

# EQUIDECOMPOSABLE AND WEAKLY NEIGHBORLY POLYTOPES

BY

MARGARET M. BAYER\*

*Department of Mathematics, University of Kansas  
Lawrence, KS 66045, USA  
bayer@math.ukans.edu*

## ABSTRACT

A polytope is equidecomposable if all its triangulations have the same face numbers. For an equidecomposable polytope all minimal affine dependencies have an equal number of positive and negative coefficients. A subclass consists of the weakly neighborly polytopes, those for which every set of vertices is contained in a face of at most twice the dimension as the set. The  $h$ -vector of every triangulation of a weakly neighborly polytope equals the  $h$ -vector of the polytope itself. Combinatorial properties of this class of polytopes are studied. Gale diagrams of weakly neighborly polytopes with few vertices are characterized in the spirit of the known Gale diagram characterization of Lawrence polytopes, a special class of weakly neighborly polytopes.

## 1. Introduction

A general question in combinatorics is how many faces various types of complexes may have. The question has been answered completely for simplicial complexes and for boundary complexes of simplicial polytopes. For boundary complexes

---

\* Supported in part by National Science Foundation grant #DMS-8801078, by the Sonderforschungsbereich 343 "Diskrete Strukturen in der Mathematik", Universität Bielefeld, and by the University of Kansas New Faculty General Research Grant Program.

Received December 1, 1990 and in revised form February 27, 1992

of arbitrary convex polytopes, however, the question is wide open. It is natural to try to apply results on simplicial complexes to triangulations of a polytope or its boundary to get information about the original polytope. In general the face numbers of a triangulation of a polytope are not functions of the polytope's combinatorial structure. Indeed, different triangulations may have different face numbers. This motivates the study of **equidecomposable** polytopes; these are the polytopes, all of whose triangulations have the same face numbers. We focus on the subclass of weakly neighborly polytopes. For these polytopes the face numbers of a triangulation can be computed from the face lattice of the polytope. The computation involves the toric or generalized  $h$ -vector [12]. Perhaps the results here relating  $h$ -vectors of triangulations and polytopes will lead to progress in interpreting generalized  $h$ -vectors. Background on combinatorial properties of polytopes can be found in [4, 6].

In Section 2 we define equidecomposable polytopes and give a property of their affine dependencies. Section 3 focuses on those triangulations whose  $h$ -vectors are the same as the  $h$ -vector of the polytope. Sections 4 and 5 deal with weakly neighborly polytopes. In Section 4 we look at general combinatorial properties and 3-dimensional polytopes; section 5 concentrates on weakly neighborly polytopes with few vertices.

I would like to thank Louis Billera and Bernd Sturmfels for getting me started on this topic, and the participants of the May 1990 workshop on polytopes in Passau and Walter Whiteley for helpful discussions.

## 2. Equidecomposable polytopes

A **triangulation** of a  $d$ -polytope  $P$  is a simplicial complex whose vertex set is the vertex set of  $P$  and whose underlying space is  $P$ . Write  $f_i(C)$  for the number of  $i$ -faces of a polyhedral complex  $C$ , and call  $f(C) = (f_0(C), f_1(C), \dots, f_d(C))$  the  **$f$ -vector** of  $C$ . A polytope is **equidecomposable** if all its triangulations have the same  $f$ -vector. In this section we show that this implies a certain condition on the affine dependencies among the vertices of the polytope.

A **circuit** of a polytope is a minimal set of affinely dependent vertices. Any circuit supports a unique (up to multiplication by a nonzero scalar) affine dependence. If this affine dependence has an equal number of positive and negative coefficients, the circuit is called **balanced**.

"Circuit" here is a matroid term. We describe what it means in terms of one

er, the question is wide open. It is natural to consider complexes to triangulations of a polytope about the original polytope. In general the face numbers of a polytope are not functions of the polytope's triangulation; different triangulations may have different face numbers. We focus on **equidecomposable** polytopes; these are polytopes whose triangulations have the same face numbers. We focus on **weakly neighborly** polytopes. For these polytopes the face numbers are computed from the face lattice of the polytope. Perhaps the study of triangulations and polytopes will lead to progress in combinatorics. Background on combinatorial properties of

equidecomposable polytopes and give a property of their triangulations whose  $h$ -vectors are the same as the original polytope. Sections 4 and 5 deal with weakly neighborly polytopes. We look at general combinatorial properties of weakly neighborly polytopes. Section 5 concentrates on weakly neighborly poly-

and Bernd Sturmfels for getting me started at the May 1990 workshop on polytopes in Bonn. I had many useful discussions.

a simplicial complex whose vertex set is the vertex set of a space is  $P$ . Write  $f_i(C)$  for the number of  $i$ -faces of  $C$  and call  $f(C) = (f_0(C), f_1(C), \dots, f_d(C))$  the  $f$ -vector of  $C$ . A polytope is **equidecomposable** if all its triangulations have the same  $f$ -vector. We show that this implies a certain condition on the face numbers of the polytope.

A set of affinely dependent vertices. Any linear combination by a nonzero scalar of the coefficients of an equal number of positive and negative coefficients is zero.

We describe what it means in terms of one

concrete representation of the matroid, the Gale transform. The reader may consult [4, 9, 14] for background on Gale transforms. A **Gale transform** of a polytope  $P$  is the set of columns of a matrix  $A$  whose rows form a basis for the affine dependencies on the vertices of  $P$ . A Gale transform  $D$  of a  $d$ -polytope  $P$  with  $n$  vertices is thus a set of  $n$  (not necessarily distinct) points in  $\mathbf{R}^{n-d-1}$ . To each vertex  $v$  of  $P$  there corresponds naturally a point  $\bar{v}$  of  $D$ . A circuit of  $P$  corresponds to the complement in  $D$  of the set of points contained in a linear hyperplane spanned by points of  $D$ . The set of points of a circuit having coefficients of one sign in the affine dependence corresponds to the set of points on one side of the hyperplane. Thus a circuit of  $P$  is balanced if and only if there is an equal number of points in either open half-space bounded by the corresponding hyperplane of  $D$ .

Some triangulations of a polytope can be constructed using the Gale transform (see Lee [7]). Let  $\bar{V}$  be a Gale transform of a  $d$ -polytope  $P$  and  $\bar{z}$  a point of  $\mathbf{R}^{n-d-1}$  on no linear hyperplane spanned by elements of  $\bar{V}$ . The maximal subsets  $S \subseteq \bar{V}$  such that  $0$  is in the relative interior of the convex hull of  $\bar{S}^c \cup \{\bar{z}\}$  are the  $d$ -simplices of a triangulation. We call this the Gale triangulation induced by  $\bar{z}$ . A triangulation obtained in this way is called **regular**. Note that multiplying the points of the Gale transform by positive scalars does not change the sets  $\bar{S}^c \cup \{\bar{z}\}$  that capture  $0$ . Thus we can (and often will) normalize the Gale transform to be a subset of  $S^{n-d-2} \cup \{0\} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{n-d-1}$ .

**THEOREM 1:** *If a polytope is equidecomposable, then all its circuits are balanced.*

*Proof:* Suppose the  $d$ -polytope  $P$  with  $n$  vertices has an unbalanced circuit,  $X = X^+ \cup X^-$ , where  $X^+$  is the set of points of  $X$  having one sign in the affine dependence,  $X^-$  the other, and  $|X^+| = k < m = |X^-|$ . Consider the Gale transform  $D$  of  $P$  with sets  $\bar{X}^+$  and  $\bar{X}^-$  in the open half-spaces,  $H^+$  and  $H^-$ , bounded by the hyperplane  $H$ . If the points of  $D$  in  $H$  capture  $0$  (in the relative interior of their convex hull), choose one of these points  $\bar{z}$ . Otherwise, since the points of  $D$  in  $H$  span  $H$ , there exists a point  $\bar{z}$  of  $H$  (not in  $D$ ) such that  $0$  is in the relative interior of the convex hull of  $(D \cap H) \cup \{\bar{z}\}$ . Choose points  $\bar{z}^+$  and  $\bar{z}^-$  close to  $\bar{z}$  in  $H^+$  and  $H^-$  (here "close" means that the line segment  $\text{conv}\{\bar{z}^+, \bar{z}^-\}$  does not intersect any spanned hyperplane of  $D$  other than  $H$ ).

Let  $\Delta^+$  and  $\Delta^-$  be the triangulations of  $P$  induced by  $\bar{z}^+$  and  $\bar{z}^-$ . The minimal

cofaces that differ for the two triangulations are those for which  $\bar{z}^+$  (or  $\bar{z}^-$ ) is the only point in its open half-space  $H^+$  (or  $H^-$ ). That is, they are of the form  $A \cup \{b, \bar{z}^+\}$  (or  $A \cup \{c, \bar{z}^-\}$ ), where  $A$  is a minimal set in  $H$  such that  $A \cup \{\bar{z}\}$  captures 0, and  $b \in \bar{X}^-$  ( $c \in \bar{X}^+$ ). For each such  $A$  there are  $m$  of these cofaces for  $\Delta^+$  and  $k$  for  $\Delta^-$ , so  $\Delta^+$  has more facets ( $d$ -faces) than  $\Delta^-$ . Thus  $P$  is not equidecomposable. ■

It is not clear whether the converse to Theorem 1 holds in general. For  $d$ -polytopes with more than  $d+3$  vertices, not all triangulations of polytopes are regular. The balanced circuit condition enables us to argue only about regular triangulations.

**PROPOSITION 2:** *If all circuits of a  $d$ -polytope  $P$  are balanced, then all regular triangulations of  $P$  have the same  $f$ -vector.*

*Proof:* Any two regular triangulations,  $\Delta$  and  $\Delta'$ , can be connected by a sequence of triangulations,  $\Delta = \Delta_1, \Delta_2, \dots, \Delta_j = \Delta'$ , where each adjacent pair  $\Delta_{i-1}$  and  $\Delta_i$  is related as  $\Delta^+$  and  $\Delta^-$  are in the proof of Theorem 1. If all circuits are balanced then  $\Delta_{i-1}$  and  $\Delta_i$  have the same  $f$ -vector for each  $i$ , so all regular triangulations have the same  $f$ -vector. ■

By [7] all triangulations of a  $d$ -polytope  $P$  with at most  $d+3$  vertices are regular. Thus we get

**COROLLARY 3:** *If  $P$  is a  $d$ -polytope with at most  $d+3$  vertices and all circuits of  $P$  are balanced, then  $P$  is equidecomposable.*

We close this section with a few examples. The regular octahedron and the triangular prism are both equidecomposable polytopes (whose triangulations have  $f$ -vectors  $(6, 13, 12, 4)$  and  $(6, 12, 10, 3)$ , respectively). Note, however, that the octahedron is combinatorially equivalent to polytopes that are not equidecomposable. The bipyramid over a triangle is not equidecomposable: it has one triangulation using two tetrahedra, one using three.

