

THE EULER CHARACTERISTIC OF FINITE CATEGORIES

MUSTAFA AKKAYA AND ÖZGÜN ÜNLÜ

ABSTRACT. We first assign a quadratic form and in particular a rational number to every finite category. In some cases, we call this rational number the Euler characteristic of the category. We show that this extends the definition of Leinster in [5] to a larger family of finite categories. Leinster’s formula for the Euler characteristic of the Grothendieck construction of a diagram of categories requires the existence of a coweighting associated with the Grothendieck construction. Here we give a formula with no assumptions about the Grothendieck construction itself but only some conditions on the diagram. We also discuss the invariance and noninvariance of several definitions, in the literature, of Euler characteristics under weak equivalences of the canonical model category structure and the Thomason model category structure on categories respectively.

1. INTRODUCTION

We first associate a quadratic form $q(\mathcal{C})$ and a rational number $\chi(\mathcal{C})$ to every category \mathcal{C} whose object and morphism sets are finite. Then we show that the assignment χ is invariant under categorical equivalences (Theorem 3.1), additive under disjoint union (Theorem 3.4), and preserves products (Theorem 3.3). Hence we call $\chi(\mathcal{C})$ the Euler characteristic of \mathcal{C} for a family of categories where this assignment also obeys a version of the inclusion–exclusion principle.

We show (Theorem 2.2) that this definition of the Euler characteristic of a finite category extends the definition of Leinster in [5] to larger family of categories. More explicitly, to define Euler characteristic Leinster requires the existence of both a weighting and a coweighting on the adjacency matrix of the directed multigraph associated to the category. Here we could define the Euler characteristic of a finite category without any condition. However, we restrict our definition to the family of finite categories which admits a weighting so that a version of the inclusion–exclusion principle (Theorem 3.2) is satisfied.

Leinster’s formula for computing the Euler characteristic of the Grothendieck construction of a diagram of categories requires existence of a coweighting on the matrix associated to the Grothendieck construction. Here we only have conditions on the diagram of categories.

In Section 4, we show that none of the Euler characteristics defined in the literature are invariant under weak equivalences of the Thomason model category structure on categories. Hence, the Euler characteristic of categories is not an invariant of the homotopy type of the geometric realizations of the nerve of a category. Here we ask Question 1 as a first step to understand if we can define an equivalence weaker than an isomorphism but stronger than a homotopy equivalence of nerves of categories under which the Euler characteristic defined above is invariant.

2. DEFINITION OF EULER CHARACTERISTIC

Let H be an Hilbert space over \mathbb{R} and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denote its inner product. The adjoint of a continuous linear operator $L : H \rightarrow H$ is the linear operator $L^* : H \rightarrow H$ determined by the equality

$$\langle L^*u, v \rangle = \langle u, Lv \rangle$$

for u, v in H . A linear operator $S : H \rightarrow H$ is called a pseudoinverse of a linear operator $L : H \rightarrow H$ if the equality

$$LSL = L$$

holds. For a linear operator $S : H \rightarrow H$, let $q(S) : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the quadratic form given by

$$q(S)(u) = \langle u, Su \rangle$$

for u in H .

Lemma 2.1. *Let l be a element in a Hilbert space H and S be a pseudoinverse of a continuous linear operator $L : H \rightarrow H$. Assume that there exists v, w in H such that $L^*v = l = Lw$. Then $\langle l, w \rangle = q(SLS)(l) = \langle v, l \rangle$*

Proof. Assuming $LSL = L$ and $L^*v = l = Lw$, we have

$$q(SLS)(l) = \langle l, SLSl \rangle = \langle l, SLSLw \rangle = \langle l, SLw \rangle.$$

Now notice that the adjoints L^*, S^* satisfy $L^*S^*L^* = L^*$. Hence we have

$$q(SLS)(l) = \langle L^*S^*l, w \rangle = \langle L^*S^*L^*v, w \rangle = \langle L^*v, w \rangle = \langle l, w \rangle$$

and we also have

$$q(SLS)(l) = \langle l, SLSl \rangle = \langle S^*L^*S^*l, l \rangle = \langle S^*L^*S^*L^*v, l \rangle = \langle S^*L^*v, l \rangle.$$

