

CONTRACTIBILITY OF THE RIPS COMPLEXES OF INTEGER LATTICES VIA LOCAL DOMINATION

ŽIGA VIRK

May 16, 2024

ABSTRACT. We prove that for each positive integer n , the Rips complexes of the n -dimensional integer lattice in the d_1 metric (i.e., the Manhattan metric, also called the natural word metric in the Cayley graph) are contractible at scales above $n^2(2n-1)^2$, with the bounds arising from the Jung’s constants. We introduce a new concept of locally dominated vertices in a simplicial complex, upon which our proof strategy is based. This allows us to deduce the contractibility of the Rips complexes from a local geometric condition called local crushing. In the case of the integer lattices in dimension n and a fixed scale r , this condition entails the comparison of finitely many distances to conclude that the corresponding Rips complex is contractible. In particular, we are able to verify that for $n = 1, 2, 3$, the Rips complex of the n -dimensional integer lattice at scale greater or equal to n is contractible. We conjecture that the same proof strategy can be used to extend this result to all dimensions n .

1. INTRODUCTION

Given a metric space X and $r \geq 0$, the (closed) **Rips complex** $\text{Rips}(X, r)$ is the abstract simplicial complex with the vertex set X , for which a finite $\sigma \subseteq X$ is a simplex iff $\text{Diam}(\sigma) \leq r$. Here, $\text{Diam}(\sigma) = \max_{x, y \in \sigma} d(x, y)$.

The Rips complexes, sometimes referred to as Vietoris-Rips complexes, were originally introduced by Vietoris [34], [25, p. 271] (following [38] we reserve the name “Vietoris complex” for the Vietoris’ cover based construction of a simplicial complex). The construction was later rediscovered by Rips in the context of geometric group theory and used by Gromov [20]. Rips proved that the Rips complexes of hyperbolic groups are contractible for large scales r [12, Proposition III.Γ.3.23], when considering a group equipped with the word metric, i.e., as a Cayley graph. This turns out to be an important aspect in terms of group actions and has far reaching ramifications in geometric group theory. There are many variations and generalizations of this

results. Some of these include [9] (from the computational perspective) and [40, 33], which also incorporate Bestvina-Brady Morse theory. The motivating question for our work has been posed by an author of the latter two papers, Matthew Zaremsky: Are the Rips complexes of the free finitely generated Abelian groups (integer lattices in d_1 metric) contractible for large scales? Our main result confirms that this is indeed the case, and thus represents an extension of the Rips’ result to the “highly” non-hyperbolic free finitely generated Abelian groups.

While the aspect of geometric group theory is one of the main motivations to study the above question, it is not the only one. The second context in which our results play a prominent role is that of the reconstruction results, i.e., the question whether the Rips complex of a space (or a nearby sample in, say, Gromov-Hausdorff metric) at a reasonably small scale attains the homotopy type of the space itself. This question was first studied by Hausmann in [21], where he has used the Rips complexes to define a new cohomology theory. He proved that the reconstruction result holds for a large class of Riemannian manifolds. A simpler proof of his reconstruction result using Vietoris complexes and Dowker duality was recently given in [38]. Motivated by the followup question of Hausmann, Latschev later proved the reconstruction result for a Gromov-Hausdorff nearby sample for a large class of Riemannian manifolds. His result has later been generalized and extended, sometimes within the setting of computational geometry, in [7, 26, 28, 27, 9], with the results of [40, 33] also fitting into this setting despite the geometric group theoretic framework. Unfortunately, none of the tools used in these papers turned out to be applicable in our setting of integer lattices. By scaling the integer lattice to a sufficiently dense set, our main result is a specific variant of a reconstruction result.

The third context in which our result can be positioned, is that of persistent homology [19], within which the Rips complexes play a fundamental role in applications [8, 15]. One of its fundamental properties is stability, a version of which also holds for the Rips complexes: If metric spaces are δ -close in the Gromov-Hausdorff distance, then the persistence diagrams (obtained via the Rips filtrations) are at distance at most 2δ , [14]. It has led, for example, to a counterexample of the Hausmann’s conjecture from [21] on the monotonicity of the connectivity of Rips complexes, see [36]. The stability theorem implies that the persistent homology of the Rips complexes of integer lattices is close to that of the Euclidean space in d_1 metric (which has trivial persistent homology), but not necessarily the same. Our main result implies that persistent homology (and the homotopy type of Rips complexes) of integer lattices are more than stable, they are rigid at large scales:

at any sufficiently large scale they reconstruct the homology (and homotopy type) of the Rips complex of the Euclidean space at that scale (which is homotopically trivial). In contrast to the reconstruction results, which are a specific type of rigidity results holding for reasonably small scales, this property holds for sufficiently large scales. Outside the realm of the reconstruction results, the rigidity of persistent homology (or the homotopy type) has only been observed in a few settings: for flag complexes of circular graphs, including the homotopy type of Rips complexes of S^1 and certain ellipses [1, 2], for 1-dimensional persistence of geodesic spaces [35], and for connectivity of the Rips complexes of spheres above small and medium scales [3].

Main results. Our main results state that the Rips complexes of the integer lattices in the d_1 metric are contractible for large scales. For dimensions $n = 1, 2, 3$ we obtain the optimal (see Section 6 for a discussion and a conjecture on the optimality) contractibility bound $r \geq n$. For larger dimensions, we obtain a bound arising from the Jung’s constants.

- Theorems 3.2 and 5.2: Fix $n \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Then for any $r \geq n$, $\text{Rips}(\mathbb{Z}^n, r)$ is contractible, when using the d_1 (Manhattan) metric.
- Theorem 5.1: Fix a positive integer $n > 0$. Then for any $r \geq n^2(2n - 1)^2$, $\text{Rips}(\mathbb{Z}^n, r)$ is contractible, when using the d_1 (Manhattan) metric.

