THE AUGMENTED EXTERNAL ACTIVITY COMPLEX OF A MATROID

ANDREW BERGET AND DANIA MORALES

ABSTRACT. For a matroid, we define a new simplicial complex whose facets are indexed by its independent sets. This complex contains the external activity complex as a subcomplex. We call our complex the augmented external activity complex since its definition is motivated by the recently defined augmented tautological classes of matroids. We prove that our complex is shellable and show that our shelling satisfies the stronger property of being an H-shelling. This explicates our result that the h-vector of our complex is the f-vector of the independence complex. We also define an augmented no broken circuit complex, which contains the usual no broken circuit complex as a subcomplex. We prove its shellability and show that our shelling is also an H-shelling. The h-vector of this complex is the f-vector of the no broken circuit complex.

1. INTRODUCTION

While any simplicial complex can be assembled one face at a time in an apparently haphazard way, *shellable* simplical complexes are those that can be assembled with some measure of control on the topology of this process. One requires that the facets of the complex can be added in such an order that when adding a new facet, it meets the previously built complex along a pure subcomplex. Such an ordering of the facets is called a shelling of the complex, and among other important consequences, shellability implies that a simplicial complex is Cohen-Macaulay and homotopy equivalent to a wedge of spheres.

Matroids give rise to supernumerary examples of shellable simplicial complexes. Two of the most important and earliest results in this area are the shellability of the independence complex and the order complex of the lattice of flats of a matroid, due to Provan and Billera, and Garsia, respectively. Provan also showed that the no broken circuit complex of M is shellable. For all of these results in one place, see [Bjö92]. The Bergman complex of a matroid, used in the resolution of the Rota-Heron-Welsh conjecture [AHK17], is homeomorphic to the order complex of its lattice of proper flats [AK06] and is, thus, shellable. The augmented Bergman complex of a matroid, used in the resolution of the Dowling-Wilson conjecture [BHM⁺23], interpolates between the independence complex and the lattice of flats, and was recently shown to be shellable [BKR⁺22]. An interesting phenomenon appears in each of these examples: it is possible to describe not just one, but many different shellings of these complexes. As a simplest example, any linear order of the ground set of a matroid induces a lexicographic ordering on its bases, and this is a shelling. This property can be used to characterize matroids among all simplicial complexes. In [AB16] a curiously defined complex called the *external activity complex* was discovered. This complex arises naturally in the study of what is now called the *Schubert variety of a linear space*, which was used in the proof of the Dowling-Wilson conjecture of a realizable matroid [HW17]. This variety is almost always singular. A consequence of [AB16] is the Cohen-Macaulay property of the external activity complex, which means that it has, in a sense, mild singularities. In [ACS16] the topology of the external activity complex was studied in greater depth, and it was shown to be shellable.

The facets of the external activity complex are in bijection with the bases of the matroid, however they record finer information than just the bases: they record each basis B along with its external activity EA(B), which is to say the elements e not in the basis B that are the maximum of the unique circuit of $B \cup \{e\}$. External activity is a concept dating back to Whitney's description of the chromatic polynomial of a graph in terms of no broken circuit sets [Whi32] and made formal in Crapo's definition of the Tutte polynomial [Cra69]. There is a notion of internal activity IA(B) of a basis, which is obtained from external activity by matroid duality. In a systematic study of orderings of bases of matroids that are known to give shellings, Las Vergnas [LV01] introduced partial orders on the bases of a matroid coming from internal and external activity. The main result in [ACS16] shows that linear extensions of Las Vergnas's external/internal partial order induce shelling orders on both the external activity complex and the independence complex, which is a subcomplex of the external activity complex.

In the current work, we describe a naturally occurring simplicial complex whose facets are indexed by the independent sets of a matroid. The facet of an independent set records, essentially, its internal and external activity. Our main results are summarized below. We use the notation $x_S = \prod_{i \in S} x_i$ to describe monomials, and a simplicial complex is described by a listing a collection of square free monomials corresponding to its facets.

Theorem. Let M be a matroid of rank r on the set E. Define a simplicial complex Δ_M , the augmented external activity complex of M, with ground set $\{x_e, y_e, z_e : e \in E\}$ and a facet,

$x_{I\cup \mathrm{EP}(I)}y_Y z_{I\cup \mathrm{EA}(I)}$

for each independent set I of M, where $I = B \setminus Y$, with B a basis and $Y \subseteq IA(B)$. Here EA, EP, IA are external activity and passivity, and internal activity, respectively. Then,

- (1) Δ_M contains the external activity complex of [ACS16] as a subcomplex.
- (2) Any linear extension of the Las Vergnas's external/internal order on independent sets of M gives a shelling of Δ_M . In particular, Δ_M is Cohen-Macaulay.
- (3) The h-vector of Δ_M is the f-vector of the independence complex of M.
- (4) Δ_M contains a shellable subcomplex Δ_M^{nbc} , itself containing the no broken circuit complex of M, NBC(M). The h-vector of Δ_M^{nbc} is equal to the f-vector of NBC(M).

While our results might at first appear to be a modest extension of the results of [ACS16], it is worth emphasizing a main difficulty in their genesis: simply coming up with a definition.

1.1. Geometric Motivation. We include here the geometric motivation for our definition and results. This material is not needed to understand the combinatorics in the body of our paper, and can be skipped if desired. In spite of this, we feel it is important to emphasize that our complex Δ_M was not divined out of the ether or was an obvious generalization of [ACS16], but had a concrete and interesting geometric origin. We will not prove the results stated here, reserving these for a future work.

The Schubert variety of a linear space $L \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is obtained by embedding $\mathbb{C}^n \subset (\mathbb{P}^1)^n$ and taking the closure of L in $(\mathbb{P}^1)^n$. The resulting variety Y_L is multiplicity free in the sense that its multidegree, which is a polynomial in t_1, \ldots, t_n , is the basis generating function of the matroid M of L. By results of Brion [Bri03] this implies Y_L is normal, has rational singularities and is Cohen-Macaulay. It also implies that Y_L flatly deforms to a reduced union of Schubert varieties in $(\mathbb{P}^1)^n$.

Let $\hat{Y}_L \subset (\mathbf{C}^2)^n$ be the multiaffine cone of Y_L . Viewing $(\mathbf{C}^2)^n$ as $\mathbf{C}^n \times \mathbf{C}^n$ affords a different description of \hat{Y}_L , coming from the tautological bundles of linear spaces in [BEST23]: \hat{Y}_L is obtained from the sum of tautological bundles $\mathcal{S}_L \oplus \mathcal{O}(-\beta)$ on the permutohedral variety \underline{X}_n as



Here the horizontal arrows are inclusions and the vertical arrows are projections. That is, we may define \hat{Y}_L to be the image of the bundle under the projection mapping. The computation of the \mathbb{Z}^2 -graded multidegree in [AB16], for example, now becomes a computation involving the Segre classes of \mathcal{S}_L and $\mathcal{O}(-\beta)$, which is done in [BEST23] and yields (essentially) $T_M(q, 1)$. From this point of view, it is natural to extend the construction of the Schubert variety of a linear space in any number of ways by varying the bundle. The main ingredient is a subbundle of a trivial bundle over a smooth projective variety.

Our complex Δ_M comes from changing the permutohedral variety \underline{X}_n to the stellahedral variety X_n , and modifying the bundles involved to be the augmented tautological bundles defined in [EHL23]. Specifically, we use the bundle $\mathcal{E}_L := \mathcal{Q}_L^{\vee} \oplus \pi_E^*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^E}(1))^{\vee}$, which is a subbundle of a trivial bundle with fiber $\mathbf{C}^n \times \mathbf{C}^n \times \mathbf{C}^{n+1}$. Applying [EHL23, Theorem 1.11], we see that the subvariety \hat{E}_L of $\mathbf{C}^n \times \mathbf{C}^n \times \mathbf{C}^{n+1}$ produced by \mathcal{E}_L will have degree equal to the number of independent subsets of the matroid M of L. We may view \hat{E}_L as the multi-affine cone over a subvariety $E_L \subset (\mathbf{P}^1)^n \times \mathbf{P}^n$. It is immediate from the definition and the main theorem of [Li18] that E_L is multiplicity free, and that its \mathbf{Z}^n multidegree is the generating function for the independent sets of M. We can thus apply the same results of Brion above, and conclude that E_L has rational singularities, is Cohen-Macaulay and flatly deforms to a reduced union of Schubert varieties.

Armed with these results, one hopes that \hat{E}_L has a Gröbner deformation (which is flat) to a Cohen-Macaulay simplicial complex that only depends on the matroid of M. This is indeed what happens and our complex Δ_M is the result of a careful analysis of the initial ideal under an appropriate term order. Implicit in this is the result that the initial ideal of \hat{E}_L only depends on the matroid M, and so we are able to give a definition that makes no reference to the geometric motivators of linear spaces, tautological bundles or varieties. As a consequence, our main theorem is entirely combinatorial. It is a natural strengthening of the statement that E_L is Cohen-Macaulay.

