

A CHARACTERIZATION OF TWO-DIMENSIONAL BUCHSBAUM MATCHING COMPLEXES

BENNET GOECKNER, FRAN HERR, LEGRAND JONES II, AND ROWAN ROWLANDS

ABSTRACT. The matching complex $M(G)$ of a graph G is the set of all matchings in G . A Buchsbaum simplicial complex is a generalization of both a homology manifold and a Cohen–Macaulay complex. We give a complete characterization of the graphs G for which $M(G)$ is a two-dimensional Buchsbaum complex. As an intermediate step, we determine which graphs have matching complexes that are themselves connected graphs.

1. INTRODUCTION

Given a graph G , a matching is a collection of edges such that no two share a common endpoint. The matching complex $M(G)$, which is the set of all matchings of G , forms a simplicial complex. Matching complexes and their topology have been studied extensively; see, e.g., [Jon08, Wac03] for surveys of the field.

Recently, all homology manifolds that arise as matching complexes have been classified [BGJM20]. Outside of dimension two, all such complexes are combinatorial (i.e., PL) balls and spheres. In dimension two, more examples appear, including a torus and a Möbius strip. See Figure 1 for one such example.

In this paper, we characterize all graphs G for which $M(G)$ is a two-dimensional Buchsbaum complex, which partially answers a question from [BGJM20]. Buchsbaum complexes are a generalization of both homology manifolds and Cohen–Macaulay complexes. Though originally defined algebraically, the Buchsbaum condition is in fact a topological property [Sch81]. In dimension two, Buchsbaum complexes can be classified in terms of connected graphs, and this is the notion we will use.

In Section 2, we introduce relevant terminology and background. In Section 3 we classify all graphs G for which $M(G)$ is a connected graph, which allows us to characterize all one-dimensional Buchsbaum and Cohen–Macaulay matching complexes in Corollary 3.7. Then we consider the local behavior of graphs with two-dimensional Buchsbaum matching complexes. Section 4 gives an explicit description of all graphs G such that $M(G)$ is a two-dimensional Buchsbaum complex and shows that this list is exhaustive, resulting in Theorem 4.20. We end with a brief discussion of similar questions in higher dimensions in Section 5.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Our two main objects of study are simple graphs and simplicial complexes. For all terms not defined here, see standard references such as [Wes96] and [Sta96].




FIGURE 1. The matching complex of C_7 is a triangulated Möbius strip. Faces of $M(C_7)$ with the same label are identified.

A (simple) graph $G = (V, E)$ consists of a vertex set $V = V(G)$ and an edge set $E = E(G)$ whose members are two-element subsets of V . If $e = \{a, b\} \in E$, we refer to vertices a and b as the *endpoints* of the edge e ; we will often use the notation $e = ab$. Given a graph G , a *matching* is a collection of edges of G such that no two share an endpoint. Unless stated otherwise, we will assume that all graphs mentioned in theorem statements are simple and do not have isolated vertices (that is, vertices that are not the endpoints of any edges).

A graph is *k-colorable* if its vertices can be colored using k colors so that no adjacent vertices use the same color. A graph is *bipartite* if it is 2-colorable, or, equivalently, if it contains no odd-sized cycles. We often refer to several common graphs: K_n the complete graph on n vertices, C_n the cycle on n vertices, and S_n the star graph with n leaves. We often refer to a path on $n + 1$ vertices as a path of length n .

A *simplicial complex* Δ is a collection of sets with the property that if $\sigma \in \Delta$ and $\tau \subseteq \sigma$, then $\tau \in \Delta$. An element $\sigma \in \Delta$ is called a *face*; throughout, we will use the convention of writing abc in place of $\{a, b, c\}$, etc. for faces of simplicial complexes. The *dimension* of a face σ is $\dim \sigma := |\sigma| - 1$, and the *dimension* of Δ , denoted $\dim \Delta$, is the maximum of the dimensions of its faces. A complex is *pure* if all maximal faces have the same dimension. Faces of dimension 0 and 1 are called vertices and edges respectively.

Note that simple graphs can be thought of as simplicial complexes of dimension one (or less, if the graph has no edges). Throughout, we will often blur the distinctions between graphs and 1-dimensional simplicial complexes and between simplicial complexes and their geometric realizations.

Given a face $\sigma \in \Delta$, its *link*, denoted $\text{link}_\Delta \sigma$ (or simply $\text{link } \sigma$ if Δ is unambiguous), is

$$\text{link}_\Delta \sigma = \{\tau \in \Delta \mid \tau \cup \sigma \in \Delta \text{ and } \tau \cap \sigma = \emptyset\}.$$

For example, the link of vertex 7 in Figure 1(b) is the path with edges 24, 25, 35 and the link of edge 16 is the pair of isolated vertices 3 and 4. The link of a face captures the local structure of Δ near that face, and many properties of simplicial complexes—including Buchsbaumness—can be defined in terms of links.

The *matching complex* $M(G)$ is the set of all matchings of G . Since any subset of a matching is also a matching, $M(G)$ is a simplicial complex. Note that the vertices of $M(G)$ correspond to the edges of G .

Many results on matching complexes concern the topological properties of their geometric realizations. Most previous results consider $M(G)$ for a family of graphs (see, e.g., [Jon08] and [Wac03] for a survey of these results), but we will instead specify the properties of $M(G)$ and then determine the structure of G . Motivated by a question from [BGJM20, Section 6], we will be primarily interested in complexes that satisfy the following definition.

Definition 2.1. Let Δ be a two-dimensional simplicial complex. We say that Δ is *Buchsbaum* if $\text{link}_\Delta v$ is a connected graph with at least one edge for each vertex $v \in \Delta$.

Note that if Δ has any maximal faces of dimension 0 or 1, then Δ cannot satisfy Definition 2.1, so all maximal faces must have dimension 2, i.e., Δ is pure. For example, the link of every vertex in Figure 1(b) is a path on four vertices, so $M(C_7)$ is Buchsbaum.

Remark 2.2. In this paper we focus on Buchsbaum complexes in dimension two. In general, a Buchsbaum complex can be defined as a pure complex where the i^{th} reduced homology of $\text{link } \sigma$ is trivial for all $i < \dim \Delta - |\sigma|$ for all non-empty faces $\sigma \in \Delta$. The Buchsbaum condition was first defined in terms of algebraic properties of the complex's associated Stanley–Reisner ring. However, the combinatorial description above is equivalent for two-dimensional complexes, and, moreover, Buchsbaumness is a topological invariant (see [Sch81, Miy89]).

Remark 2.3. Buchsbaumness is a generalization of the *Cohen–Macaulay* condition, which additionally requires that $\text{link}_\Delta \emptyset$ (i.e. Δ itself) also has vanishing i^{th} homology for all $i < \dim \Delta$. There is a related and even more restrictive class known as *Gorenstein* complexes. A complete characterization of Gorenstein matching complexes is implicit in [BGJM20, Theorem 3.1] (via [Sta96, Chapter II Theorem 5.1]) and is proved independently in [Nik21, Theorem 2.1].

In light of these remarks, we note that if $\dim \Delta = 1$, then Δ is Buchsbaum if and only if Δ is a graph with no isolated vertices, and Δ is Cohen–Macaulay if and only if it is connected. In general, a complex Δ is Buchsbaum if and only if it is pure and $\text{link}_\Delta v$ is Cohen–Macaulay for all vertices v of Δ . We will consider the one-dimensional case in Section 3, and it will be key to developing our results for two-dimensional complexes.

