

# EMBEDDING DIMENSIONS OF SIMPLICIAL COMPLEXES ON FEW VERTICES

FLORIAN FRICK, MIRABEL HU, NICK SCHEEL, AND STEVEN SIMON

ABSTRACT. We provide a simple characterization of simplicial complexes on few vertices that embed into the  $d$ -sphere. Namely, a simplicial complex on  $d + 3$  vertices embeds into the  $d$ -sphere if and only if its non-faces do not form an intersecting family. As immediate consequences, we recover the classical van Kampen–Flores theorem and provide a topological extension of the Erdős–Ko–Rado theorem. By analogy with Fáry’s theorem for planar graphs, we show in addition that such complexes satisfy the rigidity property that continuous and linear embeddability are equivalent.

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF RESULTS

Planar graphs are characterized as those without a  $K_5$ - or  $K_{3,3}$ -minor [18]. By a theorem of Fáry [7], a graph can be continuously embedded into the plane if and only if there is an embedding where every edge is a straight line segment. For higher-dimensional simplicial complexes and embeddings into  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , the situation is much more intricate: No efficient characterization of complexes that embed into  $\mathbb{R}^d$  exists in general, algorithmically deciding the existence of an embedding can be – depending on the dimensions of the complex and codomain – difficult or even impossible (see, e.g., [11, 12]), and an analogue of Fáry’s theorem asserting the equivalence of topological and linear embeddability fails even in dimension three [4, 15].

Here we show that if one restricts attention to simplicial complexes on few vertices, then both a simple characterization of complexes that embed into  $\mathbb{R}^d$  as well as the equivalence of topological and linear embeddability can be salvaged. The only simplicial complex on  $d + 2$  vertices that does not embed into the  $d$ -sphere  $S^d$  is the  $(d + 1)$ -dimensional simplex  $\Delta_{d+1}$ . We thus focus on deciding whether simplicial complexes on  $d + 3$  vertices embed into  $S^d$ . We note that a finite complex embeds into  $S^d$  but not into  $\mathbb{R}^d$  if and only if it is homeomorphic to  $S^d$ .

Fix a dimension  $d$  and let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a family of subsets of  $[d + 3] = \{1, 2, \dots, d + 3\}$ . Denote by  $\Sigma(\mathcal{F})$  the simplicial complex on  $[d + 3]$  with missing faces  $\mathcal{F}$ , that is,

$$\Sigma(\mathcal{F}) = \{\sigma \subset [d + 3] : \tau \notin \mathcal{F} \text{ for all } \tau \subset \sigma\}.$$

Note that every simplicial complex is of this form by letting  $\mathcal{F}$  be the family of non-faces. A family  $\mathcal{F}$  of subsets of  $[d + 3]$  is called *intersecting* if for all  $\sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{F}$  we have that  $\sigma \cap \tau \neq \emptyset$ . Our characterization of complexes on  $d + 3$  vertices that embed into  $S^d$  is surprisingly simple:

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a family of subsets of  $[d + 3]$ . Then  $\Sigma(\mathcal{F})$  embeds into  $S^d$  if and only if  $\mathcal{F}$  is not intersecting.*

---

*Date:* January 6, 2022.

FF was supported by NSF grant DMS 1855591, NSF CAREER grant DMS 2042428, and a Sloan Research Fellowship.

As with the Hanani–Tutte theorem [5, 16] for non-planar graphs, our proof of Theorem 1 for non-embeddings shows there must exist disjoint simplices of  $\Sigma(\mathcal{F})$  whose images overlap (see Lemma 5). As an example, suppose that  $\mathcal{F}$  consists of all the  $(d+2)$ -subsets of  $[2d+3]$ , in which case  $\Sigma(\mathcal{F})$  is the  $d$ -skeleton  $\Delta_{2d+2}^{(d)}$  of the  $(2d+2)$ -simplex. The classical van Kampen–Flores theorem [8, 17] is then recovered as an immediate corollary:

**Theorem 2** (Van Kampen–Flores theorem). *For any continuous map  $f: \Delta_{2d+2}^{(d)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ , there exist disjoint simplices  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  of  $\Delta_{2d+2}^{(d)}$  such that  $f(\sigma) \cap f(\tau) \neq \emptyset$ .*