### 3. Shallow subdivisions and $h$ -vectors

In this section we show how the  $f$ -vectors of certain triangulations of a polytope can be computed from combinatorial invariants of the original polytope (or vice versa). The combinatorial invariants form the  $h$ -vector of the polytope. The

$h$ -vector was first defined for simplicial complexes in McMullen's 1927 paper [11]). More recently, it has been used for Eulerian posets [12]. The form of Stanley's definition of the  $h$ -vector of the boundary  $\partial$  of intersection homology Betti number

Define polynomials  $h(C, x)$  for all polytopes  $C$  and spheres  $S$  by the rules:

1.  $h(\emptyset, x) = g(\emptyset, x) = 1$ ,
2. if  $\dim S = d-1$  and  $h(S, x) = \sum_{i=0}^d k_i x^i$ , where  $m = \lfloor d/2 \rfloor$  and  $k_{-1} = 0$ ,
3. if  $\dim C = d$ , then  $h(C, x) = \sum_{F \text{ face of } C} g(F, x)$  over all faces  $F$  of  $C$ .

Keeping in mind that the  $g$ -polynomial is often abbreviated to  $g(P, x)$  for a polytope  $P$ , we distinguish between  $h(\partial P, x)$  and  $h(P, x)$  for a simplicial complex having a single maximal face  $P$ . If  $C$  is a  $d$ -sphere the  $h$ -vector is  $h_i = k_{d+1-i}$  and call  $h_i = h_{d+1-i}$  for all  $i$ . The vector of coefficients is the  $g$ -vector of the sphere  $S$ . Both the  $h$ -vector of a rational polytope are nonnegative; the  $g$ -vector has a number interpretation of the  $h$ -vector.

If  $F$  is a simplex then  $g(\partial F, x) = 1$ . So  $h(F, x)$  is a function of the  $f$ -vector, namely the  $h$ -vector of a simplicial complex:

$$h_i = \sum_{j=0}^i (-1)^j f_j$$

This relation is invertible, so the  $h$ -vector determines the  $f$ -vector. In general the  $h$ -vector is a linear function of the  $f$ -vector (and vice versa) [1]. However, this fact does not hold for the  $h$ -vector in general. The next theorem

Generalizing the notion of triangulation of a  $d$ -polytope  $P$  to be a polytope

ations are those for which  $\bar{z}^+$  (or  $\bar{z}^-$ ) is  $^+$  (or  $H^-$ ). That is, they are of the form  $A \cup \{\bar{z}\}$  is a minimal set in  $H$  such that  $A \cup \{\bar{z}\}$  is a cofacet of  $\Delta^-$ . Thus  $P$  is not

to Theorem 1 holds in general. For  $d$ -polytopes, not all triangulations of polytopes are regular, which enables us to argue only about regular

polytope  $P$  are balanced, then all regular triangulations of  $P$  have the same  $f$ -vector.

$\Delta$  and  $\Delta'$ , can be connected by a sequence of triangulations  $\Delta, \Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_j = \Delta'$ , where each adjacent pair  $\Delta_i, \Delta_{i+1}$  are in the proof of Theorem 1. If all triangulations have the same  $f$ -vector for each  $i$ , so all triangulations have the same  $f$ -vector. ■

polytope  $P$  with at most  $d + 3$  vertices are

with at most  $d + 3$  vertices and all circuits are unimodularly decomposable.

polytopes. The regular octahedron and the triangular prism are simple polytopes (whose triangulations have  $d$  and  $d+1$  facets, respectively). Note, however, that the regular tetrahedron is not equidecomposable: it has one facet and one vertex using three.

ors

ors of certain triangulations of a polytope are invariants of the original polytope (or vice versa). The  $h$ -vector of the polytope. The

$h$ -vector was first defined for simplicial polytopes (its origins go back to Sommerville's 1927 paper [11]). More recently Stanley extended the definition to Eulerian posets [12]. The form of Stanley's definition comes from algebraic geometry: the  $h$ -vector of the boundary  $\partial P$  of a rational polytope  $P$  is the sequence of intersection homology Betti numbers of the associated toric variety.

Define polynomials  $h(C, x)$  for all polyhedral complexes  $C$  and  $g(S, x)$  for all spheres  $S$  by the rules:

1.  $h(\emptyset, x) = g(\emptyset, x) = 1$ ,
2. if  $\dim S = d-1$  and  $h(S, x) = \sum_{i=0}^d k_i x^i$ , then  $g(S, x) = \sum_{i=0}^m (k_i - k_{i-1}) x^i$ , where  $m = \lfloor d/2 \rfloor$  and  $k_{-1} = 0$ ,
3. if  $\dim C = d$ , then  $h(C, x) = \sum g(\partial F, x)(x-1)^{d-\dim F}$ , where the sum is over all faces  $F$  of  $C$ .

Keeping in mind that the  $g$ -polynomial is defined only for spheres, we will often abbreviate  $g(\partial P, x)$  to  $g(P, x)$  for a polytope  $P$ . (Note, however, that we distinguish between  $h(\partial P, x)$  and  $h(P, x)$ ; the latter is defined for the polyhedral complex having a single maximal face  $P$ .) For a  $d$ -complex  $C$  with  $h(C, x) = \sum_{i=0}^{d+1} k_i x^i$ , write  $h_i = k_{d+1-i}$  and call  $h(C) = (h_0, h_1, \dots, h_{d+1})$  the  $h$ -vector of  $C$ . If  $C$  is a  $d$ -sphere the  $h$ -vector satisfies the Dehn-Sommerville equations:  $h_i = h_{d+1-i}$  for all  $i$ . The vector of coefficients of  $g(S, x)$  (in standard order) is the  $g$ -vector of the sphere  $S$ . Both the  $h$ -vector and the  $g$ -vector of the boundary of a rational polytope are nonnegative; the only known proof of this uses the Betti number interpretation of the  $h$ -vector.

If  $F$  is a simplex then  $g(\partial F, x) = 1$ . So for a simplicial complex  $C$ , the  $h$ -vector is a function of the  $f$ -vector, namely the usual function defining the  $h$ -vector of a simplicial complex:

$$h_i = \sum_{j=0}^i (-1)^{i-j} \binom{d-j}{d-i} f_{j-1}.$$

This relation is invertible, so the  $h$ -vector of a simplicial complex determines the  $f$ -vector. In general the  $h$ -vector is a linear function of the flag vector (but not vice versa) [1]. However, this fact does not lead to a natural interpretation of the  $h$ -vector in general. The next theorem may provide a step in that direction.

Generalizing the notion of triangulation, we define a **(polyhedral) subdivision** of a  $d$ -polytope  $P$  to be a polyhedral complex whose vertex set is that

of  $P$  and whose underlying space is  $P$ . If  $\sigma$  is a face of a polyhedral subdivision  $\Delta$  of  $P$ , the **carrier**  $C(\sigma)$  of  $\sigma$  in  $P$  is the smallest face of  $P$  containing  $\sigma$ . A polyhedral subdivision  $\Delta$  is **shallow** if and only if for each face  $\sigma \in \Delta$ ,  $\dim C(\sigma) \leq 2(\dim \sigma - \deg g(\sigma, x))$ . In particular a triangulation  $\Delta$  is shallow if for each  $\sigma \in \Delta$ ,  $\dim C(\sigma) \leq 2 \dim \sigma$ .

Stanley [13] showed that if  $P$  is a rational polytope, then for any subdivision  $\Delta$  of  $P$ ,  $h(\Delta) \geq h(P)$ . We show shallowness gives equality.

#### THEOREM 4:

- (1) If  $\Delta$  is a shallow subdivision of a  $d$ -polytope  $P$ , then  $g(\partial P) = h(P) = h(\Delta) = g(\partial \Delta)$ .
- (2) If  $\Delta$  is a subdivision of a rational  $d$ -polytope  $P$  and  $h(P) = h(\Delta)$ , then  $\Delta$  is shallow.

We first list some identities satisfied by  $h$ -vectors and  $g$ -vectors. The second and third are straightforward generalizations of results of [10] for triangulations.

LEMMA 5:  $\Delta$

- (1) If  $C$  is a  $(d-1)$ -sphere, then

$$(x-1)h(C, x) = x^{d+1}g(C, 1/x) - g(C, x).$$

- (2) If  $Q$  is a polyhedral ball of dimension  $d$ , then

$$h(Q, x) - x^{d+1}h(Q, 1/x) = x^{d+1}g(\partial Q, 1/x) - g(\partial Q, x).$$

- (3) If  $\Delta$  is a shallow subdivision of a  $d$ -polytope  $P$ , then

$$h(\Delta, x) = x^{d+1}g(\partial \Delta, 1/x).$$

We also need the concept of an acceptable function, defined in [12]. Let  $C$  be a polyhedral complex, and  $\gamma$  a function that associates a polynomial  $\gamma(F, x)$  to every face  $F$  of  $C$ . The function  $\gamma$  is **acceptable** if for all faces  $F$  of  $C$

$$\sum_{G \text{ face of } F} \gamma(G, x)(x-1)^{\dim F - \dim G} = x^{\dim F + 1} \gamma(F, 1/x).$$

The  $g$ -polynomial is the unique acceptable function  $\gamma$  on the polytope such that  $\gamma(\emptyset, x) = 1$  and for all other faces  $F$ ,  $\deg \gamma(F, x) \leq \dim F/2$  [12].

