

THE CANONICAL JOIN COMPLEX FOR BICLOSED SETS

ALEXANDER CLIFTON, PETER DILLERY, AND ALEXANDER GARVER

ABSTRACT. The canonical join complex of a semidistributive lattice, is a simplicial complex whose faces are canonical join representations of elements of the semidistributive lattice. We give a combinatorial classification of the faces of the canonical join complex of the lattice of biclosed sets of segments supported by a tree, as introduced by the third author and McConville. We also use our classification to describe the elements of the shard intersection order of the lattice of biclosed sets. As a consequence, we prove that this shard intersection order is a lattice.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	1
2.1. Lattices	1
2.2. Biclosed sets	3
3. A CU-labeling of $\text{Bic}(T)$	4
4. Canonical join complex of $\text{Bic}(T)$	8
5. Shard intersection order	10
5.1. Elements of the shard intersection order	10
5.2. Lattice structure of the shard intersection order	12
Acknowledgements	15
References	15

1. INTRODUCTION

In [6], McConville introduced a lattice of biclosed sets as a tool for studying the lattice structure of Grid-Tamari orders. In subsequent work by McConville and the third author [2] [3] [5], biclosed sets were used to understand the lattice structure and other lattice theoretic questions about Grid-Tamari orders and oriented flip graphs. Furthermore, in [3] [5], the authors describe the lattice-theoretic shard intersection order, in the sense of [7], of the Grid-Tamari order and oriented flip graphs. The goal of this paper is to gain a combinatorial description of the lattice-theoretic shard intersection order of the lattice of biclosed sets appearing in [3].

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Lattices. Let (L, \leq_L) be a finite lattice. For $x, y \in L$, if $x < y$ and there does not exist $z \in L$ such that $x < z < y$, we write $x \triangleleft y$. Let $\text{Cov}(L) := \{(x, y) \in L^2 \mid x \triangleleft y\}$ be the set of **covering relations** of L . We let $\hat{0}, \hat{1} \in L$ denote the unique minimal and unique maximal elements of L , respectively.

A set map $\lambda : \text{Cov}(L) \rightarrow Q$, where (Q, \leq_Q) is some poset is called an **edge labeling**. We review the concepts of join- and meet-irreducibility in order to discuss an important type of labeling.

We say that an element $j \in L$ is **join-irreducible** if $j \neq \hat{0}$ and whenever $j = x \vee y$, either $j = x$ or $j = y$ holds. **Meet-irreducible** elements are defined dually. We denote the subset of join-irreducible (resp., meet-irreducible) elements by $\text{JI}(L)$ (resp., $\text{MI}(L)$). For j (resp., m) in $\text{JI}(L)$ (resp., $\text{MI}(L)$), we let j_* (resp., m^*) denote the unique element of L covered by (resp., that covers) j (resp., m).

For $A \subseteq L$, the expression $\bigvee A := \bigvee_{a \in A} a$ is **irredundant** if there does not exist a proper subset $A' \subsetneq A$ such that $\bigvee A' = \bigvee A$. Given $A, B \subseteq \text{JI}(L)$ such that $\bigvee A$ and $\bigvee B$ are irredundant and $\bigvee A = \bigvee B$, we set $A \leq B$ if for $a \in A$ there exists $b \in B$ with $a \leq b$. If $x \in L$ and $A \subseteq \text{JI}(L)$ such that $x = \bigvee A$ is irredundant, we say $\bigvee A$ is a **canonical join-representation** for x if $A \leq B$ for any other irredundant join-representation $x = \bigvee B$, $B \subseteq \text{JI}(L)$. Dually, one defines **canonical meet-representations**.

We define the **canonical join complex** of L , denoted $\Delta^{CJ}(L)$, to be the abstract simplicial complex whose vertex set is $\text{JI}(L)$ and whose faces are sets of join-irreducibles whose join is a canonical join-representation of some element of L .

Now we assume that L is a finite **semidistributive** lattice. This means that for any three elements $x, y, z \in L$, the following properties hold:

- if $x \wedge z = y \wedge z$, then $(x \vee y) \wedge z = x \wedge z$, and
- if $x \vee z = y \vee z$, then $(x \wedge y) \vee z = x \vee z$.

Moreover, each element of L has a canonical join-representation. In this case, there is a canonical bijection $L \rightarrow \Delta^{CJ}(L)$ sending $x \mapsto A$ where $\bigvee A$ is the canonical join-representation of x .

With these notions in hand, we arrive at the notions of **CN-** and **CU-labeling**, which plays a prominent role in this paper.

Definition 2.1. A labeling $\lambda : \text{Cov}(L) \rightarrow Q$ is a **CN-labeling** if L and its dual L^* satisfy the following: given $x, y, z \in L$ with $(z, x), (z, y) \in \text{Cov}(L)$ and maximal chains C_1 and C_2 in $[z, x \vee y]$ with $x \in C_1$ and $y \in C_2$,

(CN1) the elements $x' \in C_1, y' \in C_2$ such that $(x', x \vee y), (y', x \vee y) \in \text{Cov}(L)$ satisfy

$$\lambda(x', x \vee y) = \lambda(z, y), \lambda(y', x \vee y) = \lambda(z, x);$$

(CN2) if $(u, v) \in \text{Cov}(C_1)$ with $z < u, v < x \vee y$, then $\lambda(z, x), \lambda(z, y) <_Q \lambda(u, v)$;

(CN3) the labels on $\text{Cov}(C_1)$ are pairwise distinct.

We say that λ is a **CU-labeling** if, in addition, it satisfies

(CU1) $\lambda(j_*, j) \neq \lambda(j'_*, j')$ for $j, j' \in \text{JI}(L)$, $j \neq j'$, and

(CU2) $\lambda(m, m^*) \neq \lambda(m', m'^*)$ for $m, m' \in \text{MI}(L)$, $m \neq m'$.

If L admits a CU-labeling, it is said to be **congruence-uniform**, see [4, Proposition 2.6].

Given an edge labeling $\lambda : \text{Cov}(L) \rightarrow Q$, one defines

$$\lambda_{\downarrow}(x) := \{\lambda(y, x) : y \lessdot x\}, \quad \lambda^{\uparrow}(x) := \{\lambda(x, z) : x \lessdot z\}.$$

Lemma 2.2. [4, Lemma 2.7] Let L be a congruence-uniform lattice with CU-labeling $\lambda : \text{Cov}(L) \rightarrow P$. For any $s \in P$, if j is a minimal element with the property $s \in \lambda_{\downarrow}(j)$, then j is a join-irreducible. Dually, if m is a maximal element with the property $s \in \lambda^{\uparrow}(m)$, then m is meet-irreducible.

Lemma 2.3. [4, Proposition 2.10] Let L be a congruence-uniform lattice with CU-labeling λ . For $x \in L$, the canonical join-representation of x is $\bigvee_D j$, where D is the set of join-irreducibles such that $\lambda(j_*, j) \in \lambda_{\downarrow}(x)$. Dually, for $x \in L$, the canonical meet-representation of x is $\bigwedge_U m$, where U is the set of meet-irreducibles such that $\lambda(m, m^*) \in \lambda^{\uparrow}(x)$.




FIGURE 1. Acyclic paths $[1, 3]$, $[5, 4]$, and $[7, 10]$ are segments, but acyclic path $[4, 10]$ is not.

Given a lattice L with a CU-labeling, one can define a new poset known as the **shard intersection order** of L . Reading introduced this concept in [7].

Definition 2.4. Let L be a congruence-uniform lattice with CU-labeling $\lambda : \text{Cov}(L) \rightarrow P$. Let $x \in L$ and let y_1, \dots, y_k be the elements of L satisfying $(y_i, x) \in \text{Cov}(L)$. We denote the set $\{\lambda(y_i, x)\}$ by $\lambda_{\downarrow}(x)$. Define the **shard intersection order** of L , denoted $\Psi(L)$, to be the collection of sets of the form

$$\psi(x) := \{\lambda(w, z) \mid \bigwedge_i^k y_i \leq w < z \leq x, (w, z) \in \text{Cov}(L)\}$$

partially ordered by inclusion.

2.2. Biclosed sets. A **tree** is a finite connected acyclic graph. The degree-one vertices of a tree are called **leaves**. We can always embed a tree T into the disk D^2 so that exactly the leaves lie on the boundary. Unless stated otherwise, a tree is assumed to be equipped with such an embedding. Non-leaf vertices of T are thus in the interior of D^2 , and we call these **interior vertices**. We also assume that the interior vertices of T have degree at least 3.

An **acyclic path** is a sequence of pairwise distinct vertices $(v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_n})$ of T such that there is an edge connecting v_{i_j} and $v_{i_{j+1}}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n - 1$. Since an acyclic path is uniquely determined by its endpoints, we can denote the path $(v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_n})$ by $[v_{i_1}, v_{i_n}]$.

Observe that the embedding of T in D^2 determines a cyclic ordering of the edges of T that are incident to a given vertex. An acyclic path $(v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_n})$ is called a **segment** if, for each $1 \leq j \leq n - 2$, $[v_{i_{j+1}}, v_{i_{j+2}}]$ is immediately clockwise or counterclockwise from $[v_{i_j}, v_{i_{j+1}}]$ with respect to the cyclic ordering on the edges incident to $v_{i_{j+1}}$. The set of all segments supported by a tree T is denoted by $\text{Seg}(T)$. Figure 1 shows some examples and non-examples of segments.