In a different direction, we show that Theorem 1 implies an extremal criterion for embeddability of simplicial complexes with few vertices. Recall that the Erdős–Ko–Rado theorem [6] states that an intersecting family of  $k$ -element subsets of  $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$  has size at most  $\binom{n-1}{k-1}$  whenever  $n \geq 2k$ . As we will see, combining this with Theorem 1 quickly gives the following:

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $\Sigma$  be a simplicial complex on  $d+3$  vertices with fewer than  $\binom{d+2}{k}$  faces of dimension  $k-1$ , where  $k \leq \lfloor \frac{d+3}{2} \rfloor$ . Then  $\Sigma$  embeds into  $S^d$ .*

Observe that together with Theorem 1, Theorem 3 recovers the Erdős–Ko–Rado theorem itself. Thus Theorem 3 provides a natural topological generalization of the Erdős–Ko–Rado theorem. (The proof of the Erdős–Ko–Rado theorem is used in the proof of Theorem 3, however.) We also note that the lower bound of Theorem 3 is sharp, precisely because the the upper bound of the Erdős–Ko–Rado theorem is.

Our final result shows that the analogue of Fáry’s theorem holds for simplicial complexes on few vertices. To state this formally, we say that an embedding of a simplicial complex  $\Sigma$  into  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is *linear* if the image of each face of  $\Sigma$  is the convex hull of the image of its vertices, and likewise that an embedding of  $\Sigma$  into  $S^d$  is *geodesic* if the image of each face is geodesically convex in  $S^d$ , that is, for any two points in the image any shortest path (in the isotropic round metric) connecting them is also in the image. We then have the following rigidity theorem:

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $\Sigma$  be a simplicial complex on  $d+3$  vertices. Then  $\Sigma$  embeds into  $\mathbb{R}^d$  (respectively,  $S^d$ ) if and only if it embeds linearly into  $\mathbb{R}^d$  (respectively, geodesically into  $S^d$ ).*

In fact, we will show (Lemma 7) that any simplicial complex on  $d+3$  vertices that embeds into  $S^d$  is actually a subcomplex of a convex  $(d+1)$ -polytope on  $d+3$  vertices inscribed into  $S^d$ , that is, with all vertices on the unit sphere. Mani [9] showed that any triangulation of  $S^d$  on at most  $d+4$  vertices is the boundary complex of a convex polytope. However, our construction in Lemma 7 is optimal in that there exist complexes on  $d+4$  vertices that embed into  $S^d$  but which are not contained in any simplicial  $(d+1)$ -polytope on  $d+4$  vertices; see Remark 10 for an example when  $d=3$ . It remains open whether Theorem 4 holds for simplicial complexes on  $d+4$  or  $d+5$  vertices; see Problem 9. Moreover, our result does not extend to linear embeddings of polyhedra. For instance, Barnette [3] gives a simple example of a polyhedral 2-complex on six vertices that embeds into  $\mathbb{R}^3$  but for which no linear embedding exists.

We refer to Matoušek [10] for the basics about simplicial complexes and to Ziegler [19] for the basics about polytopes.

## 2. PROOFS

**2.1. Proof of Theorem 1.** To prove Theorem 1, we first show that  $\Sigma(\mathcal{F})$  on  $d+3$  vertices cannot embed in a  $d$ -sphere if  $\mathcal{F}$  is intersecting.

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be an intersecting family of subsets of  $[d+3]$ . For any continuous map  $f: \Sigma(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow S^d$ , there must exist disjoint faces  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  of  $\Sigma(\mathcal{F})$  such that  $f(\sigma) \cap f(\tau) \neq \emptyset$ .*

While this result follows easily from a special case of Sarkaria's lower bound for dimensions of Euclidean embeddings via chromatic numbers of Kneser graphs [14], we derive it instead as a direct consequence of the Topological Radon theorem [1].

**Theorem 6** (Topological Radon theorem). *For any continuous map  $f: \Delta_{d+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ , there exist disjoint simplices  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  of  $\Delta_{d+1}$  such that  $f(\sigma) \cap f(\tau) \neq \emptyset$ .*

*Proof of Lemma 5.* Given a continuous map  $f: \Sigma(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow S^d$ , we extend it to a continuous map  $F: \Delta_{d+2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$  as follows: Any point  $x$  from the simplex  $\Delta_{d+2}$  can be uniquely expressed as the convex sum of a point  $s$  from  $\Sigma(\mathcal{F})$  and a convex combination  $b$  of barycenters of pairwise incident faces of  $\Delta_{d+2}$  not contained in  $\Sigma(\mathcal{F})$ . Letting  $x = (1-t)b + ts$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ , we define  $F(x) = tf(s)$ . Here we think of  $S^d$  as the unit sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ . All that we need is that  $F$  continuously extends  $f$  and that  $F^{-1}(S^d)$  only consists of points in  $\Sigma(\mathcal{F})$ .