Now we define a new polynomial for the faces of a polytope relative to a fixed subdivision. For any polytope  $P$ , any subdivision  $\Delta$  of  $P$ , and any face  $F$  of  $P$ ,

let

$$\gamma_{\Delta}(F, x) = \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \Delta \\ C(\sigma) = F}} g(\sigma, x)$$

For a face  $F$  of  $P$ , write  $\Delta|_F$  for the subcomplex of  $\Delta$  consisting of faces of  $\Delta$  contained in  $F$ . For its boundary complex (which is a polytope) write  $\partial \Delta|_F$ .

PROPOSITION 6: If  $P$  is a polytope and  $\Delta$  is a subdivision of  $P$ , then  $\gamma_{\Delta}(F, x) = h(\Delta|_F, x)$  if and only if  $\Delta$  is shallow.

Proof: Fix the polytope  $P$  and subdivision  $\Delta$ .  
e. Consider the sum

$$S_{\Delta}(F, x) = \sum_{G \text{ face of } F} \gamma_{\Delta}(G, x)$$

By the definition of  $\gamma_{\Delta}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\Delta}(F, x) &= \sum_{G \text{ face of } F} \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \Delta \\ C(\sigma) = G}} g(\sigma, x) \\ (1) \quad &= \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \Delta \\ C(\sigma) \subseteq F}} g(\sigma, x)(x-1)^{\dim F - \dim \sigma} \end{aligned}$$

Interpreting this sum for the polyhedral complex  $\Delta|_F$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (2) \quad S_{\Delta}(F, x) &= \sum_{\sigma \in \Delta|_F} g(\sigma, x) \\ &= h(\Delta|_F, x) \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by separating the face  $F$  from the rest of  $\Delta|_F$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\Delta}(F, x) &= \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \Delta \\ C(\sigma) = F}} g(\sigma, x)(x-1)^{\dim F - \dim \sigma} \\ &\quad + (x-1) \sum_{\sigma \in \partial \Delta|_F} g(\sigma, x) \\ &= \gamma_{\Delta}(F, x) + (x-1)h(\partial \Delta|_F, x) \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5, parts (1) and (2), we get

$$\begin{aligned} (3) \quad S_{\Delta}(F, x) &= \gamma_{\Delta}(F, x) + x^{e+1} \gamma(\partial \Delta|_F, 1/x) \\ &= \gamma_{\Delta}(F, x) + h(\Delta|_F, x) \end{aligned}$$

How can you compute the carrier

dim

face

5 > d-3

. If  $\sigma$  is a face of a polyhedral subdivi-  
 in  $P$  is the smallest face of  $P$  containing  
 llow if and only if for each face  $\sigma \in \Delta$ ,  
 particular a triangulation  $\Delta$  is shallow if

ditional polytope, then for any subdivision  
 vness gives equality.

a  $d$ -polytope  $P$ , then  $g(\partial P) = h(P) =$

$d$ -polytope  $P$  and  $h(P) = h(\Delta)$ , then  $\Delta$

by  $h$ -vectors and  $g$ -vectors. The second  
 ations of results of [10] for triangulations.

$x^{d+1}g(C, 1/x) - g(C, x)$ .

sion  $d$ , then

$= x^{d+1}g(\partial Q, 1/x) - g(\partial Q, x)$ .

$d$ -polytope  $P$ , then

$x^{d+1}g(\partial \Delta, 1/x)$ .

table function, defined in [12]. Let  $C$  be  
 that associates a polynomial  $\gamma(F, x)$  to  
 ceptable if for all faces  $F$  of  $C$

$\dim G = x^{\dim F+1}\gamma(F, 1/x)$ .

le function  $\gamma$  on the polytope such that  
 $\gamma(F, x) \leq \dim F/2$  [12].

ne faces of a polytope relative to a fixed  
 bdivision  $\Delta$  of  $P$ , and any face  $F$  of  $P$ ,

let

$$\gamma_{\Delta}(F, x) = \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \Delta \\ C(\sigma) = F}} g(\sigma, x)(x-1)^{\dim F - \dim \sigma}.$$

For a face  $F$  of  $P$ , write  $\Delta|_F$  for the subcomplex of  $\Delta$  that subdivides  $F$  and  
 $\partial \Delta|_F$  for its boundary complex (which subdivides the boundary  $\partial F$  of  $F$ ).

PROPOSITION 6: If  $P$  is a polytope and  $\Delta$  is a subdivision of  $P$ , then  $\gamma_{\Delta}$  is  
 acceptable.

Proof: Fix the polytope  $P$  and subdivision  $\Delta$ . Let  $F$  be a face of  $P$  of dimension  
 $e$ . Consider the sum

$$S_{\Delta}(F, x) = \sum_{G \text{ face of } F} \gamma_{\Delta}(G, x)(x-1)^{e - \dim G}.$$

By the definition of  $\gamma_{\Delta}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\Delta}(F, x) &= \sum_{G \text{ face of } F} \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \Delta \\ C(\sigma) = G}} g(\sigma, x)(x-1)^{\dim G - \dim \sigma}(x-1)^{e - \dim G} \\ (1) \quad &= \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \Delta \\ C(\sigma) \subseteq F}} g(\sigma, x)(x-1)^{e - \dim \sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Interpreting this sum for the polyhedral complex  $\Delta|_F$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\Delta}(F, x) &= \sum_{\sigma \in \Delta|_F} g(\sigma, x)(x-1)^{e - \dim \sigma} \\ (2) \quad &= h(\Delta|_F, x). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by separating the faces of  $\Delta|_F$  carried by  $F$  in expression (1),

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\Delta}(F, x) &= \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \Delta \\ C(\sigma) = F}} g(\sigma, x)(x-1)^{e - \dim \sigma} \\ &\quad + (x-1) \sum_{\sigma \in \partial \Delta|_F} g(\sigma, x)(x-1)^{e-1 - \dim \sigma} \\ &= \gamma_{\Delta}(F, x) + (x-1)h(\partial \Delta|_F, x). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5, parts (1) and (2), we get

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\Delta}(F, x) &= \gamma_{\Delta}(F, x) + x^{e+1}g(\partial \Delta|_F, 1/x) - g(\partial \Delta|_F, x) \\ (3) \quad &= \gamma_{\Delta}(F, x) + h(\Delta|_F, x) - x^{e+1}h(\Delta|_F, 1/x). \end{aligned}$$

So, combining (2) and (3),

$$\gamma_{\Delta}(F, x) = x^{e+1} h(\Delta|_F, 1/x) = x^{e+1} S_{\Delta}(F, 1/x)$$

or

$$S_{\Delta}(F, x) = x^{e+1} \gamma_{\Delta}(F, 1/x)$$

So  $\gamma_{\Delta}$  is acceptable. ■

**COROLLARY 7:** Let  $\Delta$  be a subdivision of a  $d$ -polytope  $P$ . Then  $\Delta$  is shallow if and only if for every face  $F$  of  $P$ ,  $\gamma_{\Delta}(F, x) = g(F, x)$ .

*Proof:* As mentioned above,  $g$  is the unique acceptable function with value 1 at  $\emptyset$  and degree at most  $\dim F/2$ . Thus  $\gamma_{\Delta} = g$  if and only if  $\deg \gamma_{\Delta}(F, x) \leq \dim F/2$  for all faces  $F$  of  $P$ . This holds if and only if  $\dim C(\sigma) - \dim \sigma + \deg g(\sigma, x) \leq \dim C(\sigma)/2$  for all faces  $\sigma$  of  $\Delta$ . ■

*Proof of Theorem 4:* (1) Suppose  $\Delta$  is a shallow subdivision of  $P$ . Since each face of  $\Delta$  is carried by some face of  $P$  (possibly  $P$  itself),

$$\begin{aligned} h(\Delta, x) &= \sum_{\sigma \in \Delta} g(\sigma, x)(x-1)^{d-\dim \sigma} \\ &= \sum_{F \text{ face of } P} \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \Delta \\ C(\sigma)=F}} g(\sigma, x)(x-1)^{\dim F - \dim \sigma} (x-1)^{d-\dim F} \\ &= \sum_{F \text{ face of } P} \gamma_{\Delta}(F, x)(x-1)^{d-\dim F} \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 7

$$\begin{aligned} h(\Delta, x) &= \sum_{F \text{ face of } P} g(F, x)(x-1)^{d-\dim F} \\ &= h(P, x). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 5 (3) gives  $g(\partial P) = h(P) = h(\Delta) = g(\partial \Delta)$ .

(2) Now suppose  $P$  is rational and the triangulation  $\Delta$  of  $P$  is not shallow. Then for some face  $G$  of  $P$ ,  $\deg \gamma_{\Delta}(G, x) > \deg g(G, x)$ . (This is equivalent to  $\gamma_{\Delta}(G, x) \neq g(G, x)$ .) For any face  $F$  of  $P$ , write  $r(F) = d - \dim F + \deg \gamma_{\Delta}(F, x)$ . Let  $r = \max\{r(F) : F \text{ is a face of } P \text{ with } \deg \gamma_{\Delta}(F, x) > \deg g(F, x)\}$ . The coefficient of  $x^r$  in  $h(\Delta, x) - h(P, x)$  is the coefficient of  $x^r$  in

$$\sum_{\substack{F \text{ face of } P \\ r(F) \leq r}} (\gamma_{\Delta}(F, x) - g(F, x))(x-1)^{d-\dim F}.$$

Thus the coefficient of  $x^r$  in  $h(\Delta, x) - h(P, x) \leq r$ . The coefficient of  $x^r$  in  $h(\Delta$

$$\sum_{\substack{F \text{ face of } P \\ r(F)=r}} (\gamma_{\Delta}(F, x) - g(F, x))$$

which is

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\substack{F \text{ face of } P \\ r(F)=r}} \text{coefficient of } x^{r-d} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{F \text{ face of } P \\ r(F)=r}} \text{coefficient of } x^r \\ &= \sum_{\substack{F \text{ face of } P \\ r(F)=r}} \text{leading coefficient of } \gamma_{\Delta}(F, x) - g(F, x) \end{aligned}$$

If  $P$  is rational, each term in the last sum is an integer. So the toric  $h$ -vector of  $\Delta$  does not equal

Note that this implies that if  $P$  is a rational polytope,  $P$  has a shallow triangulation if and only if  $h(\Delta) = h(P)$ . Also, the proof of (1) shows that if the face numbers of  $\Delta$  satisfy the shalowness condition, then  $h(\Delta)$  will agree with  $h(P)$ .