The proof of our main theorem builds upon the techniques used in [ACS16], which involves an intricate analysis of Las Vergnas's external/internal order on the bases of a

matroid. Our complex Δ_M contains the external activity complex of M as a subcomplex and the argument we employ reduces to the argument in [ACS16] when restricted to this subcomplex. However, we need to extend Las Vergnas's result to define an external/internal order on all independent sets, and extra care must be taken here as new obstacles are encountered.

1.2. **Organization.** The structure of our paper is as follows: In Sections 2 and 3 we review known material on matroid activities and shellings. In Section 4 we review the construction and results of [ACS16], highlighting the results we will need later. In Section 5 we define the augmented external activity complex and prove our main result on its shellability. We include a fully worked example to aid the reader in following the delicacies of our proof. In Section 6 we describe the restriction sets of our shellings, as well as a related shelling which produces a two-variable shelling polynomial. We use our knowledge of the restriction sets to describe the *h*-vector of our complex and to prove that our shellings are a special kind of shelling called an *H*-shelling, studied previously in [ER94]. Finally, in Section 7 we define an augmented analogue of the no broken circuit complex of a matroid, proving results parallel to those in Sections 5 and 6.

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank the Kennerud Visiting Math Scholars Fund at Western Washington University for helping facilitate the nascent stages of this project. AB would like to thank Colin Crowley for useful discussions.

2. Matroid Activities

A matroid M is a pair (E, \mathcal{I}) where E is a finite set and $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}(M)$ is a simplicial complex on E satisfying the following axiom:

if $I, J \in \mathcal{I}$ and |I| < |J|, then there is $e \in J \setminus I$ with $I \cup \{e\} \in \mathcal{I}$.

The sets in \mathcal{I} are the independent sets of M and the facets of \mathcal{I} are the bases of M. We denote the collection of bases of M by $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(M)$. We refer the reader to the book of Oxley [Oxl11] for basic elements of matroid theory. We will recall further, less basic, elements of the theory below.

2.1. Activities. We recall the definitions for matroid external and internal activities, following Las Vergnas [LV01]. We abuse notation slightly in this section and all that follow, by writing the union (and set difference) of a set B with a singleton set $\{e\}$ by suppressing the set braces for the singleton set. That is, we denote $B \cup \{e\} := B \cup e$ and similarly we denote $B \setminus \{e\} := B \setminus e$.

Let M be a matroid on E and fix once and for all an arbitrary linear order < on E.

Remark 2.1. There are three orders that appear in our paper that may be difficult to keep track of on a first reading. The first is the one just introduced, <, which is a total order on E, the ground set of our matroid. The second is $\leq_{ext/int}$, which will first be a partial order on the bases and then extended to a partial order on the independent sets of M. Finally, there will be a linear extension \prec of $\leq_{ext/int}$. Which order is being used will make it clear what types of objects are being compared.

Definition 2.2. Let S be a subset of E. An element $e \in E \setminus S$ is called *externally active* with respect to S (and M) if there exists a circuit γ of M contained in $S \cup e$ so that e is the maximum element in γ . Otherwise, e is called *externally passive* with respect to S

(and M). Denote the set of elements that are externally active (externally passive) with respect to S by EA(S) (resp., EP(S)).

Typically we will not say "externally active for S and M", but only "externally active for S". However, we need the enhanced emphasis on M to make the next definition.

Definition 2.3. An element $i \in S$ is called *internally active* with respect to S (and M) if i is externally active with respect to $E \setminus S$ and M^{\perp} , where M^{\perp} is the dual matroid with the same order on the ground set. Otherwise $i \in S$ is called *internally passive* with respect to S (and M). Denote the set of elements that are internally active (internally passive) with respect to S by IA(S) (resp., IP(S)).

For a basis B of M, note that $e \notin B$ is externally active with respect to B if and only if there is no element e' > e with $e' \in B$ and $B \setminus e' \cup e$ a basis of M. Dually, $e \in B$ is internally active with respect to B if and only if there is no element e' > e with $e' \notin B$ and $B \setminus e \cup e'$ a basis of M.

The following result of Crapo was used in his definition of the Tutte polynomial of a matroid.

Proposition 2.4. [Cra69] Let M be a matroid on the ground set E and let < be a linear order on E.

- (1) Every subset S of E can be uniquely written in the form $S = B \setminus Y \cup X$ for some basis B, with $X \subset EA(B)$ and $Y \subset IA(B)$. Equivalently, the intervals $[B \setminus IA(B), B \cup EA(B)]$ form a partition of the poset of subsets of E ordered by inclusion.
- (2) Every independent set I of E can be uniquely written in the form I = B \ Y for some basis B and some subset Y ⊂ IA(B). Equivalently, the intervals [B \ IA(B), B] form a partition of the independence complex, *I*(M).

The second item here will be particularly important for us.

2.2. Active orders for matroid bases. In his study of matroid activities Las Vergnas introduced three partial orders on the collection of bases of M. We summarize a few of his results here, taking them as definitions.

Definition 2.5. [LV01, Proposition 3.1] We define the *external order* on $\mathcal{B}(M)$ by the following equivalent conditions

(1) $A \leq_{ext} B$ (2) $A \subset B \cup EA(B)$ (3) $A \cup EA(A) \subset B \cup EA(B)$

Dually, we have the following.

Definition 2.6. [LV01, Proposition 5.2] We define the *internal order* on $\mathcal{B}(M)$ by the following equivalent conditions

- (1) $A \leq_{int} B$
- (2) $A \setminus IA(A) \subset B$
- (3) $A \setminus IA(A) \subset B \setminus IA(B)$

The external/internal order on bases is the weakest order that simultaneously extends the external and internal orders.

Definition 2.7. [LV01, Proposition 6.3] We define the *external/internal order* on $\mathcal{B}(M)$ by the following equivalent conditions

(1) $A \leq_{ext/int} B$ (2) $IP(A) \cap EP(B) = \emptyset$ (3) $A \setminus IA(A) \cup EA(A) \subset B \setminus IA(B) \cup EA(B)$ (4) $IP(A) \cup EA(A) \subset IP(B) \cup EA(B)$

Example 2.8. Consider the following running example. Let M be the matroid on $E = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ (with the natural order) realized by the affine point configuration below.



We summarize here the bases along with their activities.

B	$\mathrm{EA}(B)$	$\operatorname{EP}(B)$	IA(B)	IP(B)
345	Ø	12	345	Ø
135	Ø	24	35	1
245	Ø	13	45	2
235	Ø	14	5	23
125	3	4	5	12
134	5	2	3	14
234	5	1	Ø	234
124	35	Ø	Ø	124

The Hasse diagrams of the external and internal orders on $\mathcal{B}(M)$ are shown at left and right below.



The external/internal order on $\mathcal{B}(M)$ refines both of these, and its Hasse diagram is shown below.



2.3. Active orders for independent sets. We wish to extend Las Vergnas's external/internal order to the collection of independent sets of a matroid. To do this, we associate each independent set to a basis as in Proposition 2.4 and consider external activity and internal passivity.

Definition 2.9. We say that independent sets I and J of M are *internally related* if there exists a basis B of M with $I = B \setminus Y_I$ and $J = B \setminus Y_J$ where $Y_I, Y_J \subset IA(B)$. When no confusion will arise, we will sometimes simply say I and J are *related*.

Note that by Proposition 2.4(2) every independent set is related to a unique basis and every basis is related to itself. The following result is immediate from the definition.

Proposition 2.10. Suppose that I is related to a basis B and $Y \subset IA(B)$. Then $I \setminus Y$ is related to B.

The following result describes how the activities of independent sets are determined by their related bases. We will use it frequently.

Proposition 2.11 ([LV01, Proposition 2.4(v)]). Let I be an independent set of M related to the basis B. Then EA(I) = EA(B) and IP(I) = IP(B). Moreover,

 $I \setminus IA(I) \cup EA(I) = B \setminus IA(B) \cup EA(B).$

The following definition extends the external/internal order on bases to all independent sets.

Definition 2.12. Let I and J be independent sets of M. We say that $I \leq_{ext/int} J$ if and only if I and J are not internally related and $I \setminus IA(I) \cup EA(I) \subset J \setminus IA(J) \cup EA(J)$ or I and J are internally related and $I \subset J$.

One checks that this is indeed a partial order. It is immediate that two bases B and C satisfy $B \leq_{ext/int} C$ in the previous sense if and only if they do in the current sense. Further, if an independent set I is internally related to a basis C then $I \leq_{ext/int} C$. More generally, we have the following.

Proposition 2.13. Let I and K be independent sets related to bases A and C, respectively with $A \neq C$. We have that $I \leq_{ext/int} K$ if and only if $A \leq_{ext/int} C$.

Example 2.14. We continue Example 2.8. The Hasse diagram of the external/internal order on the independent sets of M is shown below.



Note that in this example, we replace each basis C in Example 2.8 with a copy of a boolean lattice of sets of the form $\{S \cup IP(C) : S \subset IA(C)\}$.

The phenomenon of this example persists in general.

Proposition 2.15. Let B and C be bases of M with C covering B in the external/internal order on bases. Then, in the external/internal order on independent sets the interval (B, C] can be described as the boolean lattice,

$$(B,C] = \{ S \cup \operatorname{IP}(C) : S \subset \operatorname{IA}(C) \}.$$

Proof. Assume that I is such that $B \leq_{ext/int} I \leq_{ext/int} C$. We claim that I is internally related to C. If not then I is internally related to a basis $C' \neq C$. Since $I \setminus IA(I) \cup EA(I) = C' \setminus IA(C') \cup EA(C')$, it follows that $B \leq_{ext/int} C' \leq_{ext/int} C$, which is a contradiction.