Given two segments $s_1 = (v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, \dots, v_{i_k}), s_2 = (v_{i_k}, v_{i_{k+1}}, \dots, v_{i_n}) \in \text{Seg}(T)$ that share an endpoint v_{i_k} but differ at all other vertices, we define their **composition** to be the acyclic path $s_1 \circ s_2 := (v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_k}, \dots, v_{i_n})$. We say that two segments s_1 and s_2 are **composable** if $s_1 \circ s_2 \in \text{Seg}(T)$. A subset $B \subset \text{Seg}(T)$ is **closed** if for all composable $s_1, s_2 \in B$, $s_1 \circ s_2 \in B$. B is **biclosed** if both B and its complement, $B^c := \text{Seg}(T) \setminus B$, are closed. We will also often say that B is **coclosed** when B^c is closed. Additionally, if $B \subset \text{Seg}(T)$, we define \overline{B} to be the smallest closed set containing B .

We frequently use the following lemma without citing it.

Lemma 2.5. For $B_1, B_2 \in \text{Bic}(T)$, we have

$$B_1 \vee B_2 = \overline{B_1 \cup B_2}.$$

Proof. It suffices to show that $B' := \overline{B_1 \cup B_2}$ is biclosed, since it must be contained in $B_1 \vee B_2$. It's closed by construction, so we just need to show that it's coclosed. Suppose by contradiction that there exist $s_a, s_b \in (B')^c$ such that $s_a \circ s_b \in B'$, say $s_a \circ s_b = s_1 \circ s_2 \circ s_3 \dots s_m, m \in \mathbb{N}$, where we assume without loss of generality that $s_1 \in B_1$, and $s_j \in B_i$ if $j \equiv i \pmod{2}$. We can also assume that the endpoint of $s_a \circ s_b$ that s_a contains lies in s_1 . Let i be the smallest index such that s_i is not a subsegment of s_a . Then $s_a = s_1 \circ \dots \circ s_{i-1} \circ s'_i, s_b = s''_i \circ s_{i+1} \circ \dots \circ s_m$, where $s'_i, s''_i \notin (B_1 \cup B_2)$ and $s'_i \circ s''_i = s_i$. This contradicts the fact that B_1 and B_2 are biclosed. \square

The poset structure of $\text{Bic}(T)$ is studied in [4], where the following result is proved:

Theorem 2.6. [4, Theorem 4.1] The poset $\text{Bic}(T)$ is a semidistributive, congruence-uniform, and polygonal lattice. Also, for $X, Y \in \text{Bic}(T)$, if $X \subsetneq Y$, then there is a segment $y \in Y$ such that $X \sqcup \{y\} \in \text{Bic}(T)$.

Remark 2.7. This result means that the map $(-)^c: \text{Bic}(T) \rightarrow \text{Bic}(T), B \mapsto B^c$, induces a bijection between join- and meet-irreducibles. Suppose that B is join-irreducible, which means that there exists a unique $B' \triangleleft B$, and $B' \cup \{s\} = B$ for some segment $s \in B$, by Theorem 2.6. Again by Theorem 2.6, if $B^c \triangleleft A$, then $A = B^c \cup \{s\}$, which means that $A^c \cup \{s\} = B$, and so A is unique, and hence B^c is meet-irreducible. The map $(-)^c$ is now immediately a bijection since it's an involution.

Lemma 2.8. For $B_1, B_2 \in \text{Bic}(T)$, one has $B_1 \wedge B_2 = (B_1^c \vee B_2^c)^c$.

Proof. Let $s \in B_1 \wedge B_2$. It follows that $s \in B_1 \cap B_2$. Now $s \notin B_1^c \cup B_2^c \subset (B_1^c \vee B_2^c)^c$. This implies that $s \in (B_1^c \vee B_2^c)^c$.

To prove the opposite inclusion, observe that

$$B_1 \wedge B_2 = \bigvee_{\substack{B \in \text{Bic}(T) \\ B \subset B_1, B \subset B_2}} B.$$

Now notice that if $s \in (B_1^c \vee B_2^c)^c$, then $s \notin B_1^c$ and $s \notin B_2^c$. This implies that $s \in B_1$ and $s \in B_2$. Thus $(B_1^c \vee B_2^c)^c \subset B_1$ and $(B_1^c \vee B_2^c)^c \subset B_2$. Since $(B_1^c \vee B_2^c)^c \in \text{Bic}(T)$, it follows that $(B_1^c \vee B_2^c)^c$ is a joinand in the join representation of $B_1 \wedge B_2$ shown above. We obtain that $(B_1^c \vee B_2^c)^c \subset B_1 \wedge B_2$. \square

Using the following lemma, one obtains an explicit description of the facial intervals of $\text{Bic}(T)$. One can find a proof of the following lemma, in [5, Lemma 4.14].

Lemma 2.9. Given $B, B \setminus \{s_1\}, \dots, B \setminus \{s_k\} \in \text{Bic}(T)$, we have that $\bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i = \overline{B \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_k\}}$.

3. A CU-LABELING OF $\text{Bic}(T)$

In [4], the authors prove that $\text{Bic}(T)$ is congruence-uniform, and thus it admits a CU-labeling. In this section, we will explicitly construct such a labeling.

We say a segment $s \in \text{Seg}(T)$ is a **split** of a segment t if s is a proper subsegment of t , and s and t share exactly one endpoint. A **break** of a segment $[a, c]$ is a pair of splits $\{[a, b], [b, c]\}$, of $[a, c]$ for some vertex b of segment $[a, c]$ lying between a and c . We say that b is the **faultline** of the break $\{[a, b], [b, c]\}$.

Define a poset \mathcal{S}_T whose elements are of the form $(s, \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_m\}) \in \text{Seg}(T) \times 2^{\text{Seg}(T)}$ with the following properties:




FIGURE 2. The two forms of the interval $[B, B_1 \vee B_2]$ of $\text{Bic}(T)$. The labels on the covering relations as defined by the labeling $\tilde{\lambda} : \text{Cov}(\text{Bic}(T)) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_T$ are in blue. The set \mathcal{D} consists of all splits of $s \circ t$ that belong to B .

- $s = (v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{m+1})$ has m breaks,
- each s_i is a split of s , and
- two distinct splits s_i and s_j do not appear in the same break of s .

We will typically denote $(s, \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_m\}) \in \mathcal{S}_T$ by $s_{\mathcal{D}} = s_{\{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_m\}}$. The elements of \mathcal{S}_T are partially ordered as follows: given $s_{\{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k\}}, s'_{\{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_l\}} \in \mathcal{S}_T$, one has $s'_{\{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_l\}} \leq s_{\{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k\}}$ if s' is a proper subsegment of s . At times, we will also write $s' \subseteq s$ (resp., $s' \not\subseteq s$) to indicate that s' is a subsegment (resp., not a subsegment) of s . We will refer to elements of \mathcal{S}_T as **labels**.

Definition 3.1. Define a map $\tilde{\lambda} : \text{Cov}(\text{Bic}(T)) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_T$ by $\tilde{\lambda}(B, B \sqcup \{s\}) = s_{\{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k\}}$ where s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k are the splits of s which are contained in B . It is clear that $\tilde{\lambda}$ is an edge-labeling of $\text{Bic}(T)$. If we let $\lambda : \text{Cov}(\text{Bic}(T)) \rightarrow \text{Seg}(T)$ denote the first coordinate function of $\tilde{\lambda}$, we have that λ is the CN-labeling of $\text{Bic}(T)$ from [4, Theorem 4.1].

Theorem 3.2. The edge-labeling $\tilde{\lambda} : \text{Cov}(\text{Bic}(T)) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_T$ is a CU-labeling of $\text{Bic}(T)$.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. We first verify axioms (CN1), (CN2), and (CN3). Note that it is enough verify these axioms for $\text{Bic}(T)$ since $\text{Bic}(T)$ is self-dual.

Let $B_1, B_2 \in \text{Bic}(T)$ and assume that they both cover some biclosed set B . By Theorem 2.6, there exists $s, t \in \text{Seg}(T)$ such that $B_1 = B \sqcup \{s\}$ and $B_2 = B \sqcup \{t\}$. The interval $[B, B_1 \vee B_2]$ has one of the two forms shown in Figure 2 where the left (resp., right) figure occurs when s and t are not composable (resp., when s and t are composable). One deduces axioms (CN1), (CN2), and (CN3) from Figure 2.

We now verify axioms (CU1) and (CU2).

(CU2): Consider two meet-irreducibles $M_1, M_2 \in \text{JI}(\text{Bic}(T))$ which are covered by M_1^* and M_2^* , respectively. Assume for the sake of contradiction that $\tilde{\lambda}(M_1, M_1^*) = \tilde{\lambda}(M_2, M_2^*)$, and denote this label by $s_{\mathcal{D}}$. Thus $M_1^* = M_1 \sqcup \{s\}$ and $M_2^* = M_2 \sqcup \{s\}$. Note that $s \in M_1 \vee M_2$ so there exists $s_1, \dots, s_k \in M_1 \cup M_2$ such that $s = s_1 \circ \dots \circ s_k$. Without loss of generality, assume that $s_1 \in M_1$, and that $s_i \in M_2$ if $s_{i-1} \in M_1$ and $s_i \in M_1$ if $s_{i-1} \in M_2$ for each $i = 1, \dots, k$.

Next, since $\tilde{\lambda}(M_1, M_1^*) = \tilde{\lambda}(M_2, M_2^*)$, sets M_1 and M_2 both contain the same split s' or s'' from a given break $\{s', s''\}$. We know that s_1 is a split of s so $s_1 \in M_1 \cap M_2$. Since $s_2 \in M_2$, we know $s_1 \circ s_2 \in M_2$. Now $s_1 \circ s_2$ is a split of s so it follows that $s_1 \circ s_2 \in M_1 \cap M_2$. By continuing this argument, we obtain that $s \in M_1$, a contradiction.