Remark 2.4. The f -vector of a complex Δ is $f(\Delta) = (f_{-1}, f_0, \dots, f_{\dim \Delta})$ where f_i is the number of i -dimensional faces of Δ . The f -vectors of Cohen–Macaulay complexes have long been characterized [Sta77, Theorem 6]. For Buchsbaum complexes, however, only sufficient conditions are known in general [Ter96], but a full characterization is known for two-dimensional Buchsbaum complexes [Mur09].

We are not aware of any overt study of Buchsbaum matching complexes in the literature, but there are some results for similar properties for certain families of graphs. For example, [Gar79, Theorem 15] shows that $M(K_{m,n})$ is Cohen–Macaulay if and only if $n \geq 2m - 1$, and [Zie94, Theorem 2.3] shows that this is in fact equivalent to vertex decomposability for this family of matching complexes.

3. LINK BEHAVIOR AND ONE-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING COMPLEXES

We first introduce a tool that will be used throughout the remainder of the paper.

Definition 3.1. For a simple graph G and an edge $e \in E(G)$, the *non-adjacent subgraph* of e , denoted N_e , is the subgraph induced by all edges of G that do not share any endpoints with e .

Observe that N_e will never have any isolated vertices. The link of the vertex e in $M(G)$ is $\text{link}_{M(G)} e = M(N_e)$. This allows us to use non-adjacent subgraphs to translate the two-dimensional Buchsbaum condition for the matching complex $M(G)$ into conditions for the graph G .

Lemma 3.2. *Given a graph G , $M(G)$ is a two-dimensional Buchsbaum complex if and only if $M(N_e)$ is a connected graph with at least one edge for all $e \in E(G)$.*

Proof. A matching complex $M(G)$ is two-dimensional if and only if the largest size of a matching in G is three. This is equivalent to the largest dimension of the link of a vertex in $M(G)$ being one (i.e., the link is a graph with at least one edge).

Let $M(G)$ be a two-dimensional complex. Then $M(G)$ is Buchsbaum if and only if $\text{link}_{M(G)} e$ is a connected graph with at least one edge for each vertex e of $M(G)$. Since $\text{link}_{M(G)} e = M(N_e)$, this completes the proof. \square

We will use the above result throughout as our main tool for characterizing two-dimensional Buchsbaum matching complexes.

We will first consider graphs G for which $M(G)$ is a connected graph, i.e., a 1-dimensional simplicial complex. These graphs will be instrumental in Section 4, and they answer the question for 1-dimensional Cohen–Macaulay and Buchsbaum matching complexes. We first turn our attention to disconnected graphs.

Lemma 3.3. *Let G be a disconnected graph. Then $M(G)$ is a connected graph if and only if G has two components which are each either a K_3 or star graph.*

Proof. By direct computation we easily see that the matching complexes of $K_3 \sqcup K_3$, $K_3 \sqcup S_n$, and $S_n \sqcup S_m$ are all connected graphs.

Suppose that $M(G)$ is a connected graph and G is disconnected. Observe that if G had more than two components or if any component contained two non-adjacent edges, then G would contain a 3-matching. Thus G has exactly two components and all edges of each component are adjacent to each other, so the only possibility for each component of G is K_3 or a star graph. \square

We now will focus on *connected* graphs whose matching complexes are also connected graphs. We start with the following lemma.

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose G is a connected graph with at least two edges. If $M(G)$ is also a connected graph, then G has a path of length four and no paths of length five or more.*

Proof. If G has a path of length five or more, we get a 3-matching by taking the first, third, and fifth edges of the path, so $M(G)$ is not 1-dimensional.

Assume that edges $e = uv$ and $e' = u'v'$ form a matching in G . Since G is connected, there must be a path connecting u to u' . Let P be the shortest such path (which may contain e or e'). Since the vertices of e and e' are distinct, P must contain at least one edge besides e and e' , so $P \cup \{e, e'\}$ is a path containing at least three edges.

We now only need to show that G has a path of length four in particular. Suppose G contains a path of length three, say $\{12, 23, 34\}$. Now consider the edge 23. Since $M(G)$ is a connected graph, there must





FIGURE 2. Graphs appearing in the proof of Lemma 3.4

FIGURE 3. The families of connected graphs whose matching complexes are themselves connected graphs. Dotted edges are optional. For families \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 , we may repeatedly introduce filled vertices and connect them to any (nonzero) number of unfilled vertices.

be some other edge in G which does not share endpoints with 23, otherwise 23 becomes an isolated vertex in $M(G)$. Because G is connected, the only way to do this without having a path of length four is to add the edge 14, i.e., to have C_4 as a subgraph of our graph G . However, $M(C_4)$ is not a connected graph, so this subgraph cannot contain all the edges of G . Furthermore, the matching complex of any graph on four vertices that contains a 4-cycle is also disconnected. Thus we must have some edge in G which (without loss of generality) shares no endpoints with both 12 and 23 while keeping G a connected graph, which gives a path of length four. \square

Motivated by the previous lemma, we next define some families of graphs built from the length-4 path $\{12, 23, 34, 45\}$. See Figure 3 for pictures of each of these families. In \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 , we note the distinction between filled and unfilled vertices.

- For family \mathcal{G}_1 , we may add the edges 14 and 25. We may then introduce any number of filled vertices, connecting each to either or both of the unfilled vertices. (This creates paths of length two between 2 and 4 or pendants off of 2 or 4.)
- For family \mathcal{G}_2 , we add the edge 13 to our path to create a 3-cycle. Then we may add edges 14, 24, and any number of filled leaf vertices adjacent to the unfilled vertex 4.
- For family \mathcal{G}_3 , we add the edge 15 to form a 5-cycle. Then we may add any edges that do not introduce new vertices.
- Finally, we also include the bowtie graph B (also known as the butterfly graph), which we create by adding edges 13 and 35 and no additional edges.

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose G is a connected graph with at least two edges. Then $M(G)$ is a connected graph if and only if $G \in \mathcal{G}_1$, \mathcal{G}_2 , or \mathcal{G}_3 , or G is the bowtie graph B .*




FIGURE 4. Graph appearing in Case 2(b) in the proof of Lemma 3.5.

Proof. It is straightforward to check that the matching complex of any graph in these families is indeed a connected graph; we omit the details of these calculations.

For the other direction of the proof, assume $M(G)$ is a connected graph. By Lemma 3.4, G contains a path P of length four, say $P = \{12, 23, 34, 45\}$. If G is simply this path, then $G \in \mathcal{G}_1$. If this path is not all of G , let us consider what we can add. Note that we cannot add any edges which produce a 3-matching in the graph, so in particular we cannot have any edges of the form $1a$, $3a$, or $5a$ where a is a new vertex, and we cannot add any edges that do not share a vertex with this path of length four. We will break the next steps into cases.

Case 1: Suppose G has C_5 as a subgraph. We note that $M(C_5)$ is itself a connected graph (namely, $M(C_5) = C_5$). If G contains any edge whose endpoints are not both contained in this C_5 , then G contains a 3-matching. However, $M(G)$ remains connected and 1-dimensional if we add any number of edges between vertices in the C_5 . Thus G is in the family \mathcal{G}_3 .

Case 2: Suppose G has C_3 as a subgraph but not C_4 or C_5 . Without loss of generality, this can only occur if we add edge 13 or 24 to our path of length four because otherwise we immediately get a 3-matching. We will consider these as Cases 2(a) and 2(b), respectively.

In Case 2(a), we add the edge 13. Adding any edge to vertices 1 or 2 will either create a 4-cycle (if no new vertices are introduced) or 3-matching (if there are new vertices) and thus isn't allowed. Adding a pendant edge off vertex 3 gives a 3-matching. Adding any edge to vertex 5 except the edge 35 will again create a 4-cycle or 3-matching. Thus the only allowed options are to add any number of pendant edges off of vertex 4 or to instead add the edge 35. Note that doing both of these would create a 3-matching. The first of these options puts G in \mathcal{G}_2 , the second shows that G is the bowtie graph B .