Since I is related to C, it is obtained by deleting some subset of internally active elements from C. It follows that $I = S \cup IP(C)$ where $S \subset IA(C)$. The restriction of $\leq_{ext/int}$ to subsets of this form gives a boolean lattice by definition.

Remark 2.16. The proposition displays a curious non-trivial automorphism on the collection of independent sets of matroid: Every closed interval (B, C] can be "flipped upside down". That is, the map $S \cup IP(C) \mapsto (IA(C) \setminus S) \cup IP(C)$ is an involutive

bijection $\mathcal{I}(M) \to \mathcal{I}(M)$. It follows from this that

$$\sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}(M)} q^{|I|} = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}(M)} q^{|\operatorname{IA}(C_I) - Y_I| + |\operatorname{IP}(C_I)|}$$

where we write $I = C_I \setminus Y_I$ where C_I is a basis and $Y_I \subset IA(C_I)$.

Las Vergnas shows that on $\mathcal{B}(M)$, $\leq_{ext/int}$ defines a lattice [LV01, Theorem 6.4]. Denote the meet and join by $\wedge^{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\vee^{\mathcal{B}}$. We offer the following extension of this result.

Proposition 2.17. The order relation $\leq_{ext/int}$ defines a lattice on $\mathcal{I}(M)$, with meet \land and join \lor given by

- (1) $I \wedge J = I \cap J$, $I \vee J = I \cup J$ whenever I and J are internally related;
- (2) If I and J are related to different bases A and B, then $I \wedge J = A \wedge^{\mathcal{B}} B$ and $I \vee J = IP(A \vee^{\mathcal{B}} B)$.

Proof. If I and J are internally related to a basis C this is immediate from Proposition 2.15. If I and J are not related, the uniqueness of greatest lower bounds and least upper bounds is determined by the uniqueness of taking the meet and join of the related bases. \Box

3. Shellings

Here we introduce some background on shellings of simplicial complexes.

3.1. Shellable complexes. We offer the first two sections of $[Bj\ddot{o}92]$ as a particularly relevant reference on shellability of simplicial complexes, *h*-polynomials, etc. as it relates to matroids and related complexes.

Recall that a simplicial complex is pure if all its facets have the same cardinality. The dimension of a face of a simplicial complex is one less than its cardinality.

Definition 3.1. Let Δ be a pure simplicial complex with dimension d. A shelling order is an ordering of the facets F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_s such that for every i < k there exists j < kand $e \in F_k$ with $F_i \cap F_k \subseteq F_j \cap F_k = F_k \setminus e$. If a shelling order exists, then we call Δ shellable.

It is equivalent to demand that, for all $2 \leq j \leq s$, the complex generated by F_1, \ldots, F_{j-1} meets the complex generated by F_j in a pure subcomplex of dimension d-1.

Given a shelling order and a facet F_j , there is a subset R_j such that for every $A \subseteq F_j$, we have that $R_j \subseteq A$ if and only of $A \not\subseteq F_i$ for every i < j. That is, when we add the facet F_j to the subcomplex generated by F_1, \ldots, F_{j-1} , the new faces that we introduce are precisely those in the interval $[R_j, F_j]$. The set R_j is called the *restriction set* of F_j in the shelling order.

Definition 3.2. The *f*-vector of a d-1-dimensional simplicial complex Δ is $f = (f_0, \ldots, f_d)$ where f_i is the number of faces of Δ with dimension i-1. The *h*-vector $h = (h_0, \ldots, h_d)$ is defined by

$$f_0(q-1)^d + f_1(q-1)^{d-1} + \dots + f_d(q-1)^0 = h_0 q^d + h_1 q^{d-1} + \dots + h_d q^0.$$

The *h*-polynomial of Δ is $h_{\Delta}(q) = \sum_{i} h_{i} q^{d-i}$.

If Δ is a shellable simplicial complex then the *h*-vector can also be obtained from the restriction sets of the shelling order.

Proposition 3.3. If Δ is a pure simplicial complex with shelling order F_1, \ldots, F_s then $h_i = \#\{R_j : |R_j| = i\}.$

3.2. *h*-complexes and *H*-shellings. Let Δ be a shellable simplicial complex with vertex set *E* whose facets F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_s are listed here in a shelling order. Let R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_s be the restriction sets for this shelling. Assume that the collection $\Gamma = \{R_1, \ldots, R_s\}$ is, itself, a simplicial complex. This following situation, improbable as it may seem, is known to arise in several contexts and was studied by Edelman and Reiner [ER94]. In this situation, the shelling of Δ is called an *h*-shelling and Γ is called an *h*-complex.

The following result describes the f-vector of an h-complex.

Proposition 3.4. If Δ has an h-shelling with corresponding h-complex Γ then the h-vector of Δ is the f-vector of Γ .

Edelman and Reiner say that the shelling F_1, \ldots, F_s has property (H) if whenever $e \in E$ and $G \in \Delta$ is a face contained in a facet F, the following implication holds,

(H) if
$$e \in G \subset F$$
 and $e \in R(F)$, then $e \in R(G)$.

Here we employ the convention that for a facet F_i , $R(F_i) = R_i$, and for a non-facet G, if $G \in [R_i, F_i]$ then $R(G) = R_i$. In verifying (H), it is sufficient to take G to be codimension one in F by [ER94, Theorem 2.6]. (Technically our property (H) is property (H') in [ER94], but since these are equivalent we proceed with the un-primed notation.)

Theorem 3.5 ([ER94, Theorem 2.7]). If a shelling has property (H) then it is an h-shelling.

We call such a shelling an H-shelling. Property (H) is strictly stronger than being an h-shelling; see [ER94, Figure 1]. In the cases we encounter, it will be immediate that the shellings we produce are h-shellings since the associated collections of restriction sets will be familiar complexes. We will also show that our shellings satisfy the stronger property (H)

4. The External Activity Complex

In this section we review the construction and results of Ardila, Castillo and Samper [ACS16]. All the results in this section are attributable to this work.

Let E be a set with n elements and define $E(x, z) := \{x_e, z_e : e \in E\}$. We will employ the following notation: For subsets $S, T \subseteq E, x_S$ denotes $\{x_i : i \in S\}$ and z_T is defined similarly. We will write $x_S z_T$ for the union $x_S \cup z_T$.

Definition 4.1. Let $M = (E, \mathcal{B})$ be a matroid with a fixed linear order < on E. The external activity complex, denoted $\underline{\Delta}_M$, is the simplicial complex with ground set E(x, z) and facets

$$F(B) := x_{B \cup \text{EP}(B)} z_{B \cup \text{EA}(B)}$$

for each basis B.

It is immediate that $\underline{\Delta}_M$ is pure of dimension n + r - 1, when M is a matroid of rank r on n elements.

Example 4.2. Here are the bases and corresponding facets of the external activity complex in our running example.

B	$\mathrm{EA}(B)$	$\mathrm{EP}(B)$	F(B)
345	Ø	12	$x_{12345}z_{345}$
135	Ø	24	$x_{12345}z_{135}$
245	Ø	13	$x_{12345}z_{245}$
235	Ø	14	$x_{12345}z_{235}$
125	3	4	$x_{1245}z_{1235}$
134	5	2	$x_{1234}z_{1345}$
234	5	1	$x_{1234}z_{2345}$
124	35	Ø	$x_{124}z_{12345}$

4.1. Shellings of the external activity complex. In this section we describe a large set of shelling orders of the external activity complex $\underline{\Delta}_M$. We will later extend these results to the augmented external activity complex.

Theorem 4.3 ([ACS16, Theorem 1.1]). Let M be a matroid with linear order on the ground set, E. For any linear extension of Las Vergnas's external/internal order $\leq_{ext/int}$ on the collection of bases of M, the corresponding ordering of the facets is a shelling order of the external activity complex, $\underline{\Delta}_M$.

Before we review the proof of this result, it is worthwhile to note that the facets of the external activity complex are defined by the bases of a matroid along with their corresponding external activities. However, it is asserted that any linear extension of Las Vergnas's external/internal ordering of the bases produces a shelling order of this complex. This result cannot be relaxed to Las Vergnas's external order or internal order alone. Which is to say, linear extensions of \leq_{ext} on the bases of M and linear extensions of \leq_{int} on the bases of M do not necessarily produce shelling orders of Δ_M . See [ACS16, Examples 3.1,3.2]. Our point here is that internal activity is a crucial feature of the proof of their result, but this is not reflected in the definition of external activity complex itself. Our augmented external activity complex has both external and internal activity used in the definition of the complex, which is a natural reflection of the external/internal order used in the proof of Theorem 4.3.

The proof of Theorem 4.3 is organized as follows. Let \prec be an arbitrary linear order on the collection of bases of a matroid and consider the corresponding ordering of the facets of $\underline{\Delta}_M$. Recall by Definition 3.1, \prec induces a shelling of the external activity complex if for every $A \prec C$ there exists $B \prec C$ and $c \in E$ so that

$$F(A) \cap F(C) \subseteq F(B) \cap F(C) = F(C) \setminus c^x$$

where c^{xz} denotes one of x_c or z_c . The following result equivalently characterizes shelling orders of the external activity complex.