Hence, we have

$$q(SLS)(l) = \langle v, LSl \rangle = \langle v, LSLw \rangle = \langle v, Lw \rangle = \langle v, l \rangle.$$

□

For a finite set A , let H_A denote the Hilbert space of functions from A to \mathbb{R} with addition given by $(f + g)(a) = f(a) + g(a)$, scalar multiplication $(cf)(a) = cf(a)$, and inner product

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \sum_{a \in X} f(a)g(a)$$

for a in A , f, g in H_A , and c in \mathbb{R} . An orthonormal basis for H_A is

$$B_A = \{ e_a \mid a \in A \}$$

where $e_a : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $e_a(x) = 0$ if $x \neq a$ and $e_a(a) = 1$. Let

$$1_A = \sum_{a \in A} e_a.$$

A finite directed multigraph M is a 4-tuple (V, E, s, t) where V, E are two finite sets and s, t are two functions from E to V . For a finite directed multigraph $M = (V, E, s, t)$. Define a linear function $L_M : H_V \rightarrow H_V$ given by

$$L_M(f)(a) = \sum_{x \in V} |s^{-1}(a) \cap t^{-1}(x)| f(x)$$

for $f \in H_V$ and $a \in V$. Notice that both the kernel and range of L_M are closed. and for the rest of the paper we will consider operators in the this form.

Let $L : H \rightarrow H$ be a linear operator. Assume that the kernel $\ker(L)$ of L and the range $\text{im}(L)$ of L are both closed. Then let \tilde{L} denote the restriction of L to $\ker(L)^\perp$. Notice that \tilde{L} is an isomorphism from $\ker(L)^\perp$ to $\text{im}(L)$. Define the linear operator L^+ as follows:

$$L^+ : H \cong \text{im}(L) \oplus \text{im}(L)^\perp \xrightarrow{\tilde{L}^{-1} \oplus 0} \ker(L)^\perp \oplus \ker(L) \cong H.$$

Now notice that the linear operator L^+ only depends on L and

$$(1) \quad LL^+L = L$$

is satisfied. In other words L^+ is a specifically chosen pseudoinverse of L . Moreover we have

$$(2) \quad L^+LL^+ = L^+$$

and hence in particular we have $q(L^+) = q(L^+LL^+)$. We also have

$$(3) \quad (L^+L)^* = L^+L$$

because $\ker(L^+L) = \ker(L)$ and $\text{im}(L^+L) = \ker(L)^\perp$. Finally, we have

$$(4) \quad (LL^+)^* = LL^+$$

because $\ker(LL^+) = \text{im}(L)$ and $\text{im}(LL^+) = \text{im}(L)^\perp$. It is known that Equations (1), (2), (3), and (4) uniquely determines L^+ and it is called the Moore–Penrose inverse of L (see [6], [7]). For a finite directed multigraph M , we define a quadratic form $q(M)$ associated to M as follows:

$$q(M) = q(L_M^+).$$

Let \mathcal{C} be a finite category. For the rest of the paper, we write $M_{\mathcal{C}}$ to denote the directed multigraph $(\text{Obj}(\mathcal{C}), \text{Mor}(\mathcal{C}), s, t)$ where s, t are source and target functions respectively. Moreover, we denote the Hilbert space $H_{\text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})}$ by $H_{\mathcal{C}}$, the orthonormal basis $B_{\text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})}$ by $B_{\mathcal{C}}$, the vector $1_{\text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})}$ by $1_{\mathcal{C}}$, and the linear operators $L_{M_{\mathcal{C}}}, L_{M_{\mathcal{C}}}^+$ by $L_{\mathcal{C}}, L_{\mathcal{C}}^+$ respectively.

Now to any finite category \mathcal{C} we associate a quadratic form $q(\mathcal{C})$ as follows:

$$q(\mathcal{C}) = q(M_{\mathcal{C}})$$

and a rational number $\chi(\mathcal{C})$ as follows:

$$\chi(\mathcal{C}) = q(\mathcal{C})(1_{\mathcal{C}}).$$

Let $\chi_{Lein}(\mathcal{C})$ denote the Euler characteristic of the category \mathcal{C} as defined in [5]. We now show that χ is an extension of χ_{Lein} to all finite categories.