In Case 2(b), we add the edge 24. Observe that any additional edge with 1, 3, or 5 as an endpoint will create either 4-cycle or 3-matching and thus is not allowed. The only possible additional edges in this case have either 2 or 4 as an endpoint. However, any graph in this family has a disconnected matching complex—in particular, the edge 24 is not in a matching with any other edge. Thus this case is impossible.

Case 3: Suppose G has C_4 as a subgraph but not C_3 or C_5 . Without loss of generality, the only way this can occur without introducing a 3-matching is to add edge 14 to the P_4 subgraph. Observe that any additional edge with 1 or 3 as an endpoint will either create a disallowed cycle or 3-matching. This is the same for any edge with 5 as an endpoint except the edge 25, which is allowed. The edge 24 would create a 3-cycle and thus is not allowed. However, any number of pendants of 2 and 4 and any paths of length two connecting vertices 2 and 4 are allowed. Therefore $G \in \mathcal{G}_1$.

Case 4: Suppose G has both C_3 and C_4 as a subgraph but not C_5 . There are two ways to introduce the C_3 (without loss of generality): As in Case 2, we can add the edge 13 or 24. We will call these Cases 4(a) and 4(b), respectively.

In Case 4(a), we add the edge 13. The only edges involving 1 and 2 that we can add without introducing a 3-matching or 5-cycle are 14 and 24. We must add one of these to create a 4-cycle in G . Once we do so, we may add the other edge and any number of pendants off of 4. Any edge with 5 as an endpoint will create a 3-matching or 5-cycle. Thus $G \in \mathcal{G}_2$.

In Case 4(b), we add the edge 24. Pendant edges off 1, 3, or 5 create 3-matchings, and adding the edge 15 creates a 5-cycle. Without loss of generality, the only way to create a 4-cycle without introducing new vertices is to add the edge 14. The only way to prevent 24 from being an isolated vertex in the matching complex is to add the edge 13. Now adding pendants to 2 produces a 3 matching, thus $G \in \mathcal{G}_2$.

If instead we create a 4-cycle with a new vertex, the only possible way without creating 3-matchings or disallowed cycles is to add $2x$ and $4x$ for a new vertex x as in Figure 5. However, as in Case 2(b), we see that 24 must be an isolated vertex in the matching complex. Thus this case is impossible.



FIGURE 5. Graphs appearing in Case 4(b) in the proof of Lemma 3.5.

Case 5: Suppose G contains no cycles. In this case the only edges we can add without getting a 3-matching are pendants off of vertices 2 and 4. Thus $G \in \mathcal{G}_1$. \square

We immediately get the following corollary, combining the above results of this section with the definition of a two-dimensional Buchsbaum complex.

Corollary 3.6. *Let G be a graph. Then $M(G)$ is a two-dimensional Buchsbaum complex if and only if for each edge e of G , N_e is a graph described in either Lemma 3.3 or Lemma 3.5.*

Furthermore, we can classify all Cohen–Macaulay and Buchsbaum matching complexes in dimension one.

Corollary 3.7. *Let G be a graph and assume $\dim M(G) = 1$.*

- (a) *$M(G)$ is Cohen–Macaulay if and only if G is a graph described in either Lemma 3.3 or Lemma 3.5.*
- (b) *$M(G)$ is Buchsbaum if and only if G is a graph described in either Lemma 3.3 or Lemma 3.5 or $G = K_4$ or $G = C_4$.*

Proof. We recall that a 1-dimensional complex is Cohen–Macaulay if and only if it is connected, and it is Buchsbaum if and only if it has no isolated vertices.

Therefore (a) follows immediately. For (b), the only graphs that have disconnected matching complexes with no isolated vertices are K_4 and C_4 by [BGJM20, Theorem 2.9]. \square

4. BUCHSBAUM GRAPH FAMILIES

In this section, we give all graphs G for which $M(G)$ is two-dimensional and Buchsbaum. We first consider when G is disconnected.

Proposition 4.1. *If G is a disconnected graph and $M(G)$ is two-dimensional and Buchsbaum, then either*

- (a) *G has three components, each of which is either K_3 or a star graph, or*
- (b) *G has two components, one of which is K_3 or a star graph and the other is a graph described in Lemma 3.5.*

Proof. Suppose that G is a disconnected graph and $M(G)$ is two-dimensional and Buchsbaum. If G has four or more connected components, then it is guaranteed to have a 4-matching and $M(G)$ is thus not two-dimensional. If G has three components, then each must be either K_3 or a star graph because each component must have all edges adjacent to each other; otherwise we could find a 4-matching in G .

Next, suppose that G has exactly two connected components and $G = G_1 \sqcup G_2$. At least one component must not contain a 2-matching—say this component is G_1 . Then G_1 is K_3 or a star graph. If we take any edge $e \in G_1$, we see that N_e is precisely G_2 . Thus G_2 must be one of the graphs from Lemma 3.5. \square

We now turn our attention to Figure 6, which depicts several families of graphs \mathcal{B}_i and two exceptional graphs E_1 and E_2 with two-dimensional Buchsbaum matching complexes. The families are defined as follows: All solid edges are necessary and any dotted edges are optional. Observe the filled and unfilled vertices in Figure 6: For each graph, we may add any number of new filled in vertices and attach each to a non-zero number of the unfilled vertices.

There are two additional families not depicted in Figure 6. The first is \mathcal{B}_{C_7} , which is defined to be the family of all graphs containing C_7 as a subgraph that have two-dimensional Buchsbaum matching complexes. We discuss this family in more detail later in this section, in particular in Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6, Table 1, and Figure 10.




FIGURE 6. Graphs whose matching complexes are two-dimensional and Buchsbaum. As before, solid edges are required and dotted edges are optional. For each graph, any number of filled vertices may be introduced and each new vertex attached to some number of unfilled vertices.

The last family is \mathcal{B}_P , which we call petal graphs. These are formed by taking three graphs—each either a K_3 or star graph with at least two edges—and then gluing these graphs together at a single vertex. For the star graphs, the gluing vertex must be a non-central vertex of the star. The resulting graph will have one main central vertex and three ‘petals,’ each of which is a K_3 or star graph.

It is straightforward to verify that any graph in Figure 6 or the two above families has a two-dimensional Buchsbaum matching complex. For the families in Figure 6, we observe that—regardless of whether any dotted edges are included—the non-adjacent subgraph of any edge depicted in Figure 6 is a graph from Corollary 3.7. Thus we only need to consider added edges. The non-adjacent subgraphs of these correspond exactly to removing an unfilled vertex from the graph in question; again, we see that all such graphs appear in Corollary 3.7.

We will spend the remainder of this section showing that any connected graph with a two-dimensional Buchsbaum matching complex must be in one of the families in Figure 6 or the \mathcal{B}_{C_7} or \mathcal{B}_P families.

We note that the only bipartite graphs in Lemmas 3.3 and 3.5 are either the disjoint union of two star graphs or in graph family \mathcal{G}_1 . Considering Figure 6, we make precise the following observation.

Proposition 4.2. *If G is a connected, bipartite graph and $M(G)$ is a two-dimensional Buchsbaum complex, then one side of the bipartition has exactly three vertices.*

Proof. First, since $M(G)$ is two-dimensional, there is some matching of three edges in G . Each of these edges must have one vertex in each side of the bipartition, so each side must contain at least three vertices.

Now, let $e = uv$ be any edge of G . We know that the matching complex of N_e is a connected graph, so by Lemmas 3.3 and 3.5, N_e is either in one of the families \mathcal{G}_i , or the bowtie graph, or a disjoint union of two stars or triangles. But since G is bipartite, so is N_e , so we can narrow down these possibilities to \mathcal{G}_1 and a disjoint union of two stars.