For a simplicial complex  $\Delta$  write  $h(\Delta, x) = \sum_{i=0}^d f_i(\Delta) x^i$ . A result of Stanley [Sta81] states that if  $\Delta$  is a triangulation of a polytope  $P$ ,  $g(\partial \Delta, x) = h(\Delta, x)$ . This gives

**COROLLARY 8:** If  $\Delta$  is a shallow triangulation of a polytope  $P$ ,

- (1)  $g_i(P) = \sum_{j=\lfloor d/2 \rfloor+1}^{d+1-i} (-1)^{d+1-i-j} \binom{d+1-i}{j}$
- (2)  $g_{\lfloor d/2 \rfloor}(P) = f_{\lfloor d/2 \rfloor}(\Delta \setminus \partial \Delta)$ ,
- (3)  $f_j(\Delta \setminus \partial \Delta) = \sum_{i=\lfloor d/2 \rfloor+1}^{j+1} \binom{d+1-i}{d-j}$ ,
- (4)  $f_{\lfloor d/2 \rfloor+1}(\Delta \setminus \partial \Delta) = \lfloor d/2 \rfloor g_{\lfloor d/2 \rfloor}(P)$ .

It would be valuable to extend this to a general polytope  $P$  in terms of face numbers of a



$$h(\Delta, 1/x) = x^{e+1} S_{\Delta}(F, 1/x)$$

$$= x^{e+1} \gamma_{\Delta}(F, 1/x)$$

division of a  $d$ -polytope  $P$ . Then  $\Delta$  is shallow

$$\gamma_{\Delta}(F, x) = g(F, x).$$

unique acceptable function with value 1 at  $\emptyset$   
 $\Delta = g$  if and only if  $\deg \gamma_{\Delta}(F, x) \leq \dim F/2$   
 and only if  $\dim C(\sigma) - \dim \sigma + \deg g(\sigma, x) \leq$

is a shallow subdivision of  $P$ . Since each  
 (possibly  $P$  itself),

$$d - \dim \sigma$$

$$g(\sigma, x)(x-1)^{\dim F - \dim \sigma} (x-1)^{d - \dim F}$$

$$(x-1)^{d - \dim F}$$

$$g(F, x)(x-1)^{d - \dim F}$$

f  $P$

$$h(P) = h(\Delta) = g(\partial \Delta).$$

the triangulation  $\Delta$  of  $P$  is not shallow.

$x > \deg g(G, x)$ . (This is equivalent to

$P$ , write  $r(F) = d - \dim F + \deg \gamma_{\Delta}(F, x)$ .

with  $\deg \gamma_{\Delta}(F, x) > \deg g(F, x)$ . The

the coefficient of  $x^s$  in

$$g(F, x)(x-1)^{d - \dim F}.$$

Thus the coefficient of  $x^s$  in  $h(\Delta, x) - h(P, x)$  is 0 if  $s > r$ . So  $\deg(h(\Delta, x) - h(P, x)) \leq r$ . The coefficient of  $x^r$  in  $h(\Delta, x) - h(P, x)$  is the coefficient of  $x^r$  in

$$\sum_{\substack{F \text{ face of } P \\ r(F)=r}} (\gamma_{\Delta}(F, x) - g(F, x))(x-1)^{d - \dim F},$$

which is

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{F \text{ face of } P \\ r(F)=r}} \text{coefficient of } x^{r-d+\dim F} \text{ in } \gamma_{\Delta}(F, x) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{F \text{ face of } P \\ r(F)=r}} \text{coefficient of } x^{\deg \gamma_{\Delta}(F, x)} \text{ in } \gamma_{\Delta}(F, x) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{F \text{ face of } P \\ r(F)=r}} \text{leading coefficient of } \gamma_{\Delta}(F, x). \end{aligned}$$

If  $P$  is rational, each term in the last sum is positive, so  $h(\Delta, x) - h(P, x) \neq 0$ . So the toric  $h$ -vector of  $\Delta$  does not equal the toric  $h$ -vector of  $P$ . ■

Note that this implies that if  $P$  is a rational, equidecomposable polytope, then  $P$  has a shallow triangulation if and only if all subdivisions of  $P$  are shallow. Also, the proof of (1) shows that if the faces of  $\Delta$  up to dimension  $k$  satisfy the shallowness condition, then  $h(\Delta)$  will agree with  $h(P)$  up to index  $\lfloor k/2 \rfloor + 1$ .

For a simplicial complex  $\Delta$  write  $h(\Delta \setminus \partial \Delta, x) = h(\Delta, x) - (x-1)h(\partial \Delta, x)$  and  $f_i(\Delta \setminus \partial \Delta) = f_i(\Delta) - f_i(\partial \Delta)$ . A result of [10] shows that for  $\Delta$  a shallow triangulation of a polytope  $P$ ,  $g(\partial \Delta, x) = h(\Delta \setminus \partial \Delta, x)$ . Combining with Theorem 4 this gives

COROLLARY 8: If  $\Delta$  is a shallow triangulation of a  $d$ -polytope  $P$ , then

$$(1) \quad g_i(P) = \sum_{j=\lfloor d/2 \rfloor + 1}^{d+1-i} (-1)^{d+1-i-j} \binom{d+1-j}{i} f_{j-1}(\Delta \setminus \partial \Delta) \text{ for } 0 \leq i \leq d/2,$$

$$(2) \quad g_{\lfloor d/2 \rfloor}(P) = f_{\lfloor d/2 \rfloor}(\Delta \setminus \partial \Delta),$$

$$(3) \quad f_j(\Delta \setminus \partial \Delta) = \sum_{i=\lfloor d/2 \rfloor + 1}^{j+1} \binom{d+1-i}{d-j} g_{d+1-i}(P) \text{ for } 0 \leq j \leq d,$$

$$(4) \quad f_{\lfloor d/2 \rfloor + 1}(\Delta \setminus \partial \Delta) = \lfloor d/2 \rfloor g_{\lfloor d/2 \rfloor}(P) + g_{\lfloor d/2 \rfloor - 1}(P).$$

It would be valuable to extend this to an interpretation of the  $g$ -vector of a polytope  $P$  in terms of face numbers of an arbitrary triangulation.

Wow!!!

#### 4. Weakly neighborly polytopes

A polytope  $P$  is **weakly neighborly** if and only if every set of  $k + 1$  vertices is contained in a face of dimension at most  $2k$ , for all  $k$ . Among the weakly neighborly polytopes are the *even-dimensional neighborly polytopes*, those  $2m$ -dimensional polytopes for which every set of at most  $m$  vertices is the vertex set of a face.

**PROPOSITION 9:** *A polytope is weakly neighborly if and only if all its triangulations are shallow.*

*Proof:* The forward implication is clear. The reverse implication follows from the observation that every affinely independent set of vertices of  $P$  is the vertex set of a face of some triangulation of  $P$ . ■

**COROLLARY 10:** *Every weakly neighborly polytope is equidecomposable.*

Note that by definition, weak neighborliness, unlike equidecomposability, is a combinatorial property.

The Hirsch conjecture states that for any  $d$ -polytope  $P$  with  $n$  facets, the edge-distance between any two vertices is at most  $n - d$  (see [5]).

**PROPOSITION 11:** *Weakly neighborly polytopes satisfy the Hirsch conjecture.*

*Proof:* We observe, more generally, that for two vertices  $x$  and  $y$  on a 2-face of any  $d$ -polytope with  $n$  facets, the distance,  $d(x, y)$ , between  $x$  and  $y$  is at most  $n - d$ . To see this, suppose  $x$  and  $y$  are on a 2-face  $F$  and  $F$  is an  $m$ -gon. Then clearly the distance between  $x$  and  $y$  is at most  $m/2$ . We estimate the number of facets  $n$  of the polytope  $P$ .  $F$  is the intersection of  $d - 2$  facets of  $P$ . Each edge on  $F$  is the intersection of these  $d - 2$  facets with an additional distinct facet. Thus  $P$  has at least  $d - 2 + m \geq d + \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$  facets. So  $d(x, y) \leq \lfloor m/2 \rfloor \leq n - d$ , as desired. ■

Although we are most interested in using shallow triangulations to study non-simplicial polytopes, we first look briefly at the simplicial case. A simplicial  $d$ -polytope is  **$k$ -stacked** if and only if  $P$  has a triangulation in which every  $(d - k - 1)$ -face is a face of  $P$  (see [10]).

**PROPOSITION 12:** *Let  $P$  be a simplicial  $d$ -polytope. Then  $P$  has a shallow triangulation if and only if  $P$  is  $\lfloor d/2 \rfloor$ -stacked.*

*Proof:*  $\Rightarrow$  Let  $\Delta$  be a shallow triangulation of  $P$ . If  $\dim \sigma < d/2$ , then the carrier of  $\sigma$  is some proper simplex, because  $P$  is simplicial, so every subset of  $\sigma$  is a face of  $P$ . Thus  $\sigma$  is a face of  $P$ . So every face of  $P$  is a face of  $\Delta$ , so  $P$  is  $\lfloor d/2 \rfloor$ -stacked.

$\Leftarrow$  Suppose the simplicial  $d$ -polytope  $P$  is  $\lfloor d/2 \rfloor$ -stacked. Let  $\Delta$  be a triangulation of  $P$  for which every face of dimension  $< \lfloor d/2 \rfloor$  is a face of  $P$ . Then  $\Delta$  is clearly shallow. ■

**PROPOSITION 13:** *A simplicial polytope is weakly neighborly if and only if it is a simplex or an even-dimensional neighborly polytope.*

*Proof:* Simplices and even-dimensional neighborly polytopes are weakly neighborly. Now suppose  $P$  is a simplicial weakly neighborly polytope. Every set of  $m = \lfloor (d + 1)/2 \rfloor$  vertices of  $P$  is contained in a face of  $P$ , so any set of  $m$  vertices of  $P$  is the vertex set of a simplex. Thus  $P$  is  $m$ -neighborly. If  $d$  is even, this implies  $P$  is an even-dimensional neighborly polytope. If  $d$  is odd, it implies  $P$  is a simplex. ■

Among nonsimplicial polytopes there are two classes of weakly neighborly polytopes. The first of these is the class of Lave polytopes. A Lave polytope is a polytope with an even number of facets and a unimodular (normalized) Gale transform. Equivalently, there is a set  $\{u_1, \dots, u_n, v_1, \dots, v_n\}$  such that the convex hull of any  $n$  vertices is a face. The flag vector of a Lave polytope is the flag vector of the underlying matroid. It is open whether this characterizes Lave polytopes. We shall return to this question in a future paper.