Now suppose that  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  are disjoint faces of  $\Delta_{d+2}$  for which  $f(\sigma) \cap f(\tau) \neq \emptyset$ . If  $\mathcal{F}$  is intersecting, then it is easy to see that both  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  must lie in  $\Sigma(\mathcal{F})$ . Indeed, any two simplices which are not contained in  $\Sigma(\mathcal{F})$  must intersect. On the other hand, suppose that  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  are disjoint, where  $\sigma$  lies in  $\Sigma(\mathcal{F})$  and  $\tau$  does not. Then clearly  $f(\sigma) \cap f(\tau) = \emptyset$  as well.  $\square$

To conclude the proof of Theorem 1, we show that  $\Sigma(\mathcal{F})$  embeds in  $S^d$  whenever  $\mathcal{F}$  is not intersecting, and moreover that this embedding is geodesic. To that end, recall that the *matching number*  $\nu(\mathcal{F})$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  is the maximum number of pairwise disjoint sets of  $\mathcal{F}$ . As  $\nu(\mathcal{F}) = 1$  if and only if  $\mathcal{F}$  is intersecting, the following lemma completes the proof of Theorem 1.

**Lemma 7.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a family of subsets of  $[d] = \{1, \dots, d\}$ . Then  $\Sigma(\mathcal{F})$  embeds geodesically into  $S^{d-\nu(\mathcal{F})-1}$ . In fact,  $\Sigma(\mathcal{F})$  is a subcomplex of a convex  $(d - \nu(\mathcal{F}))$ -polytope with all  $d$  vertices on the unit sphere.*

*Proof of Lemma 7.* Let  $\nu = \nu(\mathcal{F})$  and let  $\mathcal{M} = \{S_1, \dots, S_\nu\}$  be a maximal collection of pairwise disjoint sets of  $\mathcal{F}$ . As  $\Sigma(\mathcal{F})$  is a subcomplex of  $\Sigma(\mathcal{M})$ , it suffices to show that  $\Sigma(\mathcal{M})$  embeds geodesically into the  $(d - \nu - 1)$ -sphere. To that end, let  $\Delta_i$  denote the simplex determined by  $S_i$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq \nu$ . As the  $S_i$  are pairwise disjoint,

$$\Sigma(\mathcal{M}) = \partial\Delta_1 * \dots * \partial\Delta_\nu * \Delta$$

is the join of the boundaries of the  $\Delta_i$  with the join of the simplex  $\Delta$  given by any vertices of  $[d]$  (if any) which are not covered by  $\mathcal{M}$ . Understanding  $S^{-1}$  to be the empty set, each  $\partial\Delta_i$  is a  $(|S_i| - 2)$ -dimensional sphere, so their join is a sphere of dimension  $\sum_i |S_i| - \nu - 1$ .

The boundary of any  $k$ -simplex is a triangulation of the  $(k - 1)$ -dimensional sphere and can be realized with geodesically convex faces, for example, by radially projecting a  $k$ -simplex inscribed into the sphere. The join  $\partial\Delta_1 * \dots * \partial\Delta_\nu * \Delta$  may then be realized with geodesically convex faces as well, and so  $\Sigma(\mathcal{F})$  embeds geodesically into the sphere as a subcomplex of  $\Sigma(\mathcal{M})$ .  $\square$

**2.2. Proof of Theorem 3.** Using Theorem 1, we now prove our topological generalization of the Erdős–Ko–Rado theorem. We recall the statement of the latter:

**Theorem 8** (Erdős–Ko–Rado theorem). *Let  $k \geq 2$  and  $n \geq 2k$  be integers. If  $\mathcal{F}$  is an intersecting family of  $k$ -element subsets of  $[n]$ , then  $|\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n-1}{k-1}$ .*