For every graph in \mathcal{G}_1 , any bipartition has one side with only two vertices, namely the two vertices 2 and 4 in Figure 3. The edge e itself contributes one more vertex to each side, so this side has exactly 3 vertices in G .




FIGURE 7. The case where N_e is a disjoint union of two stars, bipartitioned badly, in Proposition 4.2.




FIGURE 8. Graphs appearing in the proof of Proposition 4.3.

This only leaves the case where N_e is a disjoint union of two stars. Since this subgraph is disconnected, there is more than one way to bipartition it—the centers of the stars can be on either the same side of the bipartition or opposite sides. If the centers of the stars are on the same side, the same argument as above works, since e again contributes one more vertex to this side. However, in the bipartition of $N_e = S_i \sqcup S_j$ which puts the centers on opposite sides, each side may be arbitrarily large: We must argue that this is not allowed in G .

Since G is connected, there must be at least one edge in G joining e to each star. We claim that such an edge cannot connect to the center of the star: If this edge is called f , then N_f consists only of the other star with possibly an extra pendant, which does not contain a path of length four, which would violate Lemma 3.4 (see Figure 7). Therefore, there must be an edge from e to some leaf vertex of each star. But if both stars have more than one edge, this gives us a matching of size four.

Thus this case is impossible, so one side of the bipartition of G must have exactly 3 vertices. \square

There are several relevant observations about non-bipartite graphs that we can make as well.

Proposition 4.3. *Assume G is connected and $M(G)$ is a two-dimensional Buchsbaum complex. If G contains C_5 , then G contains C_7 .*

Proof. Assume first that G contains a 5-cycle and an edge $e = ab$ that is disjoint from this cycle, as depicted in Figure 8(a).

Now, N_e must be in \mathcal{G}_3 , so all other edges of G must be either adjacent to e or have both vertices in this 5-cycle. Since G is connected, we assume the edge $x = 1a$ exists without loss of generality. Considering N_x , we see that there must be an edge between b and some vertex of C_5 other than vertex 1. If either of the

edges $2b$ or $5b$ exist, then G will contain a 7-cycle. Without loss of generality, we assume that $y = 3b$ exists. We see that $N_{45} \in \mathcal{G}_3$, thus G cannot contain any additional vertices.

Observe that adding $4a$, $5b$, or any additional edge with vertex 2 as an endpoint will create a 7-cycle. Considering N_x again, we see that it is impossible for this subgraph to contain a path of length four without creating a 7-cycle in G . Therefore, whenever G has an edge disjoint from the 5-cycle, then G contains a 7-cycle.

We now instead assume that all other edges of G share at least one vertex with this 5-cycle. Observe, for example, that the edges 23 and 45 form a matching. Since $M(G)$ is two-dimensional and Buchsbaum, these two edges must be part of a 3-matching with some additional edge that uses the vertex 1 and some vertex u_1 outside of the 5-cycle. By applying the same argument for each pair of non-adjacent edges in this 5-cycle, we conclude that each of the five vertices in this 5-cycle is an endpoint of some edge whose other endpoint is a vertex outside the 5-cycle. Furthermore, we must be able to choose five such edges—one for each vertex—such that not all share the same new vertex as an endpoint (otherwise any non-adjacent subgraph would be connected but have only four vertices). Thus G has at least two vertices outside of this 5-cycle.

Consider these edges for each of the five vertices in the 5-cycle. If we take three vertices of the 5-cycle in a row, then at least two of these edges must have a shared endpoint, otherwise G would contain a 4-matching as depicted in Figure 8(b).

Without loss of generality, there are two options for the additional edges off vertices 1, 2, and 3, as depicted in Figures 8(c) and 8(d).

Assume that the edges $1a$, $2a$, and $3b$ exist as in Figure 8(c). Then, considering the vertices 2, 3, 4 in a row with the same logic as above, either $4a$ or $4b$ exists. If $4b$ exists, then G contains a 7-cycle. If $4a$ exists, we apply the same logic to 3, 4, 5 to see that either $5a$ or $5b$ exists. If $5b$ exists, then G contains a 7-cycle. If $5a$ exists, observe that $N_{3b} \in \mathcal{G}_3$, which implies that G cannot have any additional vertices. Furthermore, N_{23} needs a path of length four. The only way to create such a path is to have some edge between one of the vertices in N_{23} and b , which creates a 7-cycle.


Assume instead that the edges $1a$ and $3a$ exist as in Figure 8(d). We perform the same analysis as in the previous paragraph—either one of the edges $4b$ or $5b$ exists which creates a 7-cycle, or both of the edges $4a$ and $5a$ exist. In the latter case, we again see that we need some edge between one of the vertices in N_{23} and b , which creates a 7-cycle. \square

We know by Proposition 4.3 that the existence of a 5-cycle will force the existence of a 7-cycle. We now consider non-bipartite graphs containing 6-cycles.


Lemma 4.4. *Let G be a graph whose matching complex is a two-dimensional Buchsbaum complex. If G has both C_6 and C_3 as subgraphs then it also has C_7 as a subgraph.*

Proof. There are a number of ways that the C_3 and C_6 could interact. By Proposition 4.3, any time we deduce that G must have a C_5 it must also contain a C_7 .


- If the C_3 subgraph shares at most one vertex with the C_6 , then we have a 4-matching — take every second edge of the C_6 together with an edge of the C_3 that does not touch the C_6 . Hence this case cannot appear.




- Suppose our C_3 subgraph shares two vertices with the C_6 and no edges. These two vertices are either distance 2 or distance 3 apart in the C_6 , and in both cases our graph contains C_5 as a subgraph, so Proposition 4.3 gives us a C_7 .




- Suppose that our C_3 subgraph shares three vertices with the C_6 and no edges. There is only one way to do this, without loss of generality, and this way gives us a C_5 as a subgraph, so again Proposition 4.3 says that G contains C_7 as a subgraph.




- If our C_3 subgraph shares two vertices and one edge with the C_6 , we immediately get C_7 as a subgraph.



- If the C_3 shares three vertices and one edge with the C_6 , we again get C_5 as a subgraph, so again we must also have C_7 .



- Finally, if the C_3 shares all three vertices and two edges with the C_6 , we obtain a C_5 and thus also a C_7 .



This covers all possibilities, so G must always contain C_7 as a subgraph. \square

Once a graph contains a C_7 , it must have a very constrained structure.

Lemma 4.5. *If G is a graph (with no isolated vertices) which contains C_7 as a subgraph and $M(G)$ is two-dimensional, then G has exactly 7 vertices.*

Proof. See Figure 9. \square

We note that the graphs in Lemma 4.5 are all Hamiltonian, i.e., they each contain a cycle that uses all vertices of the graph.

A consequence of Lemma 4.5 is that there are only finitely many possibilities to check to find all graphs containing C_7 whose matching complex is two-dimensional and Buchsbaum: Simply take a C_7 and add every subset of the $\binom{7}{2} - 7 = 14$ edges that could be added, giving $2^{14} = 16384$ possibilities. While this would be impractical to check by hand, a computer can search these possibilities without difficulty. We have included this code in an appendix. The conclusion of this code is that out of the 383 isomorphism classes of graphs on 7 vertices containing a C_7 , 125 of them have a matching complex that is two-dimensional and Buchsbaum. See Table 1 for more refined data.



FIGURE 9. Any graph containing C_7 and any additional non-isolated vertices will always contain a 4-matching.

