that the set of edge length assignments such that there is one real connected component is Zariski dense as well.

We refer to the classical “Grashof conditions for four bar linkages” for a more detailed analysis of the graphs in Figure 10. ◁

A The fiber product lemma

The goal of this appendix is to prove Lemma 10. For this we require scheme theoretic language, but we provide precise references for the non-expert.

We assume that varieties are affine, but not necessarily irreducible. If X is a variety, then $\mathbb{C}[X]$ and $\mathbb{C}(X)$ denote the *function ring* and *function field* of X , respectively (see [14, pages 4 and 16] where function ring is called “coordinate ring”). The *generic fiber* of a morphism $f: X \rightarrow Y$ between irreducible varieties X and Y is defined as

$$\text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[X] \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[Y]} \mathbb{C}(Y).$$

We refer to [14, pages xvi, 16, 87 and 89, and Exercise II.2.7 at page 80] or [20, Definition 1.5 in Chapter 3] for more details about the fiber at a “generic point”, which is closely related to our notion of general point.

Lemma 32. *Suppose that $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a dominant morphism between irreducible varieties.*

(a) *The fiber product $X \times_f X$ is irreducible if and only if the tensor product*

$$\mathbb{C}[X] \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[Y]} \mathbb{C}[X]$$

is an integral domain.

(b) The fiber $f^{-1}(y)$ is irreducible for general $y \in Y$ if and only if

$$\mathbb{C}[X] \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[Y]} \mathbb{C}(Y)$$

is an integral domain.

Proof. Assertions (a) and (b) are a direct consequence of the definitions. \square

Lemma 33. If R is an A -module and $S \subset A$ a multiplicatively closed subset, then

$$R \otimes_A S^{-1}A \cong S^{-1}R.$$

Proof. See for example [1, Proposition 3.5] for this well-known result. \square

Lemma 34. If $\mathbb{C}[X] \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[Y]} \mathbb{C}[X]$ is an integral domain for varieties X and Y , then $\mathbb{C}(X) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}(Y)} \mathbb{C}(X)$ is an integral domain as well.

Proof. If $R := \mathbb{C}[X] \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[Y]} \mathbb{C}[X]$, then its localization at the multiplicatively closed set $S = R \setminus \{0\}$ is as a direct consequence of the definitions at [1, Ch. 3] equal to

$$S^{-1}R = \mathbb{C}(X) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}(Y)} \mathbb{C}(X).$$

Since R is an integral domain, $S^{-1}R$ is an integral domain as well. \square

Lemma 35. If \mathbb{E}/\mathbb{F} is a field extension such that $\mathbb{E} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{E}$ an integral domain, and $e \in \mathbb{E}$ is algebraic over \mathbb{F} , then $e \in \mathbb{F}$.

Proof. Suppose by contradiction that $e \notin \mathbb{F}$. Let $p(t) = \sum_{i=1}^d p_i \cdot t^i$ be the minimal polynomial of e so that $d \geq 2$ and $p_d = 1$. Since $p(e) = 0$, we have

$$0 = p(e) \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes p(e) = \sum_{i=1}^d p_i \cdot (e^i \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes e^i).$$

We observe that for all $1 \leq i \leq d$,

$$x^i - y^i = (x - y) \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} x^j y^{i-1-j},$$

and thus

$$e^i \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes e^i = (e \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes e) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e^j \otimes e^{i-1-j}.$$

We established that $\alpha \cdot \beta = 0$, where

$$\alpha := e \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes e \quad \text{and} \quad \beta := \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} p_i \cdot e^j \otimes e^{i-1-j}.$$

Since the minimal polynomial $p(t)$ is of degree d , we find that the following set is linear independent:

$$\{e^i \otimes e^j : 1 \leq i, j \leq d-1\}.$$

This implies that $\beta \neq 0$, and thus α and β are zero divisors in $\mathbb{E} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{E}$. We arrived at a contradiction as $\mathbb{E} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{E}$ is an integral domain. \square