*Proof of Theorem 3.* Suppose that  $\Sigma$  be a simplicial complex on  $d + 3$  vertices with fewer than  $\binom{d+2}{k}$  faces of dimension  $k - 1$ ,  $d + 3 \geq 2k$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}$  denote the family of non-faces of  $\Sigma$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{F} = \{\sigma \subseteq [d + 3] \mid \sigma \notin \Sigma\}$ . Thus  $\Sigma = \Sigma(\mathcal{F})$ . As  $\Sigma$  has fewer than  $\binom{d+2}{k}$  faces of dimension  $k - 1$ ,  $\mathcal{F}$  has more than  $\binom{d+3}{k} - \binom{d+2}{k} = \binom{d+2}{k-1}$  subsets of order  $k$ . Thus  $\mathcal{F}$  cannot be intersecting by the Erdős–Ko–Rado theorem and so  $\Sigma$  must embed into  $S^d$  by Theorem 1.  $\square$

**2.3. Proof of Theorem 4.** The proof of our Fáry-type result is again a direct consequence of the lemmas above.

*Proof of Theorem 4.* Let  $f: \Sigma \rightarrow S^d$  be a continuous embedding, and let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the set of non-faces of  $\Sigma$ . Thus  $\Sigma = \Sigma(\mathcal{F})$ . By Theorem 1,  $\mathcal{F}$  is not intersecting, and thus  $\Sigma$  geodesically embeds into  $S^d$  by Lemma 7. To finish the proof, suppose that  $f: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  is an embedding. Composing with the inverse of the stereographic projection then gives a continuous embedding  $f: \Sigma \rightarrow S^d$  into the punctured  $d$ -sphere. By Lemma 7,  $\Sigma$  is a proper subcomplex of the boundary of a convex  $(d + 1)$ -polytope  $P$  and therefore linearly embeds into  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , for example by considering the Schlegel diagram of  $P$  with respect to a facet not contained in  $\Sigma$ .  $\square$

We conclude with a problem and some comments concerning the optimality of Theorem 4 and Lemma 7.

**Problem 9.** Brehm [4] constructed a triangulation of the Möbius strip on nine vertices that does not linearly embed into  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Thus, embeddability and linear embeddability into  $\mathbb{R}^d$  differ for complexes on  $d + 6$  vertices. As far as we know, it remains open whether these notions of embeddability coincide for simplicial complexes on  $d + 4$  or even  $d + 5$  vertices.

It is tempting to think that the two triangulations of  $S^3$  on eight vertices that are not boundary complexes of convex polytopes [2] are good candidates to show that Theorem 4 cannot be extended to complexes on  $d + 5$  vertices. As shown by Mihalisin and Williams [13], these non-polytopal 3-spheres do linearly embed into  $\mathbb{R}^4$ , however. As an application of Theorem 4, we provide a quick alternative proof of this fact in Remark 11 below. Nonetheless, we can use one of these two exceptional spheres to show that our construction in Lemma 7 cannot be extended to complexes on  $d + 4$  vertices:

**Remark 10.** We construct a simplicial complex on seven vertices that embeds into  $\mathbb{R}^3$  but which is not contained in any convex simplicial 4-polytope on seven vertices. Following the notation and facet list of [13], the simplicial 3-sphere  $\mathcal{M}'$  has a vertex  $p$  whose vertex link is an octahedron. Every edge not involving  $p$  is present in  $\mathcal{M}'$ . The complex  $\Sigma$  obtained from  $\mathcal{M}'$  by deleting  $p$  and all its incident faces is a 3-ball, and thus embeds into  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Suppose  $\Sigma$  were a subcomplex of a convex simplicial 4-polytope on seven vertices. To triangulate the boundary octahedron of  $\Sigma$ , this polytope must have an additional edge. This leads to a double edge, however, since all edges are already present in  $\Sigma$ .