# edges added to C_7	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	total
# graphs up to isomorphism	1	2	10	30	58	77	73	56	37	20	10	5	2	1	1	383
# graphs where $M(G)$ is 2D Buchsbaum, up to isomorphism	1	1	3	7	11	18	19	20	18	12	7	4	2	1	1	125


TABLE 1. Data on graphs containing C_7 .

FIGURE 10. Graphs with 5 vertices whose matching complex is a connected graph.

In particular, C_7 itself has a two-dimensional Buchsbaum matching complex, as does K_7 . Deleting any one or two edges from K_7 gives a two-dimensional Buchsbaum matching complex, and so does one of the two ways of adding a single edge to C_7 (up to isomorphism).

Lemma 4.5 also puts restrictions on what N_e can be for any edge e in these graphs: There must be exactly five vertices in N_e , and there are only a few possibilities allowed by Lemmas 3.3 and 3.5 with only 5 vertices.

Lemma 4.6. *If G is a graph containing C_7 whose matching complex is two-dimensional and Buchsbaum, and e is an edge of G , then N_e must be one of the graphs in Figure 10.*

4.1. Link connected graphs. We split up our remaining casework using the following definition.

Definition 4.7. Let G be a connected graph. We call G *link connected* if N_e is a connected graph for every edge $e \in E(G)$.


Remark 4.8. The above definition is similar to the definition of a 3-vertex-connected graph. In particular a 3-vertex-connected graph (or a “3-connected graph”) is a graph such that the removal of any two vertices cannot disconnect the graph. The difference here is that we call G link connected if it is a graph such that the removal of any two *adjacent* vertices cannot disconnect the graph. Furthermore, 3-connected graphs cannot have any isolated vertices after removing the two specified vertices, but our definition of N_e does not include isolated vertices by construction.

Here we will be working to describe all link connected graphs whose matching complexes are two-dimensional Buchsbaum complexes. We start with some tools which will assist us with this.


Lemma 4.9. *Suppose G is a link connected graph. If $M(G)$ is a two-dimensional Buchsbaum complex, then G has C_k as a subgraph for some $k \in \{4, 5, 6, 7\}$.*

Proof. First note that if $k \geq 8$, then G cannot have C_k as a subgraph, since such cycles all contain a 4-matching.

Take any edge $uv \in E(G)$ and consider N_{uv} . By Lemma 3.4 we know that we have the following as a subgraph of G :



Since G is a link connected graph, N_{bc} must be connected, so there must be a path in G between either u or v and either d or e . If this path contains a , then it creates a k -cycle for $k \geq 4$ without using either of u or v , so we assume this does not occur. Similarly, N_{cd} must be connected, so there is a path in G from either u or v to either a or b . Similarly, we may assume this path does not contain e .




Patching these paths together, we get a cycle whose length is at least 4. □


We will be using Lemma 4.9 to break up our casework in this section.

Lemma 4.10. *Let G be a link connected graph. If $M(G)$ is a two-dimensional Buchsbaum complex and G has C_4 as a subgraph, then either G has C_k as a subgraph for some $k \in \{5, 6, 7\}$ or $G \in \mathcal{B}_1$.*


Proof. By assumption, G has C_4 as a subgraph. Label the vertices of this subgraph as follows:



Because 14 and 23 are in a 2-matching together, they must be part of a 3-matching. Therefore, we must have at least one more edge 56 which is disjoint from the 4-cycle:




Since G is link connected, N_{12} must be a connected graph, so without loss of generality there must be a path between vertices 3 and 6. This path cannot have length three or more, as that would introduce a 4-matching, so we must have one of these two cases:



First, let us consider Case I. Since N_{37} must be connected, there must be a path from 1, 2, or 4 to either 5 or 6, but every way to do this produces a cycle C_k with $k \geq 5$.

This leaves us with Case II. The edges 14 and 36 form a 2-matching together, so they must be part of a 3-matching with some other edge of G . This other edge cannot be disjoint from the picture above, since that would give us a 4-matching made of edges 12, 34, 56 and the new edge. So the possibilities for the new edge are:


- 25, in which case G has C_6 as a subgraph;
- 5x where x is a vertex not previously in our subgraph, which puts us into case II, which we have already dealt with;
- or 2x where x is a vertex not previously in our subgraph.




In this case, now, 12 and 36 are in a 2-matching together, so once again they must be part of a 3-matching. The possibilities for the third edge in this 3-matching are:

- 45, which gives us a C_6 ;
- $4x$, which results in some C_k for $k \in \{5, 6, 7\}$ after noticing that N_{23} must also be connected;
- $5x$, which gives a C_5 ;
- $4y$ where y is a new vertex, which we will come back to momentarily;
- $5y$, which contains case II and is thus already dealt with;
- or xy , which gives a 4-matching.

Now we consider the case with edge $4y$.



Applying similar logic again, N_{34} must be a connected graph, so we can deduce that either G has C_k with $k \in \{5, 6, 7\}$ or has the following as a subgraph:



This graph is in \mathcal{B}_1 . If this is a proper subgraph of G , then the only other edges we can add without introducing a 4-matching or a larger cycle are pendants attached to vertices 2, 4, and 6, which keep G in \mathcal{B}_1 . \square

As a consequence, we can split link connected graphs in the following way.

Corollary 4.11. *Suppose G is link connected and $M(G)$ is a two-dimensional Buchsbaum complex. Then either G has exactly 7 vertices and has C_7 as a subgraph, or G is bipartite.*

Proof. First, G cannot contain any cycles on 8 or more vertices without including a 4-matching.

Lemma 4.9 tells us that G must contain C_k , with $4 \leq k \leq 7$. If G includes C_7 , we are done immediately by Lemma 4.5; and if G includes a C_5 , then Proposition 4.3 gives us a C_7 and we are done.

This only leaves the case where G contains C_4 or C_6 but not C_5 or C_7 . If G contains C_4 but not C_5 or C_7 , then Lemma 4.10 implies that either G is in \mathcal{B}_1 and thus bipartite, or G contains C_6 . And if G contains C_6 but not C_5 or C_7 , then Lemma 4.4 implies that G cannot contain C_3 either, so G has no odd cycles and is thus bipartite. This covers all cases. \square

We now consider link connected graphs that contain a 6-cycle.

Proposition 4.12. *Suppose G is a link connected graph. If $M(G)$ is a two-dimensional Buchsbaum complex and G has C_6 as a subgraph, then $G \in \mathcal{B}_3, \mathcal{B}_4, \mathcal{B}_5, \mathcal{B}_6$, or \mathcal{B}_{C_7} .*




FIGURE 11. A subgraph appearing in the proof of Proposition 4.12.

Proof. Note that if G also contains C_3 or C_5 , then $G \in \mathcal{B}_{C_7}$ by Lemma 4.4 or Proposition 4.3 respectively. Thus we will limit our consideration to bipartite graphs, which implies that $N_e \in \mathcal{G}_1$ for all edges e of G . Furthermore, G must contain some edges that have a vertex outside of this 6-cycle (since each N_e has at least 5 vertices), and G cannot have an edge that is disjoint from this 6-cycle (since this would create a 4-matching). Therefore we assume G contains the subgraph in Figure 11. By Proposition 4.2, G cannot have any additional unfilled vertices.

Considering N_x , we see that G must contain an additional edge e with vertex 3 as an endpoint. Similarly, considering N_y , we see that G must contain an additional edge e' with vertex 5 as an endpoint.

Case I: The other vertices of e and e' are not in this C_6 . If $e = 3a$ and $e' = 5a$, then $G \in \mathcal{B}_4$.

Assume instead $e = 3a$ and $e' = 5b$ where b is a vertex not shown in Figure 11. (Observe that this case is equivalent to if $e = 3b$ and $e' = 5a$ or if $e = 3b$ and $e' = 5b$.) If neither of the edges $1b$ and $3b$ exist, then $G \in \mathcal{B}_5$.