Lemma 36. *Suppose that $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a dominant morphism between varieties and let $f^*: \mathbb{C}(Y) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}(X)$ be the homomorphism between function fields that sends the function α to the composition $\alpha \circ f$. Let $\mathbb{E} := \mathbb{C}(X)$ and $\mathbb{F} := f^*(\mathbb{C}(Y))$ so that \mathbb{E}/\mathbb{F} is a field extension. If \mathbb{F} is algebraically closed in \mathbb{E} , then $\mathbb{C}[X] \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[Y]} \mathbb{C}(Y)$ is an integral domain.*

Proof. Suppose by contradiction that $R := \mathbb{C}[X] \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[Y]} \mathbb{C}(Y)$ is not an integral domain. In this case, the generic fiber of f decomposes into $k \geq 2$ irreducible components:

$$\text{Spec } R = C_1 \cup \cdots \cup C_k.$$

By Sard's theorem the generic fiber is smooth and thus its irreducible components coincide with the connected components. Let $r \in R$ define the function $\text{Spec } R \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ that sends c to i if $c \in C_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ and consider the polynomial

$$\tilde{p} := (t - 1) \cdots (t - k).$$

Notice that the composition $\tilde{p} \circ r$ vanishes identically. Moreover, we observe that $\tilde{p} \in \mathbb{C}(Y)[t]$ is the minimal polynomial of r . With the multiplicative set $S := \mathbb{C}[Y] \setminus \{0\}$, we find that

$$R = \mathbb{C}[X] \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[Y]} S^{-1}\mathbb{C}[Y].$$

We know from Lemma 33 that $R \cong S^{-1}\mathbb{C}[X]$. Since $S^{-1}\mathbb{C}[X] \subset \mathbb{C}(X) = \mathbb{E}$, there exists an injective ring homomorphism

$$\varphi: R \rightarrow \mathbb{E},$$

such that $\varphi(\mathbb{C}(Y)) = \mathbb{F}$. It follows that $\varphi(r) \in \mathbb{E}$ has a nonzero minimal polynomial in $\mathbb{F}[t]$. As \mathbb{F} is algebraically closed in \mathbb{E} by assumption, we established that $\varphi(r) \in \mathbb{F}$. This implies that $\varphi(r)$ defines a rational function $X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ that is the composition of $f: X \rightarrow Y$ with some function $\alpha: Y \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. We arrived at a contradiction as $(\alpha \circ f)(C_i) = (\alpha \circ f)(C_j)$ although $r(C_i) \neq r(C_j)$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k$. \square

Proof of Lemma 10. We may assume without loss of generality that X, Y are affine irreducible varieties and f is a smooth morphism (see [14, Proposition III.10.4]).

(a) This assertion follows from [14, Proposition III.10.1(d)].

(b) Since $X \times_f X$ is irreducible, we know from Lemma 32(a) that $\mathbb{C}[X] \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[Y]} \mathbb{C}[X]$ is an integral domain. Hence, it follows from Lemma 34 that $\mathbb{C}(X) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}(Y)} \mathbb{C}(X)$ is an

integral domain as well. We apply Lemma 35 with $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{C}(X)$ and $\mathbb{F} = f^*(\mathbb{C}(Y))$, and find that \mathbb{F} is algebraically closed in \mathbb{E} . Therefore, $\mathbb{C}[X] \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[Y]} \mathbb{C}(Y)$ is an integral domain by Lemma 36. We conclude from Lemma 32(b) that the general fiber of f is irreducible. \square

B Invariants of components of fibers

The goal of this appendix is to prove Proposition 38 and Corollary III, which concerns algebro geometric invariants of irreducible components of sets of realizations that are compatible with some general edge length assignment. We assume the notation of Appendix A.

If $X \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is a variety, then its *dimension*, *degree* and *arithmetic genus* are denoted by $\dim X$, $\deg X$ and $p_a(X)$, respectively (see [14, §I.7 and Exercise I.7.2]). If X is a curve, then we denote by $g(X)$ its *geometric genus* [14, Remark II.8.18.2].