(CU1): Consider elements J^1 and J^2 of $\text{Bic}(T)$ which cover J_*^1 and J_*^2 , respectively. Notice that $(J^1)^c$ and $(J^2)^c$ are meet-irreducibles of $\text{Bic}(T)$ which are covered by $(J_*^1)^c$ and $(J_*^2)^c$, respectively.

If $\tilde{\lambda}(J_*^1, J^1) = \tilde{\lambda}(J_*^2, J^2)$ and we denote this label by $s_{\mathcal{D}}$, then $\tilde{\lambda}((J^1)^c, (J_*^1)^c) = \tilde{\lambda}((J^2)^c, (J_*^2)^c)$ and the common label is $s_{\mathcal{D}'}$ where $\mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{D}' = \emptyset$. This contradicts property (CU1). \square

We conclude this section by classifying the join- and meet-irreducible biclosed sets. We do this by choosing a label $s_{\mathcal{D}} \in \mathcal{S}_T$ and constructing the minimal biclosed set B where $\tilde{\lambda}_{\downarrow}(B) = \{s_{\mathcal{D}}\}$ and by constructing the maximal biclosed set where $\tilde{\lambda}_{\uparrow}(B) = \{s_{\mathcal{D}}\}$.

Given $s_{\mathcal{D}} \in \mathcal{S}_T$, define

$$J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) := \{s\} \sqcup \mathcal{D} \sqcup \bigcup_{t \in \mathcal{D}} S(t)$$

where $S(t) = S(t, \mathcal{D}) \subset \text{Seg}(T)$ is defined to be the set of all splits s' of t satisfying the following:

- i) segment s' is not a split of s , and
- ii) segment s' is not composable with any segment in \mathcal{D} .

Lemma 3.3. The set $J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ is biclosed. In fact, no two elements of $J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ are composable.

Proof. We show that $J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ is closed by showing that no two elements are composable. For any element $t \in \mathcal{D}$, no two elements of $\{s\} \sqcup \mathcal{D} \sqcup S(t)$ are composable. Thus it is enough to show that given $t_1, t_2 \in \mathcal{D}$, any two segments $s_1 \in S(t_1)$ and $s_2 \in S(t_2)$ are not composable.

Suppose that t_1 and t_2 do not agree along a segment. If s_1 and s_2 are composable, then so are t_1 and t_2 . This contradicts the definition of \mathcal{D} .

Now suppose that t_1 and t_2 agree along a segment. If s_1 and s_2 are composable, the definition of \mathcal{D} implies that there exists $d \in \mathcal{D}$ where either s_1 and d are composable or s_2 and d are composable. This contradicts the definition of $S(t_1)$ or that of $S(t_2)$. We conclude that $J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ is closed.

Next, we show that $J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ is coclosed by showing that given any element $s_1 \in J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ and any break $\{s', s''\}$ of s , one has $s' \in J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ or $s'' \in J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$. It is enough to show that this is true for elements of $J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \setminus \{s\}$.

Assume $s_1 \in \mathcal{D}$ and $s_1 = s' \circ s''$ where s' is not a split of s . We can also assume that $s'' \notin J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$, otherwise we are done. Since $s_1 \in \mathcal{D}$, the definition of \mathcal{D} implies that there is no split of s that belongs to \mathcal{D} and is composable with s' . Thus $s' \in S(s_1)$ so $s' \in J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$.

Next, assume that $s_1 \in S(t_1)$ for some $t_1 \in \mathcal{D}$ and $s_1 = s' \circ s''$ where s' is not a split of t_1 . Now assume $s'' \notin J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$. This implies that $s'' \notin S(t_1)$ so there exists $t'' \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $s'' \circ t'' \in \text{Seg}(T)$. It follows that exactly one of the following holds:

- segments s' and t'' have no common vertices, or
- segment s' is a split of t'' .

The former case is impossible because $t_1 \in \mathcal{D}$ and $s = t_1 \circ t''$.

We show that $s' \in S(t'')$. Suppose there exists $t \in \mathcal{D}$ such that s' and t are composable. Either segments t and t'' are composable or segments t and s_1 are composable. Since $t'' \in \mathcal{D}$ and $s_1 \in S(t_1)$, we obtain a contradiction. Thus $J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ is coclosed. \square

Proposition 3.4. The set $J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ satisfies $\tilde{\lambda}_{\downarrow}(J(s_{\mathcal{D}})) = \{s_{\mathcal{D}}\}$. Moreover, any biclosed set B with $s_{\mathcal{D}} \in \tilde{\lambda}_{\downarrow}(B)$ satisfies $J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \subset B$. Consequently, the set map $J : \mathcal{S}_T \rightarrow \text{Jl}(\text{Bic}(T))$ is a bijection.

Proof. By construction, $J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \setminus \{s\}$ is biclosed so $s_{\mathcal{D}} \in \tilde{\lambda}_{\downarrow}(J(s_{\mathcal{D}}))$. Also, the set $J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \setminus \{t\}$ is not coclosed for any $t \neq s$ so $\tilde{\lambda}_{\uparrow}(J(s_{\mathcal{D}})) = \{s_{\mathcal{D}}\}$.

Let $B \in \text{Bic}(T)$ be such that $s_{\mathcal{D}} \in \tilde{\lambda}_{\downarrow}(B)$. This implies that $\{s\} \sqcup \mathcal{D} \subset B$.

Now let $s_1 \in S(t)$ for some $t \in \mathcal{D}$ and suppose that $s_1 \notin B$. Since $B \in \text{Bic}(T)$, there exists $s'_1 \in B$ such that $t = s_1 \circ s'_1$. Observe that $s'_1 \notin \mathcal{D}$, but s'_1 is a split of s . This means that the set

of splits of s that belong to B is strictly larger than \mathcal{D} . This contradicts that $s_{\mathcal{D}} \in \tilde{\lambda}_{\downarrow}(B)$. We conclude that $J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \subset B$.

That the map $J : \mathcal{S}_T \rightarrow \text{JI}(\text{Bic}(T))$ is a bijection follows from Lemma 2.2 and from the fact that any biclosed set B with $s_{\mathcal{D}} \in \tilde{\lambda}_{\downarrow}(B)$ satisfies $J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \subset B$. \square

Next, we classify the meet-irreducible biclosed sets. Given $s_{\mathcal{D}} \in \mathcal{S}_T$, define

$$M(s_{\mathcal{D}}) := J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \setminus \{s\} \sqcup \{t \in \text{Seg}(T) : t \not\sqsubseteq s\} \sqcup \bigcup_{t \in \mathcal{D}} R(t)$$

where $R(t) = R(t, \mathcal{D}) \subset \text{Seg}(T)$ is defined to be the set of all splits s' of t satisfying the following:

- i) segment s' is not a split of s , and
- ii) segment s' is composable with some element of \mathcal{D} .

Observe that if $s' \in R(t)$ for some $t \in \mathcal{D}$, then there is necessarily a unique element $t' \in \mathcal{D}$ where $t' \sqsubseteq t$ and t' is composable with s' and $s' \circ t' = t$.

Lemma 3.5. The set $M(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ is biclosed.

Proof. We first show that $M(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ is closed. Let $t_1, t_2 \in M(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ be composable. We know from Lemma 3.3 that no two elements of $J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ are composable.

Suppose that one these segments is not a subsegment of s . This implies that their composition is not a subsegment of s so $t_1 \circ t_2 \in M(s_{\mathcal{D}})$.

We can now assume that $t_1 \in R(t)$ for some $t \in \mathcal{D}$ and $t_2 \in J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \setminus \{s\} \sqcup \bigcup_{t \in \mathcal{D}} R(t)$. If $t_2 \in J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \setminus \{s\}$, then t_2 is either the unique element of \mathcal{D} that is composable with t_1 or $t_2 \in S(t')$ where $t' \in \mathcal{D}$ is the unique element that is composable with t_1 . In the former case, $t_1 \circ t_2 = t \in M(s_{\mathcal{D}})$. In the latter case, $t_1 \circ t_2 \in S(t)$.

It remains to consider when $t_1 \in R(t)$ and $t_2 \in R(t')$ for some $t' \in \mathcal{D}$ where $t' \neq t$, as no two elements of $R(t)$ are composable. Without loss of generality, we can assume that t' is a split of t . Let t'' denote the unique element of \mathcal{D} that is composable with t_2 . Since t_1 and t_2 are composable, segment $t_1 \circ t_2$ is composable with t'' . Thus $t_1 \circ t_2 \in R(t)$ so $M(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ is closed.

Next, we show that $M(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ is coclosed by showing that given any element $t_1 \in M(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ and any break $\{t', t''\}$ of t_1 , one has $t' \in M(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ or $t'' \in M(s_{\mathcal{D}})$. We know from Proposition 3.4 that $J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \setminus \{s\}$ is coclosed so we can assume that $t_1 \not\sqsubseteq s$ or $t_1 \in R(t)$ for some $t \in \mathcal{D}$. In the former case, it is clear that $t' \not\sqsubseteq s$ or $t'' \not\sqsubseteq s$ so $t' \in M(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ or $t'' \in M(s_{\mathcal{D}})$.

Now assume that $t_1 \in R(t)$ for some $t \in \mathcal{D}$. We can further assume that t' is a split of t . If t' is not composable with any element of \mathcal{D} , then $t' \in S(t)$. If there exists an element of \mathcal{D} that is composable with t' , then $t' \in R(t)$. In either case, $t' \in M(s_{\mathcal{D}})$. Thus $M(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ is coclosed. \square

Proposition 3.6. The set $M(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ satisfies $\tilde{\lambda}^{\uparrow}(M(s_{\mathcal{D}})) = \{s_{\mathcal{D}}\}$. Moreover, any biclosed set B with $s_{\mathcal{D}} \in \tilde{\lambda}^{\uparrow}(B)$ satisfies $B \subset M(s_{\mathcal{D}})$. Consequently, the set map $M : \mathcal{S}_T \rightarrow \text{MI}(\text{Bic}(T))$ is a bijection.