If both edges $1b$ and $3b$ exist, then again $G \in \mathcal{B}_4$. Assume without loss of generality that the edge $3b$ exists but $1b$ does not. We claim that the family that G is in depends on whether any additional edges between the vertices of the C_6 in question exist. If no such edges exist or only the edge 36 exists, then $G \in \mathcal{B}_3$. If either or both of the other possible edges (i.e., 14 and 25) exist, then $G \in \mathcal{B}_4$.

Case II: At least one of e and e' has both vertices in this C_6 . Assume without loss of generality that $e = 36$ and consider N_{36} , which we recall must be a member of \mathcal{G}_1 . Thus G must contain the edge 14 or one of the edges 25 and $5a$.

Assume G does not contain either of the edges 25 or $5a$. Thus G must contain 14 and $5b$ where b is a vertex not shown in Figure 11. Therefore $G \in \mathcal{B}_6$.

If instead G contains $5a$, then $G \in \mathcal{B}_4$. Finally, we consider the case where G contains 25 but not $5a$. Considering N_{12} , we see that G must contain the edge $3a$ (in which case $G \in \mathcal{B}_4$) or an edge $3b$ or $5b$ where b is a vertex not shown in Figure 11. In either of these cases, $G \in \mathcal{B}_6$. \square

4.2. Non-link connected graphs. We now consider connected graphs which are not link connected. By definition, these graphs have at least one edge e for which the non-adjacent subgraph N_e is not a connected graph. By Lemma 3.3, each such graph G with a two-dimensional Buchsbaum matching complex must contain an edge e such that N_e is a graph in Figure 12, and, furthermore, any additional edges in G must be adjacent to the edge e . (Note that P_2 is also a star graph, but since it does not have a single center vertex, it behaves somewhat differently from other star graphs and thus we treat it separately.) The following lemma shows that any two edges with disconnected non-adjacent subgraphs must share a vertex.

Lemma 4.13. *Let G be a connected graph such that $M(G)$ is two-dimensional. If there exist edges $e, e' \in E$ such that both N_e and $N_{e'}$ are disconnected, then e and e' must share a vertex.*

Proof. Assume that N_e is disconnected with components G_1 and G_2 . All edges of G that are not in one of these components must share a vertex with edge e . Without loss of generality, let e' be an edge in G_1 .

Since G is connected, there must be an edge connecting e and G_2 . Thus e and G_2 form a connected subgraph of G , so the only way for $N_{e'}$ to be disconnected is for it to contain some edge $x \in G_1$ that is disjoint from e' . But this shows that $\{e, e', x, y\}$ is a 4-matching for any $y \in G_2$, which contradicts that $M(G)$ is two-dimensional. \square

We now consider each of the cases from Figure 12 in turn. As a reminder, G will always be a connected graph in the remainder of this section, and all additional edges of G must be adjacent to e .



FIGURE 12. The possibilities for N_e disconnected.

FIGURE 13. Graphs appearing in Proposition 4.14.




FIGURE 14. Graphs appearing in the proof of Proposition 4.15


Proposition 4.14. Assume G is connected but not link connected and $M(G)$ is a two-dimensional Buchsbaum matching complex. If G contains an edge e such that $N_e = K_3 \sqcup K_3$ (i.e., N_e is the graph in Figure 12(a)), then $G \in \mathcal{B}_7$.

Proof. Since G is connected and all additional edges must touch e , each K_3 must be connected to e with an edge. If the two copies of K_3 are connected to e via different endpoints of e , as in Figure 13(a), then G will contain a 4-matching. Since all remaining edges of G must share a vertex with e , we therefore must have the graph depicted in Figure 13(b), and the other endpoint of e cannot connect to either K_3 . Considering N_x and N_y , we see that each must be a member of \mathcal{G}_2 . This completely determines G , so we see that $G \in \mathcal{B}_7$. \square


Proposition 4.15. Assume G is connected but not link connected and $M(G)$ is a two-dimensional Buchsbaum matching complex. If G contains an edge e such that $N_e = P_2 \sqcup P_2$ (i.e., N_e is the graph in Figure 12(b)), then $G \in \mathcal{B}_P$.

Proof. Assume that the two copies of P_2 are attached to e via different endpoints of e . Call these two new edges x and y as in Figure 14(a). Since all additional edges of G are adjacent to e , there is no 3-matching containing x and y , thus $M(G)$ is not Buchsbaum. Thus, only one endpoint of e can be connected to either of the two edges in N_e .


This gives the graph depicted in Figure 14(b). We must add an edge off of vertex b so that N_z contains a path of length four. All other edges must be adjacent to e , and pendants off of vertex a would form a 4-matching and are thus not allowed. We may add any number of pendants off of b , or, instead, we can add a single edge between a and the edge connected to b to form a K_3 . Similarly, we may connect up a to either edge in N_e . Thus G must be in the “petal graph family.” \square



(A) The case when $N_x = B$ in Proposition 4.16. We further consider N_y , which leads to a contradiction.



(B) The case when $N_x \in \mathcal{G}_2$ in Proposition 4.16. Considering N_y , we see that there must be an edge connecting b and an endpoint of x .



(C) The case when $N_x \in \mathcal{G}_2$ in Proposition 4.16. Considering N_z , least one of the red edges p and q must exist.

FIGURE 15. Graphs appearing in the proof of Proposition 4.16.

Proposition 4.16. *Assume G is connected but not link connected and $M(G)$ is a two-dimensional Buchsbaum matching complex. If G contains an edge e such that $N_e = K_3 \sqcup P_2$ (i.e., N_e is the graph in Figure 12(c)), then $G \in \mathcal{B}_7, \mathcal{B}_8, \mathcal{B}_{C_7}$, or G is one of the two exceptional graphs E_1 and E_2 .*

Proof. Let x be the isolated edge of N_e . By Lemma 4.13, we see that either $N_x = B$ or $N_x \in \mathcal{G}_2$ or \mathcal{G}_3 . If $N_x \in \mathcal{G}_3$, then $G \in \mathcal{B}_{C_7}$ by Proposition 4.3.

If $N_x = B$, then the graph in Figure 15(a) is a subgraph of G and all other edges of G are adjacent to both e and x . By Lemma 4.13, N_y must be connected and thus have a path of length four. But this is impossible, so this case cannot happen.

If instead $N_x \in \mathcal{G}_2$, then the graph in Figure 15(b) is a subgraph of G and all other edges of G are adjacent to both e and x or of the form of the dotted edges in Figure 15(b). Again, N_y must be connected and have a path of length four, which forces the edge connecting vertex b and an endpoint of x to exist. Calling this edge z and considering N_z , at least one of the edges labeled p and q in Figure 15(c) must appear.

Assume the edge labeled p exists. If the edge between b and the other endpoint of x exists, then $G \in \mathcal{B}_7$. Otherwise, the only possibility is to have $G \in \mathcal{B}_8$.

If the edge labeled p does not exist, then q must exist. Considering the other edges of K_3 in turn, we see that the K_4 containing this K_3 must be completed because each needs a path of length four in its non-adjacent subgraph. Furthermore, the other two edges between e and x can either both exist or neither exist. Thus G is either E_1 or E_2 , the exceptional graphs in Figure 6. \square

Proposition 4.17. *Assume G is connected but not link connected and $M(G)$ is a two-dimensional Buchsbaum matching complex. If G contains an edge e such that $N_e = P_2 \sqcup S_n$ with $n \geq 2$ (i.e., N_e is the graph in Figure 12(d)), then $G \in \mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2, \mathcal{B}_3, \mathcal{B}_8, \mathcal{B}_9, \mathcal{B}_{C_7}$, or \mathcal{B}_P .*

Proof. Let x be the isolated edge in N_e and consider N_x . Since all remaining edges of N_x are adjacent to e , $N_x = B$ is impossible, and if $N_x \in \mathcal{G}_3$, then $G \in \mathcal{B}_{C_7}$ by Proposition 4.3.