Another example of weakly neighborly polytopes is the product of two simplices (of any dimension). [3] showed that these polytopes are equidecomposable with regular triangulations of the product  $T^m \times T^n$  and computed the  $h$ -vector of such a triangulation. The  $h$ -vector of the product of two simplices is  $g_k(T^m \times T^n) = \binom{m}{k}$ .

Which operations on polytopes preserve weak neighborliness?

**PROPOSITION 14:** *Let  $Q$  be a weakly neighborly polytope.*

(1) *The pyramid  $PQ$  over  $Q$  is weakly neighborly.*

neighborly if and only if all its triangu-

every polytope is equidecomposable.

orliness, unlike equidecomposability, is a

polytopes satisfy the Hirsch conjecture.

that for two vertices  $x$  and  $y$  on a 2-face of  $P$ , the distance,  $d(x, y)$ , between  $x$  and  $y$  is at most  $m/2$  if  $x$  and  $y$  are on a 2-face  $F$  and  $F$  is an  $m$ -gon. Then  $d(x, y) \leq m/2$ . We estimate the number of intersections of  $d - 2$  facets of  $P$ . Each edge is on at most 2 facets with an additional distinct facet. So  $d(x, y) \leq \lfloor m/2 \rfloor \leq n - d$ .

using shallow triangulations to study non-  
 chiefly at the simplicial case. A simplicial  
 if  $P$  has a triangulation in which every  
 )),).

licial  $d$ -polytope. Then  $P$  has a shallow  $d$ -stacked.

⇐ Suppose the simplicial  $d$ -polytope  $P$  is  $\lfloor d/2 \rfloor$ -stacked. Then  $P$  has a triangulation  $\Delta$  for which every face of dimension less than  $d/2$  is a face of  $P$ . The triangulation  $\Delta$  is clearly shallow. ■

PROPOSITION 13: A simplicial polytope is weakly neighborly if and only if it is a simplex or an even-dimensional neighborly polytope.

*Proof:* Simplices and even-dimensional neighborly polytopes are clearly weakly neighborly. Now suppose  $P$  is a simplicial weakly neighborly  $d$ -polytope. Then every set of  $m = \lfloor (d+1)/2 \rfloor$  vertices of  $P$  is contained in a facet. The facets are all simplices, so any set of  $m$  vertices of  $P$  is the vertex set of an  $(m-1)$ -face of  $P$ . Thus  $P$  is  $m$ -neighborly. If  $d$  is even, this says that  $P$  is neighborly; if  $d$  is odd, it implies  $P$  is a simplex. ■

Among nonsimplicial polytopes there are two classes known to be weakly neighborly. The first of these is the class of Lawrence polytopes [2]. A Lawrence polytope is a polytope with an even number of vertices and a centrally symmetric (normalized) Gale transform. Equivalently, it is a polytope with vertex set  $\{u_1, \dots, u_n, v_1, \dots, v_n\}$  such that the complement of each pair  $\{u_i, v_i\}$  is the vertex set of a face. The flag vector of a Lawrence polytope depends only on the underlying matroid. It is open whether this is true for all weakly neighborly polytopes. We shall return to this question in the next section.

Another example of weakly neighborly polytopes is given by the Cartesian product of two simplices (of any dimension). Billera, Cushman and Sanders [3] showed that these polytopes are equidecomposable. They described certain regular triangulations of the product  $T^m \times T^n$  of an  $n$ -simplex and an  $m$ -simplex, and computed the  $h$ -vector of such a triangulation. This gives the  $g$ -vector of the product of two simplices:  $g_k(T^m \times T^n) = \binom{m}{k} \binom{n}{k}$  for  $0 \leq k \leq (m+n)/2$ .

### Which operations on polytopes preserve weak neighborliness?

PROPOSITION 14: *Let  $Q$  be a weakly neighborly polytope. Then*

(1) The pyramid  $PQ$  over  $Q$  is weakly neighborly.

- (2) Any subpolytope (that is, the convex hull of any subset of the vertices of  $Q$ ) is weakly neighborly. In particular, any face of  $Q$  is weakly neighborly.

*Proof:* (1) Let  $S$  be a set of  $k+1$  vertices of  $PQ$ . If  $S$  is contained in the vertex set of  $Q$ , then  $S$  is contained in a face of  $Q$  of dimension at most  $2k$ . This face is also a face of  $PQ$ . Now suppose  $S$  contains the pyramiding vertex  $v$  of  $PQ$ . Then  $S \setminus \{v\}$  is a set of  $k$  vertices of  $Q$ , and hence is contained in a face  $F$  of  $Q$  of dimension at most  $2k-2$ . Then  $S$  is contained in the pyramid over  $F$ , a face of  $PQ$  of dimension at most  $2k-1$ .

(2) Let  $P$  be a subpolytope of  $Q$ , and let  $S$  be a set of  $k+1$  vertices of  $P$ . Then  $S$  is contained in a face  $F$  of  $Q$  of dimension at most  $2k$ . Now let  $G = F \cap P$ ;  $G$  is a face of  $P$  containing  $S$  and of dimension at most  $2k$ . ■

This section closes with the characterization of weakly neighborly 3-polytopes.

**THEOREM 15:** *The only weakly neighborly 3-polytopes are the prism over a triangle and the pyramids over 2-polytopes.*

*Proof:* Suppose  $P$  is a weakly neighborly 3-polytope, and hence is equidecomposable. Then every set of five vertices, being dependent, contains a circuit of size four. The affine span of these four vertices is 2-dimensional; its intersection with  $P$  is a quadrilateral. The endpoints of a diagonal of this quadrilateral must be in a 2-face, so the four vertices are in a 2-face. Thus, if  $P$  is a weakly neighborly 3-polytope, then every five vertices contain four that are contained in a face of  $P$ .

Recall that the only simplicial weakly neighborly 3-polytope is a simplex (which is a pyramid over a triangle). Suppose now that  $P$  has a face with  $k \geq 6$  vertices,  $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k$  in cyclic order. If  $P$  has only one other vertex, then  $P$  is a pyramid over a  $k$ -gon. If  $P$  has at least two other vertices,  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ , then  $\{u_1, u_3, u_5, v_1, v_2\}$  does not contain four vertices in a 2-face. This contradicts the weak neighborliness of  $P$ .

So let  $k$  be the maximum number of vertices of a face of  $P$ ,  $k = 4$  or  $k = 5$ . Let  $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k$  be the vertices of the face  $F_1$  of  $P$ . If  $P$  has only one other vertex, then  $P$  is a pyramid over a  $k$ -gon. Otherwise, let  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  be two other vertices of  $P$ . Then  $\{u_1, u_2, u_3, v_1, v_2\}$  contains four vertices in a 2-face. This 2-face  $F_2$  cannot contain both  $u_1$  and  $u_3$ , so without loss of generality say the four vertices are  $u_1, u_2, v_1$ , and  $v_2$ . Let  $w_1$  (respectively,  $w_2$ ) be the vertex of  $F_2$  other than  $u_2$  (respectively, other than  $u_1$ ) adjacent to  $u_1$  (respectively,  $u_2$ ). See Figure 1.




Figure 1: Two 2-faces of a polytope.

Now suppose  $P$  has another vertex  $v$ . Then  $\{u_1, u_2, u_k, w_2, w_3\}$ . Neither of the pairs  $\{u_1, u_2, u_k, w_2\}$  and  $\{u_1, u_2, u_k, w_3\}$  contains four of these. So there is no 2-face.

So all vertices of  $P$  are in  $F_1 \cup F_2$ . If  $P$  has more than two vertices in a 2-face, and neither of the pairs  $\{u_1, u_2, u_k, w_2\}$  and  $\{u_1, u_2, u_k, w_3\}$  contains four of these. So there is no 2-face,  $\{u_3, u_k, w_1, w_2\}$  must be in a 2-face. Then  $\{u_3, u_4, w_1, w_2\}$  must be in a 2-face, so  $k = 4$ . Then  $\{u_3, u_4, w_1, w_2\}$  must be in a 2-face. Thus  $P$  has vertex set  $\{u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4, w_1, w_2\}$ . Then  $P$  has vertex set  $\{u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4, w_1, w_2\}$ ,  $\{u_1, u_2, w_1, w_2\}$ , and  $\{u_3, u_4, w_1, w_2\}$ . Thus  $P$  is a triangle. ■

## 5. Weakly neighborly polytopes with $d+2$ vertices

### 5.1 DESCRIPTION OF THE GALE TRANSFORM

transforms to study weakly neighborly polytopes. First consider the case of  $d$ -polytopes with  $d+2$  vertices. The Gale transform of a set of  $d+2$  points consists of  $d+2$  points distributed between two sets. The induced triangulation of the two sets, then the induced triangulation of a strictly smaller set, then the induced triangulation of all polytopes with  $d+2$  vertices have shallow faces. The faces of the polytope are shallow if and only if the faces of the Gale transform are the same size; in this case the Gale transform is a simplex. We conclude:

convex hull of any subset of the vertices  
particular, any face of  $Q$  is weakly neighborly.

ices of  $PQ$ . If  $S$  is contained in the vertex  
of  $Q$  of dimension at most  $2k$ . This face  
contains the pyramiding vertex  $v$  of  $PQ$ .  
 $Q$ , and hence is contained in a face  $F$  of  $Q$ .  
is contained in the pyramid over  $F$ , a face

and let  $S$  be a set of  $k+1$  vertices of  $P$ . Then  
dimension at most  $2k$ . Now let  $G = F \cap P$ ;  $G$   
dimension at most  $2k$ . ■

erization of weakly neighborly 3-polytopes.

ghborly 3-polytopes are the prism over a  
topes.

borly 3-polytope, and hence is equidecom-  
es, being dependent, contains a circuit of  
r vertices is 2-dimensional; its intersection  
nts of a diagonal of this quadrilateral must  
in a 2-face. Thus, if  $P$  is a weakly neigh-  
ices contain four that are contained in a

y neighborly 3-polytope is a simplex (which  
ose now that  $P$  has a face with  $k \geq 6$   
. If  $P$  has only one other vertex, then  $P$   
at least two other vertices,  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ , then  
ar vertices in a 2-face. This contradicts the

vertices of a face of  $P$ ,  $k = 4$  or  $k = 5$ . Let  
ce  $F_1$  of  $P$ . If  $P$  has only one other vertex,  
erwise, let  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  be two other vertices  
as four vertices in a 2-face. This 2-face  $F_2$   
hout loss of generality say the four vertices  
ctively,  $w_2$ ) be the vertex of  $F_2$  other than  
ent to  $u_1$  (respectively,  $u_2$ ). See Figure 1.