Lemma 4.4 ([ACS16, Lemma 4.2]). Let \prec be a linear order on the collection of bases a matroid. Then \prec induces a shelling of the external activity complex $\underline{\Delta}_M$, if and only if for any bases $A \prec C$ there exists a basis $B \prec C$ so that

- (1) $B = C \setminus c \cup b$ where $b \neq c$,
- (2) $c \notin A$ and $c \in EA(B)$ if and only if $c \in EA(A)$, and
- (3) for any $d \notin B \cup C$ we have $d \in EA(B)$ if and only if $d \in EA(C)$.

It is then shown that any linear extension of Las Vergnas's external/internal order on the collection of bases of M satisfies Lemma 4.4 and this proves Theorem 4.3. In particular, let \prec be a linear extension of Las Vergnas's external/internal order on the collection of bases of M and let $A \prec C$. This implies that $C \not\leq_{ext/int} A$. Ardila, Castillo and Samper produce a basis B with $B \leq_{ext/int} C$, so that B precedes C in \prec , and then they carefully show that B satisfies the conditions of Lemma 4.4.

In the following lemma we summarize the results that we will make use of and extend towards our discussion of the augmented external activity complex and its shellability.

Lemma 4.5. For any bases $C \not\leq_{ext/int} A$ there exists a basis B so that

- (1) $B <_{ext/int} C$,
- (2) $B = C \setminus c \cup b$ where $b \neq c$,
- (3) $c \notin A$ and $c \in EA(B)$ if and only if $c \in EA(A)$, and
- (4) for any $d \notin B \cup C$ we have $d \in EA(B)$ if and only if $d \in EA(C)$.
- (5) Furthermore, $c \in IP(C) \cap EP(A) \cap EP(B)$, and
- (6) $F(A) \cap F(C) \subset F(B) \cap F(C) = F(C) \setminus z_c$.

Proof. The first four claims occur in [ACS16] when showing that any linear extension of $\leq_{ext/int}$ on the bases of M satisfies [ACS16, Lemma 4.2]. Claim (5) follows by the construction of $B = C \setminus c \cup b$ in the proof of [ACS16, Theorem 1.1] and then applying (3). To be specific, $c \in C$ is chosen so that $c \in IP(C) \cap EP(A)$ and (3) implies that $c \in EP(B)$. The last claim is justified as follows: claims (2), (3) and (4) imply that $F(A) \cap F(C) \subset F(B) \cap F(C) = F(C) \setminus c^{xz}$ where c^{xz} denotes one of x_c or z_c and (5) has that $c \in EP(B)$. We conclude that $c \notin EA(B) \cup B$ and this means z_c does not appear in F(B), giving (6).

5. The Augmented External Activity Complex

In this section we define the augmented external activity complex and prove our main result on its shellability. Before we give this rather technical proof, we include a fully worked example which will explain the structure of the proof.

5.1. Basic properties and statement of the main theorem. We will need the following notation. Let E be a finite set and define $E(x, y, z) := \{x_e, y_e, z_e : e \in E\}$. We write E(x), E(y, z), etc. for the obvious subsets of E(x, y, z). For subsets $S, T, U \subseteq E$, x_S denotes $\{x_i : i \in S\}$, and z_T, y_U are defined similarly. We will write $x_S y_U z_T$ for the union $x_S \cup y_U \cup z_T$. We now define our complex.

Definition 5.1. Let $M = (E, \mathcal{I})$ be a matroid and let < be a linear order on E. Define a simplicial complex Δ_M with ground set E(x, y, z) and facets

$$F(I) := x_{I \cup \text{EP}(I)} y_Y z_{I \cup \text{EA}(I)}$$

for every independent set I where $I = B \setminus Y$, with B a basis and $Y \subset IA(B)$ (recall that every I is uniquely expressible in this way). We call Δ_M the *augmented external activity* complex of M.

We emphasize that this definition is new. It is immediate that Δ_M is pure of dimension n + r - 1, when M is a matroid of rank r on n elements. Observe that the external activity complex, $\underline{\Delta}_M$, is the subcomplex of the augmented external activity complex Δ_M

generated by the facets F(B) where B is a basis of M. Also, we have $\Delta_M \cap E(x, z) = \underline{\Delta}_M$, which is to say, that Δ_M is the subcomplex of faces that contain no $y_e, e \in E$.

In what follows we will write $\operatorname{supp}_x(G)$ for $\{e \in E : x_e \in G\}$ where $G \in \Delta_M$. We call this the x-support of the face G. Analogous notation will be used for y and z.

Proposition 5.2. Each basis B of M has $\operatorname{supp}_{u}(F(B)) = \emptyset$.

Proposition 5.3. Suppose that I is internally related to a basis B, then $\operatorname{supp}_x(F(I)) = \operatorname{supp}_x(F(B))$.

Proof. We need to show that $I \cup EP(I) = B \cup EP(B)$. Since I is internally related to the basis B we have EA(I) = EA(B) by Proposition 2.11. Taking the complement in E gives $I \cup EP(I) = B \cup EP(B)$.

Proposition 5.4. Suppose that $I = B \setminus Y$ is internally related to B, then $\operatorname{supp}_z(F(I)) = \operatorname{supp}_z(F(B)) \setminus Y$.

Proof. Suppose that I is internally related to the basis B so that $I = B \setminus Y$ with $Y \subset IA(B)$. We make note that EA(I) = EA(B) by Proposition 2.11 and compute,

 $\operatorname{supp}_{z}(F(I)) = I \cup \operatorname{EA}(I) = (B \setminus Y) \cup \operatorname{EA}(B) = (B \cup \operatorname{EA}(B)) \setminus Y = \operatorname{supp}_{z}(F(B)) \setminus Y. \ \Box$

Corollary 5.5. Suppose that $I = B \setminus Y$ is internally related to the basis B. The facet F(I) is given by taking the facet F(B) and replacing z_Y with y_Y . That is, $F(I) = F(B) \setminus z_Y \cup y_Y$.

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of the definition along with Proposition 5.3 and Proposition 5.4. \Box

Example 5.6. Consider, from our running example, the basis B = 245, which has IA(B) = 45, with its internally related independent sets. The corresponding facets are listed below.

Ι	$B \setminus Y_I$	F(I)
245	$245 \setminus \emptyset$	$x_{12345}z_{245}$
25	$245 \setminus 4$	$x_{12345}y_4z_{25}$
24	$245 \setminus 5$	$x_{12345}y_5z_{24}$
2	$245 \setminus 45$	$x_{12345}y_{45}z_2$

We are now ready to state our main result.

Theorem 5.7. Let M be a matroid with linear order < on the ground set, E. For any linear extension of Las Vergnas's external/internal order on the independent sets of M, the corresponding ordering of the facets of Δ_M is a shelling order.

The proof of this theorem will occupy the rest of this section. We outline the proof with an example in Section 5.2 and then we will provide all the details in Section 5.3.

5.2. **Proof outline and example.** Let \prec be a linear extension of Las Vergnas's external/internal order on the collection of independent sets of M. Recall, by Definition 3.1, \prec gives a shelling order of the augmented external activity complex if for independent sets $I \prec K$ there exists an independent set $J \prec K$ and $c \in E$ so that

$$F(I) \cap F(K) \subset F(J) \cap F(K) = F(K) \setminus c^{xyz}$$

where c^{xyz} denotes one of x_c , y_c or z_c . In our proof, given any $I \prec K$ we will produce an independent set $J \prec K$ and $c \in E$ satisfying,

(*)
$$F(I) \cap F(K) \subset F(J) \cap F(K) = F(K) \setminus z_c.$$

To do this, we will need to consider two cases. The first case occurs when I and K are internally related and the second case is when they are not. We now provide an example for each case. We begin with the case that I and K are internally related.

Consider the linear extension of $\leq_{ext/int}$ on the independent sets from our running example indicated below.

The sets I = 3 and K = 45 (suppressing brackets) are indicated here with $I \prec K$. These sets are internally related to the basis C = 345, which has IA(C) = 345. See that,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} I &=& C \setminus Y_I, & K &=& C \setminus Y_K, \\ 3 &=& 345 \setminus 45, & 45 &=& 345 \setminus 3. \end{array}$$

Since $I \prec K$ are internally related, this implies that $K \not\leq_{ext/int} I$ and $K \not\subset I$. Choose $c \in K \setminus I$ and notice that $c \in IA(C)$.

Now we define $J := K \setminus c$ and argue that this is the requisite independent set J in (*). In our example, we see that $K \setminus I = 45$ and we will choose c = 4, which is in IA(C) = 345. We have,

$$J := K \setminus c$$

5 := 45 \ 4.

Here is a figure showing I, J and K in the external/internal order on independent sets (only part of the poset is shown here).