Proof. By construction, $M(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \sqcup \{s\}$ is biclosed so $s_{\mathcal{D}} \in \tilde{\lambda}^{\uparrow}(M(s_{\mathcal{D}}))$.

Now suppose $M(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \sqcup \{s'\}$ is a biclosed set that covers $M(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ for some segment $s' \neq s$. This means that $s' \sqsubseteq s$. If s' is a split of s , then $s' \notin \mathcal{D}$ so s' is composable with some split $t' \in \mathcal{D}$. This implies $s' \circ t' = t \notin M(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \sqcup \{s'\}$. This contradicts that $M(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \sqcup \{s'\}$ is closed so s' is not a split of s .

If s' is not a split of some segment $t \in \mathcal{D}$, then there exists $t', t'' \in \mathcal{D}$ where $t' \circ s' \circ t'' = s \notin M(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \sqcup \{s'\}$. This contradicts that $M(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \sqcup \{s'\}$ is closed.

We conclude that s' is a split of some element $t \in \mathcal{D}$. Since s' is not a split of s , either $s' \in S(t)$ or $s' \in R(t)$. Thus $M(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \sqcup \{s'\} = M(s_{\mathcal{D}})$, a contradiction. This implies that $\tilde{\lambda}^{\uparrow}(M(s_{\mathcal{D}})) = \{s_{\mathcal{D}}\}$.

Next, let $B \in \text{Bic}(T)$ be such that $s_{\mathcal{D}} \in \tilde{\lambda}^\uparrow(B)$. By Proposition 3.4, we know that $J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \setminus \{s\} \subset B$. Now, let $s' \in B$ where $s' \subseteq s$. If s' is a split of some $t \in \mathcal{D}$, then $s' \in M(s_{\mathcal{D}})$. Therefore, assume that s' is not a split of any $t \in \mathcal{D}$. Now, observe that there exists $t' \in \mathcal{D}$ that is composable with s' . Since $s' \circ t' \notin \mathcal{D}$, we see that the set of splits of s that belong to B is strictly larger than \mathcal{D} . This contradicts that $s_{\mathcal{D}} \in \tilde{\lambda}^\uparrow(B)$.

That the map $S : \mathcal{S}_T \rightarrow \text{JI}(\text{Bic}(T))$ is a bijection follows from Lemma 2.2 and from the fact that any biclosed set B with $s_{\mathcal{D}} \in \tilde{\lambda}^\uparrow(B)$ satisfies $B \subset M(s_{\mathcal{D}})$. \square

4. CANONICAL JOIN COMPLEX OF $\text{BIC}(T)$

In this section, we describe the faces of the canonical join complex of $\text{Bic}(T)$. In [1, Theorem 1.1], it is shown that the canonical join complex of a finite join-semidistributive lattice L is a **flag complex**. That is, the minimal nonfaces of $\Delta^{CJ}(L)$ have size two. Thus, it is enough to classify the pairs of elements of $\text{JI}(\text{Bic}(T))$ that join canonically.

Theorem 4.1. A collection $\{J(s_{\mathcal{D}_1}^1), \dots, J(s_{\mathcal{D}_k}^k)\} \subset \text{JI}(\text{Bic}(T))$ is a face of $\Delta^{CJ}(\text{Bic}(T))$ if and only if labels $s_{\mathcal{D}_i}^i$ and $s_{\mathcal{D}_j}^j$ satisfy the following:

- 1) segments s^i and s^j are distinct,
- 2) neither s^i nor s^j is expressible as a composition of at least two segments in $J(s_{\mathcal{D}_i}^i) \cup J(s_{\mathcal{D}_j}^j)$

for any distinct $i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$.

Proof. Let $\{J(s_{\mathcal{D}_1}^1), \dots, J(s_{\mathcal{D}_k}^k)\} \subset \text{JI}(\text{Bic}(T))$ where there exists distinct $i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $J(s_{\mathcal{D}_i}^i)$ and $J(s_{\mathcal{D}_j}^j)$ do not satisfy all of the stated properties. Then Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.4 imply that $J(s_{\mathcal{D}_i}^i) \vee J(s_{\mathcal{D}_j}^j)$ is not a canonical join representation. By [1, Theorem 1.1], we obtain that $\{J(s_{\mathcal{D}_1}^1), \dots, J(s_{\mathcal{D}_k}^k)\}$ is not a face of $\Delta^{CJ}(\text{Bic}(T))$.

Conversely, suppose $\{J(s_{\mathcal{D}_1}^1), \dots, J(s_{\mathcal{D}_k}^k)\} \subset \text{JI}(\text{Bic}(T))$ satisfies all of the stated properties. Then Lemma 4.5 implies that $J(s_{\mathcal{D}_i}^i) \vee J(s_{\mathcal{D}_j}^j)$ is a canonical join representation for any distinct $i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. Now, using [1, Theorem 1.1], we have that $\bigvee_{i=1}^k J(s_{\mathcal{D}_i}^i)$. Thus $\{J(s_{\mathcal{D}_1}^1), \dots, J(s_{\mathcal{D}_k}^k)\} \subset \text{JI}(\text{Bic}(T))$ is a face of $\Delta^{CJ}(\text{Bic}(T))$. \square

Lemma 4.2. Let $s_{\mathcal{D}} \in \mathcal{S}_T$ and $t \in \mathcal{D}$ be given, and let $\mathcal{D}(t) := \{s' \in J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) : s' \text{ is a split of } t\}$. Then $J(t_{\mathcal{D}(t)}) \subset J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$. Moreover, $J(t_{\mathcal{D}(t)})$ consists of subsegments of t that belong to $J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$.

Proof. As $J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ is biclosed and no two elements of $J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ are composable, we see that for each break $\{s_1, s_2\}$ of t exactly one of these splits belongs to $J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$. Thus $J(t_{\mathcal{D}(t)})$ is well-defined.

Clearly, $\{t\} \sqcup \mathcal{D}(t) \subset J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$. Now consider $S(s', \mathcal{D}(t))$ for some $s' \in \mathcal{D}(t)$. Either $s' \in \mathcal{D}$ or $s' \in S(t)$ so it suffices to assume the latter.

Let $t' \in S(s', \mathcal{D}(t))$. Now write $s' = t' \circ s_3$, $t = s_1 \circ t' \circ s_3$, and $s = s_1 \circ t' \circ s_3 \circ s_2$ for some $s_1, s_2, s_3 \in \text{Seg}(T)$. Since $s' \in S(t)$, we know that s_1 and s_2 , which are splits of s , do not belong to \mathcal{D} . This means that $s' \circ s_2 \in \mathcal{D}$. Since $t' \in S(s', \mathcal{D}(t))$, we also know that s_1 and s_3 , which are splits of t , do not belong to $\mathcal{D}(t)$. This implies that $t' \in S(s' \circ s_2, \mathcal{D}) \subset J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$.

Lastly, let $t' \in J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ where $t' \subseteq t$. We can assume that t' is not a split of t . Now write $s = t_1 \circ t' \circ t_2$ and $t = t_1 \circ t' \circ t'_2$ for some $t_1, t_2, t'_2 \in \text{Seg}(T)$ where $t'_2 \subseteq t$. Since $t' \in J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ it is not composable with any element of $J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$. Thus we know that $t_1, t_2 \notin \mathcal{D}$ and $t'_2 \notin J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$. This implies that $t_1 \circ t', t' \circ t_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ and $t' \in S(t_1 \circ t', \mathcal{D}) \cap S(t' \circ t_2, \mathcal{D})$. Since $t'_2 \notin J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$, we also know that $t' \in S(s_1, \mathcal{D}(t))$. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.3. Given a biclosed set $B \in \text{Bic}(T)$ and distinct covering relations $(B_1, B), (B_2, B) \in \text{Cov}(\text{Bic}(T))$, the segment $s_1 = \lambda(B_1, B)$ is not a split of $s_2 = \lambda(B_2, B)$ and $s_1 \neq s_2$.

Proof. It is clear that $s_1 \neq s_2$.

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there exist some biclosed sets B_1, B_2 such that $s_1 = \lambda(B_1, B)$ is a split of $s_2 = \lambda(B_2, B)$. Then $B_1 = B \setminus \{s_1\}$ and $B_2 = B \setminus \{s_2\}$.

Let $t \in \text{Seg}(T)$ denote the segment satisfying $s_1 \circ t = s_2$. Observe that since $s_1 \notin B_1$, we have $t \in B_1$. This implies $t \in B$ and so $t \in B_2$. However, this means that $s_1, t \in B_2$, but $s_2 = s_1 \circ t \notin B_2$, which contradicts that B_2 is biclosed. \square

Lemma 4.4. Given $s_{\mathcal{D}}, s'_{\mathcal{D}'} \in \mathcal{S}_T$. Assume that there exists $t^1, \dots, t^k \in J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \cup J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'})$ with $k \geq 2$ such that $s = t^1 \circ \dots \circ t^k$. Then $J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \vee J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'})$ is not a canonical join representation.

Proof. Assume $s = t^1 \circ \dots \circ t^k$ with $k \geq 2$ for some $t^1, \dots, t^k \in J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \cup J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'})$. We assume that segment t^1 as long as possible with the property that t^1 is not expressible as a composition of at least two elements of $J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \cup J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'})$. Inductively, by choosing t^1, \dots, t^i in this way, we can then choose t^{i+1} is as long as possible with the property that t^{i+1} is not expressible as a composition of at least two elements of $J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \cup J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'})$. We can assume that s' is not a split of s , otherwise we obtain the desired result from Lemma 4.3. Without loss of generality, segment $t^1 \not\subseteq s'$. Now since no two elements of $J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ are composable and no two elements of $J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'})$ are composable, we have that $t^1, t^3, \dots \in J(s_{\mathcal{D}})$ and $t^2, t^4, \dots \in J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'})$.