**Remark 11.** Finally, we remark that we can simplify the constructions of Mihalisin and Williams [13] for linear embeddings of the two non-polytopal 3-spheres on eight vertices. Indeed, let  $\mathcal{M}'$  be the non-polytopal triangulation of  $S^3$  on eight vertices whose 1-skeleton is not complete (i.e., “Barnette’s sphere”). Delete the two endpoints  $v$  and  $w$  of the missing edge and all their incident faces from  $\mathcal{M}'$ . The resulting complex embeds into  $\mathbb{R}^3$  and has six vertices; thus it embeds linearly by Theorem 4. Thinking of  $\mathbb{R}^3$  as a hyperplane in  $\mathbb{R}^4$ , place  $v$  above this hyperplane and  $w$  below it. This yields

a linear embedding of  $\mathcal{M}'$  into  $\mathbb{R}^4$ . Now consider  $\mathcal{M}$ , the non-polytopal 3-sphere on eight vertices with complete 1-skeleton (i.e., “Grünbaum’s sphere”). Deleting any vertex yields a stacked 3-ball which linearly embeds into  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . One now only need add the deleted vertex back by placing it above the  $\mathbb{R}^3$ -hyperplane in  $\mathbb{R}^4$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] E. Bajmóczy and I. Bárány. On a common generalization of Borsuk’s and Radon’s theorem. *Acta Math. Hung.*, 34: 347–350, 1979.
- [2] D. Barnette. The triangulations of the 3-sphere with up to 8 vertices. *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. A*, 14(1): 37–53, 1973.
- [3] D. Barnette. Two “simple” 3-spheres. *Discrete Math.*, 67(1): 97–99, 1987.
- [4] U. Brehm. A nonpolyhedral triangulated Möbius strip. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 89(3): 519–522, 1983.
- [5] Ch. Chojnacki. Über wesentlich unplättbare Kurven im dreidimensionalen Raume. *Fund. Math.*, 23(1): 135–142, 1934.
- [6] P. Erdős, C. Ko, and R. Rado. Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets. *Q.J. Math.*, 12(1): 313–320, 1961.
- [7] I. Fáry. On straight-line representation of planar graphs. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)*, 12: 229–233, 1948.
- [8] A. Flores, Über  $n$ -dimensionale Komplexe die im  $\mathbb{R}^{2n+1}$  absolut selbstverschlungen sind. *Ergeb. Math. Kolloq.*, 6: 4–7, 1933.
- [9] P. Mani. Spheres with few vertices. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A*, 13(3): 346–352, 1972.
- [10] J. Matoušek. *Using the Borsuk–Ulam theorem: Lectures on topological methods in combinatorics and geometry*. Springer-Verlag, 2008.
- [11] J. Matoušek, M. Tancer, and U. Wagner. Hardness of embedding simplicial complexes in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, 13(2): 259–295, 2011.
- [12] A. de Mesmay, Y. Rieck, E. Sedgwick, and M. Tancer. Embeddability in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  is NP-hard. *J. ACM*, 67(4): 1–29, 2020.
- [13] J. Mihalisin and G. Williams. Nonconvex embeddings of the exceptional simplicial 3-spheres with 8 vertices. *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. A*, 98(1): 74–86, 2002.
- [14] K. S. Sarkaria. A generalized Kneser conjecture. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B*, 49(2): 236–240, 1990.
- [15] L. Schewe. Nonrealizable minimal vertex triangulations of surfaces: showing nonrealizability using oriented matroids and satisfiability solvers. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 43(2): 289–302, 2010.
- [16] W. T. Tutte. Toward a theory of crossing numbers. *J. Comb. Theory*, 8: 45–53, 1970.
- [17] E. van Kampen. Komplexe in euklidischen Räumen. *Abh. Math. Semin. Univ. Hamb.*, 9: 72–78, 1932.
- [18] K. Wagner. Über eine Eigenschaft der ebenen Komplexe. *Math. Ann.*, 114: 570–590, 1937.
- [19] G. M. Ziegler. *Lectures on polytopes*. Grad. Texts Math. 152, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.

(FF) DEPT. MATH. SCIENCES, CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY, PITTSBURGH, PA 15213, USA  
 INST. MATH., FREIE UNIVERSITÄT BERLIN, ARNIMALLEE 2, 14195 BERLIN, GERMANY  
*Email address:* frick@cmu.edu

(MH) DEPT. MATH. SCIENCES, CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY, PITTSBURGH, PA 15213, USA  
*Email address:* zixinh@andrew.cmu.edu

(NS) DEPT. MATH., BARD COLLEGE, ANNANDALE-ON-HUDSON, NY 12504, USA  
*Email address:* ns5044@bard.edu

(SS) DEPT. MATH., BARD COLLEGE, ANNANDALE-ON-HUDSON, NY 12504, USA  
*Email address:* ssimon@bard.edu