Figure 1: Two 2-faces of a weakly neighborly polytope

Now suppose  $P$  has another vertex  $w_3$ , not in  $F_1$  or  $F_2$ . Consider the set  $\{u_1, u_2, u_k, w_2, w_3\}$ . Neither of the pairs  $\{u_2, u_k\}$  and  $\{u_1, w_2\}$  can be in a 2-face containing four of these. So there is no set of four of the vertices contained in a 2-face.

So all vertices of  $P$  are in  $F_1 \cup F_2$ . Since  $\{u_2, u_3, u_k, w_1, w_2\}$  contains four vertices in a 2-face, and neither of the pairs  $\{u_2, u_k\}$  and  $\{u_2, w_1\}$  can be in such a 2-face,  $\{u_3, u_k, w_1, w_2\}$  must be in a 2-face. Such a 2-face cannot contain both  $u_3$  and  $u_5$ , so  $k = 4$ . Then  $\{u_3, u_4, w_1, w_2\}$  is the set of vertices of a 2-face. Thus  $P$  has vertex set  $\{u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4, w_1, w_2\}$  and three of the 2-faces of  $P$  are  $\{u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4\}$ ,  $\{u_1, u_2, w_1, w_2\}$ , and  $\{u_3, u_4, w_1, w_2\}$ . Clearly  $P$  is a prism over a triangle. ■

## 5. Weakly neighborly polytopes with few vertices

**5.1 DESCRIPTION OF THE GALE TRANSFORMS.** In this section we use Gale transforms to study weakly neighborly  $d$ -polytopes with at most  $d+3$  vertices. First consider the case of  $d$ -polytopes with  $d+2$  vertices. The Gale transform consists of  $d+2$  points distributed between  $+1$  and  $-1$ . A Gale triangulation is induced by adding one more point. If the new point has the sign of the larger of the two sets, then the induced triangulation is shallow. If the new point has the sign of a strictly smaller set, then the induced triangulation is not shallow. Thus all polytopes with  $d+2$  vertices have shallow triangulations. All triangulations of the polytope are shallow if and only if the two sets of its Gale transform are the same size; in this case the Gale transform is centrally symmetric. Thus we conclude:

PROPOSITION 16: Let  $P$  be a  $d$ -polytope with  $d+2$  vertices. Then the following are equivalent.

- (1)  $P$  is equidecomposable.
- (2)  $P$  is weakly neighborly.
- (3)  $P$  is an  $r$ -fold pyramid over a Lawrence polytope, for some  $r \geq 0$ .
- (4)  $P$  is an  $r$ -fold pyramid over an even-dimensional cyclic polytope, for some  $r \geq 0$ .

We can also characterize the Gale transforms of weakly neighborly  $d$ -polytopes with  $d+3$  vertices. First we consider equidecomposable polytopes. Recall that the condition that all circuits are balanced is equivalent, in the Gale transform, to every spanned linear hyperplane bounds two open half-spaces with the same number of points (counting multiplicity).

THEOREM 17: Let  $P$  be a  $d$ -polytope with  $d+3$  vertices. Then  $P$  is equidecomposable if and only if  $P$  is an  $r$ -fold pyramid ( $r \geq 0$ ) over a polytope whose Gale transform satisfies

- (1) there exists a nonnegative integer  $c$  such that each diameter of the Gale transform has exactly  $c$  more points on one end than on the other; and
- (2) if  $c \neq 0$ , then the number of diameters is odd, and in the cyclic order the diameter ends alternate between having more points and having fewer points.

Proof:  $\Rightarrow$  Suppose  $P$  is an equidecomposable  $d$ -polytope with  $d+3$  vertices. Since a pyramid is equidecomposable if and only if its base is, we may assume  $P$  is not a pyramid. The normalized Gale transform of  $P$  is a circle with numbers of points at the ends of the  $k$  diameters,  $a_1^+, a_2^+, \dots, a_k^+, a_1^-, a_2^-, \dots, a_k^-$ .  $P$  being equidecomposable means that for every  $j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq k$ ,

$$(4) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} a_i^+ + \sum_{i=j+1}^k a_i^- = \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} a_i^- + \sum_{i=j+1}^k a_i^+.$$

For  $1 \leq j \leq k-1$ , subtract Equation 4 for  $j+1$  from Equation 4 for  $j$ . Then for  $1 \leq j \leq k-1$ ,  $a_{j+1}^+ - a_j^- = a_{j+1}^- - a_j^+$ , or  $a_{j+1}^+ - a_{j+1}^- = a_j^- - a_j^+$ . Letting  $c = |a_1^+ - a_1^-|$ , we get condition 1, and we see that if  $c \neq 0$ , the excess must alternate between positive and negative. Now observe that Equation 4 for  $j=1$  says  $\sum_{i=2}^k (a_i^+ - a_i^-) = 0$ . If  $k$  is even, the sum on the left can be 0 only if  $c = 0$ .

$\Leftarrow$  Now suppose conditions 1 and 2 are satisfied. For every  $i$ ,  $a_i^- = a_i^+ + (-1)^i c$ . It is easy to see that for every  $j$ , so  $P$  is equidecomposable. ■

For an equidecomposable polytope  $P$ ,  $c$  is the **sign difference** of  $P$ .

THEOREM 18: Let  $P$  be a  $d$ -polytope with  $d+3$  vertices. Then  $P$  is weakly neighborly if and only if  $P$  is equidecomposable or 1.

Proof: The theorem follows easily from the fact that  $P$  is weakly neighborly if and only if the Gale transform  $D$  of  $P$  as described in Theorem 17 is weakly neighborly.

$\Rightarrow$  Suppose  $P$  is weakly neighborly with  $d+3$  vertices. Without loss of generality that  $a_1^+ - a_1^- = c$ , so  $a_j^- = a_j^+ + (-1)^j c$ . The set of  $\sum_{i=1}^k a_i^-$  points on the half-open set  $[0, 1)$  is a proper face of  $P$ . Now

$$\begin{aligned} 2|S| - 2 &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^k a_i^- - 2 \sum_{i=1}^k a_i^+ \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k a_i^- + \sum_{i=1}^k a_i^- - \sum_{i=1}^k a_i^+ - \sum_{i=1}^k a_i^+ \\ &= d+3 - c - (d+3) = -c. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $P$  is weakly neighborly,  $2|S| - 2 \geq 0$ .

$\Leftarrow$  Assume  $P$  is an equidecomposable polytope with  $d+3$  vertices or  $c = 1$ . Note that  $P$  has (possibly) two  $(d-1)$ -dimensional faces which are two-dimensional in the Gale transform. Both types of facet are weakly neighborly. If  $S$  is contained in a facet of  $P$ , then  $S$  is contained in a face of  $P$  of dimension  $d-1$ . But this face is also a face of  $P$ , so  $S$  is contained in a face of  $P$  of its dimension. If  $S$  is not contained in a facet of  $P$ , then  $S$  contains  $\{a_1^+, a_2^+, \dots, a_j^+, a_{j+1}^-, \dots, a_k^-\}$ .

be with  $d+2$  vertices. Then the following

reference polytope, for some  $r \geq 0$ .

$n$ -dimensional cyclic polytope, for some

transforms of weakly neighborly  $d$ -polytopes  
equidecomposable polytopes. Recall that  
ced is equivalent, in the Gale transform,  
ends two open half-spaces with the same  
).

with  $d+3$  vertices. Then  $P$  is equide-  
pyramid ( $r \geq 0$ ) over a polytope whose

$r$  such that each diameter of the Gale  
ts on one end than on the other; and  
ameters is odd, and in the cyclic order  
en having more points and having fewer

composable  $d$ -polytope with  $d+3$  vertices.  
and only if its base is, we may assume  $P$   
transform of  $P$  is a circle with numbers  
,  $a_1^+, a_2^+, \dots, a_k^+, a_1^-, a_2^-, \dots, a_k^-$ .  $P$  being  
 $j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq k$ ,

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} a_i^- + \sum_{i=j+1}^k a_i^+.$$

4 for  $j+1$  from Equation 4 for  $j$ . Then  
 $a_j^+$ , or  $a_{j+1}^+ - a_{j+1}^- = a_j^- - a_j^+$ . Letting  
l we see that if  $c \neq 0$ , the excess must  
. Now observe that Equation 4 for  $j=1$   
the sum on the left can be 0 only if  $c=0$ .

$\Leftarrow$  Now suppose conditions 1 and 2 are satisfied. Thus we may assume for every  $i$ ,  $a_i^- = a_i^+ + (-1)^i c$ . It is easy to check that Equation 4 is satisfied for every  $j$ , so  $P$  is equidecomposable. ■

For an equidecomposable polytope  $P$ , call the constant  $c$  given by Theorem 17 the **sign difference** of  $P$ .

**THEOREM 18:** Let  $P$  be a  $d$ -polytope with  $d+3$  vertices. Then  $P$  is weakly neighborly if and only if  $P$  is equidecomposable and the sign difference of  $P$  is 0 or 1.

*Proof:* The theorem follows easily from the case where  $P$  is not a pyramid. So suppose  $P$  is a  $d$ -polytope with  $d+3$  vertices that is not a pyramid. Consider the Gale transform  $D$  of  $P$  as described in the proof of Theorem 17.

