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#### Abstract

A crystallisation of a closed PL-manifold is an edgecoloured graph, which represents it via a contracted triangulation. Any two crystallisations of the same manifold are proved to be joined by a finite sequence of moves, two alternative sets of which are defined. A further move for dimension 3 is introduced.


1. Introduction and notation. Throughout this work balls, spheres, manifolds and maps are piecewise-linear (in the sense of [9] and [17]).

An $n$-dimensional ball-complex $K$ will be said to be a pseudocomplex ${ }^{1}$ if each $h$-ball, considered with all its faces, is abstractly isomorphic with an $h$-simplex. Further, $K$ will be said to be a contracted $n$-complex if the number of its vertices is $n+1$. We shall also call simplex each element of a pseudocomplex.

By a pseudodissection (resp. contracted triangulation) of a polyhedron $\boldsymbol{P}$ we mean a pair $(K, f)$, where $K$ is a pseudocomplex (resp. a contracted complex) and $f:|K| \rightarrow \boldsymbol{P}$ is a homeomorphism. About pseudodissections, compare also [11].

A theorem of Pezzana states that every closed, connected, $n$ dimensional manifold admits a contracted triangulation (for proofs see [14] and [6] and the sketch contained in this work, §4). The theorem can be extended to manifolds with connected boundary and to more general spaces (see [2]). A method for constructing pseudocomplexes from a set of disjoint $n$-simplexes is shown in [6] and [7].

Note that even in a pseudodissected manifold, stars and links of simplexes are not necessarily balls and spheres. But there exists a minimal set of severings on them, which makes them balls and spheres. The so modified stars (resp. links) are called disjoined stars (resp. disjoined links); compare the quoted papers for detailed definitions and proofs.

Closely related is the notion of ( $n+1$ )-coloured graph. Let $\Gamma=(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{E})$ be a finite nonoriented multigraph without loops, $\mathscr{C}$ a set (called colour-set), $\gamma: \boldsymbol{E} \rightarrow \mathscr{C}$ a map (called a coloration). Such a pair ( $\Gamma, \gamma$ ) is defined to be an h-coloured graph with boundary if:
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${ }^{1}$ In all references pseudocomplexes are symbolised with a tild on top of the letter, which we omit throughout this work.
(1) Card $\mathscr{C}=h$,
(2) $\gamma\left(e_{1}\right) \neq \gamma\left(e_{2}\right)$ for each pair of adjacent edges $e_{1}, e_{2}$.

Observe that properties (1) and (2) imply that each vertex of $\Gamma$ has degree $\leqq h$. A vertex of degree $<h$ will be called a bound-ary-vertex. If all vertices have degree exactly $h$, then ( $\Gamma, \gamma$ ) will be simply called an $h$-coloured graph. If $\mathscr{B} \cong \mathscr{C}$, we define $\Gamma_{\mathscr{S}}$ to be the partial graph of $\Gamma$ determined by the edge set $\gamma^{-1}(\mathscr{B})$. For each $c \in \mathscr{C}, \hat{c}$ will be the set $\mathscr{C}-\{c\}$.

In order to evidence the possibly existing boundary-vertices, we will draw as many "one-ended" edges coming out of them, as to make their degree equal to $h$. Figure 1 shows a 4 -coloured graph with just one (boundary-) vertex.


Figure 1
For every ( $n+1$ )-coloured graph ( $\Gamma, \gamma$ ) (either with or without boundary), we can construct a finite $n$-dimensional pseudocomplex $K(\Gamma)$, whose $n$-simplexes are in bijection with the vertices of $\Gamma$, and two have a common ( $n-1$ )-face iff the corresponding vertices are adjacent. Actually $\Gamma$ turns out to be the 1 -skeleton of the ballcomplex dual to $K(\Gamma)$. For the general construction and properties see [4] and [7]. We just recall that $K(\Gamma)$ is a contracted complex iff $(\Gamma, \gamma)$ also satisfies:
(3) for each colour $c \in \mathscr{C}$, the partial graph $\Gamma_{\hat{\mathrm{c}}}$ is connected.

We will call contracted a graph ( $\Gamma, \gamma$ ) satisfying 3). Note that, if $(\Gamma, \gamma)$ is contracted, to each colour $c$ there corresponds a vertex $v_{c}$ of $K(\Gamma)$. Otherwise, $K(\Gamma)$ has as many vertices corresponding to $c$ as the connected components of $\Gamma_{\hat{\mathrm{e}}}$.