Theorem 2.2. *Let \mathcal{C} be a finite category. Assume that $\chi_{Lein}(\mathcal{C})$ is defined. Then*

$$\chi_{Lein}(\mathcal{C}) = \chi(\mathcal{C}).$$

Proof. Let \mathcal{C} be a finite small category. Assume that the Euler characteristic $\chi_{Lein}(\mathcal{C})$ of the category \mathcal{C} is defined as in [5]. This means that there exists v and w in $H_{\mathcal{C}}$ such that $L_{\mathcal{C}}^*(v) = 1_{\mathcal{C}} = L_{\mathcal{C}}(w)$. Now notice $L_{\mathcal{C}}^+$ is a pseudoinverse of $L_{\mathcal{C}}$. Hence by Lemma 2.1 we have

$$\chi(\mathcal{C}) = q(\mathcal{C})(1_{\mathcal{C}}) = q(L_{\mathcal{C}}^+)(1_{\mathcal{C}}) = q(L_{\mathcal{C}}^+L_{\mathcal{C}}L_{\mathcal{C}}^+)(1_{\mathcal{C}}) = \langle v, 1_{\mathcal{C}} \rangle = \langle 1_{\mathcal{C}}, w \rangle = \chi_{Lein}(\mathcal{C}).$$

□

However we only call the rational number $\chi(\mathcal{C})$, the Euler characteristic of \mathcal{C} when $1_{\mathcal{C}}$ is in $\text{im}(L_{\mathcal{C}})$. We put this restriction because we can only prove the pushout property under this restriction. Notice that Leinster requires $1_{\mathcal{C}}$ to be in $\text{im}(L_{\mathcal{C}}) \cap \text{im}(L_{\mathcal{C}}^*)$. Hence we strictly extend the definition of Leinster.

3. PROPERTIES OF EULER CHARACTERISTIC

For an object a in a category \mathcal{A} , let $I_{\mathcal{A}}(a)$ denote the set of objects that are isomorphic to a in \mathcal{A} . For a functor $\alpha : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ between finite categories \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , let $K_{\alpha} : H_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{B}}$ be the linear operator determined by

$$K_{\alpha}(e_a) = \sum_{b \in I_{\mathcal{B}}(\alpha(a))} e_b$$

for a an object in \mathcal{A} . For a finite category \mathcal{A} , let $D_{\mathcal{A}} : H_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the linear operator determined by

$$D_{\mathcal{A}}(e_a) = \frac{1}{|I(a)|} e_a$$

for a an object in \mathcal{A} . Notice that for a finite category \mathcal{Z} we have

$$L_{\mathcal{Z}} D_{\mathcal{Z}} K_{\text{Id}_{\mathcal{Z}}} = L_{\mathcal{Z}} \quad \text{and} \quad D_{\mathcal{Z}}^* = D_{\mathcal{Z}}$$

and

$$D_{\mathcal{Z}} L_{\mathcal{Z}} = L_{\mathcal{Z}} D_{\mathcal{Z}} \quad \text{and} \quad K_{\text{Id}_{\mathcal{Z}}} L_{\mathcal{Z}} = L_{\mathcal{Z}} K_{\text{Id}_{\mathcal{Z}}} \quad \text{and} \quad K_{\text{Id}_{\mathcal{Z}}} D_{\mathcal{Z}} = D_{\mathcal{Z}} K_{\text{Id}_{\mathcal{Z}}}.$$