Recall that the facet corresponding to the basis C is $F(C) = x_{12345}z_{345}$. For the independent sets I, J and K internally related to C we have the corresponding facets,

$$F(I) = x_{12345}y_{45}z_3, \quad F(J) = x_{12345}y_{34}z_5, \quad F(K) = x_{12345}y_{3}z_{45}.$$

Comparing the facets gives the desired result:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} F(I) \cap F(K) & \subset & F(J) \cap F(K) & = & F(K) \setminus z_c \\ x_{12345} & \subset & x_{12345}y_3z_5 & = & F(45) \setminus z_4. \end{array}$$

Summarizing, given $I \prec K$ that are internally related to C, we will show that $K \not\subset I$ and that there is $c \in K \setminus I \subset IA(C)$. We will then prove that $J = K \setminus c$ is a set and c is an element that satisfies (*). We proceed to the case that I and K are not internally related. Consider the following linear extension of $\leq_{ext/int}$ on the independent sets from our running example shown below.

 $\cdots \prec 345 \prec \cdots \prec 245 \prec \cdots \prec 135 \prec \cdots \prec 23 \prec \cdots \prec 14 \prec \cdots \prec 124$

The sets I = 23 and K = 14 are indicated here with $I \prec K$. The set I is internally related to the basis A = 235, which has IA(A) = 5 and the set K is internally related to the basis C = 134, which has IA(C) = 3. See that,

$$I = A \setminus Y_A, \qquad K = C \setminus Y,$$

23 = 235 \ 5, 14 = 134 \ 3.

To produce the required independent set J that satisfies (*), we first consider the bases A and C and choose a basis B that satisfies Lemma 4.5. We then construct the independent set J from the basis B by deleting a subset of its internally active elements.

Observe that since I and K are independent sets related to bases A and C, respectively with $K \not\leq_{ext/int} I$ then $C \not\leq_{ext/int} A$. Choose a basis $B = C \setminus c \cup b$ that satisfies Lemma 4.5. In this example, we choose c = 4 and b = 5 so that,

$$B = C \setminus c \cup b$$
$$135 = 134 \setminus 4 \cup 5$$

Here is a figure showing A, B and C in the external/internal order on bases.



Recall for the bases A, B and C, we have the corresponding facets,

$$F(A) = x_{12345}z_{235}, \quad F(B) = x_{12345}z_{135}, \quad F(C) = x_{1234}z_{1345}.$$

Comparing the facets for these bases gives,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} F(A) \cap F(C) & \subset & F(B) \cap F(C) & = & F(C) \setminus z_c \\ x_{1234}z_{35} & \subset & x_{1234}z_{135} & = & F(134) \setminus z_4. \end{array}$$

We now construct the set J from the basis B. We claim that the basis B produced necessarily has $Y \subset IA(C) \subset IA(B)$. In this example, we observe that,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} Y & \subset & \mathrm{IA}(C) & \subset & \mathrm{IA}(B) \\ 3 & \subset & 3 & \subset & 35. \end{array}$$

The above inclusion allows us to define $J := B \setminus Y$ so that J is internally related to B. We argue that J is the desired independent set that is a witness to (*). In our example, we have

$$J := B \setminus Y$$
$$15 := 135 \setminus 3$$

Here is a figure showing I, J and K in the external/internal order on independent sets.



For the independent sets I, J and K internally related to A, B and C, respectively, recall that the corresponding facets of Δ_M are obtained by migrating a subset of internally active z's to y's. In our example we have,

 $F(I) = x_{12345}y_5z_{23}, \quad F(J) = x_{12345}y_3z_{15}, \quad F(K) = x_{1234}y_3z_{145}.$

Comparing the facets gives the following desired result:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} F(I) \cap F(K) & \subset & F(J) \cap F(K) & = & F(K) \setminus z_c, \\ x_{1234} & \subset & x_{1234}y_3z_{15} & = & F(14) \setminus z_4. \end{array}$$

Summarizing, given $I \prec K$ that are internally related to the bases A and C, we will show that $C \not\leq_{ext/int} A$ and choose a basis $B = C \setminus c \cup b$ that satisfies Lemma 4.5. Further, given that $K = C \setminus Y$ where $Y \subset IA(C)$, we will show that $Y \subset IA(C) \subset IA(B)$. We will then prove that $J = B \setminus Y$ is an independent set and c is an element that satisfies (*).

5.3. **Proof of the main theorem.** Fix a linear extension \prec of the order $\leq_{ext/int}$ on $\mathcal{I}(M)$. Assume that $I \prec K$, equivalently, $K \not\leq_{ext/int} I$. We will produce an independent set J and element c such that $J <_{ext/int} K$ and (*) holds.

Mirroring our example, we begin with case that I and K are both internally related to the basis C.

Lemma 5.8. Suppose that I and K are independent sets internally related to a basis C with $K \not\leq_{ext/int} I$. Then

- (1) $K \setminus I \subset IA(C)$,
- (2) there exists $c \in K \setminus I$, and
- (3) the independent set $J := K \setminus c$ is internally related to C with $J \leq_{ext/int} K$.
- (4) Also, $c \in EP(I)$.

Proof. Since I and K are internally related to the basis C then C contains K and I contains IP(C) by Proposition 2.4(2). It follows that $K \setminus I \subset C \setminus IP(C) = IA(C)$. The independent sets I and K are internally related with $K \not\leq_{ext/int} I$ and so by definition, $K \not\subset I$. This implies that there must exist $c \in K \setminus I \subset IA(C)$. Suppose that $K = C \setminus Y$ where $Y \subset IA(C)$. The independent set

$$J := K \setminus c = C \setminus (Y \cup c)$$

has $Y \cup c \subset IA(C)$ and hence J is internally related to the basis C. Moreover, $J \subset K$ so by definition, $J <_{ext/int} K$. Recall that I is internally related to the basis C so by Proposition 5.3, $I \cup EP(I) = C \cup EP(C)$. However, $c \in C$ and $c \notin I$ and thus $c \in EP(I)$.

Lemma 5.9. Suppose that I and K are independent sets internally related to a basis C with $K \not\leq_{ext/int} I$. Let J and $c \in K$ be an independent set and element as furnished by Lemma 5.8. Then,

(1) $J <_{ext/int} K$; in particular J precedes K in any linear extension of $\leq_{ext/int}$. (2) $F(I) \cap F(K) \subset F(J) \cap F(K) = F(K) \setminus z_c$.

Proof. The first claim is a restatement of Lemma 5.8(3) and the definition of being a linear extension.

For the second claim, we compare the supports of the corresponding facets. For the x-support, recall that I, J and K are all internally related to the basis C. By Proposition 5.3, $\operatorname{supp}_x(F(I)) = \operatorname{supp}_x(F(J)) = \operatorname{supp}_x(F(K))$ and hence,

 $\operatorname{supp}_x(F(I)) \cap \operatorname{supp}_x(F(K)) = \operatorname{supp}_x(F(J)) \cap \operatorname{supp}_x(F(K)) = \operatorname{supp}_x(F(K)).$

We now consider the y-support of these facets, by first comparing the facets corresponding to J and K. Suppose that $K = C \setminus Y$ and $J = C \setminus (Y \cup c)$ with $Y \cup c \subset IA(C)$. We have,

$$\operatorname{supp}_{\eta}(F(J)) \cap \operatorname{supp}_{\eta}(F(K)) = (Y \cup c) \cap Y = Y = \operatorname{supp}_{\eta}(F(K)).$$

This implies,

$$\operatorname{supp}_{u}(F(I)) \cap \operatorname{supp}_{u}(F(K)) \subset \operatorname{supp}_{u}(F(K)) = \operatorname{supp}_{u}(F(J)) \cap \operatorname{supp}_{u}(F(K)).$$

For the z-support, again, we first compare the facets corresponding to J and K and note that $c \notin EA(C)$ since $c \in K \setminus I \subset C$. We compute,

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{supp}_{z}(F(J)) \cap \operatorname{supp}_{z}(F(K)) &= (J \cup \operatorname{EA}(J)) \cap (K \cup \operatorname{EA}(K)) \\ &= (J \cap K) \cup \operatorname{EA}(C) \quad (\operatorname{EA}(J) = \operatorname{EA}(K) = \operatorname{EA}(C) \text{ by Proposition 2.11}) \\ &= (K \setminus c) \cup \operatorname{EA}(C) \\ &= (K \cup \operatorname{EA}(K)) \setminus c \\ &= \operatorname{supp}_{z}(F(K)) \setminus c. \end{aligned}$$

To include the facet corresponding to I in our comparison, we recall that $c \in EP(I)$ by Lemma 5.8(4). This implies that $c \notin I \cup EA(I) = \operatorname{supp}_{z}(F(I))$. We conclude that

$$\operatorname{supp}_{z}(F(I)) \cap \operatorname{supp}_{z}(F(K)) \subset \operatorname{supp}_{z}(F(K)) \setminus c = \operatorname{supp}_{z}(F(J)) \cap \operatorname{supp}_{z}(F(K)).$$

This completes the proof of our lemma.

This lemma proves that the required shelling property holds when I and K are internally related. We now consider the case that I and K are not internally related. We will take I and K related to bases A and C, respectively, in what follows. The argument then proceeds in three lemmas: The first lemma builds on the results of [ACS16] discussed in Section 4. The second lemma uses the first to define the independent set J and element c that verifies the shelling property. Finally, the third lemma proves that the proposed Jand c defined satisfy the required shelling property and this completes the proof of our main theorem.