A comment on other d_p metrics. For a definition of d_p metrics for $p \in [1, \infty]$ see the beginning of Section 6. For example, d_2 is the Euclidean metric. In [40, Example 4.7], Matt Zaremsky has proved that $\text{Rips}((\mathbb{Z}^n, d_2), t)$ is contractible for all $t > \sqrt{n}/(2 - \sqrt{3})$ using the Bestvina-Brady discrete Morse theory. He has later informed us that a similar argument also seems to work for $d_{1+\varepsilon}$ metrics for positive $\varepsilon > 0$, although the argument hasn’t been written down by the time of the writing. For this reason, the present paper focuses on the d_1 metric, and only comments on why the same arguments hold in other d_p metrics in Section 6.

Main tool. As our main tool we introduce a new concept: local domination of a vertex in a simplicial complex, see Definition 3.1. The local domination is a generalization of the classical domination and allows us to remove a locally dominated (but not necessarily dominated) vertex from a simplicial complex without changing the homotopy type. As a novel tool in combinatorial topology it is of independent interest. While domination suffices to prove our main results in dimensions 1 and 2, higher dimensional lattices require the use of local domination.

The metric counterpart of the local domination which allows for a transition to Rips complexes is called a local crushing. It is a generalization of the Hausmann's crushing [21].

The structure of the paper is as follows.

Section 2: we provide preliminaries.

Section 3: we demonstrate how domination is used to prove our first main result about contractibility in dimensions 1 and 2, see Theorem 3.2. We then discuss why the approach fails in higher dimensions (Remark 3.3) and introduce local domination (Definition 3.1 and Theorem 3.4), along with its metric counterpart aimed at Rips complexes, local crushing (Definition 3.6 and Theorem 3.7).

Section 4: We introduce a variant of the local crushing in our context, the Local Euclidean crushing property LEC (Definition 4.1, Theorem 4.4).

Section 5: We prove our capital results on the contractibility of the Rips complexes of lattices in dimension 3 (Theorem 5.2) and higher (Theorem 5.1) using LEC.

Section 6: We discuss why our approach works for all d_p metrics. We conjecture that our proof strategy can be used to prove optimal contractibility bounds, and comment on why $\text{Rips}(\mathbb{Z}^n, r)$ is not contractible for $r < n$.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Let n be a non-negative integer. Point $(0, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ will be denoted by 0^n . Throughout the paper, the distance d on \mathbb{R}^n will always be the d_1 distance (also called the Manhattan distance) unless stated otherwise:

$$d_1((a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n), (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)) = \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i - b_i|.$$

The one point space is denoted by \bullet . The notation $X \simeq \bullet$ means X is contractible. An (abstract) simplicial complex is a subset-closed collection of non-empty subsets of its vertex set. The relation of being a subcomplex is denoted by \leq . The n^{th} skeleton of K will be denoted by $K^{(n)} \leq K$. The vertex set of K is $V(K) = K^{(0)}$. Given a vertex $a \in V(K)$, its star is $\text{St}_K(a) = \{\sigma \in K \mid a \in \sigma\} \leq K$ and its link is $\text{Lk}_K(a) = \{\sigma \in K \mid a \notin \sigma, \sigma \cup \{a\} \in K\} \leq \text{St}_K(a)$. A simplicial complex K is a **flag complex** if the following condition holds: $\sigma \subseteq V(K)$ is a simplex in K iff each pair contained in σ is a simplex in K . Given $A \subseteq V(K)$, the induced subcomplex is defined as $\text{Ind}_K(A) = \{\sigma \in K \mid$

$\sigma \subseteq A\} \leq K$. Given a subcomplex $K' \leq K$, the induced subcomplex is $\text{Ind}_K(K') = \text{Ind}_K(V(K')) \geq K'$. Clearly, each Rips complex is a flag complex.

Definition 2.1. Let K be a simplicial complex and $a, b \in V(K)$. A vertex a is **dominated** by the vertex $b \neq a$ if $\forall \sigma \in K : a \in \sigma \implies \{b\} \cup \sigma \in K$.

3. LOCAL DOMINATION AND LOCAL CRUSHING

Definition 3.1. Let K be a simplicial complex and $a \in V(K)$ a non-isolated vertex. A vertex a is **locally dominated** in K if there exists a simplex $L_a \in K$ not containing a , such that the following condition holds: if $\sigma \in K$ with $a \in \sigma$, then $\exists b_\sigma \in L_a : \sigma \cup \{b_\sigma\} \in K$. In particular, a is not isolated.

The local domination is a combinatorially-local variant of the concept of the domination. If L_a can be chosen to be a vertex in Definition 3.1, the corresponding local domination is the standard domination, see Figure 1.

The following results will motivate the local domination. It turns out that the domination is sufficient to prove contractibility of Rips complexes of lattices in dimension 1 and 2 (Theorem 3.2), but falls short in higher dimensions (Remark 3.3).

Theorem 3.2. *Let $n \in \{1, 2\}$. Then for each $r \geq n$, $\text{Rips}(\mathbb{Z}^n, r) \simeq \bullet$.*

Proof. By the Whitehead Theorem it suffices to show that all the homotopy groups are trivial. As any homotopy class is contained in the Rips complex on finitely many points, it suffices to show that for each positive integer M , $\text{Rips}(Z_M^n, r) \simeq \bullet$, where $Z_M = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, M\}$.

n=1: First, note that 0 is dominated by 1 in Z_M as $r \geq 1$. Removing 0 thus preserves the homotopy type. We proceed by induction (see Figure 2) removing the left-most point until we reach the one-vertex simplicial complex $\text{Rips}(\{M\}, r)$.

n=2: The proof is similar to the case $n = 1$ in the sense that we are inductively removing dominated points from Z_M^2 in a certain order. Starting in the lowest row, we are removing the vertices from left to the right (see Figure 3). Assume that v is the leftmost vertex in the lowest row of the (potentially reduced) Z_M^2 , and let the y coordinate of v be below M :