To complete the proof, it is enough to show that

$$J(t^1_{\mathcal{D}(t^1)}) \vee J(t^3_{\mathcal{D}(t^3)}) \vee \dots \vee J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'}) = J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \vee J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'})$$

as the former is a refinement of the latter. By Lemma 4.2, we see that the set on the left-hand side is contained in $J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \vee J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'})$. Moreover, if $t \in J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \vee J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'})$ satisfies $t \subseteq t^i$ for some $i = 1, \dots, k$, then t belongs to $J(t^1_{\mathcal{D}(t^1)}) \vee J(t^3_{\mathcal{D}(t^3)}) \vee \dots \vee J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'})$. This means that to prove the opposite containment, we must show that $t \in J(t^1_{\mathcal{D}(t^1)}) \vee J(t^3_{\mathcal{D}(t^3)}) \vee \dots \vee J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'})$ when one of the following holds:

- 1) $t = t^1 \circ t^2 \circ \dots \circ t^{j-1} \circ t'_j$ for some $t'_j \in J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \cup J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'})$,
- 2) $t = t'_i \circ t^{i+1} \circ \dots \circ t^{k-1} \circ t^k$ for some $t'_i \in J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \cup J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'})$, or
- 3) $t = t'_i \circ t^{i+1} \circ \dots \circ t^{j-1} \circ t'_j$ for some $t'_j, t'_i \in J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \cup J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'})$.

We verify *Case 2)*, and the proof of *Case 1)* and *3)* is similar to that of *Case 2)*.

Case 2): We show that $t'_i \in J(t^i_{\mathcal{D}(t^i)})$. Suppose $t'_i \notin J(t^i_{\mathcal{D}(t^i)})$. Since t'_i is a split of t^i , we may write $t''_i \circ t'_i = t^i$ for some $\text{Seg}(T)$. As t'_i does not belong to $J(t^i_{\mathcal{D}(t^i)})$, we know that $t''_i \in \mathcal{D}(t^i)$. We also know $t'_i \in J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \cup J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'})$ and so the expression $t^i = t''_i \circ t'_i$ contradicts our choice of t' . \square

Lemma 4.5. Let $s_{\mathcal{D}}, s'_{\mathcal{D}'} \in \mathcal{S}_T$ be labels with the following properties:

- 1) segments s and s' are distinct,
- 2) neither s nor s' is expressible as a composition of at least two segments from $J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \cup J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'})$.

Then $J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \vee J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'})$ is a canonical join representation.

Proof. As s and s' are distinct and neither s nor s' is expressible as a composition of at least two segments from $J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \cup J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'})$, we know that the join representation $J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \vee J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'})$ is irredundant.

Next, suppose that $J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \vee J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'}) = \bigvee_{i=1}^k J(t^i_{\mathcal{D}^i})$ where the latter is irredundant. We will show that $J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \subset J(t^i_{\mathcal{D}^i})$ for some $i = 1, \dots, k$, and one uses the same strategy to prove that $J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'}) \subset J(t^j_{\mathcal{D}^j})$ for some $j = 1, \dots, k$.

Since $s \in \bigvee_{i=1}^k J(t^i_{\mathcal{D}^i})$, there exist $t_{i_j} \in J(t^{i_j}_{\mathcal{D}^{i_j}})$ with $j = 1, \dots, \ell$ such that $s = t_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ t_{i_\ell}$. As s is not expressible as a composition of at least two segments from $J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \cup J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'})$, this implies that $s = t_{i_1}$ where $\ell = 1$ and so $s \in J(t^i_{\mathcal{D}^i})$ for some $i = 1, \dots, k$.

Now let $t \in \mathcal{D}$. We can write $s = t \circ t'$ for some $t' \in \text{Seg}(T)$. Suppose $t \notin J(t_{\mathcal{D}^i}^i)$. Since $J(t_{\mathcal{D}^i}^i)$ is biclosed, $t' \in J(t_{\mathcal{D}^i}^i)$. However, by the fact that $J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \vee J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'}) = \bigvee_{i=1}^k J(t_{\mathcal{D}^i}^i)$, the equation $s = t \circ t'$ contradicts that s is not expressible as a composition of at least two segments from $J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \cup J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'})$.

Next, let $t' \in S(t, \mathcal{D})$ for some $t \in \mathcal{D}$. We show that $t' \in J(t_{\mathcal{D}^i}^i)$ by showing that no elements of \mathcal{D}^i are composable with t' . Write $t^i = t_1 \circ t \circ t_2$ for some $t_1, t_2 \in \text{Seg}(T)$ where, without loss of generality, t_2 and t' are composable. Since $t \in J(t_{\mathcal{D}^i}^i)$ and no two elements of $J(t_{\mathcal{D}^i}^i)$ are composable, we know that $t_1, t_2 \notin \mathcal{D}^i$.

It remains to show that $t' \in S(t_1 \circ t, \mathcal{D}^i)$. To prove this, it is enough to show that $s_1 \notin \mathcal{D}^i$ where $s_1 \circ t'$. Suppose $s_1 \in \mathcal{D}^i$ and write $t_1 \circ t'_1$ for some $t'_1 \in \text{Seg}(T)$. Since $t_1 \notin J(t_{\mathcal{D}^i}^i)$ and $J(t_{\mathcal{D}^i}^i)$ is biclosed, $t'_1 \in J(t_{\mathcal{D}^i}^i)$.

On the other hand, $t' \in S(t, \mathcal{D})$ so $t'_1 \notin \mathcal{D}$. This means that if we write $s = t'_1 \circ t'_2$, we have $t'_2 \in \mathcal{D}$. However, by the fact that $J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \vee J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'}) = \bigvee_{i=1}^k J(t_{\mathcal{D}^i}^i)$, the equation $s = t'_1 \circ t'_2$ contradicts that s is not expressible as a composition of at least two segments from $J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \cup J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'})$. Thus $J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \subset J(t_{\mathcal{D}^i}^i)$ so $J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \vee J(s'_{\mathcal{D}'})$ is a canonical join representation. \square

5. SHARD INTERSECTION ORDER

5.1. Elements of the shard intersection order. Let $B \in \text{Bic}(T)$ be a biclosed set whose lower covers are B_1, B_2, \dots, B_k . Let $s_{i\mathcal{D}^i} = \tilde{\lambda}(B_i, B)$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $\lambda_{\downarrow}(B) = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k\}$ where $s_i = \lambda(B_i, B)$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Now fix a segment $s \in \lambda_{\downarrow}(B)$ expressed as $s = s_{i_1} \circ s_{i_2} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_{\ell}}$ with each $s_{i_j} \in \lambda_{\downarrow}(B)$. If $t \in \text{Seg}(T)$ is a split of s that can be expressed as either $t = s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_j}$ or $t = s_{i_j} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_{\ell}}$ for some $j = 2, \dots, \ell - 1$, we say that t is a **faultline split** of s . Otherwise, we say that t is a **non-faultline split** of t . Additionally, we refer to $\{s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_j}, s_{i_{j+1}} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_{\ell}}\}$ as a **faultline break**.

Theorem 5.1. Given a biclosed set $B \in \text{Bic}(T)$, we have that $\psi(B)$ is the set of all labels of the form

$$(s_{i_1} \circ s_{i_2} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_{\ell}})_{\mathcal{D}}$$

with $s_{i_j} \in \lambda_{\downarrow}(B)$ where $s_{i_1} \circ s_{i_2} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_{\ell}}$ is any element of $\overline{\lambda_{\downarrow}(B)}$ and where \mathcal{D} is any set of segments that satisfies the following properties:

- (i) $|\mathcal{D}| = |\{\text{breaks of } s_{i_1} \circ s_{i_2} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_{\ell}}\}|$,
- (ii) each segment $t \in \mathcal{D}$ is a split of $s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_{\ell}}$,
- (iii) no two distinct splits $t_1, t_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ appear in the same break of $s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_{\ell}}$, and
- (iv) whenever $t \in \mathcal{D}$ is a non-faultline split of $s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_{\ell}}$, we have that $t = s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_{j-1}} \circ t_j$ for some $j = 1, \dots, \ell$ and some $t_j \in \mathcal{D}_{i_j}$ or $t = t_j \circ s_{i_{j+1}} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_{\ell}}$ for some $j = 1, \dots, \ell$ and some $t_j \in \mathcal{D}_{i_j}$. In the former case if $j = 1$, we mean $t = t_1$, and in the latter case, if $j = \ell$, we mean $t = t_{\ell}$.

Remark 5.2. We obtain the following consequence of Theorem 5.1, which is stated using the notation of the theorem. If $s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_{\ell}} \in B$ and segments t and t' are non-faultline splits of $s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_{\ell}}$ where $s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_{\ell}} = t \circ t'$, then exactly one of t and t' belongs to B .

Lemma 5.3. Given $B \in \text{Bic}(T)$ and any $s_{\mathcal{D}} \in \psi(B)$, there is a unique way to express s as a composition of segments $s_i := \lambda(B_i, B)$ with $i = 1, \dots, k$ where B_1, \dots, B_k are all of the lower covers of B . In particular, for any $s_{\mathcal{D}}, t_{\mathcal{D}''} \in \psi(B)$ where $s = t \circ t'$, we have that $t'_{\mathcal{D}''} \in \psi(B)$ for some \mathcal{D}'' .