Assume $N_x \in \mathcal{G}_2$. In this case, G contains the graph in Figure 16(a) as a subgraph. If e is the vertical edge in this figure, we let y be the edge labeled in Figure 16(a) and consider N_y . By Lemma 4.13, N_y is connected and thus must have a path of length four. However, this is impossible, so this cannot happen. Instead assume e is one of the other edges of the triangle in this figure. All additional edges of G are of the form of one of the dotted edges or are between e and x . Considering all possible options, the only that works is to have either or both edges between vertex a and x , pendants off of the center of the star, and no other edges. In either case, $G \in \mathcal{B}_P$.

The last case to consider is $N_x \in \mathcal{G}_1$. We will consider two cases: In the first e connects to the star via a non-central vertex (Figure 16(b)); in the second no such connections are allowed (Figure 16(c)). In each case, all remaining edges in N_x are of the form of a dotted edge in the respective figure. All other edges of G must be adjacent to both e and x .

Suppose we have the case in Figure 16(b) and consider N_y where y is the edge indicated in this figure. Note that N_y must be connected and thus have a path of length four. All edges of N_y are either adjacent to both e and x or have b as an endpoint and are of the form of one of the dotted edges in Figure 16(b). Thus for N_y to contain a path of length four, G must have an edge connecting x and the vertex a (call this edge z) and also one of the red edges in Figure 16(d).

If $N_y \in \mathcal{G}_1$, then the only possible edge that can be added to G (besides the dotted edges) connects b to the vertex of x that is not in edge z . Call this edge γ . If G contains γ , then G cannot contain the edge connecting vertex a to the center of the star (this edge would have a disallowed non-adjacent subgraph). Thus $G \in \mathcal{B}_2$ (if the edge connecting b and a non-central vertex of the star does not exist) or $G \in \mathcal{B}_3$ (if this edge does exist). If G does not contain the edge γ , then, $G \in \mathcal{B}_2$ (consider N_z in Figure 16(d) to see we must have an additional edge off of b or the center of the star).

If instead $N_y \in \mathcal{G}_2$, then G must contain the edge that creates a triangle with x and z . Assume the edge between a and the center of the star exists. Considering the non-adjacent subgraph for this edge, we see that no additional edges between e and x can exist. Considering N_z , we see that either b or the center of the star must have a pendant and thus $G \in \mathcal{B}_9$.

Assume instead that the edge between a and the center of the star does not exist. If the other two edges between e and x both exist, then G can be the exceptional graph E_2 or $G \in \mathcal{B}_8$. If G contains one of the other edges between e and x we assume, without loss of generality, that it is the edge adjacent to z . Considering the non-adjacent subgraph of this new edge, we cannot have the edge connecting a and the center of the star. Considering N_z , which shows G must have another edge of b or the center of the star (that doesn't attach to a). Thus $G \in \mathcal{B}_8$.

Now we consider the case in Figure 16(c) and N_y where y is the edge labeled in this figure. For same reasons as the previous case, there must be an edge between x and vertex a .

Assume $N_y \in \mathcal{G}_1$. The only way for N_y to contain a cycle if $N_y \in \mathcal{G}_1$ is to have z as in Figure 16(e). However, we see that N_z cannot contain a path of length four. Thus there are no edges other than the dotted ones in Figure 16(e), so $G \in \mathcal{B}_1$.

If instead $N_y \in \mathcal{G}_2$, then the edge between a and the vertex of x that is not already contained in an edge must exist and we see that $G \in \mathcal{B}_P$. \square

Proposition 4.18. *Assume G is connected but not link connected and $M(G)$ is a two-dimensional Buchsbaum matching complex. If G contains an edge e such that $N_e = K_3 \sqcup S_n$ with $n \geq 2$ (i.e., N_e is the graph in Figure 12(e)), then $G \in \mathcal{B}_8$.*

Proof. Let x be an edge of the star graph in N_e and consider N_x . Observe that $N_x \in \mathcal{G}_3$ is impossible by Lemma 4.5. Since N_x contains a K_3 , either $N_x = B$ or $N_x \in \mathcal{G}_2$.

Assume $N_x = B$ and we will show that this is impossible. We know that G contains the graph in Figure 17(a). Observe that an edge that connects e to a non-central vertex of the star produces a 4-matching and thus is forbidden. Instead if there is an edge connecting e and the central vertex of the star, we consider N_y , where y is the edge labeled in Figure 17(a). Observe that N_y is connected but cannot have a path of length four, so this situation is impossible.

Instead assume $N_x \in \mathcal{G}_2$. We claim that $G \in \mathcal{B}_8$. Without loss of generality, we assume that there is an edge between a and a vertex of the K_3 in N_e , as in Figure 17(b). Let y be the edge of K_3 that is not adjacent to this new edge. Observe that we cannot have an edge that connects b to a non-central vertex since this would give a 4-matching in G . Considering N_y , we see that there cannot be an edge that connects a to the central vertex of the star, for this would render N_y connected without a path of length 4. Let z be one of other the edges of the K_3 and consider N_z . This non-adjacent subgraph must be connected.

If G has an edge connecting a to a non-central vertex of the star containing x , then $G \in \mathcal{B}_8$. If G does not have such an edge, then G must have an edge connecting b to the center of this star. Call this new edge w . Considering N_w , we see that there must be a pendant off of vertex a , so again we can conclude that $G \in \mathcal{B}_8$. \square




FIGURE 16. Graphs appearing in the proof of Proposition 4.17.




FIGURE 17. Graphs appearing in the proof of Proposition 4.18

Proposition 4.19. *Assume G is connected but not link connected and $M(G)$ is a two-dimensional Buchsbaum matching complex. If G contains an edge e such that $N_e = S_m \sqcup S_n$ with $m, n \geq 2$ (i.e., N_e is the graph in Figure 12(f)), then $G \in \mathcal{B}_2, \mathcal{B}_3, \mathcal{B}_6$, or \mathcal{B}_P .*

Proof. Let x be any edge in N_e and consider N_x . Since all remaining edges of N_x are adjacent to e , $N_x = B$ is impossible. Similarly $N_x \in \mathcal{G}_3$ is impossible by Lemma 4.5.

Assume that $N_x \in \mathcal{G}_2$. In this case, G contains the graph in Figure 18(a) as a subgraph. All remaining edges of G are either of the form of the dotted edges in this figure or adjacent to both e and x . As in Proposition 4.17, we see that e cannot be the vertical edge in Figure 18(a). Similarly, if e is a different edge of the triangle, then G must have an edge between a and the center of the star containing x . Furthermore, G can only contain more pendants off these stars, so $G \in \mathcal{B}_P$.

Thus the only remaining possibility is to have $N_x \in \mathcal{G}_1$. Observe that e can connect to the star that does not contain x either via a non-central vertex Figure 18(b) or connect only via the central vertex Figure 18(c). All remaining edges in N_x have to be of the form of one of the dotted edges in these figures. All other edges of G must be attached to the edge e or the central vertex of the star containing x .

Consider the case in Figure 18(b) and consider N_y where y is the edge indicated in this figure. Note that N_y must be connected and thus have a path of length four. Observe that connecting b to the central vertex




FIGURE 18. Graphs appearing in the proof of Proposition 4.19.

of the star containing x or connecting a to a non-central vertex of this star both create a contradiction for N_y . Thus the only remaining edges in G must be of the form of the dotted edges in Figure 18(d).