Theorem 3.1. *If \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are equivalent finite categories then $\chi(\mathcal{A}) = \chi(\mathcal{B})$.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be finite categories and $\alpha : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$, $\beta : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, be equivalences of categories so that $\alpha \circ \beta \cong \text{Id}_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\beta \circ \alpha \cong \text{Id}_{\mathcal{A}}$. Notice that we have

$$K_{\beta} D_{\mathcal{B}} K_{\alpha} = K_{\text{Id}_{\mathcal{A}}} \quad \text{and} \quad K_{\alpha} D_{\mathcal{A}} K_{\beta} = K_{\text{Id}_{\mathcal{B}}} \quad \text{and} \quad K_{\alpha}^* = K_{\beta}$$

and

$$L_{\mathcal{B}} = D_{\mathcal{B}} K_{\alpha} L_{\mathcal{A}} D_{\mathcal{A}} K_{\beta} \quad \text{and} \quad L_{\mathcal{A}} = D_{\mathcal{A}} K_{\beta} L_{\mathcal{B}} D_{\mathcal{B}} K_{\alpha}.$$

Hence we have

$$L_{\mathcal{B}}^+ = D_{\mathcal{B}} K_{\alpha} L_{\mathcal{A}}^+ D_{\mathcal{A}} K_{\beta} \quad \text{and} \quad L_{\mathcal{A}}^+ = D_{\mathcal{A}} K_{\beta} L_{\mathcal{B}}^+ D_{\mathcal{B}} K_{\alpha}$$

by considering the uniqueness of $L_{\mathcal{B}}^+$ among operators that satisfy corresponding versions of Equations (1), (2), (3), and (4). Now we are done because we have

$$D_{\mathcal{A}} K_{\beta}(1_{\mathcal{B}}) = 1_{\mathcal{A}} \quad \text{and} \quad K_{\alpha}^* D_{\mathcal{B}}^*(1_{\mathcal{B}}) = 1_{\mathcal{A}}$$

and hence

$$\chi(\mathcal{A}) = \langle 1_{\mathcal{A}}, L_{\mathcal{A}}^+(1_{\mathcal{A}}) \rangle = \langle 1_{\mathcal{B}}, L_{\mathcal{B}}^+(1_{\mathcal{B}}) \rangle = \chi(\mathcal{B}).$$

□

For objects a, b in \mathcal{C} , let $s_{a,b}(\mathcal{C})$ denote the real number so that for every object a in \mathcal{C} , we have

$$L_{\mathcal{C}}^+(e_a) = \sum_{b \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})} s_{a,b}(\mathcal{C}) e_b.$$

Let \mathcal{A} be a category and $F : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{Cat}$ be a pseudofunctor. Then $G(F)$ will denote the Grothendieck construction. Now notice the category

$$\mathcal{P} = \{b \leftarrow a \rightarrow c\}$$

is a poset and

$$L_{\mathcal{P}} \text{ is represented by } \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \text{ with respect to the basis } B_{\mathcal{P}}$$

and

$$L_{\mathcal{P}}^{\dagger} \text{ is represented by } \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \text{ with respect to the basis } B_{\mathcal{P}}.$$

So we have

$$\sum_{i,j \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{P})} s_{i,j}(\mathcal{P}) \chi(F(i)) = \chi(F(b)) + \chi(F(c)) - \chi(F(a)).$$

Hence the following result implies that the Euler characteristic defined above satisfies the usual pushout formula.

Theorem 3.2. *Let \mathcal{A} be a poset and $F : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{Cat}$ be a pseudofunctor. Assume that for every object a in \mathcal{A} , the category $F(a)$ is finite and $1_{F(a)} \in \text{im}(L_{F(a)})$. Then we have*

$$\chi(G(F)) = \sum_{i,j \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{A})} s_{i,j}(\mathcal{A}) \chi(F(i)).$$

Proof. Let \mathcal{A} be a poset and $F : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{Cat}$ be a pseudofunctor. Let $U : \mathbf{Cat} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ denote the functor that sends a category to its set of objects. Let $T : \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Cat}$ denote the natural inclusion. Define $F_1 : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{Cat}$ as follows $F_1 = T \circ U \circ F$. Notice that there exists a natural transformation $i : T \circ U \Rightarrow \text{Id}_{\mathbf{Cat}}$ given by inclusion on each component. Define $F_2 : T \circ U(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Cat}$ as follows $F_2 = F \circ i_{\mathcal{A}}$. Let $L = L_{G(F)}$, $L_1 = L_{G(F_1)}$, and $L_2 = L_{G(F_2)}$. Then notice that we have

$$L = L_1 \circ L_2 \text{ and } L_2 = \bigoplus_{i \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{A})} L_{F(i)} \text{ and } 1_{G(F)} = \bigoplus_{i \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{A})} 1_{F(i)}.$$