Proof. We know from Theorem 5.1 that s may be expressed as a composition of the elements $s_i := \lambda(B_i, B)$. Now suppose $s = s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_{\ell}}$ and $s = s_{j_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{j_m}$ for some $s_{i_1}, \dots, s_{i_{\ell}}, s_{j_1}, \dots, s_{j_m} \in$

$\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$. If $s_{i_l} \subseteq s_{j_m}$, then $s_{j_m} = s_{i_l} \circ t'$ for some segment $t' \in \text{Seg}(T)$. However, such an equation contradicts Lemma 4.3. The analogous argument shows s_{j_m} is not properly contained in s_{i_l} . We conclude that $s_{j_m} = s_{i_l}$. By repeating this argument and removing pairs of equal segments $s_{j_n} = s_{i_r}$ with $n \leq m$ and $r \leq l$, we either obtain an equation $s_{j_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{j_{n-1}} = s_{i_1}$ or $s_{j_1} = s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_{m-1}}$. In either case, we reach a contradiction. \square

Lemma 5.4. Given a biclosed $B \in \text{Bic}(T)$ whose lower covers are $B_1, \dots, B_k \in \text{Bic}(T)$. We have that $\bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i \sqcup \{s_j\}$ is a biclosed set where $s_j = \lambda(B_j, B)$ for any $j = 1, \dots, k$.

Proof. Note that $B = \bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i \sqcup \overline{\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}}$ by Lemma 2.9.

To show that $\bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i \sqcup \{s_j\}$ is closed, it is enough to show that if $s \in \bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i$ then $s \circ s_j \in \bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i \sqcup \{s_j\}$. Note that $s \circ s_j \in B = \bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i \sqcup \overline{\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}}$ so we can assume that $s \circ s_j \notin \bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i$. Write $s \circ s_j = s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_\ell}$ where $s_{i_1}, \dots, s_{i_\ell} \in \{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$, and we can assume that $m \geq 2$. By Lemma 4.3, we see that $s_j = s_{i_1}$ or $s_j = s_{i_\ell}$. We conclude that $s \in \overline{\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}}$, a contradiction.

Next, we show that $(\bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i \sqcup \{s_j\})^c = (\bigvee_{i=1}^k B_i^c) \setminus \{s_j\}$ is closed. It is clear that if $s, t \in (\bigvee_{i=1}^k B_i^c) \setminus \{s_j\}$ are composable, then $s \circ t \in (\bigvee_{i=1}^k B_i^c)$. Thus, it remains to show that $s \circ t \neq s_j$.

Suppose $s \circ t = s_j$. Suppose further that $s, t \in (\bigvee_{i=1}^k B_i^c) \setminus \overline{\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}}$. Since the closed set $B^c = (\bigvee_{i=1}^k B_i^c) \setminus \overline{\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}}$, we know that $s \circ t \in (\bigvee_{i=1}^k B_i^c) \setminus \overline{\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}}$. However, this contradicts that $s \circ t = s_j$. We conclude that $s \in \overline{\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}}$ or $t \in \overline{\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}}$.

We assume $s \in \overline{\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}}$, without loss of generality. Write $s = s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_\ell}$ for some $s_{i_1}, \dots, s_{i_\ell} \in \{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$. Since $s \circ t = s_j$, we have $s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_\ell} \circ t = s_j$. This implies that s_{i_1} is a split of s_j , and this contradicts Lemma 4.3. \square

By Lemma 5.4 and [3, Proposition 4.2], we obtain that $B' \in \left[\bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i, B \right]$ if and only if $B' = (\bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i) \sqcup S'$ where S' and $\overline{\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}} \setminus S'$ are closed subsets of $\overline{\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}}$.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. We know that the set $\psi(B)$ consists of labels of the form $(s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_\ell})_{\mathcal{D}}$ where \mathcal{D} is some subset of $\text{Seg}(T)$ and $s_{i_1}, \dots, s_{i_\ell} \in \lambda_1(B)$. Since any biclosed set $B' \in \left[\bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i, B \right]$ is of the form $\bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i \sqcup S'$ where S' is some biclosed subset of $\overline{\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}}$, the segment $s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_\ell}$ may be any element of $\overline{\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}}$. Moreover, we know that any two sets \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{D}' appearing on labels $(s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_\ell})_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $(s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_\ell})_{\mathcal{D}'}$ contain the same non-faultline splits.

It remains to show that given a segment $s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_\ell}$, the subsets \mathcal{D} appearing on labels $(s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_\ell})_{\mathcal{D}}$ are exactly those sets of splits of $s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_\ell}$ with the properties appearing in the statement of the theorem.

First, given a label $(s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_\ell})_{\mathcal{D}} \in \psi(B)$, we show that \mathcal{D} has the desired properties. It is clear from the definition of $\tilde{\lambda}$ that \mathcal{D} satisfies properties (i), (ii), and (iii). Thus, we proceed by induction on ℓ to prove property (iv). Assume that $\ell = 1$ so we consider labels of the form $(s_{i_1})_{\mathcal{D}}$. Observe that there are no nontrivial faultline splits of s_{i_1} so \mathcal{D} contains no faultline splits. Since $(s_{i_1})_{\mathcal{D}_{i_1}}$ is another label appearing on a covering relation in $\left[\bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i, B \right]$, we have $|\mathcal{D}| = |\mathcal{D}_{i_1}|$. Thus $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_{i_1}$.

Next, suppose that for any label $(s_{j_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{j_{\ell'}})_{\mathcal{D}'}$ where $s_{j_1}, \dots, s_{j_{\ell'}} \in \{s_{i_1}, \dots, s_{i_\ell}\}$ and $\ell' < \ell$ the subsets \mathcal{D}' satisfy property (iv). Now consider $(s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_\ell})_{\mathcal{D}} \in \psi(B)$ and let $t \in \mathcal{D}$ be a non-faultline split of $s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_\ell}$. Without loss of generality, $t = s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_{j-1}} \circ t_j$. Since t_j is a non-faultline split of s_{i_j} , by induction, $t_j \in \mathcal{D}_{i_j}$.

To prove the converse, it is enough to show that any family $\mathcal{F} \subset \overline{\{s_{i_1}, \dots, s_{i_\ell}\}}$ of $\ell - 1$ faultline splits of $s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_\ell}$ satisfying the properties in the statement of the theorem belongs to a set

\mathcal{D} that appears on some label $(s_{i_1} \circ \cdots \circ s_{i_\ell})_{\mathcal{D}}$. Given $f = s_{i_1} \circ \cdots \circ s_{i_j} \in \mathcal{F}$, define

$$D(f) := \{f = s_{i_1} \circ \cdots \circ s_{i_j}, s_{i_2} \circ \cdots \circ s_{i_j}, \dots, s_{i_{j-1}} \circ s_{i_j}, s_{i_j}\}.$$

The set $D(f)$ is defined analogously when $f = s_{i_j} \circ \cdots \circ s_{i_\ell}$. By construction, $D(f)$ and $\overline{\{s_{i_1}, \dots, s_{i_\ell}\} \setminus D(f)}$ are closed subsets of $\overline{\{s_{i_1}, \dots, s_{i_\ell}\}}$.

Now observe that $\overline{\bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} D(f)}$ and $\overline{\{s_{i_1}, \dots, s_{i_\ell}\} \setminus \bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} D(f)}$ are closed subsets of $\overline{\{s_{i_1}, \dots, s_{i_\ell}\}}$. This implies that $\overline{\bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} D(f)} \sqcup \bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i \in \left[\bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i, B \right]$ is a biclosed set. Moreover, the only (necessarily) faultline splits of $s_{i_1} \circ \cdots \circ s_{i_\ell}$ in $\overline{\bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} D(f)}$ are the elements of \mathcal{F} . Thus, setting $B^{(1)} := \overline{\bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} D(f)} \sqcup \bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i$ and $B^{(2)} := B^{(1)} \sqcup \{s_{i_1} \circ \cdots \circ s_{i_\ell}\}$, we obtain that $\tilde{\lambda}(B^{(1)}, B^{(2)}) = (s_{i_1} \circ \cdots \circ s_{i_\ell})_{\mathcal{F} \sqcup \mathcal{N}}$ where \mathcal{N} is the set of non-faultline splits of $s_{i_1} \circ \cdots \circ s_{i_\ell}$ that appears in every label of the form $(s_{i_1} \circ \cdots \circ s_{i_\ell})_{\mathcal{D}}$. \square

Remark 5.5. It follows from the proof of Theorem 5.1 that for any two labels $s_{\mathcal{D}}, s_{\mathcal{D}'} \in \psi(B)$, the sets \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{D}' contain exactly the same non-faultline splits of s . In addition, for any biclosed set $B \in \text{Bic}(T)$, the set $\tilde{\lambda}_1(B)$ consists of exactly the elements $s_{\mathcal{D}} \in \psi(B)$ with the property that there does not exist $s'_{\mathcal{D}'} \in \psi(B)$ where $s = s' \circ t'$ for some $t' \in \text{Seg}(T)$.

5.2. Lattice structure of the shard intersection order. Let $\psi(B), \psi(B') \in \Psi(\text{Bic}(T))$ and let $B_1, \dots, B_k \in \text{Bic}(T)$ (resp., $B'_1, \dots, B'_l \in \text{Bic}(T)$) be the lower covers of B (resp., B'). Now set $s_j := \lambda(B_j, B)$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$ and $t_j := \lambda(B'_j, B')$ for $j = 1, \dots, l$. Consider $\psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$, and let $\text{Seg}(\psi(B) \cap \psi(B'))$ denote the set of segments that appear in some label in the set $\psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$.

We will prove that $\Psi(\text{Bic}(T))$ is a lattice by showing that $\psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$ is the meet of $\psi(B)$ and $\psi(B')$. We first prove a strengthening of Lemma 5.3.