Lemma 5.10. Suppose that A and C are bases with $C \not\leq_{ext/int} A$ and produce a basis $B \leq_{ext/int} C$ with $B = C \setminus c \cup b$ as in Lemma 4.5. Then $IA(C) \subset IA(B)$.

Proof. Let us begin by defining $X := C \setminus c$ so that $C = X \cup c$ and $B = X \cup b$. Since $B \leq_{ext/int} C$ by Definition 2.7 we have,

$$\operatorname{IP}(B) \cup \operatorname{EA}(B) \subset \operatorname{IP}(C) \cup \operatorname{EA}(C).$$

Recall, that $c \in EP(B)$ by Lemma 4.5(5). This implies that $c \notin IP(B) \cup EA(B)$ and thus,

$$\operatorname{IP}(B) \cup \operatorname{EA}(B) \subset (X \cap \operatorname{IP}(C)) \cup \operatorname{EA}(C).$$

Further, Lemma 4.5(4) yields, $EA(C) \subset EA(B) \cup b$ and this implies,

 $IP(B) \cup EA(B) \subset (X \cap IP(C)) \cup EA(B) \cup b.$

Next, we will consider two cases according to the internal activity of $b \in B$. If it is the case that $b \in IP(B)$ then,

 $(X \cap \operatorname{IP}(B)) \cup \operatorname{EA}(B) \cup b \subset (X \cap \operatorname{IP}(C)) \cup \operatorname{EA}(B) \cup b.$

We conclude that $X \cap IP(B) \subset X \cap IP(C)$. If it is the case that $b \notin IP(B)$ then $IP(B) = X \cap IP(B)$ and so,

$$(X \cap \operatorname{IP}(B)) \cup \operatorname{EA}(B) \subset (X \cap \operatorname{IP}(C)) \cup \operatorname{EA}(B).$$

Again, we conclude that $X \cap IP(B) \subset X \cap IP(C)$. In both cases, taking the complement in X, gives

$$X \cap IA(C) \subset X \cap IA(B) \subset IA(B).$$

Recall, $c \in IP(C)$ by Lemma 4.5(5) and so $X \cap IA(C) = IA(C)$ and the result follows. \Box

We are now ready to construct the needed independent set J.

Lemma 5.11. Suppose that the independent sets $K \not\leq_{ext/int} I$ are not internally related. Further suppose that A and C are the distinct bases internally related to I and K, respectively. Write $K = C \setminus Y$ where $Y \subset IA(C)$.

Observe that $C \not\leq_{ext/int} A$ and let $B <_{ext/int} C$ and c be a basis and element produced as in Lemma 4.5 from A and C. We have,

- (1) $Y \subset IA(B)$,
- (2) the independent set $J := B \setminus Y$ is internally related to B,
- (3) $J \leq_{ext/int} K$, and
- (4) $c \in EP(I)$.

Proof. The independent set $K = C \setminus Y$ has $Y \subset IA(C)$ and applying Lemma 5.10 gives the desired inclusion, $Y \subset IA(C) \subset IA(B)$.

By definition, $J := B \setminus Y$ where $Y \subset IA(B)$ by (1) and therefore J is an independent set internally related to B.

We have that the independent sets J and K are internally related to the bases B and C, respectively, with $B <_{ext/int} C$ and this gives $J <_{ext/int} K$.

Recall that $c \in EP(A)$ by Lemma 4.5(5) and I is internally related to A. Proposition 5.3 yields $I \cup EP(I) = A \cup EP(A)$. However, $c \notin A \supset I$ and therefore $c \in EP(I)$.

We conclude by proving that the J produced in the previous lemma satisfies (*).

Lemma 5.12. Maintaining the notation from Lemma 5.11, we have

(1) $J <_{ext/int} K$; in particular J precedes K in any linear extension of $\leq_{ext/int}$. (2) $F(I) \cap F(K) \subset F(J) \cap F(K) = F(K) \setminus z_c$.

Proof. The first claim is a restatement of Lemma 5.11(3) and the definition of being a linear extension.

For the second claim, we compare the supports of the facets F(I), F(J) and F(K). For the x-support, first observe that by Lemma 4.5(6), the facets corresponding to the bases A, B and C satisfy

 $\operatorname{supp}_x(F(A)) \cap \operatorname{supp}_x(F(C)) \subset \operatorname{supp}_x(F(B)) \cap \operatorname{supp}_x(F(C)) = \operatorname{supp}_x(F(C)).$

Since I, J and K are internally related to the bases A, B and C, respectively, by Proposition 5.3, this gives $\operatorname{supp}_x(F(I)) = \operatorname{supp}_x(F(A))$, $\operatorname{supp}_x(F(J)) = \operatorname{supp}_x(F(B))$ and $\operatorname{supp}_x(F(K)) = \operatorname{supp}_x(F(C))$. We conclude that,

 $\operatorname{supp}_x(F(I)) \cap \operatorname{supp}_x(F(K)) \subset \operatorname{supp}_x(F(J)) \cap \operatorname{supp}_x(F(K)) = \operatorname{supp}_x(F(K)).$

We now consider the y-support of the facets F(I), F(J) and F(K) by first comparing the facets corresponding to J and K. By definition of K and construction of J,

$$\operatorname{supp}_{u}(F(J)) \cap \operatorname{supp}_{u}(F(K)) = Y = \operatorname{supp}_{u}(F(K))$$

This implies,

$$\operatorname{supp}_{u}(F(I)) \cap \operatorname{supp}_{u}(F(K)) \subset \operatorname{supp}_{u}(F(K)) = \operatorname{supp}_{u}(F(J)) \cap \operatorname{supp}_{u}(F(K)).$$

For the z-support, we first observe that by Lemma 5.10(6), the facets corresponding to the bases A, B and C satisfy

 $\operatorname{supp}_{z}(F(A)) \cap \operatorname{supp}_{z}(F(C)) \subset \operatorname{supp}_{z}(F(B)) \cap \operatorname{supp}_{z}(F(C)) = \operatorname{supp}_{z}(F(C)) \setminus c.$

We wish to compare the facets corresponding to J and K, first. Making use of Proposition 5.4 we write the z-supports of J and K in terms of z-supports of their corresponding bases. This gives $\operatorname{supp}_z(F(J)) = \operatorname{supp}_z(F(B)) \setminus Y$ and $\operatorname{supp}_z(F(K)) = \operatorname{supp}_z(F(C)) \setminus Y$. Noting that $c \in \operatorname{IP}(C)$, and $Y \subset \operatorname{IA}(C)$ we have the following,

$$\begin{split} \operatorname{supp}_z(F(B)) \cap \operatorname{supp}_z(F(C)) &= \operatorname{supp}_z(F(C)) \setminus c, \\ (\operatorname{supp}_z(F(B)) \cap \operatorname{supp}_z(F(C))) \setminus Y &= (\operatorname{supp}_z(F(C)) \setminus c) \setminus Y, \\ (\operatorname{supp}_z(F(B)) \setminus Y) \cap (\operatorname{supp}_z(F(C)) \setminus Y) &= (\operatorname{supp}_z(F(C)) \setminus Y) \setminus c, \\ \operatorname{supp}_z(F(J)) \cap \operatorname{supp}_z(F(K)) &= \operatorname{supp}_z(F(K)) \setminus c. \end{split}$$

To include the facet corresponding to I in our comparison, we recall from Lemma 5.11(4) that $c \in EP(I)$ and so $c \notin I \cup EA(I) = \operatorname{supp}_{z}(F(I))$. We conclude that

$$\operatorname{supp}_{z}(F(I)) \cap \operatorname{supp}_{z}(F(K)) \subset \operatorname{supp}_{z}(F(K)) \setminus c = \operatorname{supp}_{z}(F(J)) \cap \operatorname{supp}_{z}(F(K)).$$

This completes the proof. \Box

-

6. Restriction Sets

Here we investigate the restriction sets of two different families of shelling orders of Δ_M . In one case we find that the restriction sets form (a complex isomorphic to) the independence complex of M. In the second case the restriction sets give rise to a two-variable enrichment of the *h*-polynomial that has a nice expression in terms of the Tutte polynomial.

6.1. Restriction sets of linear extensions of $\leq_{ext/int}$.

Proposition 6.1. Let \prec be a linear extension of $\leq_{ext/int}$ on $\mathcal{I}(M)$. For each independent set I of M, then the restriction set of F(I) in this order is equal to z_I .

Proof. Our argument proceeds in two parts:

- (1) We begin by showing that z_I is a new face when F(I) is added to the complex generated by the facets preceding it in \prec . For this, we will prove that if $z_I \subseteq F(J)$ then $I \leq_{ext/int} J$ which means that I must come before J in \prec .
- (2) We complete the proof by showing that z_I is the minimal new face when F(I) is added to the complex generated by the facets preceding it in \prec . To accomplish this, we argue that if $z_S \subsetneq z_I$ then z_S must be contained in a facet that precedes F(I) in \prec .