Lemma 37. *If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a dominant morphism between irreducible varieties, then $\mathbb{C}[X] \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[Y]} \mathbb{C}(Y)$ is an integral domain.*

Proof. Notice that $\mathbb{C}[X]$ is a $\mathbb{C}[Y]$ -module via the pullback $f^*: \mathbb{C}[Y] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[X]$. By Lemma 33, $\mathbb{C}[X] \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[Y]} \mathbb{C}(Y) \cong S^{-1}\mathbb{C}[X]$, where $S := \mathbb{C}[Y] \setminus \{0\}$ is a multiplicatively closed set. Since $\mathbb{C}[X]$ is an integral domain, its localization is integral as well. \square

Proposition 38. *Suppose that $f: X \subset \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow Y$ is a dominant morphism between smooth and irreducible varieties X and Y . Let C and C' be different components of the fiber $f^{-1}(y)$ for some general $y \in Y$.*

- (a) *C is smooth, $C \cap C' = \emptyset$, $\dim C = \dim C'$, $\deg C = \deg C'$ and $p_a(C) = p_a(C')$.*
- (b) *If $\dim C = 1$, $\rho: \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^m$ is the projection to the first $m \leq n$ coordinates and its restriction $\rho|_{f^{-1}(y)}$ is birational, then*

$$\deg \rho(C) = \deg \rho(C') \quad \text{and} \quad g(\rho(C)) = g(\rho(C')).$$

Proof. (a) Since f is a morphism between differentiable manifolds, it follows from Sard's theorem that the general fiber of f is smooth, which implies that C is smooth and $C \cap C' = \emptyset$. It follows from Lemma 37 that the generic fiber

$$Z := \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[X] \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[Y]} \mathbb{C}(Y)$$

is irreducible over the function field $\mathbb{C}(Y)$. Suppose that $\mathbb{E}/\mathbb{C}(Y)$ is an extension field such that $Z = Z_1 \cup Z_2 \cup \dots \cup Z_k$ decomposes into $k \geq 2$ irreducible components, where Z_i is defined by polynomials with coefficients in \mathbb{E} for all $1 \leq i \leq k$.

By [14, Proposition I.7.6 at page 52 and Exercise I.7.2 at page 54] there exists for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ a unique *Hilbert polynomial* $P_{Z_i} \in \mathbb{C}(Y)[t]$ with *leading coefficient* $\text{lc}(P_{Z_i}) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $\dim Z_i = \deg P_{Z_i}$, $\deg Z_i = (\deg P_{Z_i})! \cdot \text{lc}(P_{Z_i})$ and $p_a(Z_i) = (-1)^{\deg P_{Z_i}} \cdot (P_{Z_i}(0) - 1)$. The Galois group of the field extension $\mathbb{E}/\mathbb{C}(Z)$ induces a field isomorphism $\mathbb{C}(Z_i) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}(Z_j)$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k$. It follows from the procedure for computing Hilbert polynomials as described at [7, §9.3] that this field isomorphism identifies P_{Z_i} with P_{Z_j} so that $\deg P_{Z_i} = \deg P_{Z_j}$, $\text{lc}(P_{Z_i}) = \text{lc}(P_{Z_j})$ and $P_{Z_i}(0) = P_{Z_j}(0)$. The proof is now concluded as a direct consequence of the definitions of generic and general fibers.

(b) The ideal of $\rho(Z)$ is obtained from the ideal of Z by elimination of variables (see [7, §3.2, Theorem 3]). Since Z is irreducible over the function field $\mathbb{C}(Y)$, we deduce that $\rho(Z)$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{C}(Y)$ as well. It follows from [14, Theorem II.8.19, Remark III.7.12.2 and Exercise IV.1.8] that $g(\rho(C)) = p_a(C)$. The same arguments as before conclude the proof. \square

The following simple example is to clarify Proposition 38 and its proof.