Lemma 5.6. If $s_{\mathcal{D}}, s'_{\mathcal{D}'} \in \psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$ with $s = s' \circ t''$ for some $t'' \in \text{Seg}(T)$, then there exists $\mathcal{D}'' \subset \text{Seg}(T)$ such that $t''_{\mathcal{D}''} \in \psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$.

Proof. By Lemma 5.3, we know that there exists $\mathcal{D}^1, \mathcal{D}^2 \subset \text{Seg}(T)$ such that $t''_{\mathcal{D}^1} \in \psi(B)$ and $t''_{\mathcal{D}^2} \in \psi(B')$. This implies that s' and t'' are faultline splits of $s = s_{i_1} \circ \cdots \circ s_{i_n}$ and $s = t_{j_1} \circ \cdots \circ t_{j_m}$. We can therefore write $t'' = s_{i_k} \circ \cdots \circ s_{i_n}$ and $t'' = t_{j_r} \circ \cdots \circ t_{j_m}$ for some $1 < k \leq n$ and some $1 < r \leq m$.

Now define

$$\mathcal{D}'' := \begin{cases} t^* & : \text{ if } t^* \in \mathcal{D} \text{ and } t^* \text{ is a proper subsegment of } t'', \\ t^* & : \text{ if } s' \circ t^* \in \mathcal{D}. \end{cases}$$

The splits in \mathcal{D}'' satisfy the properties in the statement of Theorem 5.1 with respect to both $\psi(B)$ and $\psi(B')$, since the splits in \mathcal{D} satisfy these. Thus $t''_{\mathcal{D}''} \in \psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$. \square

Let $\{s_{\mathcal{D}^{(i)}}\}_{i=1}^{\ell}$ denote the elements of $\psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$ where $s^{(i)}$ appears in exactly one label in $\psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$. If such a collection of labels exists, it is unique. We prove that such a collection exists in the following lemma.

Lemma 5.7. The collection of elements $\{s_{\mathcal{D}^{(i)}}\}_{i=1}^{\ell} \subset \psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$ is nonempty. In particular, the segments $s^{(1)}, \dots, s^{(\ell)}$ are pairwise distinct.

Proof. Suppose that any segment in $\text{Seg}(\psi(B) \cap \psi(B'))$ belongs to at least two labels of $\psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$. Let $s_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $s_{\mathcal{D}'}$ be minimal elements of the subposet $\psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$ of \mathcal{S}_T . Since $\mathcal{D} \neq \mathcal{D}'$, there exists $t \in \mathcal{D}$ and $t' \in \mathcal{D}'$ such that $s = t \circ t'$. From Remark 5.5, segments t and t' are faultline splits of s in terms of its expression as a composition of the segments s_1, \dots, s_k . Segments t and t'

are also faultline splits of s in terms of its expression as a composition of t_1, \dots, t_l . In particular, $t, t' \in \overline{\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}} \cap \overline{\{t_1, \dots, t_l\}}$.

We now show that $t_{\mathcal{D}(t)} \in \psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$ where $\mathcal{D}(t) := \{s' \in J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) : s' \text{ is a split of } t\}$. This contradicts that $s_{\mathcal{D}}$ is a minimal element of the subposet $\psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$ and therefore completes the proof. We show that $t_{\mathcal{D}(t)} \in \psi(B)$ and an analogous argument shows that $t_{\mathcal{D}(t)} \in \psi(B')$ so we omit the latter.

First, consider the biclosed sets

$$B^1 := \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i \right) \vee (J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \setminus \{s\}), \quad B^2 := \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i \right) \vee (J(t_{\mathcal{D}(t)}) \setminus \{t\}) \in \left[\bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i, B \right].$$

We know that $B^2 \in \left[\bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i, B \right]$ since $J(t_{\mathcal{D}(t)}) \setminus \{t\} < J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) \setminus \{s\}$ by Lemma 4.2. We show that $\tilde{\lambda}(B^2, B^2 \sqcup \{t\}) = t_{\mathcal{D}(t)}$ by showing that $B^2 \sqcup \{t\}$ is biclosed. From this it follows that $t_{\mathcal{D}(t)} \in \psi(B)$.

By construction, $B^2 \sqcup \{t\}$ is coclosed. Since B^2 is closed, we show that $B^2 \sqcup \{t\}$ is closed by showing that, without loss of generality, for any $t^1 \in \bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i$ that is composable with t , we have $t \circ t^1 \in \bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i$. We know that $t, t^1 \in B$ so $t \circ t^1 \in B$.

Now, suppose that $t \circ t^1 \in \overline{\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}}$. This means there exists $\mathcal{D}^* \subset \text{Seg}(T)$ such that $(t \circ t^1)_{\mathcal{D}^*} \in \psi(B)$. By Lemma 5.3, we know that there is a unique way to express t , and $t \circ t^1$ as a composition of elements of $\overline{\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}}$. It follows that $t^1 \in \overline{\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}}$, but this contradicts that $t^1 \in \bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i$. \square

Lemma 5.8. The labels $\{s_{\mathcal{D}^{(i)}}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{\ell}$ are precisely the elements $s_{\mathcal{D}} \in \psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$ with the property that there does not exist $s'_{\mathcal{D}'} \in \psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$ where $s = s' \circ t'$ for some $t' \in \text{Seg}(T)$.

Proof. Suppose there exists a label $s'_{\mathcal{D}'}$ in $\psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$ such that $s^{(i)} = s' \circ t'$ for some $t' \in \text{Seg}(T)$. By Lemma 5.6, there exists $\mathcal{D}'' \subset \text{Seg}(T)$ such that $t'_{\mathcal{D}''} \in \psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$. By Remark 5.5, s' and t' are faultline splits of $s^{(i)}$ regardless of whether these segments are expressed in terms of s_1, \dots, s_k or t_1, \dots, t_l . Without loss of generality, we assume that $s' \in \mathcal{D}^{(i)}$. Thus $s_{\mathcal{D}^{(i)}}^{(i)}, s_{(\mathcal{D}^{(i)} \setminus \{s'\}) \sqcup \{t'\}}^{(i)} \in \psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$. However, this contradicts the definition of $s_{\mathcal{D}^{(i)}}^{(i)}$.

Let $s_{\mathcal{D}} \in \psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$ with the stated property. Suppose there are two distinct labels $s_{\mathcal{D}}, s_{\mathcal{D}'}$ in $\psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$. Then there exist $t \in \mathcal{D}$ and $t' \in \mathcal{D}'$ such that $s = t \circ t'$. We claim that $t_{\mathcal{D}(t)}, t'_{\mathcal{D}'(t')} \in \psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$ where $\mathcal{D}(t) := \{s' \in J(s_{\mathcal{D}}) : s' \text{ is a split of } t\}$ and $\mathcal{D}'(t') := \{s' \in J(s_{\mathcal{D}'}) : s' \text{ is a split of } t'\}$. This claim contradicts that $s_{\mathcal{D}}$ has the property in the statement of the lemma. Thus s appears in exactly one label in $\psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$. Therefore, $s = s^{(i)}$ and $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}^{(i)}$ for some $i = 1, \dots, \ell$.

One proves our claim by adapting the proof of Lemma 5.7. \square

Lemma 5.9. $\text{Seg}(\psi(B) \cap \psi(B')) = \overline{\{s^{(1)}, \dots, s^{(\ell)}\}}$.

Proof. To show that $\overline{\{s^{(1)}, \dots, s^{(\ell)}\}} \subset \text{Seg}(\psi(B) \cap \psi(B'))$, it is enough to show that the composition of any two composable segments $s^{(i)}$ and $s^{(j)}$ belongs to $\text{Seg}(\psi(B) \cap \psi(B'))$. We know that $s^{(i)} \circ s^{(j)} \in \overline{\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}} \cap \overline{\{t_1, \dots, t_l\}}$ since this is true for $s^{(i)}$ and $s^{(j)}$. Now the result follows from the description of $\psi(B)$ and $\psi(B')$ obtained in Theorem 5.1.

To prove the opposite containment, let $s \in \text{Seg}(\psi(B) \cap \psi(B'))$, and assume that any segment in $\text{Seg}(\psi(B) \cap \psi(B'))$ that is shorter than s belongs to $\overline{\{s^{(1)}, \dots, s^{(\ell)}\}}$. Since $s \in \text{Seg}(\psi(B) \cap \psi(B'))$, there exists $\mathcal{D} \subset \text{Seg}(T)$ such that $s_{\mathcal{D}} \in \psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$.

We can further assume that $s \neq s^{(i)}$ for any $i = 1, \dots, \ell$. By Lemma 5.8, this implies that there exists $s'_{\mathcal{D}'}$ in $\psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$ where $s = s' \circ t''$ for some $t'' \in \text{Seg}(T)$. By Lemma 5.6, there

exists $\mathcal{D}'' \subset \text{Seg}(T)$ such that $t''_{\mathcal{D}''} \in \psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$. Since s' and t'' are both shorter than s , we have that $s', t'' \in \overline{\{s^{(1)}, \dots, s^{(\ell)}\}}$ so $s = s' \circ t'' \in \overline{\{s^{(1)}, \dots, s^{(\ell)}\}}$. \square

Lemma 5.10. The expression $\bigvee_{i=1}^{\ell} J(s_{\mathcal{D}^{(i)}}^{(i)})$ is a canonical join representation.

Proof. By Theorem 4.1, it is enough to show that for any $s_{\mathcal{D}^{(i)}}^{(i)}, s_{\mathcal{D}^{(j)}}^{(j)} \in \psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$ with $i \neq j$ the expression $J(s_{\mathcal{D}^{(i)}}^{(i)}) \vee J(s_{\mathcal{D}^{(j)}}^{(j)})$ is a canonical join representation.