For (1), write $I = A \setminus Y_A$ and $J = B \setminus Y_B$ with A, B bases, $Y_A \subset IA(A)$ and $Y_B \subset IA(B)$. Since $z_I \subset F(J)$ we have $I \subset J \cup EA(J)$. If I and J are not related then

$$IP(A) = IP(I) \subset I \subset J \cup EA(J) \subset B \cup EA(B).$$

It follows that $IP(A) \cap EP(B) = \emptyset$ and so $A \leq_{ext/int} B$ by Definition 2.7(2). This implies $I \leq_{ext/int} J$. If I and J are related then A = B and $I \subset J \cup EA(J)$ implies that $I \subset J$, so $I \leq_{ext/int} J$ and we are done.

For (2), observe that $S \subsetneq I$ so S is an independent set. Write $S = B \setminus G$ where B is a basis and $G \subseteq IA(B)$ by Proposition 2.4(2) and $I = A \setminus Y$ where A is a basis and

 $Y \subset IA(A)$. Notice that $S = B \setminus G \subset B \cup EA(B)$ so that z_S is contained in the facet F(B). If $A \neq B$ then

$$\mathrm{IP}(B) \subset B \setminus G = S \subsetneq I \subset A.$$

By Definition 2.6(2) this implies that $B <_{ext/int} A$. Because I is internally related to A, we obtain $B <_{ext/int} I$. We have just shown that z_S is contained in the facet F(B) and F(B) precedes F(I) in \prec . It remains to consider the case A = B. If A = B then $S = A \setminus G$ where $G \subset IA(A)$. This gives $S \subsetneq I$ with I and S are both internally related to the basis A. Further, z_S is contained in the facet F(S), with $S <_{ext/int} I$ by definition and thus F(S) precedes F(I) in \prec .

The following corollary is immediate from the definition of the Tutte polynomial.

Corollary 6.2. The h-polynomial of Δ_M is

$$\sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}(M)} q^{n+r-|I|} = q^n T_M(1+q,1)$$

where T_M is the Tutte polynomial of M.

Recall from Section 3.2 that a shelling of a simplicial complex is called an *h*-shelling if its restriction sets form a subcomplex. Since the restriction sets of a shelling of Δ_M produced from any linear extension of $\leq_{ext/int}$ forms a complex visibly isomorphic to the independence complex of M, it is immediate that this is an *h*-shelling. However, we can say more.

Corollary 6.3. For any linear extension of $\leq_{ext/int}$, the corresponding shelling of Δ_M has property (H).

This further explains why the *h*-vector of Δ_M is the *f*-vector of $\mathcal{I}(M)$.

Proof. Assume that $G \subset F(J)$ is face. It is sufficient to consider the case that G is codimension one in F(J), by [ER94, Theorem 2.6]. Say that G is obtained by deleting some x_i , y_i with $i \in E$, or z_i with $i \notin J$, from F(J). Then $G \in [z_J, F(J)]$ and hence $R(G) = R(F(J)) = z_J$ and the implication in (H) is trivial.

Assume $G = F(J) \setminus z_j$ with $j \in J$. Say that $G \in [z_I, F(I)]$ for some independent set I. To show property (H), it is sufficient to prove that $J \setminus j \subset I$. For a facet of Δ_M , we can recover its corresponding independent set by intersecting its x and z supports. Thus,

$$J \setminus j = \operatorname{supp}_x(G) \cap \operatorname{supp}_z(G) \subset \operatorname{supp}_x(F(I)) \cap \operatorname{supp}_z(F(I)) = I.$$

6.2. A bivariate *h*-polynomial. Recall that $\leq_{ext/int}$ is a partial order on $\mathcal{I}(M)$ defined by saying $I \leq_{ext/int} J$ if and only if the related bases A and B are distinct and satisfy $A \leq_{ext/int} B$, or the bases related to I and J are the same and $I \subset J$. In this section we consider a different partial order on $\mathcal{I}(M)$.

For $I, J \in \mathcal{I}(M)$, say that $I \leq_{ext/int}^{\prime} J$ if and only if the related bases A and B are distinct and satisfy $A \leq_{ext/int} B$, or the bases related to I and J are the same and $J \subset I$. Informally, one obtains $\leq_{ext/int}^{\prime}$ from $\leq_{ext/int}$ by flipping each small boolean lattice in $\leq_{ext/int}$ upside down; see the Hasse diagram in Example 2.14 and Remark 2.16.

It is a straightforward generalization of the (admittedly subtle) arguments in Section 5 that every linear extension of $\leq'_{ext/int}$ gives a shelling of Δ_M . We leave the details to the motivated reader.

We wish to describe the restriction sets for shelling orders, \prec' , on Δ_M that are produced from linear extensions of $\leq'_{ext/int}$. Before we state and prove our result we will require a lemma.

Lemma 6.4. Let A be a basis with $a \in IP(A)$ and define the basis

$$D := A \setminus a \cup d$$

where d is a maximum. Then $D <_{ext/int} A$ and $IA(A) \subset IA(D)$.

Proof. Let us begin by defining $X := A \setminus a$ so that $A = X \cup a$ and $D = X \cup d$. Notice that $d \in IA(D)$ and this gives $IP(D) \subset X \subset A$. We obtain $D <_{int} A$ by Definition 2.6(2) and hence $D <_{ext/int} A$.

To show that $IA(A) \subset IA(D)$, first observe that $D <_{int} A$ and so by Definition 2.6(3), $IP(D) \subset IP(A)$. Since $d \notin IP(D)$ this gives $IP(D) = IP(D) \cap X$. Also, $a \notin D \supset IP(D)$ and thus

$$\operatorname{IP}(D) \cap X = \operatorname{IP}(D) \subset \operatorname{IP}(A) \cap X.$$

Taking the complement in X gives

$$\operatorname{IA}(A) \cap X \subset \operatorname{IA}(D) \cap X \subset \operatorname{IA}(D).$$

Recall, $a \in IP(A)$ and this implies that $IA(A) = IA(A) \cap X$. The result follows.

Proposition 6.5. Let \prec' be a linear extension of $\leq'_{ext/int}$ on $\mathcal{I}(M)$. For each independent set I related to a basis A, write $I = A \setminus Y_I$ where $Y_I \subset IA(A)$. Then the restriction set of F(I) in \prec' is equal to $y_{Y_I} z_{IP(A)}$.

Proof. Similar to Proposition 6.1, our proof is organized in two parts:

- (1) We begin by showing that $y_{Y_I} z_{\mathrm{IP}(A)}$ is a new face when F(I) is added to the complex generated by the facets preceding it in \prec' .
- (2) We finish by showing that $y_{Y_I} z_{\text{IP}(A)}$ is the minimal new face when F(I) is added to the complex generated by the facets preceding it in \prec' .

For (1), let $I = A \setminus Y_I$ and $J = B \setminus Y_J$ be independent sets internally related to the bases A, B with $Y_I \subset IA(A)$ and $Y_J \subset IA(B)$. It is sufficient to show that if $y_{Y_I} z_{IP(A)}$ is contained in a facet F(J) then $I \leq'_{ext/int} J$.

Suppose that $y_{Y_I} z_{IP(A)} \subset F(J)$. Consideration of the z-support gives

$$IP(A) \subset J \cup EA(J) \subset B \cup EA(B).$$

This implies that $IP(A) \cap EP(B) = \emptyset$ and thus $A \leq_{ext/int} B$. Since A and B are bases we obtain, $A \leq'_{ext/int} B$. If A and B are distinct bases then $I \leq'_{ext/int} J$ and we are done. Otherwise A = B, and we examine the y-supports. We see that $Y_I \subset Y_J$ and this implies that $J = A \setminus Y_J \subset A \setminus Y_I = I$. Again, we conclude that $I \leq'_{ext/int} J$.

For (2), let $I = A \setminus Y_I$ with A a basis and $Y \subset IA(I)$. It is sufficient to show that if $y_S z_T \subsetneq y_{Y_I} z_{IP(A)}$ then $y_S z_T$ is contained in a facet that precedes F(I) in \prec' .

Let us assume that $y_S z_T \subsetneq y_{Y_I} z_{IP(A)}$. We will consider two cases according to the y-support. In both cases, we will construct an independent set J so that the facet F(J)contains the face $y_S z_T$ and $J <'_{ext/int} I$.

For the first case, say that $S \subsetneq Y_I$. Define $J := A \setminus S$ and observe that J is an independent set internally related to A. We claim that the face $y_S z_T$ is contained in the

facet F(J). To see this, we have $S = \operatorname{supp}_{u}(F(J))$ by definition. Also,

$$T \subset \operatorname{IP}(A) \subset J \subset \operatorname{supp}_z(F(J)).$$

Further, $I = A \setminus Y_I \subsetneq A \setminus S = J$ is properly contained in J and thus $J <'_{ext/int} I$.

For the second case, say that $S = Y_I$ and $T \subsetneq IP(A)$. Let $a \in IP(A) \setminus T$ and define the basis,

$$D := A \setminus a \cup d$$

where d is a maximum. The basis D satisfies Lemma 6.4. This gives $D <_{ext/int} A$ so that $D <'_{ext/int} A$. Also, $S = Y_I \subset IA(A) \subset IA(D)$. We claim that $J := D \setminus S$ is the needed independent set. To see this, observe that it is immediate that $J <'_{ext/int} I$, so we argue that $y_S z_T$ is contained in the facet F(J).