Example 39. Suppose that $f: \mathbb{C}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ maps (x, y, z) to (x^2, z) . The generic fiber is defined as $\text{Spec } \mathbb{F}[x, y, z]/\langle x^2 - s, z - t \rangle$, where $\mathbb{F} := \{p/q : p, q \in \mathbb{C}[s, t], q \neq 0\}$ denotes the function field of \mathbb{C}^2 . Although $x^2 - s$ is irreducible over the function field \mathbb{F} , it factors as $(x - u)(x + u)$ over the extension field $\mathbb{E} := \mathbb{F}(u)/\langle u^2 - s \rangle$. The Galois group of this field extension \mathbb{E}/\mathbb{F} is generated by a field automorphism that sends u to $-u$ and leaves \mathbb{F} elementwise invariant. If the projection $\rho: \mathbb{C}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ maps (x, y, z) to (x, y) , then the image of the generic fiber of f is $\text{Spec } \mathbb{F}[x, y]/\langle x^2 - s \rangle$. Hence, the image of the generic fiber is irreducible over the field \mathbb{F} . This implies that the irreducible components $\text{Spec } \mathbb{E}[x, y]/\langle x - u \rangle$ and $\text{Spec } \mathbb{E}[x, y]/\langle x + u \rangle$ have the same dimension, degree and arithmetic genus. \triangleleft

Corollary III. *Suppose that $G = (V, E)$ is a sparse graph, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^E$ a general edge length assignment, and let C, C' be different irreducible components in the set $\mathcal{E}_G^{-1}(\lambda) \subset \mathbb{C}^{2V}$ of λ -compatible realizations. Then C is smooth,*

$$C \cap C' = \emptyset, \quad \dim C = \dim C', \quad \deg C = \deg C' \quad \text{and} \quad p_a(C) = p_a(C').$$

Proof. The edge map $\mathcal{E}_G: \mathbb{C}^{2V} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^E$ is dominant by Lemma 3(a) and thus the proof is concluded by applying Proposition 38(a) to \mathcal{E}_G with $\mathbb{C}^{2V} \cong \mathbb{C}^{2|V|}$. \square

Acknowledgements

Financial support for Niels Lubbes and Mehdi Makhul was provided by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF): P36689 and P33003.

References

- [1] M. F. Atiyah and I. G. Macdonald. *Introduction to commutative algebra*. Westview Press, 1969.
- [2] E. Bartzos, I. Emiris, J. Legerský, and E. Tsigaridas. On the maximal number of real embeddings of minimally rigid graphs in \mathbb{R}^2 , \mathbb{R}^3 and S^2 . *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 102:189–208, 2021. doi:10.1016/j.jsc.2019.10.015.
- [3] E. Bartzos, I. Emiris, and R. Vidunas. New upper bounds for the number of embeddings of minimally rigid graphs. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 2022. doi:10.1007/s00454-022-00370-3.
- [4] C. Borcea and I. Streinu. The number of embeddings of minimally rigid graphs. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 31:287–303, 2004. doi:10.1007/s00454-003-2902-0.
- [5] J. Capco, M. Gallet, G. Grasegger, C. Koutschan, N. Lubbes, and J. Schicho. The number of realizations of a Laman graph. *SIAM Journal on Applied Algebra and Geometry*, 2(1):94–125, 2018. doi:10.1137/17M1118312.
- [6] R. Connelly. Generic global rigidity. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 33(4):549–563, 2005. doi:10.1007/s00454-004-1124-4.
- [7] D. Cox, J. Little, and D. O’Shea. *Ideals, varieties, and algorithms*. Third edition, 2007. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-35651-8.
- [8] S. Dewar and G. Grasegger. The number of realisations of a rigid graph in Euclidean and spherical geometries. 2023. arXiv:2309.16416.
- [9] M. Gallet, G. Grasegger, N. Lubbes, and J. Schicho. Calligraphs and sphere realizations. 2023. arXiv:2308.15305.
- [10] S. J. Gortler, A. D. Healy, and D. P. Thurston. Characterizing generic global rigidity. *Am. J. Math.*, 132(4):897–939, 2010. doi:10.1353/ajm.0.0132.
- [11] G. Grasegger, B. El Hilany, and N. Lubbes. Software library: Calligraphs and counting realizations of minimally rigid graphs, 2022. doi:10.5281/zenodo.6421148.
- [12] G. Grasegger, B. El Hilany, and N. Lubbes. Coupler curves of moving graphs and counting realizations of rigid graphs. *Math. Comput.*, 93(345):459–504, 2024. doi:10.1090/mcom/3886.
- [13] G. Grasegger, C. Koutschan, and E. Tsigaridas. Lower bounds on the number of realizations of rigid graphs. *Experimental Mathematics*, 29(2):125–136, 2020. doi:10.1080/10586458.2018.1437851.
- [14] R. Hartshorne. *Algebraic geometry*. Springer, 1977.
- [15] L. Henneberg. *Die graphische Statik der starren Systeme*. Teubner, 1911.
- [16] K. H. Hunt. *Kinematic geometry of mechanisms*, volume 7. Clarendon Press, 1990.