Assume

$$w_i = \sum_{j \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{A})} s_{i,j}(\mathcal{A}) \text{ and } v_i = L_{F(i)}^+(1_{F(i)})$$

for $i \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{A})$. Now since we assumed $1_{F(i)} \in \text{im}(L_{F(i)})$ for all $i \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{A})$, we have $L_{F(i)}(v_i) = 1_{F(i)}$ for all $i \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{A})$. Hence

$$L \left(\bigoplus_{i \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{A})} w_i v_i \right) = L_1 \circ L_2 \left(\bigoplus_{i \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{A})} w_i v_i \right) = L_1 \left(\bigoplus_{i \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{A})} w_i L_{F(i)}(v_i) \right) = 1_{G(F)}.$$

Also notice that L_1 is invertible because \mathcal{A} is a poset. Moreover we have

$$\bigoplus_{i \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{A})} w_i v_i \in \bigoplus_{i \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{A})} \ker(L_{F(i)})^{\perp} = \ker(L_2)^{\perp} = \ker(L)^{\perp}.$$

The last equality holds because L_1 is invertible. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(G(F)) &= \langle 1_{G(F)}, L^+(1_{G(F)}) \rangle = \langle 1_{G(F)}, \bigoplus_{i \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{A})} w_i v_i \rangle \\ &= \sum_{i \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{A})} w_i \langle 1_{F(i)}, v_i \rangle = \sum_{i \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{A})} w_i \langle 1_{F(i)}, L_{F(i)}^+(1_{F(i)}) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{i \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{A})} w_i \chi(F(i)) = \sum_{i, j \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{A})} s_{i, j}(\mathcal{A}) \chi(F(i)).$$

□

The above result doesn't imply that the Euler characteristic preserves products so we prove this separately.

Theorem 3.3. *Let \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} be two finite categories. Then we have*

$$\chi(\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}) = \chi(\mathcal{A})\chi(\mathcal{B}).$$

Proof. Here we consider $H_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes H_{\mathcal{B}} = H_{\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}}$ by identifying $e_a \otimes e_b = e_{(a, b)}$. Under this identification we have the following equalities:

$$L_{\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}}^+ = (L_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes L_{\mathcal{B}})^+ = L_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \otimes L_{\mathcal{B}}^+ \quad \text{and} \quad 1_{\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}} = 1_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes 1_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}) &= \langle 1_{\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}}, L_{\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}}^+(1_{\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}}) \rangle = \langle 1_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes 1_{\mathcal{B}}, L_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \otimes L_{\mathcal{B}}^+(1_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes 1_{\mathcal{B}}) \rangle \\ &= \langle 1_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes 1_{\mathcal{B}}, L_{\mathcal{A}}^+(1_{\mathcal{A}}) \otimes L_{\mathcal{B}}^+(1_{\mathcal{B}}) \rangle = \langle 1_{\mathcal{A}}, L_{\mathcal{A}}^+(1_{\mathcal{A}}) \rangle \langle 1_{\mathcal{B}}, L_{\mathcal{B}}^+(1_{\mathcal{B}}) \rangle = \chi(\mathcal{A})\chi(\mathcal{B}). \end{aligned}$$

□

Now we show that we don't need the extra condition about weightings to show that Euler characteristic is additive under disjoint unions.

Theorem 3.4. *Let \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} be two finite categories. Then we have*

$$\chi(\mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{B}) = \chi(\mathcal{A}) + \chi(\mathcal{B}).$$

Proof. Here we consider $H_{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq H_{\mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{B}}, H_{\mathcal{B}} \subseteq H_{\mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{B}}$, and $H_{\mathcal{A}} \oplus H_{\mathcal{B}} = H_{\mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{B}}$ by the inclusions $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{B}$. Notice

$$L_{\mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{B}}^+ = L_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \oplus L_{\mathcal{B}}^+ \quad \text{and} \quad 1_{\mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{B}} = 1_{\mathcal{A}} \oplus 1_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

Hence we are done as above. □

4. EULER CHARACTERISTIC AND WEAK EQUIVALENCES

In the previous section we showed that the Euler characteristic defined above is preserved by categorical equivalences. In other words, the Euler characteristic of a finite category is invariant under weak equivalences of the canonical model category structure on category of small categories. Here in this section we will discuss the noninvariance of the Euler characteristics defined above and some others in the literature under weak equivalences of the Thomason model category structure on category of small categories.