There must be some edge connecting e and the star containing x . If there are no edges connecting e and y , then adding any edges connecting e and the star containing x puts G in \mathcal{B}_2 . (Note that if the edge from a to x exists, it forces an additional edge off of b .) Similarly, if the edges connecting e and the star containing x only use non-central vertices of this star, then again $G \in \mathcal{B}_2$.

Now assume there are two edges connecting e and the star containing x . If they both contain b as an endpoint, then adding either or both dotted edges between e and y puts G in the family \mathcal{B}_3 . If instead one edge contains a as an endpoint, then we have the graph in Figure 18(e) without loss of generality. If this graph contains the edge connecting a and y , then $G \in \mathcal{B}_6$. If this edge is not present but the one connecting b and y is, then $G \in \mathcal{B}_3$.

Finally consider the case in Figure 18(c), and let y be the edge indicated in this figure. Observe that in this case there can be no additional edges between e and the star containing y . Considering N_y , we see that the edge connecting a and a non-central vertex of the star containing x or b and the central vertex of the star containing x would create a contradiction.

Thus all additional edges in G must be of the form of the dotted edges in Figure 18(f). There must be some edge connecting e and the star containing x . If the edge between the center of this star and the edge coming off of vertex b in Figure 18(f) exists, then an additional edge off of b must exist, which shows that $G \in \mathcal{B}_2$. Similarly, if an edge exists between b and a non-central vertex of this star, then $G \in \mathcal{B}_2$. If instead the only edge connecting e and this star is the edge between a and the center of this star, then $G \in \mathcal{B}_P$. \square

This completes our characterization of graphs with two-dimensional Buchsbaum matching complexes.

Theorem 4.20. *Let G be a graph. Then $M(G)$ is a two-dimensional Buchsbaum complex if and only if G is a disconnected graph described in Proposition 4.1 or G is a member of one of the families \mathcal{B}_{C_7} , \mathcal{B}_P , or \mathcal{B}_i for some $i \in \{1, \dots, 9\}$.*

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Outside of dimension two, all homology manifolds that arise as matching complexes are combinatorial spheres and balls [BGJM20]. However, in the Buchsbaum case, we do not expect higher dimensions to be as well behaved. Still one might seek to understand Buchsbaum matching complexes in higher dimensions. Though this is perhaps currently infeasible in general, it may be possible when restricted to certain families of graphs. For example, we can give a complete characterization for complete bipartite graphs: If $G = K_{m,n}$

is a complete bipartite graph with $m \leq n$, then $M(G)$ is Buchsbaum if and only if $n \geq 2m - 2$. This follows from [Gar79, Theorem 15], which says that $M(K_{m,n})$ is Cohen–Macaulay if and only if $n \geq 2m - 1$.

We further note that by [Zie94, Theorem 2.3] shows that $M(K_{m,n})$ is vertex decomposable if and only if $n \geq 2m - 1$, so vertex decomposability, shellability, and Cohen–Macaulayness are equivalent for matching complexes of complete bipartite graphs. For other families of graphs, however, none of these properties hold in general. For example, $M(K_n)$ is never Cohen–Macaulay (and thus not shellable or vertex decomposable) if $n \geq 8$. However, work has been done on the shellability [SW07] and vertex decomposability [Ath04] of skeleta of these matching complexes. It may be interesting to study Buchsbaumness of skeleta of matching complexes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project began as a part of the Washington Experimental Mathematics Laboratory. B. Goeckner was supported by a grant from the Simons Foundation (Grant Number 814268, MSRI) and by an AMS-Simons travel grant. R. Rowlands was supported by NSF grants DMS-1664865 and DMS-1953815.

APPENDIX

The following is Mathematica code to check whether a Hamiltonian graph on 7 vertices has a Buchsbaum matching complex. This code was used to generate the data in Table 1.

```
MatchingComplex[g_] := RelationGraph[DisjointQ, EdgeList@g]
(* Computes the 1-skeleton of the matching complex *)

VertexLink[g_, v_] := VertexDelete[NeighborhoodGraph[g, v], v]
(* Computes the link of v by finding its neighborhood and deleting v *)

TwoDBuchsbaumQ[g_] := (Length@First@FindClique@g == 3) &&
  AllTrue[VertexList@g, (ConnectedGraphQ@# && EdgeCount@# > 0) & @
    VertexLink[g, #] &]
(* Checks for 2D Buchsbaumness by checking that the largest clique has size 3
  and all vertex links are connected graphs with at least one edge *)

c7andedges = Table[EdgeAdd[CycleGraph@7, #] & /@
  Subsets[EdgeList@GraphComplement@CycleGraph@7, {i}] //
  DeleteDuplicates[#, IsomorphicGraphQ] &, {i, 0, 14}];
(* Takes all subsets of edges in the complement of C7, grouped by size of the
  subset, and adds them to C7, then throws out all but one graph from each
  isomorphism class *)

c7buchsbaums = Select[#, TwoDBuchsbaumQ@*MatchingComplex] & /@ c7andedges;
(* Picks out the graphs whose matching complex is 2D and Buchsbaum *)
```

REFERENCES

- [Ath04] Christos A. Athanasiadis, *Decompositions and connectivity of matching and chessboard complexes*, Discrete Comput. Geom. **31** (2004), no. 3, 395–403.
- [BGJM20] Margaret Bayer, Bennet Goeckner, and Marija Jelić Milutinović, *Manifold matching complexes*, Mathematika **66** (2020), no. 4, 973–1002.
- [Gar79] Peter Freedman Garst, *Cohen–Macaulay complexes and group actions*, ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 1979, Thesis (Ph.D.)—The University of Wisconsin - Madison.
- [Jon08] Jakob Jonsson, *Simplicial complexes of graphs*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1928, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2008.
- [Miy89] Mitsuhiro Miyazaki, *Characterizations of Buchsbaum complexes*, Manuscripta Math. **63** (1989), no. 2, 245–254.
- [Mur09] Satoshi Murai, *Face vectors of two-dimensional Buchsbaum complexes*, Electron. J. Combin. **16** (2009), no. 1, Research Paper 68, 14.
- [Nik21] Ashkan Nikseresht, *Gorenstein and Cohen–Macaulay matching complexes*, 2021.

- [Sch81] Peter Schenzel, *On the number of faces of simplicial complexes and the purity of Frobenius*, Math. Z. **178** (1981), no. 1, 125–142.
- [Sta77] Richard P. Stanley, *Cohen-Macaulay complexes*, Higher combinatorics (Proc. NATO Advanced Study Inst., Berlin, 1976), 1977, pp. 51–62. NATO Adv. Study Inst. Ser., Ser. C: Math. and Phys. Sci., 31.
- [Sta96] ———, *Combinatorics and commutative algebra*, second ed., Progress in Mathematics, vol. 41, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1996.
- [SW07] John Shareshian and Michelle L. Wachs, *Torsion in the matching complex and chessboard complex*, Adv. Math. **212** (2007), no. 2, 525–570.
- [Ter96] Naoki Terai, *On h -vectors of Buchsbaum Stanley-Reisner rings*, Hokkaido Math. J. **25** (1996), no. 1, 137–148.
- [Wac03] Michelle L. Wachs, *Topology of matching, chessboard, and general bounded degree graph complexes*, Algebra Universalis **49** (2003), no. 4, 345–385.
- [Wes96] Douglas B. West, *Introduction to graph theory*, Prentice Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, 1996.
- [Zie94] Günter M. Ziegler, *Shellability of chessboard complexes*, Israel J. Math. **87** (1994), no. 1-3, 97–110.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Email address: goeckner@uw.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Email address: fanhrr@gmail.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Email address: legjones@iu.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Email address: rowanr@uw.edu