- [17] B. Jackson and J. C. Owen. Equivalent realisations of a rigid graph. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 256:42–58, 2019. doi:10.1016/j.dam.2017.12.009.
- [18] G. Laman. On graphs and rigidity of plane skeletal structures. *J. Engrg. Math.*, 4:331–340, 1970. doi:10.1007/BF01534980.
- [19] A. Lee and I. Streinu. Pebble game algorithms and sparse graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 308(8):1425–1437, 2008. doi:10.1016/j.disc.2007.07.104.
- [20] Q. Liu. *Algebraic geometry and arithmetic curves*, volume 6 of *Oxf. Grad. Texts Math.* Oxford University Press, 2002.
- [21] J. C. Maxwell. On the calculation of the equilibrium and stiffness of frames. *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science*, 27(182):294–299, 1864. doi:10.1080/14786446408643668.
- [22] H. Pollaczek-Geiringer. Über die Gliederung ebener Fachwerke. *Z. Angew. Math. Mech.*, 7:58–72, 1927. doi:10.1002/zamm.19270070107.
- [23] M. Sadjadi, V. F. Hagh, M. Kang, M. Sitharam, R. Connelly, S. J. Gortler, L. Theran, M. Holmes-Cerfon, and M. F. Thorpe. Realizations of isostatic material frameworks. *physica status solidi (b)*, 258(9):2000555, 2021. doi:10.1002/pssb.202000555.
- [24] J. Schicho. And yet it moves: paradoxically moving linkages in kinematics. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society. New Series*, 59(1):59–95, 2022. doi:10.1090/bull/1721.
- [25] I. R. Shafarevich. *Basic algebraic geometry 1*. Second edition, 1994. Varieties in projective space.
- [26] M. Sitharam, A. St. John, and J. Sidman, editors. *Handbook of geometric constraint systems principles*. Discrete Math. Appl. 2019.
- [27] R. Steffens and T. Theobald. Mixed volume techniques for embeddings of Laman graphs. *Computational Geometry*, 43:84–93, 2010. doi:10.1016/j.comgeo.2009.04.004.
- [28] M. F. Thorpe and P. M. Duxbury. *Rigidity Theory and Applications*. 2002. doi:0.1007/b115749.
- [29] W. Wunderlich. Höhere Koppelkurven. *Österreichisches Ingenieur-Archiv*, 17:162–165, 1963.

Addresses of authors:

Institute for Algebra, Research Institute for Symbolic Computation (RISC),
 Johannes Kepler University, Linz, Austria
info@nielslubbes.com

josef.schicho@risc.jku.at

Johann Radon Institute for Computational and Applied Mathematics (RICAM),
 Austrian Academy of Sciences, Linz, Austria

mehdi.makhul@oeaw.ac.at

audie.warren@oeaw.ac.at