For every category \mathcal{C} we have a simplicial set called its nerve and denoted by $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{C})$ whose n -simplices are the n -length of chains of its morphisms i.e. functors $[\mathbf{n}] \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$. In the Thomason model category structure on categories, a functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is called a weak equivalence if it induces a weak equivalence $\mathcal{N}(F) : \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{D})$ in the classical model structure on simplicial sets i.e. morphisms whose geometric realization is a weak homotopy equivalence of topological spaces.

4.1. Contractible and Strongly Contractible Simplicial Sets. A simplicial map f from a simplicial set X to a simplicial set Y consists of functions $f_n : X_n \rightarrow Y_n$ for $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ which commute with face and degeneracy maps. A simplicial homotopy between simplicial maps $f, g : X \rightarrow Y$ is a family of morphisms $h_n^i : X_n \rightarrow X_{n+1}$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n+1$ and $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ such that

- $d_{n+1}^0 h_n^0 = f_n,$
- $d_{n+1}^{n+1} h_n^n = g_n,$
- $d_{n+1}^i h_n^j = \begin{cases} h_{n-1}^{j-1} d_n^i & \text{if } i < j \\ d_{n+1}^i h_n^{i-1} & \text{if } i = j \\ h_{n-1}^j d_n^{i-1} & \text{if } i > j + 1, \end{cases}$
- $s_{n+1}^i h_n^j = \begin{cases} h_{n+1}^j s_n^{i-1} & \text{if } i > j \\ h_{n+1}^{j+1} s_n^i & \text{if } i \leq j. \end{cases}$

Here lower indices are omitted for simplicity. In [1], a sequence of maps $t_n : X_n \rightarrow X_{n+1}$ for $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ is called a contraction of X if it satisfies the following conditions:

- $d^0 t = \text{id},$
- $d^i t = t d^{i-1},$ for $i > 0,$
- $s^i t = t s^{i-1},$ for $i > 0.$

A simplicial set X is called contractible if there exists a contraction of X . The conditions to be a contraction are same as the conditions of having an extra degeneracy map that would satisfy a natural continuation of the conditions for degeneracy maps except the one $s^0 t = t t$. If a contraction also satisfies the condition $s^0 t = t t$, it is called a strong contraction and X is called strongly contractible.

Let t be a contraction of X . Set $h^i = (s^0)^i t (d^0)^i : X_n \rightarrow X_{n+1}$. Let $r_0 : X_0 \rightarrow A_0$ be the coequalizer of $d_1^0, d_1^1 : X_1 \rightarrow X_0$. Define $A_n = A_0$ for all n . We define a simplicial map $r : X \rightarrow A$ by $r_n = r_0 (d^0)^n : X_n \rightarrow A_0 = A_n$. It is shown in [1] that for some simplicial map $i : A \rightarrow X$ the composition $r \circ i$ is equal to the identity map on A and h is a homotopy between the identity map on X and $i \circ r$. Notice that A is a constant simplicial set. In particular, if X is connected then the geometric realization of A is just a point and hence the geometric realization of X is contractible.

Let \mathcal{M} denote the category with a unique object whose endomorphism monoid is the monoid $M = \{1, \tau\}$ where 1 is the identity element and $\tau^2 = \tau$.

Proposition 4.1. *The geometric realization of the simplicial set $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M})$ is contractible.*

Proof. Let a be the unique object of \mathcal{M} . Let $\beta : [\mathbf{n}] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ be an n -simplex of $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M})$. Let β^i in \mathcal{M} be the image of the unique morphism α_n^i from $i-1$ to i in $[\mathbf{n}]$. Set $t_n : \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M})_n \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M})_{n+1}$ to be the function defined as follows:

$$(5) \quad t_n(\beta)(\alpha_{n+1}^i) = \begin{cases} \tau & \text{if } i = 1 \\ \beta^{i-1} & \text{if } i > 1. \end{cases}$$

Now to complete the proof, we show that t is a contraction.