- (1) If v is not the last vertex in the row, then v is dominated by the vertex $v + (1, 1)$, and can thus be removed. Observe that the d_1 distance is the same as the induced path distance on the




FIGURE 1. Domination on top (Definition 2.1) and local domination at the bottom (Definition 3.1). Vertex a in the top row being dominated means there exists a vertex b contained in each maximal simplex containing a . Thus “pushing” a to b is a homotopy equivalence. Vertex a in the bottom row being locally dominated means we can choose a designated b_i in each maximal simplex containing a (in our figure, the maximal simplices are the three shaded tetrahedra with the points b_i hidden behind the front faces on the left side), so that the collection of the vertices b_i forms a simplex. Theorem 3.4 shows that, roughly speaking, “spreading” a towards all b_i is a homotopy equivalence, i.e., that the non-shaded area on the right can be filled in by some simplices.

indicated grid on Figure 3: at any scale, the shortest path α from a point $w \neq v$ to v passes either through $v + (1, 0)$ or through $v + (0, 1)$ just before reaching v , and so we obtain a path of the same length from w to $v + (1, 1)$ by diverting the last segment of α towards $v + (1, 1)$.

- (2) If a vertex v is the last vertex in the row, then v is dominated by the vertex $v + (0, 1)$, and can thus be removed.

When the reduction reaches $Z_M \times \{M\}$ we refer to the case $n = 1$ to conclude the contractibility.

Assumption $r \geq 2$ was used in two places. First, to assure that the pairs of vertices $(v, v + (1, 1))$ and $(v, v + (0, 1))$ form an edge. Second, to invoke case $n = 1$, where $r \geq 1$ is required. \square



FIGURE 2. The proof of Theorem 3.2 for $n = 1$: we inductively remove the leftmost vertex, which is dominated by the second leftmost vertex.




FIGURE 3. The proof of Theorem 3.2 for $n = 2$: we inductively remove the lexicographically smallest vertex, which is dominated by the vertex indicated by the arrow.

Remark 3.3. The vertex $0^3 \in Z = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^3$ is not dominated in $\text{Rips}(Z, 3)$. While each of the three vertices $(3, 0, 0), (0, 3, 0), (0, 0, 3)$ forms an edge with 0^3 (i.e., are at distance at most 3), it is easy to see that there is no vertex on Z , other than 0^3 , that would be at distance at most 3 from all three of them. Thus, the domination cannot be used and we turn our attention to the more general local domination.

The following theorem establishes the crucial property that removing a locally dominated (and in a special case, a dominated vertex) vertex is a homotopy equivalence.

Theorem 3.4 (Local domination). *Let K be a simplicial complex and $a \in V(K)$ a (non-isolated) locally dominated vertex in K . If K is a finite flag complex, then $\text{Ind}_K(V(K) \setminus \{a\}) \simeq K$.*

In the proof of Theorem 3.4 we will use the following well known lemma, see for example [10, Gluing Lemma 10.3], or recent uses in [17, 18].

Lemma 3.5. *Let K be a flag simplicial complex and $a \in V(K)$. If $\text{Lk}_K(a) \simeq \bullet$, then $K \simeq \text{Ind}_K(V(K) \setminus \{a\})$.*

Proof of Theorem 3.4. According to Lemma 3.5 it suffices to show that $\text{Lk}_K(a) \simeq \bullet$. Choose a simplex L_a according to Definition 3.1. Define a cover \mathcal{U} of $\text{Lk}_K(a)$ by subcomplexes $\mathcal{U} = \{M_\sigma\}_{\sigma \in \text{Lk}_K(a)}$, where $M_\sigma = \text{Ind}_{\text{Lk}_K(a)}(\sigma \cup L_a)$. Observe that the nerve $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{U})$ is the full simplex as the intersection of \mathcal{U} is non-trivial (it contains at least L_a). In particular, $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{U}) \simeq \bullet$. By the nerve theorem it remains to prove that \mathcal{U} is a good cover of $\text{Lk}_K(a)$.

Let $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_\ell$ be a collection of simplices in $\text{Lk}_K(a)$. We intend to prove that $\mathcal{I} = \bigcap_{i=1}^\ell M_{\sigma_i} \simeq \bullet$. Observe that $\mathcal{I} = \text{Ind}_{L_a} \left(L_a \cup \bigcap_{i=1}^\ell \sigma_i \right)$. Now $\bigcap_{i=1}^\ell \sigma_i \in \text{Lk}_K(a)$ and by Definition 3.1, there exists $b \in L_a$, such that $\bigcap_{i=1}^\ell \sigma_i \cup \{b\} \in \text{Lk}_K(a)$. This implies that every vertex of $\bigcap_{i=1}^\ell \sigma_i$ is connected to b . As \mathcal{I} is a flag complex and $b \in L_a$, this implies \mathcal{I} is a cone with the apex at b (as every vertex of \mathcal{I} is connected to b) and thus contractible. As a result, \mathcal{U} is a good cover and the theorem follows. \square

We now translate the local domination concept into a metric setting amenable to Rips complexes.

Definition 3.6. Let (X, d) be a finite metric space, $x \in X$, and $r > 0$. Point x is **locally crushable** (at scale r) in X if there exists a subset $L_x \subset X$ not containing x and of diameter $\text{Diam}(L_x) \leq r$, such that for each $A \subset X$ satisfying $x \in A$, $\text{Diam}(A) \leq r$, there exists $y \in L_x$: $\text{Diam}(A \cup \{y\}) \leq r$.

The concept of a crushing as a method of transforming the underlying set of a Rips complex while preserving the homotopy type of the complex has first been used by Hausmann [21]. Crushing and its discrete variant have later been used in [24, 37, 1, 31, 26]. Definition 3.6 provides a combinatorially-local version of crushing.

The following theorem is a direct consequence of Theorem 3.4 and the definition of Rips complexes.