$\Rightarrow$  Suppose  $P$  is weakly neighborly with sign difference  $c$ . Suppose without loss of generality that  $a_1^+ - a_1^- = c$ , so  $a_j^- = a_j^+ + (-1)^j c$  for all  $j$ . Let  $\bar{S}$  be the set of  $\sum_{i=1}^k a_i^-$  points on the half-open semicircle of  $D$ . Then  $S$  is contained in no proper face of  $P$ . Now

$$\begin{aligned} 2|S| - 2 &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^k a_i^- - 2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k a_i^- + \sum_{i=1}^k (a_i^- - (-1)^i c) - c - 2 \\ &= d + 3 - c - 2 = d + 1 - c \end{aligned}$$

Since  $P$  is weakly neighborly,  $2|S| - 2 \geq d$ , so  $c \leq 1$ .

$\Leftarrow$  Assume  $P$  is an equidecomposable nonpyramid with sign difference  $c = 0$  or  $c = 1$ . Note that  $P$  has (possibly) two kinds of facets: simplices (whose cofacets are two-dimensional in the Gale transform), and equidecomposable  $(d-1)$ -polytopes with  $d+1$  vertices (whose cofacets are located on one diagonal). Both types of facet are weakly neighborly polytopes. Suppose  $S$  is a set of vertices of  $P$ . If  $S$  is contained in a facet, then because the facet is weakly neighborly,  $S$  is contained in a face of the facet of at most twice its dimension. But this face is also a face of  $P$ , so  $S$  is contained in a face of  $P$  of at most twice its dimension. If  $S$  is not contained in a facet, then there exists  $j$  such that  $\bar{S}$  contains  $\{a_1^+, a_2^+, \dots, a_j^+, a_{j+1}^-, \dots, a_k^-\}$ . So

$$\begin{aligned}
2|S| - 2 &\geq 2 \sum_{i=1}^j a_i^+ + 2 \sum_{i=j+1}^k a_i^- - 2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^j a_i^+ + \sum_{i=1}^j (a_i^+ + (-1)^i c) - \sum_{i=1}^j (-1)^i c \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=j+1}^k a_i^- + \sum_{i=j+1}^k (a_i^- - (-1)^i c) + \sum_{i=j+1}^k (-1)^i c - 2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^k a_i^+ + \sum_{i=1}^k a_i^- + \sum_{i=2}^k (-1)^i c - (-1)^j c - 2 \\
&= d + 3 - (-1)^j c - 2 = d + 1 - (-1)^j c \\
&\geq d + 1 - c \geq d.
\end{aligned}$$

So  $S$  is contained in a face of dimension at most twice the dimension of  $S$ . Thus  $P$  is weakly neighborly. ■

**5.2 SHELLINGS AND  $h$ -VECTORS.** The  $h$ -vectors of weakly neighborly  $d$ -polytopes with  $d+2$  vertices are the vectors of the form  $(1, 2, 3, \dots, k, k, \dots, k, k-1, \dots, 3, 2, 1)$  (here  $k = 1/2(d-r+2)$  if  $P$  is an  $r$ -fold pyramid). This is the entire set of possible  $h$ -vectors for  $d$ -polytopes with  $d+2$  vertices. We shall see that this fails for  $d$ -polytopes with  $d+3$  vertices: not all  $h$ -vectors of  $d$ -polytopes with  $d+3$  vertices are  $h$ -vectors of weakly neighborly polytopes.

It is well known that the  $h$ -vector of a shellable simplicial complex can be calculated from an explicit shelling. Lee [8] used this to compute the  $h$ -vector of a simplicial polytope from its Gale diagram. We apply this technique to weakly neighborly polytopes.

A **shelling** of a pure simplicial  $d$ -complex  $\Delta$  is an ordering  $F_1, F_2, \dots, F_m$  of its facets so that for each  $j$ ,  $2 \leq j \leq m$ ,  $F_j \cap (\cup_{i < j} F_i)$  is a pure  $(d-1)$ -dimensional subcomplex of  $F_j$ . If  $F_1, F_2, \dots, F_m$  is a shelling of  $\Delta$ , then  $h_k(\Delta)$  is the number of  $j$  such that  $k$  is the cardinality of the minimal face of  $F_j$  not contained in any previous  $F_i$  [9].

Suppose a  $d$ -polytope  $P$  with  $d+3$  vertices has a (normalized) Gale transform  $D$ . We say a ray  $r$  from 0 is in **general position** with respect to  $D$  if  $-r$  contains no point of  $D$  and  $r$  does not meet the intersection of any two diagonals of  $D$  (a diagonal of  $D$  is a line segment connecting two points of  $D$ ). The pairs  $\{\bar{x}, \bar{y}\}$

of points of  $D$  such that the open ray  $r$   $\text{conv}\{\bar{x}, \bar{y}\}$  are the cofaces of the maximum. (This is the Gale triangulation induced by  $r$ .)

We describe a shelling order for  $\Delta$  (the triangulation of  $P$  induced by  $r$ ). First, an ordering of the points of  $D$  of affine independence is assumed). First, order the points of  $D$  by their location. Now order the diagonals of  $D$  by their distance from 0 along  $r$ . Let  $\bar{X}_i^+$  and  $\bar{X}_i^-$  be the two cofaces of the diagonal  $\bar{x}_i \bar{y}_i$ . Order the pairs in  $\bar{X}_i^+ \times \bar{X}_i^-$  by their distance from 0 along  $r$ . This gives an ordering of all pairs  $\{\bar{x}, \bar{y}\}$  whose convex hull intersects  $r \setminus \{0\}$ . It is straightforward to check that it gives a shelling order for  $\Delta$ .

Say that a point  $\bar{v}$  is **weakly separated** from 0 by a ray  $r$  if  $\bar{v}$  is in the open half-space bounded by the line  $\text{aff}\{0, \bar{v}\}$  and  $\bar{v}$  is not in the same set  $\bar{X}_i^+ \cup \bar{X}_i^-$  as  $\bar{x}$  and  $\bar{y}$  and occurs after  $\bar{x}_i \bar{y}_i$  in the ordering of  $\bar{X}_i^\pm$ . If  $F$  is a facet of  $\Delta$  with coface  $\bar{x}_i \bar{y}_i$ , then  $F$  is contained in a previous facet of the shelling if  $\bar{v}$  is weakly separated from 0 by  $\{\bar{x}, \bar{y}\}$  whose convex hull intersects  $r \setminus \{0\}$ . Applying Theorem 4 gives

**PROPOSITION 19:** Let  $P$  be a  $d$ -polytope with  $d+3$  vertices. Let  $r$  be a ray from 0 in general position with respect to  $D$ . Let  $\Delta$  be the triangulation of  $P$  induced by  $r$ . Let  $i$  be the number of pairs  $\{\bar{x}, \bar{y}\}$  whose convex hull intersects  $r \setminus \{0\}$  and separates exactly  $i$  points from 0.

For a weakly neighborly polytope this implies that the Gale transform separates more than  $d/2$  points from 0.

For Lawrence polytopes the flag vector depends only on the underlying matroid, not on the oriented matroid. The next theorem shows that equidecomposable and weakly neighborly polytopes have the same flag vector.

**THEOREM 20:** If  $P$  and  $Q$  are equidecomposable  $d$ -polytopes having the same matroid, then  $P$  and  $Q$  have the same  $f$ -vector. If  $P$  and  $Q$  are weakly neighborly  $d$ -polytopes having the same matroid, then  $P$  and  $Q$  have the same  $h$ -vector.

**Proof:** For equidecomposable polytopes



$$a_i^- - 2$$

$$-(-1)^i c - \sum_{i=1}^j (-1)^i c$$

$$\sum_{j+1}^k (a_i^- - (-1)^i c) + \sum_{i=j+1}^k (-1)^i c - 2$$

$$\sum_{i=2}^k (-1)^i c - (-1)^j c - 2$$

$$2 = d + 1 - (-1)^j c$$

on at most twice the dimension of  $S$ . Thus

the  $h$ -vectors of weakly neighborly  $d$ -polytopes of the form  $(1, 2, 3, \dots, k, k, \dots, k, k - 1)$  if  $P$  is an  $r$ -fold pyramid). This is the case for polytopes with  $d + 2$  vertices. We shall see that for polytopes with  $d + 3$  vertices: not all  $h$ -vectors of  $d$ -polytopes are weakly neighborly polytopes.

of a shellable simplicial complex can be seen [8] used this to compute the  $h$ -vector of a diagram. We apply this technique to weakly

complex  $\Delta$  is an ordering  $F_1, F_2, \dots, F_m$  of the faces of  $\Delta$  such that  $F_j \cap (\cup_{i < j} F_i)$  is a pure  $(d-1)$ -dimensional face of  $F_j$ . If  $\Delta$  is a shelling of  $\Delta$ , then  $h_k(\Delta)$  is the number of minimal faces of  $F_j$  not contained in any

vertices has a (normalized) Gale transform of  $P$  in general position with respect to  $D$  if  $-r$  contains the intersection of any two diagonals of  $D$  (a line segment connecting two points of  $D$ ). The pairs  $\{\bar{x}, \bar{y}\}$

of points of  $D$  such that the open ray  $r \setminus \{0\}$  intersects the relative interior of  $\text{conv}\{\bar{x}, \bar{y}\}$  are the cofaces of the maximal simplices of a triangulation  $\Delta$  of  $P$ . (This is the Gale triangulation induced by a point  $\bar{z}$  on  $-r \setminus \{0\}$ .)

We describe a shelling order for  $\Delta$  (this follows [7], where a certain degree of affine independence is assumed). First choose an ordering of the points at each point location. Now order the diagonals in order of decreasing distance from 0 along  $r$ . Let  $\bar{X}_i^+$  and  $\bar{X}_i^-$  be the points at the two ends of the  $i$ th diagonal. Order the pairs in  $\bar{X}_i^+ \times \bar{X}_i^-$  consistently with the orderings of  $\bar{X}_i^\pm$ . This gives an ordering of all pairs  $\{\bar{x}, \bar{y}\}$  whose convex hulls intersect  $r \setminus \{0\}$ . It is straightforward to check that it gives a shelling of  $\Delta$ .