• $d^0 t = id$:

$$\begin{aligned} d^0 t_n(\beta)(\alpha_n^i) &= \begin{cases} t_n(\beta)(\alpha_{n+1}^2) & \text{if } i = 1 \\ t_n(\beta)(\alpha_{n+1}^{i+1}) & \text{if } i > 1 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \beta^1 & \text{if } i = 1 \\ \beta^{i+1-1} & \text{if } i > 1 \end{cases} \\ &= \beta^i. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $d^0 t$ is just an identity map.

• $d^j t = t d^{j-1}$ for $j > 0$:

For $j = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} d^1 t_n(\beta)(\alpha_n^i) &= \begin{cases} t_n(\beta)(\alpha_{n+1}^2) \circ t_n(\beta)(\alpha_{n+1}^1) & \text{if } i = 1 \\ t_n(\beta)(\alpha_{n+1}^{i+1}) & \text{if } i > 1 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} t_n(\beta)(\alpha_{n+1}^2) \circ \tau & \text{if } i = 1 \\ \beta^{i+1-1} & \text{if } i > 1 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \tau & \text{if } i = 1 \\ d^0(\beta)(\alpha_{n-1}^{i-1}) & \text{if } i > 1 \end{cases} \\ &= t_{n-1} d^0(\beta)(\alpha_n^i). \end{aligned}$$

For $1 < j < n + 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} d^j t_n(\beta)(\alpha_n^i) &= \begin{cases} t_n(\beta)(\alpha_{n+1}^i) & \text{if } i < j \\ t_n(\beta)(\alpha_{n+1}^{i+1}) \circ t_n(\beta)(\alpha_{n+1}^i) & \text{if } i = j \\ t_n(\beta)(\alpha_{n+1}^{i+1}) & \text{if } i > j \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \tau & \text{if } i = 1 \\ \beta^{i-1} & \text{if } 1 < i < j \\ \beta^i \circ \beta^{i-1} & \text{if } i = j \\ \beta^i & \text{if } i > j \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \tau & \text{if } i = 1 \\ \beta^{i-1} & \text{if } 0 < i - 1 < j - 1 \\ \beta^i \circ \beta^{i-1} & \text{if } i - 1 = j - 1 \\ \beta^{i-1+1} & \text{if } i - 1 > j - 1 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \tau & \text{if } i = 1 \\ d^{j-1}(\beta)(\alpha_{n-1}^{i-1}) & \text{if } i > 1 \end{cases} \\ &= t_{n-1} d^{j-1}(\beta)(\alpha_n^i). \end{aligned}$$

For $j = n + 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
d^{n+1}t_n(\beta)(\alpha_n^i) &= t_n(\beta)(\alpha_{n+1}^i) \\
&= \begin{cases} \tau & \text{if } i = 1 \\ \beta^{i-1} & \text{if } i > 1 \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} \tau & \text{if } i = 1 \\ d^n(\beta)(\alpha_{n-1}^{i-1}) & \text{if } i > 1 \end{cases} \\
&= t_{n-1}d^n(\beta)(\alpha_n^i).
\end{aligned}$$

• $s^j t = t s^{j-1}$ for $j > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
s^j t_n(\beta)(\alpha_{n+2}^i) &= \begin{cases} t_n(\beta)(\alpha_{n+1}^i) & \text{if } i < j + 1 \\ 1_a & \text{if } i = j + 1 \\ t_n(\beta)(\alpha_{n+1}^{i-1}) & \text{if } i > j + 1 \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} \tau & \text{if } i = 1 \\ \beta^{i-1} & \text{if } 1 < i < j + 1 \\ 1_a & \text{if } i = j + 1 \\ \beta^{i-1-1} & \text{if } i > j + 1 \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} \tau & \text{if } i = 1 \\ s^{j-1}(\beta)(\alpha_{n+1}^{i-1}) & \text{if } i > 1 \end{cases} \\
&= t_{n+1} s^{j-1}(\beta)(\alpha_{n+2}^i).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Observe that the above contraction t does not satisfy the condition $s^0 t = t t$. It is also straightforward to show that there is no other contraction of $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M})$. Thus $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M})$ is not strongly contractible.