Theorem 3.7. *Let X be a finite metric space, $x \in X$, and $r > 0$. If point x is locally crushable in X , then $\text{Rips}(X, r) \simeq \text{Rips}(X \setminus \{x\}, r)$.*

4. LOCAL EUCLIDEAN CRUSHING

In this section we prove a variant of the local crushing property for compact subsets of a Euclidean space, see Definition 4.1. While our

intended application is to finite subsets (i.e., the simplices of Rips complexes), the use of Jung's constant allows us to phrase it for compact subsets. Throughout this section we fix a positive integer n .

Given a subset $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, let $\text{Box}(A)$ denote the smallest box of the form $\prod_{i=1}^n [a_i, b_i] \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ containing A . In particular, each a_i is the minimal value of the i^{th} coordinate attained by A .

Definition 4.1. Given a positive integer n and $\rho > 0$, we say that the **local Euclidean crushing property** $\text{LEC}(n, \rho)$ holds, if for each compact $\tau \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times [0, \infty)$ with $0^n \in \tau$, $\text{Diam}(\tau) \leq 2n - 1$, there exists $c_\tau \in ([-1, 1]^{n-1} \times [0, 1]) \cap \text{Box}(\tau)$, such that the following holds: $\forall x \in \tau : d(x, c_\tau) \leq (2n - 1) - \rho$.

Observe that if $\text{LEC}(n, \rho)$ holds, then $\text{LEC}(n, \rho')$ also holds for all positive $\rho' < \rho$.

Remark 4.2. Here we provide a few comments on Definition 4.1. In a forthcoming argument, Definition 4.1 will be used inductively in the lexicographical order. To that purpose, we have phrased it in terms of subsets of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times [0, \infty)$ (where all lexicographical successors of 0^n lie) instead of \mathbb{R}^n . The definition is essentially phrasing a local crushing condition for compact subsets in $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times [0, \infty)$ with the redundancy ρ . The redundancy will later be required to pass to the lattices. Without the loss of generality, the ‘‘anchor’’ point is taken to be 0^n . The role of the subset L_x from Definition 3.6, onto which the local crushing is occurring, is assigned to the box $[-1, 1]^{n-1} \times [0, 1]$ as one of the simplest forms of easily determined diameter. Its diameter $2n - 1$ is thus used as the diameter bound.

The proof of the variant of the LEC property using \mathbb{R}^n instead of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times [0, \infty)$, and $L_x = [-1, 1]^n$ instead of $[-1, 1]^{n-1} \times [0, 1]$, is identical to the given proof.

We will now explain how the constant ρ is related to the Jung's constant.

Given $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $r > 0$, define the closed ball $B(x, r) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid d_1(x, y) \leq r\}$. For a compact subset $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ define the smallest enclosing radius $\text{Rad}(A)$ as the minimal radius of a ball in \mathbb{R}^n containing A , and keep in mind that we are using the d_1 metric. By compactness, the minimum $\text{Rad}(A)$ exists. The center $C(A)$ of such a ball may not be unique though. For $A' = \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}$, any point on the closed line segment from $(0, 0)$ to $(1, 1)$ is the center of such a ball. Therefore, a center may not be contained the convex hull of A . However, each center is in $\text{Box}(A)$. This is easy to see: if a point C' has, for example, the first coordinate smaller than the first coordinates of all points of A ,

then increasing its first coordinate to the minimal first coordinate of A decreases the distances from C' to each point of A . Performing such a modification for each coordinate we obtain a $C(A)$ within $\text{Box}(A)$.

Definition 4.3. Given a positive integer n , the **Jung's constant** is defined as

$$J(n) = \sup\{\text{Rad}(A) \mid A \subset \mathbb{R}^n, \text{Diam}(A) \leq 1\}.$$

There is a long history of results on parameters $J(n)$, starting with [23] who proved that $J(n, d_2) = \sqrt{\frac{n}{n+1}}$ holds for the Euclidean metric d_2 . For a review of the topic see [32] or [6]. For our argument it will be crucial to have $J(n) < 1$ (which holds by (1) of Theorem 4.4), while explicit upper bounds will provide eventual bounds on the scales at which the Rips complexes of integer lattices are contractible. The following proposition states some of the bounds on the Jung's constant that we will be using.

Theorem 4.4. *The following are some of the bounds on the Jung's constant in the d_1 metric:*

- (1) *The bound $J(n) \leq \frac{n}{n+1}$ was proved by [11], see also a short proof using the Helly's theorem in [6, Proposition 2.12]*
- (2) *$J(n) = \frac{n}{n+1}$ iff there exists a Hadamard matrix of order $n+1$. This result was proved by [16], see also [5, Section 15] and [22] for some related results.*

Lemma 4.5 (LEC and the Jung's constant). *Fix a positive integer n and $\kappa \in [J(n), 1)$. Then $\text{LEC}(n, \rho(n))$ holds for $\rho(n) = \frac{1-\kappa}{(2n-1)\kappa}$.*

Proof. Choose a compact $\tau \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times [0, \infty)$ with $0^n \in \tau$, $\text{Diam}(\tau) \leq 2n-1$. There exists $c'_\tau \in \text{Box}(\tau)$ such that $\forall x \in \tau : d(x, c'_\tau) \leq (2n-1)\kappa$. As $0^n \in \text{Box}(\tau)$, so is the convex combination

$$c_\tau = \frac{1}{(2n-1)\kappa} c'_\tau + \left(1 - \frac{1}{(2n-1)\kappa}\right) 0^n.$$

Choose any $y \in \tau$. Then by the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} d(y, c_\tau) &\leq \frac{1}{(2n-1)\kappa} d(y, c'_\tau) + \left(1 - \frac{1}{(2n-1)\kappa}\right) d(y, 0^n) \leq \\ &\leq 1 + \left((2n-1) - 1/\kappa\right) = (2n-1) \left(\frac{1}{2n-1} + 1 - \frac{1}{(2n-1)\kappa}\right) = \\ &= (2n-1) \left(1 - \frac{1-\kappa}{(2n-1)\kappa}\right). \end{aligned}$$

and similarly, $d(0^n, c_\tau) \leq 1$, which implies $c_\tau \in ([-1, 1]^{n-1} \times [0, 1])$. Thus the theorem holds. \square

For the purposes of the inductive proof of Theorem 5.1 we will require the $\text{LEC}(n, \rho(n))$ property with a parameter $\rho(n)$ which is monotone in n . Combining with (1) of Theorem 4.4 we thus phrase the following.