For the y-support, we have $S = \operatorname{supp}_y(F(J))$ by definition. For the z-support, by construction

$$T \subset \mathrm{IP}(A) \setminus a \subset A \setminus a \subset D.$$

Now recall that $Y_I \cap IP(A) = \emptyset$, $S = Y_I$ and $T \subset IP(A)$. This implies that $S \cap T = \emptyset$. Since $T \subset D$, we obtain the following inclusion,

$$T \subset D \setminus S = J \subset \operatorname{supp}_z(F(J)).$$

We have just shown that $y_S z_T$ is contained in the facet F(J) with $J <'_{ext/int} I$ and so we are done.

The restriction sets here have more information associated to them than their size alone: We may record how the restriction set are partitioned into y's and z's, thus obtaining a bivariate h-polynomial. This polynomial depends on $\leq'_{ext/int}$ but not \prec' .

Corollary 6.6. Maintaining the notation above, the bivariate h-polynomial of Δ_M is

$$\sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}(M)} q^{-|Y_I|} t^{n+r-|\operatorname{IP}(I)|} = t^n T_M((1/q+1)t, 1).$$

Setting t = q gives the *h*-polynomial we computed earlier. Note that the bivariate information is strictly finer than the information of the normal *h*-polynomial.

Proof. First note that IP(I) is the internal passivity of its related basis. We use the well-known expansion for the Tutte polynomial,

$$T_M(q,t) = \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}(M)} q^{|\operatorname{IA}(B)|} t^{|\operatorname{EA}(B)|}.$$

We have,

$$\begin{split} t^n T_M((1/q+1)t,1) &= \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}(M)} (1/q+1)^{|\operatorname{IA}(B)|} t^{n+r-|\operatorname{IP}(B)|} \\ &= \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}(M)} \sum_{Y \subset \operatorname{IA}(B)} q^{-|Y|} t^{n+r-|\operatorname{IP}(B)|}. \end{split}$$

Exchanging the order of summation gives the result.

7. The augmented no broken circuit complex

Given a matroid M on a set E totally ordered by \langle , a circuit with its maximum element deleted is called a *broken circuit*. The collection of subsets S that contain no broken circuit form a simplicial complex NBC(M) – the no broken circuit complex of M. The faces of NBC(M) are called nbc sets and it is immediate that every nbc set is independent in M. An independent set I is at once seen to be nbc if and only if EA(I) = \emptyset . The following result due to Provan is well-known; see [Bjö92, Theorem 7.4.3].

Theorem 7.1. For any matroid M, NBC(M) is shellable under any lexicographic ordering of its facets. Its h-polynomial is $T_M(q, 0)$.

As a first attempt at augmenting the nbc complex of M, we might consider the subcomplex of Δ_M generated by those F(I) where $\text{EA}(I) = \emptyset$. This turns out to have a large number of cone points: the elements of E(x) are obvious cone points, although there are more. Deleting these elements, we obtain the following definition.

Definition 7.2. The augmented nbc complex of M is the complex Δ_M^{nbc} on E(y, z) with facets $G(I) := y_{B_I \setminus I} z_I$ for every nbc set I of M related a basis B_I .

This is a subcomplex of Δ_M , pure of dimension r-1. The nbc complex is visibly isomorphic to the subcomplex of Δ_M^{nbc} induced by $E(z) \subset E(y, z)$. Our main results on the augmented nbc complex is the following.

Theorem 7.3. For any linear extension \prec of $\leq_{ext/int}$ on NBC(M), the corresponding ordering of the facets of Δ_M^{nbc} is a shelling.

Proof. It is sufficient to check that for any for any pair of nbc sets $I \prec K$ there is an nbc set $J \prec K$ and $c \in E$ satisfying

$$G(I) \cap G(K) \subset G(J) \cap G(K) = G(K) \setminus z_c.$$

Since I and K are independent sets, the proof of Theorem 5.7 produces J and c satisfying

$$F(I) \cap F(K) \subset F(J) \cap F(K) = F(K) \setminus z_c$$

We will show that J can be chosen to be nbc, and deleting the elements of E(x) from these facets gives the needed statement.

In the case that J and c are produced as in Lemma 5.8 we have J and K are internally related and hence they have equal external activity by Proposition 2.11. Since K is nbc, it follows that J is too. In the case that J is produced as in Lemma 5.11 it suffices to assume that I and K are nbc bases and apply parts (3) and (4) of Lemma 4.5 to see that $EA(J) = \emptyset$ if $EA(K) = \emptyset$.

The following two results are now immediate.

Corollary 7.4. Let \prec be a linear extension of $\leq_{ext/int}$ on NBC(M). For each independent set I of M, the restriction set of G(I) in this order is equal to z_I .

Corollary 7.5. The h-polynomial of Δ_M^{nbc} is equal to $T_M(1+q,0)$. That is, the h-vector of Δ_M^{nbc} is the f-vector of NBC(M).

Since the restriction sets in one of our shellings of Δ_M^{nbc} form a complex isomorphic to NBC(M), they are h-shellings as in Section 3.2.

Corollary 7.6. For any linear extension \prec of $\leq_{ext/int}$ on NBC(M), the corresponding shelling of Δ_M^{nbc} has property (H).

Proof. Assume $S \subset G(J)$ is codimension one. If S is obtained by deleting some y_i from G(J) then $S \in [z_J, G(J)]$ and the implication in (H) is trivial. If $S = G(J) \setminus z_j$ for some $j \in J$ then assume $S \in [z_I, G(I)]$ for some no broken circuit set I. It is immediate that $J \setminus j \subset I$ by taking z-supports and this is what (H) demands.

8. QUESTIONS

We close with a short selection of questions for future work.

- (1) We can identify the lattice of flats of M as a sublattice of the poset $\mathcal{I}(M)$ (with the order $\leq_{ext/int}$). Here a flat X corresponds to the unique independent set I satisfying $I \cup \text{EA}(I) = X$. Is this poset non-pure shellable? Similarly, is the external or internal order on $\mathcal{B}(M)$ (pure) shellable?
- (2) Does any direct sum of tautological bundles give rise to a shellable simplicial complex, as in Section 1.1?

References

- [AB16] Federico Ardila and Adam Boocher, The closure of a linear space in a product of lines, J. Algebraic Combin. 43 (2016), no. 1, 199–235. MR 3439307
- [ACS16] Federico Ardila, Federico Castillo, and José Alejandro Samper, The topology of the external activity complex of a matroid, Electron. J. Combin. 23 (2016), no. 3, Paper 3.8, 20. MR 3558045
- [AHK17] Karim Adiprasito, June Huh, and Eric Katz, Hodge theory of matroids, Notices Amer. Math. Soc. 64 (2017), no. 1, 26–30. MR 3586249
- [AK06] Federico Ardila and Caroline J. Klivans, The Bergman complex of a matroid and phylogenetic trees, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 96 (2006), no. 1, 38–49. MR 2185977
- [BEST23] Andrew Berget, Christopher Eur, Hunter Spink, and Dennis Tseng, Tautological classes of matroids, Invent. Math. 233 (2023), no. 2, 951–1039. MR 4607725
- [BHM⁺23] Tom Braden, June Huh, Jacob P. Matherne, Nicholas Proudfoot, and Botong Wang, Singular hodge theory for combinatorial geometries, 2023.
- [Bjö92] Anders Björner, The homology and shellability of matroids and geometric lattices, Matroid applications, Encyclopedia Math. Appl., vol. 40, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1992, pp. 226–283. MR 1165544
- [BKR⁺22] Elisabeth Bullock, Aidan Kelley, Victor Reiner, Kevin Ren, Gahl Shemy, Dawei Shen, Brian Sun, and Zhichun Joy Zhang, *Topology of augmented Bergman complexes*, Electron. J. Combin. **29** (2022), no. 1, Paper No. 1.31, 19. MR 4396472
- [Bri03] Michel Brion, Multiplicity-free subvarieties of flag varieties, Commutative algebra (Grenoble/Lyon, 2001), Contemp. Math., vol. 331, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2003, pp. 13– 23. MR 2011763
- [Cra69] Henry H. Crapo, The Tutte polynomial, Aequationes Math. 3 (1969), 211–229. MR 262095
- [EHL23] Christopher Eur, June Huh, and Matt Larson, Stellahedral geometry of matroids, Forum Math. Pi 11 (2023), Paper No. e24. MR 4653766
- [ER94] Paul H. Edelman and Victor Reiner, h-shellings and h-complexes, Adv. Math. 106 (1994), no. 1, 36–64. MR 1275865
- [HW17] June Huh and Botong Wang, Enumeration of points, lines, planes, etc., Acta Math. 218 (2017), no. 2, 297–317. MR 3733101
- [Li18] Binglin Li, Images of rational maps of projective spaces, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN (2018), no. 13, 4190–4228. MR 3829180
- [LV01] Michel Las Vergnas, Active orders for matroid bases, European J. Combin. 22 (2001), no. 5, 709–721, Combinatorial geometries (Luminy, 1999). MR 1845495

- [Ox111] James Oxley, Matroid theory, second ed., Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 21, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2011. MR 2849819
- [Whi32] Hassler Whitney, The coloring of graphs, Ann. of Math. (2) 33 (1932), no. 4, 688–718. MR 1503085