Next, we complete proof by showing that, without loss of generality, $s^{(i)}$ is not expressible as a composition of at least two segments from $J(s_{\mathcal{D}^{(i)}}^{(i)}) \cup J(s_{\mathcal{D}^{(j)}}^{(j)})$. Suppose we can write $s^{(i)} = t^1 \circ \dots \circ t^r$ where $t^1, \dots, t^r \in J(s_{\mathcal{D}^{(i)}}^{(i)}) \cup J(s_{\mathcal{D}^{(j)}}^{(j)})$ with $r \geq 2$. Clearly, $t^1, t^2 \circ \dots \circ t^r \in J(s_{\mathcal{D}^{(i)}}^{(i)}) \vee J(s_{\mathcal{D}^{(j)}}^{(j)})$. We also know that $J(s_{\mathcal{D}^{(i)}}^{(i)}) \vee J(s_{\mathcal{D}^{(j)}}^{(j)}) \leq B$ and $J(s_{\mathcal{D}^{(i)}}^{(i)}) \vee J(s_{\mathcal{D}^{(j)}}^{(j)}) \leq B'$, since $s_{\mathcal{D}^{(i)}}^{(i)}, s_{\mathcal{D}^{(j)}}^{(j)} \in \psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$. By Remark 5.2, we obtain that t^1 and $t^2 \circ \dots \circ t^r$ are faultline splits of $s^{(i)} = s_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{i_n}$ and $s^{(i)} = t_{j_1} \circ \dots \circ t_{j_m}$. We can assume, without loss of generality, that $t^1 \in \mathcal{D}^{(i)}$.

We obtain that $s_{\mathcal{D}^{(i)}}^{(i)}, s_{(\mathcal{D}^{(i)} \setminus \{t^1\}) \sqcup \{t^2 \circ \dots \circ t^r\}}^{(i)} \in \psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$. However, this contradicts that $s^{(i)}$ is a segment in exactly one label in $\psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$. We conclude that the expression $J(s_{\mathcal{D}^{(i)}}^{(i)}) \vee J(s_{\mathcal{D}^{(j)}}^{(j)})$ is a canonical join representation. \square

Lemma 5.11. We have that $\psi\left(\bigvee_{i=1}^{\ell} J(s_{\mathcal{D}^{(i)}}^{(i)})\right) = \psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$.

Proof. By Theorem 5.1, any element of $\psi\left(\bigvee_{i=1}^{\ell} J(s_{\mathcal{D}^{(i)}}^{(i)})\right)$ is of the form $(s^{(i_1)} \circ \dots \circ s^{(i_r)})_{\mathcal{D}}$ for some $i_1, \dots, i_r \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$. From Lemma 5.9, we know that $s^{(i_1)} \circ \dots \circ s^{(i_r)} \in \text{Seg}(\psi(B) \cap \psi(B'))$.

We now show that $(s^{(i_1)} \circ \dots \circ s^{(i_r)})_{\mathcal{D}} \in \psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$. We show $(s^{(i_1)} \circ \dots \circ s^{(i_r)})_{\mathcal{D}} \in \psi(B)$ and the analogous argument shows that $(s^{(i_1)} \circ \dots \circ s^{(i_r)})_{\mathcal{D}} \in \psi(B')$. Consider the biclosed set

$$B^* := \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i \right) \vee \left(J((s^{(i_1)} \circ \dots \circ s^{(i_r)})_{\mathcal{D}}) \setminus \{s^{(i_1)} \circ \dots \circ s^{(i_r)}\} \right).$$

Clearly, $\bigwedge_{i=1}^k B_i \leq B^*$ and $B^* < B$ as $s^{(i_1)} \circ \dots \circ s^{(i_r)} \in B \setminus B^*$.

If we assume that $B^* \sqcup \{s^{(i_1)} \circ \dots \circ s^{(i_r)}\}$ is biclosed, we obtain that $\tilde{\lambda}(B^*, B^* \sqcup \{s^{(i_1)} \circ \dots \circ s^{(i_r)}\}) = (s^{(i_1)} \circ \dots \circ s^{(i_r)})_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $B^* \sqcup \{s^{(i_1)} \circ \dots \circ s^{(i_r)}\} \leq B$. From this it follows that $(s^{(i_1)} \circ \dots \circ s^{(i_r)})_{\mathcal{D}} \in \psi(B)$. One shows that $B^* \sqcup \{s^{(i_1)} \circ \dots \circ s^{(i_r)}\}$ is biclosed by adapting the argument that we used in Lemma 5.7.

Conversely, suppose $(s^{(i_1)} \circ \dots \circ s^{(i_r)})_{\mathcal{D}} \in \psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$. By Theorem 5.1, we know that there exist labels $\tilde{\lambda}(B^1, B^2) \in \psi\left(\bigvee_{i=1}^{\ell} J(s_{\mathcal{D}^{(i)}}^{(i)})\right)$ such that $\lambda(B^1, B^2) = s^{(i_1)} \circ \dots \circ s^{(i_r)}$. Thus it is enough to show that \mathcal{D} satisfies the properties appearing in the statement of Theorem 5.1 with respect to the labels $\{s_{\mathcal{D}^{(i)}}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{\ell}$. In fact, it is enough to check that the non-faultline splits of \mathcal{D} satisfy (iv) in the statement of Theorem 5.1. If $r = 1$, the label under consideration is $s_{\mathcal{D}^{(i_1)}}^{(i_1)}$ and the result follows.

Now suppose that $s^{(i_1)} \circ \dots \circ s^{(i_{j-1})} \circ t^{(i_j)} \in \mathcal{D}$ is a non-faultline split of $s^{(i_1)} \circ \dots \circ s^{(i_r)}$ where $t^{(i_j)}$ is a split of $s^{(i_j)}$. We assume that the result holds for labels $(s^{(j_1)} \circ \dots \circ s^{(j_{r'})})_{\mathcal{D}} \in \psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$ with $r' < r$. Using the approach in the proof of Lemma 5.6, we have that the label $(s^{(i_j)} \circ \dots \circ s^{(i_r)})_{\mathcal{D}''} \in \psi(B) \cap \psi(B')$ where

$$\mathcal{D}'' := \begin{cases} t^* & : \text{ if } t^* \in \mathcal{D} \text{ and } t^* \text{ is a proper subsegment of } s^{(i_j)} \circ \dots \circ s^{(i_r)}, \\ t^* & : \text{ if } s^{(i_1)} \circ \dots \circ s^{(i_{j-1})} \circ t^* \in \mathcal{D}. \end{cases}$$

We observe that $t^{(i_j)} \in \mathcal{D}''$. By induction, $t^{(i_j)} \in \mathcal{D}^{(i_j)}$. We conclude that $(s^{(i_1)} \circ \dots \circ s^{(i_r)})_{\mathcal{D}} \in \psi \left(\bigvee_{i=1}^{\ell} J(s_{\mathcal{D}^{(i)}}^{(i)}) \right)$. \square

Theorem 5.12. The shard intersection order $\Psi(\text{Bic}(T))$ is a lattice.

Proof. The shard intersection order $\Psi(\text{Bic}(T))$ is finite. So, to prove that it is a lattice, we show that it has a unique maximal element and that for any $\psi(B), \psi(B') \in \Psi(\text{Bic}(T))$ one has $\psi(B) \cap \psi(B') \in \Psi(\text{Bic}(T))$. The latter is a consequence of Lemma 5.11.

Next, the shard intersection order of $\text{Bic}(T)$ has a unique maximal element. The set $\text{Seg}(T)$ is the top element of $\text{Bic}(T)$, and the coatoms of $\text{Bic}(T)$ are the sets of the form $\text{Seg}(T) \setminus \{[a, b]\}$ where a and b are interior vertices connected by an edge of T . Thus the meet of all coatoms of $\text{Bic}(T)$ is the empty set. Now, using the definition of $\Psi(\text{Bic}(T))$ and Proposition 3.4, we see that $\psi(\text{Seg}(T)) = \tilde{\lambda}(\text{Cov}(\text{Bic}(T))) = \mathcal{S}_T$. This implies that $\psi(\text{Seg}(T))$ is the unique maximal element of $\Psi(\text{Bic}(T))$. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was carried out as part of the 2016 summer REU program at the School of Mathematics, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, and was supported by NSF RTG grant DMS-1148634. The authors would like to thank Craig Corsi, Thomas McConville, and Vic Reiner for their valuable advice and conversations. Alexander Garver also received support from NSERC and the Canada Research Chairs program during various parts of this project.

REFERENCES

- [1] Emily Barnard. The canonical join complex. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.05137*, 2016.
- [2] Alexander Garver and Thomas McConville. Lattice properties of oriented exchange graphs and torsion classes. *arXiv:1507.04268*, 2015.
- [3] Alexander Garver and Thomas McConville. Oriented flip graphs and noncrossing tree partitions. *preprint available at <http://lacim.uqam.ca/~garver/>*, 2016.
- [4] Alexander Garver and Thomas McConville. Oriented flip graphs and noncrossing tree partitions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.06009*, 2016.
- [5] Alexander Garver and Thomas McConville. Enumerative properties of grid-associahedra. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.04901*, 2017.
- [6] Thomas McConville. Lattice structure of grid–tamari orders. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 148:27–56, 2017.
- [7] Nathan Reading. Lattice theory of the poset of regions. In *Lattice Theory: Selected Topics and Applications. Volume 2*. Birkhäuser/Springer Basel AG, Basel, 2016.

E-mail address: `aclifton@mit.edu`

E-mail address: `dillery@umich.edu`

LABORATOIRE DE COMBINATOIRE ET D'INFORMATIQUE MATHÉMATIQUE, UNIVERSITÉ DU QUÉBEC À MONTRÉAL

E-mail address: `alexander.garver@lacim.ca`