Corollary 4.6. *Fix a positive integer n . Then $\text{LEC}(n, \rho(n))$ holds for $\rho(n) = \frac{1}{n(2n-1)}$.*

Proof. Apply $\kappa = \frac{n}{n+1}$ from (1) of Theorem 4.4 to Lemma 4.5. \square

5. CONTRACTIBILITY OF INTEGER LATTICES

In Subsection 5.1 we use the LEC property inductively to conclude the contractibility of Rips complexes of integer lattices at large scales. In Subsection 5.2 we provide ad-hoc local crushings dimension 3, which yield smaller scales of contractibility for Rips complexes of \mathbb{Z}^3 .

In both of these arguments we will be using the **lexicographical order** in \mathbb{R}^n defined as follows: $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \prec (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)$ iff the largest index i at which the two vectors differ satisfies $x_i < y_i$. When $x_i, y_i \in \{0, 1, \dots, 9\}$, the equivalent condition is that the corresponding n -digit numbers satisfy $x_n x_{n-1} \dots x_2 x_1 < y_n y_{n-1} \dots y_2 y_1$. In comparison to the standard lexicographical order we have reversed the indexing so as to have the last coordinate being the dominant one. Also, for a positive number w let $(w\mathbb{Z})^n$ denote the integer lattice scaled by w , i.e., $\{w \cdot z \mid z \in \mathbb{Z}^n\}$. For each i let $\pi_i: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denote the projection to the i^{th} coordinate.

5.1. Contractibility of integer lattices at large scales.

Theorem 5.1. *For each $r \geq n^2(2n-1)^2$ we have $\text{Rips}((\mathbb{Z}^n, d_1), r) \simeq \bullet$.*

Proof. Define $\rho = \frac{1}{n(2n-1)}$ and observe that $\text{LEC}(n', \rho)$ holds for all $n' \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ by Corollary 4.6. Choose any real $m \geq n/\rho$. We **claim** that $\text{Rips}((1/m \cdot \mathbb{Z})^n, (2n-1))$ is contractible. Deferring the proof of the claim for a moment, we observe that the claim combined with the scaling of $(1/m \cdot \mathbb{Z})^n$ by m implies that $\text{Rips}(\mathbb{Z}^n, (2n-1)m)$ is contractible, $\forall m \geq n/\rho$. This means that the theorem holds for all scales $r = (2n-1)m \geq n^2(2n-1)^2$.

It thus remains to prove the claim that $\text{Rips}((1/m \cdot \mathbb{Z})^n, 2n-1)$ is contractible. By the Whitehead theorem it suffices to show that for each sufficiently large $M > 0$, the Rips complex $\text{Rips}(X, 2n-1)$ is contractible for $X = (1/m \cdot \mathbb{Z})^n \cap [-M, M]^n$, as each element of a homotopy group of $\text{Rips}((1/m \cdot \mathbb{Z})^n, 2n-1)$ is contained in a $\text{Rips}(X, 2n-1)$ for a large enough M .

The proof that $\text{Rips}(X, 2n-1)$ is contractible proceeds by induction. Let x_1, x_2, \dots, x_ℓ denote the collection of points of $X = X_0$ arranged in

the lexicographical order and define $X_i = X \setminus \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i\}$. We will prove that for each $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, \ell-2\}$, x_{i+1} is locally crushable in X_i at scale $2n-1$. By Theorem 3.7, this will imply that $\text{Rips}(X, 2n-1) \simeq \text{Rips}(X_{\ell-1}, 2n-1)$ and is thus contractible as $X_{\ell-1}$ is a single point.

There are two different types of inductive steps to prove that x_{i+1} is locally crushable in X_i at scale $2n-1$.

- (1) The first type is used when the last coordinate of x_{i+1} (namely, $\pi_n(x_{i+1})$) is not maximal within X , i.e., $\pi_n(x_{i+1}) < \max_{z \in X_i} \pi_n(z)$. By the definition of the lexicographical order, X_i contains the entire subgrid of X above x_{i+1} , namely the non-empty subset $X'_i = (1/m \cdot \mathbb{Z})^n \cap ([-M, M]^{n-1} \times [\pi_n(x_{i+1}) + 1/m, M])$.

We will now prove that x_{i+1} is locally crushable in X_i with the subset $L_{x_{i+1}}$ (see Definition 3.6) being

$$L_{x_{i+1}} = \{z \in X_i \mid 1 \geq |\pi_j(z) - \pi_j(x_{i+1})|, \forall j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}; \pi_n(z) > \pi_n(x_{i+1})\}.$$

Observe that $L_{x_{i+1}}$ is contained in the box $[-1, 1]^{n-1} \times [0, 1]$ translated by x_{i+1} . We refer to this translated box as B_i .

Following the definition of the local crushing, choose a simplex $\tau \in \text{Rips}(X_i, 2n-1)$ containing x_{i+1} . By the LEC property there exists $c_\tau \in B_i \cap \text{Box}(\tau) : d(y, c_\tau) \leq 2n-1-\rho, \forall y \in \tau$. Next, we change each of the coordinate of c_τ by at most $1/m$ to reach a point c'_τ of $L_{x_{i+1}}$:

- For $j < n$ we snap the j^{th} coordinate of c_τ (namely, $\pi_j(c_\tau)$) to the closest value of $1/m \cdot \mathbb{Z}$ in the direction of $\pi_j(x_{i+1})$. (If $\pi_j(c_\tau) = \pi_j(x_{i+1})$, no change occurs.)
- We snap the n^{th} coordinate to the closest value of $1/m \cdot \mathbb{Z}$ in the direction of $\pi_n(x_{i+1})$. In case that new value is $\pi_n(x_{i+1})$, we have $\pi_n(c_\tau) \in [\pi_n(x_{i+1}), \pi_n(x_{i+1}) + 1/m)$ and we thus snap to $\pi_n(x_{i+1}) + 1/m$ instead.