4.2. Euler characteristics. Let \mathcal{M} denote the category defined in the previous section. Now the Euler characteristic of the terminal category $*$ with one object and one morphism is equal to 1 for all defined Euler characteristics in the literature. As we proved in the previous section the unique functor from \mathcal{M} to $*$ induces a weak equivalence in the Thomason model category structure. However, the Euler characteristics assigned to \mathcal{M} in the literature are not equal to 1. For example we have

$$\chi_\Sigma(\mathcal{M}) = \chi_{Lein}(\mathcal{M}) = \chi(\mathcal{M}) = \frac{1}{2} \neq 1$$

where $\chi_\Sigma(\mathcal{M})$ denotes the series Euler characteristic as in [2].

Let R be an associative commutative ring with unit and $\chi^{(2)}$, \underline{R} , \mathcal{N} and S be as defined in [3] and [4]. Assume that $I_i(M)$ denotes the $R\mathcal{M}$ -module satisfying $I_i(M)(*) = M$ and $I_i(M)(\tau) = i \cdot \text{id}_M$ for $i = 1, 2$ as in Example 2.18 of [4]. Then a projective resolution of \underline{R} is P_* where $P_0 = I_1(R)$ and $P_n = 0$ if $n \neq 0$. Let x be the unique object of \mathcal{M} . Then

$$S_x(I_1(R)) = \text{coker}(id_R) = 0.$$

So considering $R = \mathbb{C}$ we have

$$\chi^{(2)}(\mathcal{M}) = \sum_{n \geq 0} (-1)^n \dim_{\mathcal{N}(x)}(H_n(S_x P_* \otimes_{R[x]} \mathcal{N}(x))) = 0 \neq 1.$$

We know that the Euler characteristic of two finite categories is same if they have isomorphic nerves. It is desirable to define an equivalence relation on nerves of categories more like homotopy equivalence and still have the Euler characteristic well-defined up to such an equivalence. Notice that the unique map $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow *$ induces a homotopy equivalence from $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M})$ to $\mathcal{N}(*)$ but it is not strong in the sense discussed above. Hence one could try to define strong homotopy equivalences of nerves of categories using the definitions in the previous section. As a first step, we can ask the following question.

Question 1. Let \mathcal{C} be a finite category with a connected and strongly contractible nerve. Can we prove that $\chi(\mathcal{C}) = 1$?

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The first author would like to thank Matthew Gelvin for helpful discussions and motivating to study this topic.

DATA AVAILABILITY

Not applicable.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- [1] Michael Barr, John F. Kennison, and Robert Raphael. Contractible simplicial objects. *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin.*, 60(4):473–495, 2019.
- [2] Clemens Berger and Tom Leinster. The Euler characteristic of a category as the sum of a divergent series. *Homology Homotopy Appl.*, 10(1):41–51, 2008.
- [3] Thomas M. Fiore, Wolfgang Lück, and Roman Sauer. Euler characteristics of categories and homotopy colimits. *Doc. Math.*, 16:301–354, 2011.
- [4] Thomas M. Fiore, Wolfgang Lück, and Roman Sauer. Finiteness obstructions and Euler characteristics of categories. *Adv. Math.*, 226(3):2371–2469, 2011.
- [5] Tom Leinster. The Euler characteristic of a category. *Doc. Math.*, 13:21–49, 2008.
- [6] Eliakim Hastings Moore. On the reciprocal of the general algebraic matrix. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 26(9):394–395, 1920.
- [7] R. Penrose. A generalized inverse for matrices. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 51:406–413, 1955.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BILKENT UNIVERSITY
 ÇANKAYA, ANKARA, TURKEY
Email address: mustafa.akkaya@bilkent.edu.tr

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BILKENT UNIVERSITY
 ÇANKAYA, ANKARA, TURKEY
Email address: unluo@fen.bilkent.edu.tr