Say that a point  $\bar{v}$  is **weakly separated** from 0 by  $\{\bar{x}, \bar{y}\}$  if either  $\bar{v}$  is in the open half-space bounded by the line  $\text{aff}\{\bar{x}, \bar{y}\}$  not containing 0, or  $\bar{v}$  is in the same set  $\bar{X}_i^+ \cup \bar{X}_i^-$  as  $\bar{x}$  and  $\bar{y}$  and occurs before  $\bar{x}$  or  $\bar{y}$  in the chosen orderings of  $\bar{X}_i^\pm$ . If  $F$  is a facet of  $\Delta$  with coface  $\{\bar{x}, \bar{y}\}$  then the minimal face of  $F$  not contained in a previous facet of the shelling is spanned by the vertices  $v$  such that  $\bar{v}$  is weakly separated from 0 by  $\{\bar{x}, \bar{y}\}$ . Thus  $h_i(\Delta)$  is the number of pairs  $\{\bar{x}, \bar{y}\}$  whose convex hull intersects  $r \setminus \{0\}$  and which weakly separate exactly  $i$  points from 0. Applying Theorem 4 gives the following.

**PROPOSITION 19:** *Let  $P$  be a  $d$ -polytope with  $d + 3$  vertices; let  $D$  be a Gale transform of  $P$ ; let  $r$  be a ray from 0 in general position with respect to  $D$ ; and let  $\Delta$  be the triangulation of  $P$  induced by  $r$ . If  $\Delta$  is shallow, then  $g_i(P)$  is the number of pairs  $\{\bar{x}, \bar{y}\}$  whose convex hull intersects  $r \setminus \{0\}$  and which weakly separate exactly  $i$  points from 0.*

For a weakly neighborly polytope this implies that no diagonal of a Gale transform separates more than  $d/2$  points from 0.

For Lawrence polytopes the flag vector (and hence,  $f$ -vector and  $h$ -vector) depends only on the underlying matroid (the affine matroid on the vertices), not on the oriented matroid. The next theorem gives a partial extension to equidecomposable and weakly neighborly polytopes.

**THEOREM 20:** *If  $P$  and  $Q$  are equidecomposable polytopes with at most  $d + 3$  vertices having the same matroid, then all triangulations of  $P$  and  $Q$  have the same  $f$ -vector. If  $P$  and  $Q$  are weakly neighborly polytopes with at most  $d + 3$  vertices having the same matroid, then  $h(\partial P) = h(\partial Q)$ .*

**Proof:** For equidecomposable polytopes with at most  $d + 2$  vertices, the ma-

roid determines the combinatorial type of the polytope. Now suppose  $P$  is an equidecomposable  $d$ -polytope with  $d + 3$  vertices, and let  $D_P$  be a normalized Gale transform for  $P$ . Let  $Q$  be a polytope with normalized Gale transform  $D_Q$  differing from  $D_P$  in that two diameters are exchanged (and flipped to preserve equivariance).

Consider a ray  $r$  from the origin in general position, and the induced triangulations  $\Delta_P$  and  $\Delta_Q$  of  $P$  and  $Q$ , respectively. A straightforward calculation shows that the diagonals crossed by  $r$  in the two Gale transforms make the same contribution to the  $h$ -vectors of  $\Delta_P$  and  $\Delta_Q$ .

Since  $P$  and  $Q$  are equidecomposable, all triangulations of the two polytopes have the same  $h$ -vector. The  $h$ -vector of a simplicial complex determines its  $f$ -vector, so the first statement of the theorem is proved. Finally, for weakly neighborly polytopes, the  $h$ -vector of a triangulation determines the  $h$ -vector of the boundary of the polytope, so the second statement holds. ■

**CONJECTURE 21:** *The flag vector and  $h$ -vector of (the boundary of) a weakly neighborly  $d$ -polytope depend only on the underlying matroid.*

By examining Gale transforms of 6-polytopes with nine vertices it can be shown that there is no equidecomposable polytope with  $h$ -vector  $(1, 3, 4, 5, 4, 3, 1)$ . Thus not all  $h$ -vectors of  $d$ -polytopes with  $d + 3$  vertices can be realized by equidecomposable or weakly neighborly polytopes.

## 6. Further problems

Analogues of Theorems 17 and 18 hold only for "generic"  $d$ -polytopes with  $d + 4$  vertices. Here we call a polytope generic if the distinct diameters of its Gale transform are in general position, while any number of points may occur on each diameter. An equidecomposable generic  $d$ -polytope with  $d + 4$  vertices has a Gale transform satisfying

- (1) there exists a nonnegative integer  $c$  such that each diameter of the Gale transform has exactly  $c$  more points at one end than at the other; and
- (2) if  $c \neq 0$ , then the number of diameters is even.

Furthermore, a generic equidecomposable  $d$ -polytope with  $d + 4$  vertices is weakly neighborly if and only if this sign difference  $c$  is 0 or 1.

Finally we mention some open questions for weakly neighborly polytopes of any dimension and any number of vertices.

1. Are all weakly neighborly polytopes if its face lattice uniquely determines it?
2. Can a proper subdivision (with no new vertices) be weakly neighborly?
3. Does every even-dimensional weakly neighborly polytope have a triangulation minimal among polytopes with the same  $h$ -vector?

The interpretation of the  $h$ -vector for non-generic polytopes suggests further progress on facial enumeration questions. The study of weakly neighborly polytopes will suggest interesting problems.

## References

- [1] Margaret M. Bayer and Andrew Klapper, *Computational Geometry* **6** (1991), 33–44.
- [2] Margaret M. Bayer and Bernd Sturmfels, *Adv. Math.* **42** (1990), 62–79.
- [3] L. J. Billera, R. Cushman and J. A. Saito, *Harmonic oscillator*, Proc. Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen Ser A **91** (1988), 375–393.
- [4] Branko Grünbaum, *Convex Polytopes*, Interscience Publishers, New York, 1967.
- [5] Victor Klee and Peter Kleinschmidt, *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* **12** (1987), 718–755.
- [6] Victor Klee and Peter Kleinschmidt, *Combinatorics*, (Martin J. Heule, eds.), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1991.
- [7] Carl W. Lee, *Regular triangulations of convex polytopes*, in *Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science*, Mathematical Society, Providence, 1991, pp. 44–55.
- [8] Carl W. Lee, *Winding numbers and the geometry of polytopes*, Volume 6 of *DIMACS Series in Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1992.
- [9] Peter McMullen and Geoffrey C. Shephard, *Conjectures*, Volume 3 of *London Mathematical Society Student Papers*, Cambridge University Press, London–New York, 1983.

type of the polytope. Now suppose  $P$  is an  $(d+3)$ -polytope with  $d+3$  vertices, and let  $D_P$  be a normalized Gale transform of  $P$ . Let  $Q$  be a  $(d+3)$ -polytope with normalized Gale transform  $D_Q$ . Vertices of  $P$  and  $Q$  are exchanged (and flipped to preserve orientation).

Let  $T_P$  and  $T_Q$  be triangulations of  $P$  and  $Q$ , respectively. A straightforward calculation shows that the induced triangulations of  $P$  and  $Q$  in the two Gale transforms make the same triangulation of  $\Delta_Q$ .

Since the  $h$ -vector of a simplicial complex determines its triangulation, the theorem is proved. Finally, for weakly neighborly polytopes, a triangulation determines the  $h$ -vector of the polytope. The second statement holds. ■

*h*-vector of (the boundary of) a weakly neighborly polytope is the  $h$ -vector of the underlying matroid.

For  $(d+3)$ -polytopes with nine vertices it can be shown that a  $(d+3)$ -polytope with  $h$ -vector  $(1, 3, 4, 5, 4, 3, 1)$ . Thus  $(d+3)$ -polytopes with  $d+3$  vertices can be realized by equidecomposable polytopes.

It is known that only for "generic"  $d$ -polytopes with  $d+4$  vertices is the  $h$ -vector generic if the distinct diameters of its Gale transform are all different. Any number of points may occur on each diameter of a  $d$ -polytope with  $d+4$  vertices has a Gale transform with  $d+4$  vertices.

Let  $c$  be a positive integer such that each diameter of the Gale transform has  $c$  points at one end than at the other; and  $c$  is even.

For a  $d$ -polytope with  $d+4$  vertices is possible to have a difference  $c$  is 0 or 1.

Questions for weakly neighborly polytopes of dimension  $d$ .

1. Are all weakly neighborly polytopes rigid? Here a polytope is called rigid if its face lattice uniquely determines its oriented matroid.
2. Can a proper subdivision (with no new vertices) of a polytope be weakly neighborly?
3. Does every even-dimensional weakly neighborly polytope have  $f$ -vector minimal among polytopes with the same  $h$ -vector?

The interpretation of the  $h$ -vector for nonsimplicial polytopes is important for further progress on facial enumeration questions. We hope that the study of weakly neighborly polytopes will suggest ideas in that direction.

#### References

- [1] Margaret M. Bayer and Andrew Klapper, *A new index for polytopes*, Discrete & Computational Geometry **6** (1991), 33–47.
- [2] Margaret M. Bayer and Bernd Sturmfels, *Lawrence polytopes*, Canadian J. Math. **42** (1990), 62–79.
- [3] L. J. Billera, R. Cushman and J. A. Sanders, *The Stanley decomposition of the harmonic oscillator*, Proc. Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen Ser A **91** (1988), 375–393.
- [4] Branko Grünbaum, *Convex Polytopes*, Interscience Publishers John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1967.
- [5] Victor Klee and Peter Kleinschmidt, *The  $d$ -step conjecture and its relatives*, Math. Oper. Res. **12** (1987), 718–755.
- [6] Victor Klee and Peter Kleinschmidt, *Convex polytopes and related complexes*, in *Handbook of Combinatorics*, (Martin Grötschel, Laszlo Lovász, and Ronald Graham, eds.), North-Holland, Amsterdam, to appear.
- [7] Carl W. Lee, *Regular triangulations of convex polytopes*, Volume 4 of DIMACS Series in Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1991, pp. 443–456.
- [8] Carl W. Lee, *Winding numbers and the generalized lower-bound conjecture*, Volume 6 of DIMACS Series in Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1991, pp. 209–219.
- [9] Peter McMullen and Geoffrey C. Shephard, *Convex polytopes and the upper bound conjecture*, Volume 3 of London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, Cambridge University Press, London–New York, 1971.