The resulting point is denoted by c'_τ . We first argue that $c'_\tau \in X_i$. By the LEC property, $c_\tau \in \text{Box}(X)$. By the structure of the X (the cubical grid), the above modification $c_\tau \rightarrow c'_\tau$ snapping coordinates towards $x_{i+1} \in X$ (or the last coordinate to $\pi_n(x_{i+1}) + 1/m$) thus results in c'_τ being in X . Since $\pi_n(c'_\tau) > \pi_n(x_{i+1})$, and since X_i contains all the points of X with n^{th} coordinate above $\pi_n(x_{i+1})$ due to the lexicographical order (i.e., it contains X'_i), we have $c'_\tau \in X_i$.

Next we argue that the resulting point c'_τ is in $L_{x_{i+1}}$:

- For $j < n$, as $|\pi_j(c_\tau) - \pi_j(x_{i+1})| \leq 1$ due to the LEC property, so is $|\pi_j(c'_\tau) - \pi_j(x_{i+1})| \leq 1$ as the j^{th} coordinate was moved (if moved) towards $\pi_j(x_{i+1})$.

- In the same spirit we can observe that $\pi_n(c'_\tau) - \pi_j(x_{i+1}) \in (0, 1]$. In particular, this means that $c'_\tau \neq x_i$.

Thus c'_τ is in L_{x+1} .

Changing each coordinate by at most $1/m$ in the transition $c_\tau \rightarrow c'_\tau$ provides a change by at most n/m in the distance. Thus $\forall y \in \tau$:

$$d(y, c'_\tau) \leq d(y, c_\tau) + d(c_\tau, c'_\tau) \leq (2n - 1 - \rho) + n/m < 2n - 1$$

by the definition of m . The locally crushing condition thus holds, with c'_τ being the point corresponding to τ according to Definition 3.6.

- (2) The second type of the inductive step on the index i uses another induction, that on the dimension n . Let i be the first index, for which $\pi_n(X_i)$ is a single point. This means that

$$X_i = ((1/m \cdot \mathbb{Z})^{n-1} \cap [-M, M]^{n-1}) \times \{\pi_n(x_{i+1})\}.$$

By the statement of this theorem for $n - 1$, we may inductively assume that a sequence of local crushings induces the homotopy equivalence $\text{Rips}(X_i, 2n - 1) \simeq \text{Rips}(X_{\ell-1}, 2n - 1)$, because the relevant parameters have been chosen so that they hold for the case $n - 1$ as well:

- We have chosen ρ so that $\text{LEC}(n', \rho)$ holds for all $n' \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.
- We have chosen $r \geq n^2(2n - 1)^2$ and thus $r \geq (n - 1)^2(2(n - 1) - 1)^2$ also holds.
- We have chosen $m \geq n/\rho$ and thus $m \geq (n - 1)/\rho$ also holds.

Thus X can be transformed to $X_{\ell-1}$ by a sequence of local crushings and thus $\text{Rips}(X, 2n - 1) \simeq \text{Rips}(X_{\ell-1}, 2n - 1) \simeq \bullet$. \square

5.2. Contractibility of integer lattices at small scales. The overall strategy of the next result is the same as that of Theorem 3.2 (see Figures 2 and 3) with the incorporation of local crushings. It is also an adaptation of the strategy of Theorem 5.2, using explicit local domination steps instead of the ones implied by the LEC property.

Theorem 5.2. *For each $r \geq 3$, $\text{Rips}(\mathbb{Z}^3, r) \simeq \bullet$.*

Proof. As in the proof of Theorems 3.2 and 5.2, it suffices to show that for arbitrarily large $M > 0$ and $Z = \{0, 1, \dots, M\}^3$, we have $\text{Rips}(Z, r) \simeq \bullet$. Again, we will proceed by induction, removing points from Z in the lexicographical order. Assume z_1, z_2, \dots, z_ℓ are the points of Z ordered in the lexicographical order, and define $Z_i =$

$Z \setminus \{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_i\}$. We will prove that for each $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, \ell - 2\}$, z_{i+1} is locally crushable in Z_i , yielding $\text{Rips}(Z, r) \simeq \text{Rips}(Z_{\ell-1}, r) = \bullet$.

Fix i . Translating by $-z_{i+1}$ we recenter Z_i so that z_{i+1} corresponds to 0^3 . Thus, there exist integers $a_1, a_2 \leq 0$ and $b_1, b_2, b_3 \geq 0$ so that Z_i consists of those points in

$$\{a_1, a_1 + 1, \dots, b_1\} \times \{a_2, a_2 + 1, \dots, b_2\} \times \{0, 1, \dots, b_3\}$$

which appear lexicographically after 0^3 . We proceed by case analysis:

- (1) If i is the first index at which $b_3 = 0$, the grid Z_i is two-dimensional and thus there is a sequence of local crushings inducing $\text{Rips}(Z_i, r) \simeq \bullet$ by Theorem 3.2.
- (2) If $b_3 \neq 0$ but $b_1 = b_2 = 0$, then all the points of Z_i except for 0^3 have the last coordinate 1, hence 0^3 is dominated in $\text{Rips}(Z_i, 3)$ by $(0, 0, 1)$. The technical reason is that $\forall w \in Z_i, w \neq 0^3 : d(w, (0, 0, 1)) = d(w, 0^3) - 1$.
- (3) Similarly, if $b_2, b_3 \neq 0$ but $b_1 = 0$, then 0^3 is dominated in $\text{Rips}(Z_i, 3)$ by $(0, 1, 1)$. The technical reason is that $\forall w \in Z_i : d(w, (0, 1, 1)) \leq d(w, 0^3)$. This is easy to see because any point in Z_i other than 0^3 has either the second or the third coordinate non-zero and is thus at distance at most $r - 1$ from either $(0, 1, 0)$ or $(0, 0, 1)$. The same argument was used in the proof of Theorem 3.2, case $n = 2$, item (1). Analogously, if $b_1, b_3 \neq 0$ but $b_2 = 0$, then 0^3 is dominated in $\text{Rips}(Z_i, 3)$ by $(1, 0, 1)$.
- (4) Assume $b_1, b_2, b_3 \neq 0$. We will prove that the local crushing condition holds for 0^3 with $L_{0^3} = \{(0, 0, 1), (1, 1, 0)\}$, which is of diameter 3. Assume $\tau \in \text{Rips}(Z_i, r)$ contains 0^3 . If $\tau \cup \{(0, 0, 1)\}$ is not a simplex, then there exists $(t_1, t_2, 0) \in \tau : |t_1| + t_2 = r$ (note that $t_2 > 0$ due to the lexicographical order). Take any $(s_1, s_2, s_3) \in \tau$ different than 0^3 . As $d((t_1, t_2, 0), (s_1, s_2, s_3)) \leq r$, we can't have both s_1 and s_2 equal to 0. In particular, either $s_2 > 0$ (in this case s_1 may be negative) or $s_1 > 0$. This means that (s_1, s_2, s_3) is either at distance at most $r - 1$ from $(0, 1, 0)$ or $(1, 0, 0)$ respectively. In both cases we can conclude $d((s_1, s_2, s_3), (1, 1, 0)) \leq r$ as in (3) above. This implies $\tau \cup \{(1, 1, 0)\} \in \text{Rips}(Z_i, r)$ and thus concludes the proof of local crushing.

□

6. CONCLUSION

We conclude with two comments on our results.

First, **the proof of Theorem 5.1 actually holds for any d_p metric.** For finite $p \geq 1$, d_p is defined as

$$d_p((a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n), (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i - b_i|^p \right)^{1/p},$$

while

$$d_\infty((a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n), (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)) = \max_{i=1,2,\dots,n} |a_i - b_i|.$$

There are only few places in the proof of Theorem 5.1 that actually use specifics of d_1 . We next discuss them and comment on why the same argument holds for any d_p metric with $p \in [1, \infty]$.

- (1) The proof makes use of $L_{x_{i+1}}$, which is contained in the box $[-1, 1]^{n-1} \times [0, 1]$. The diameter of this box is $2n - 1$ in d_1 (see Remark 4.2) and strictly less in other d_p metrics. Hence the estimates of the proof hold for any other d_p metric.
- (2) Another property that is used is the fact that the center of the minimal ball in (\mathbb{R}^n, d_1) containing A lies in $\text{Box}(A)$. The same argument that is given just before Definition 4.3 implies that the same holds in any d_p for $p \in [1, \infty)$. A special case is d_∞ : there a center is not unique, but it is easy to see (again, by the same argument that is given just before Definition 4.3) that it can be chosen in $\text{Box}(A)$.
- (3) All the other metric estimates in the proof hold for any d_p as they only use the triangle inequality.
- (4) The bound of (1) of Theorem 4.4 holds for any d_p metric by the same references ([11], [6, Proposition 2.12]) and consequently so does the auxiliary Lemma 4.5.

The smaller diameter of the mentioned box in (1), and tighter bounds on the Jung's constant in (4) can be used to deduce better bounds of the main result for d_p metrics.

The second comment is related to the following **question: Is the Rips complex $\text{Rips}((\mathbb{Z}^n, d_1), r)$ contractible for each $r \geq n$?** We conjecture that the same proof strategy as that in the proof of Theorem 5.2 should work. Unfortunately, we failed to notice a general pattern in the case analysis of the said proof, that would extend to higher dimensions. However, it is clear that for each fixed dimension n , such a case analysis only needs to consider finitely many cases, hence specific low dimensions may be amenable to computational verification. Concerning the lower bound for the scale parameter, it is easy to see that for $r < n$, the complex $\text{Rips}((\mathbb{Z}^n, d_1), r)$ is not contractible: according to [4] the Rips complex $\text{Rips}((\{0, 1\}^n, d_1), r)$ has non-trivial homology, and since there

is a contraction (1-Lipschitz retraction) $\mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$, the inclusion $\{0, 1\}^n \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n$ induces an injection on the homology of Rips complexes at each scale r , see [39]

7. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank Henry Adams, Arseniy Akopyan, and Matthew Zaremsky for fruitful discussions on the subject. The author was supported by the Slovenian Research Agency grants No. J1-4001 and P1-0292.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Adamaszek, H. Adams. *The Vietoris-Rips complexes of a circle*. Pacific Journal of Mathematics 290 (2017), 1–40.
- [2] M. Adamaszek, H. Adams, and S. Reddy: *On Vietoris-Rips complexes of ellipses*, Journal of Topology and Analysis 11 (2019), 661-690.
- [3] H. Adams, J. Bush, and Ž. Virk, *The connectivity of Vietoris-Rips complexes of spheres*, in preparation.
- [4] H. Adams and Ž. Virk, *Lower bounds on the homology of Vietoris-Rips complexes of hypercube graphs*, Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc. 47, 72 (2024).
- [5] A. R. Alimov and I. G. Tsar'kov, *Chebyshev centres, Jung constants, and their applications*, Russ. Math. Surv. 74 (2019), 775–849.
- [6] D. Amir, *On Jung's constant and related constants in normed linear spaces*, Pacific J. Math. 118(1): 1–15 (1985).
- [7] D. Attali, A. Lieutier, and D. Salinas. Vietoris-Rips complexes also provide topologically correct reconstructions of sampled shapes. In Proceedings of the 27th annual ACM symposium on Computational geometry, SoCG '11, pages 491–500, New York, NY, USA, 2011. ACM.
- [8] U. Bauer, *Ripsner: efficient computation of Vietoris-Rips persistence barcodes*, Journal of Applied and Computational Topology, 5:391–423, 2021.
- [9] U. Bauer and F. Roll, *Gromov Hyperbolicity, Geodesic Defect, and Apparent Pairs in Vietoris-Rips Filtrations*, In: 38th International Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG 2022). Vol. 224. Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs). 2022.
- [10] A. Björner, *Topological Methods*, in: Handbook of Combinatorics (ed. R. Graham, M. Grötschel, L. Lovász), Chapter 34, 1819–1872. North-Holland, Amsterdam (1995).
- [11] F. Bohnenblust, *Convex regions and projections in Minkowski spaces*, Ann. Math.,39 (1938), 301–308.
- [12] M.R. Bridson and A. Haefliger, *Metric spaces of non-positive curvature*, volume 319 of Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.
- [13] M. Cencelj, J. Dydak, A. Vavpetič, and Ž. Virk: *A combinatorial approach to coarse geometry*, Topology and its Applications 159(2012), 646–658.
- [14] F. Chazal, V. de Silva, and S. Oudot, *Persistence stability for geometric complexes*, Geom. Dedicata (2014) 173: 193.

- [15] M. Čufar, *Ripsrerer.jl: flexible and efficient persistent homology computation in Julia*, Journal of Open Source Software, 5(54), 2614 (2020).
- [16] V.L. Dol'nikov, *Jung constant in ℓ_1^n* , Mathematical Notes of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR 42, 787–791 (1987).
- [17] Z. Feng, *Homotopy types of Vietoris-Rips complexes of Hypercube Graphs*, arXiv:2305.07084.
- [18] S. Goyal, S. Shukla, and A. Singh, *Matching complexes of $3 \times n$ grid graphs*, Electronic Journal of Combinatorics, vol. 28, no. 4, Article no. P4.16, 2021.
- [19] H. Edelsbrunner and J.L. Harer, *Computational Topology. An Introduction*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, Rhode Island, 2010.
- [20] M. Gromov, Hyperbolic groups in *Essays in group theory*, S.M. Gersten (ed.), MSRI Publ. 8 75–263 (1987).
- [21] J.-C. Hausmann. *On the Vietoris-Rips complexes and a cohomology theory for metric spaces*. Annals of Mathematics Studies, 138:175–188, 1995.
- [22] V.I. Ivanov and S.A. Pichugov, *Jung constants of the ℓ_p^n -spaces*, Mathematical Notes of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR 48, 997–1004 (1990).
- [23] H.W.E. Jung, *Über die kleinste Kugel, die eine räumliche Figur einschliesst*, J. Reine. Angew. Math, 123 (1901), 241–257.
- [24] J. Latschev. *Vietoris-Rips complexes of metric spaces near a closed Riemannian manifold*. Archiv der Mathematik, 77(6):522–528, 2001.
- [25] S. Lefschetz, *Algebraic Topology*, AMS Coll. Publ. 27 (1942).
- [26] B. Lemež and Ž. Virk, *Reconstruction Properties of Selective Rips Complexes*, Glasnik Matematički 57(2022), vol. 2, 73–88.
- [27] S. Majhi, *Vietoris-Rips complexes of metric spaces near a metric graph*. J Appl. and Comput. Topology 7, 741–770 (2023).
- [28] S. Majhi, *Demystifying Latschev's Theorem: Manifold Reconstruction from Noisy Data*, Discrete Comput Geom (2024).
- [29] J.R. Munkres, *Topology*, second edition, Prentice Hall, 2000.
- [30] J. Roe, *Coarse cohomology and index theory for complete Riemannian manifolds*, Memoirs Amer. Math. Soc. No. 497, 1993.
- [31] A. Rolle, *The Degree-Rips Complexes of an Annulus with Outliers*, in 38th International Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG 2022). Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs), Volume 224, pp. 58:1–58:14, Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz–Zentrum für Informatik (2022)
- [32] M. N. Vrahatis, *Towards the mathematical foundation of the minimum enclosing ball and related problems*, arXiv:2402.06629.
- [33] M. Varisco and M. Zaremsky, *Equivariant Morse theory on Vietoris-Rips complexes and universal spaces for proper actions*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. Vol. 53 (2021), No. 6, 1724–1739.
- [34] L. Vietoris, *Über den höheren Zusammenhang kompakter Räume und eine Klasse von zusammenhangstreuen Abbildungen*. Math. Ann. 97, 454–472 (1927).
- [35] Ž. Virk, *Approximations of 1-Dimensional Intrinsic Persistence of Geodesic Spaces and Their Stability*, Revista Matemática Complutense 32 (2019), 195–213.
- [36] Ž. Virk: *A Counter-example to Hausmann's Conjecture*, Found Comput Math 22(2022), 469–475.

- [37] Ž. Virk, *Footprints of geodesics in persistent homology*, Mediterranean Journal of Mathematics 19 (2022).
- [38] Ž. Virk, *Rips complexes as nerves and a Functorial Dowker-Nerve Diagram*, Mediterranean Journal of Mathematics 18 (2021).
- [39] Ž. Virk, *Contractions in persistence and metric graphs*, Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc. 45 (2022), 2003–2016
- [40] M. Zaremsky, *Bestvina-Brady discrete Morse theory and Vietoris-Rips complexes*, Amer. J. Math. Vol. 144 (2022), No. 5, 1177–1200.

UNIVERSITY OF LJUBLJANA AND INSTITUTE IMFM, LJUBLJANA, SLOVENIA
Email address: ziga.virk@fri.uni-lj.si