On the other hand, if $K$ is a contracted $n$-complex triangulating a closed manifold $M$, then there exists an ( $n+1$ )-coloured graph $(\Gamma, \gamma)$, such that $K(\Gamma)=K .{ }^{2}$

Pezzana's theorem then enables us to represent every closed, connected, $n$-dimensional manifold $M$ by a (contracted) $(n+1)$-coloured graph related with a contracted triangulation.

Such a graph is called a crystallisation of $M$. Further information on crystallisations is available in [8], [15], [5].

Let now ( $\Gamma, \gamma$ ) and ( $\Gamma^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}$ ) be two ( $n+1$ )-coloured graphs (either with or without boundary), and $\mathscr{C}, \mathscr{C}^{\prime}$ the respective colour-sets.

[^0]Definition. Given a bijection $\psi: \mathscr{C} \rightarrow \mathscr{C}^{\prime}$, a graph isomorphism $\Psi: \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma^{\prime}$ will be called a colour-isomorphism compatible with if if

$$
\gamma^{\prime} \circ \Psi=\psi \circ \gamma
$$

$(\Gamma, \gamma)$ and $\left(\Gamma^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}\right)$ will then be said to be isomorphic.
Since, by the construction itself, colour-isomorphism of crystallisations is equivalent to abstract isomorphism of the related ballcomplexes, colour-isomorphism also implies homeomorphism of their spaces. The converse is not true, as nonisomorphic contracted triangulations - hence also nonisomorphic edge-coloured graphs - can be given for the same polyhedron.

The aim of this work is to solve the equivalence problem for crystallisations of closed manifolds of arbitrary dimension. This is the analogous for crystallisations, to what has already been obtained for Heegaard diagrams and splittings of 3-manifolds (in [18], [16], and [1]), for framed links (in [12] and [3]) and, recently, for generalised Heegaard diagrams of 4-manifolds (in [13]).

A possible development of the results of this work could be the determination of topological invariants of manifolds, as graph theoretical invariants of crystallisations, which are left unaltered by the moves (e.g., the number of vertices of a 2 -manifold crystallisation is such an invariant, which classifies 2-manifolds up to orientability character).

We also are exploring the problem of detecting $S^{3}$ and $S^{1} \times S^{2}$, at the light of the results presented here.
2. Connected sum of $h$-coloured graphs. Let $\left(\Gamma_{1}, \gamma_{1}\right),\left(\Gamma_{2}, \gamma_{2}\right)$ be $h$-coloured graphs, $\psi$ a bijection between their colour-sets $\mathscr{C}_{1}$ and $\mathscr{C}_{2}$. Let then $\Lambda_{1}, \Lambda_{2}$ be subgraphs of $\Gamma_{1}$ and $\Gamma_{2}$ respectively, such that:
(1) there exists a colour-isomorphism $\Psi: \Lambda_{1} \rightarrow \Lambda_{2}$ compatible with $\psi$;
(2) $j_{i}\left(\left|K\left(\Lambda_{i}\right)\right|\right)$ is an $(h-1)$-ball $(i=1,2), j_{i}$ being the inclusion of $\left|K\left(\Lambda_{i}\right)\right|$ into $\left|K\left(\Gamma_{i}\right)\right|$.

Definition. We define polyhedral connected sum of $\Gamma_{1}$ and $\Gamma_{2}$, with respect to $\Lambda_{1}, \Lambda_{2}, \psi$ and $\Psi$, the $h$-coloured graph $\Gamma_{1} \#_{\Lambda_{1} \Lambda_{2}} \Gamma_{2}$ so constructed:
(a) consider the graphs $\Gamma_{1}^{\prime}, \Gamma_{2}^{\prime}$ complementary of $\Lambda_{1}, \Lambda_{2}$ in $\Gamma_{1}$, $\Gamma_{2}$ respectively;
(b) join two boundary-vertices $P_{1}$ of $\Gamma_{1}^{\prime}$ and $P_{2}$ of $\Gamma_{2}^{\prime}$ by an $s$ coloured edge $\left(s \in \mathscr{C}_{1}\right)$ iff $P_{1}$ is joined with a vertex $Q_{1}$ of $\Lambda_{1}$ in $\Gamma_{1}$ by an $s$-coloured edge, and $P_{2}$ with a vertex $Q_{2}$ of $\Lambda_{2}$ in $\Gamma_{2}$ by a $\psi(s)$-coloured edge, so that $\Psi\left(Q_{1}\right)=Q_{2}$.
(c) colour the edges of the resulting graph by the coloration induced by $\gamma_{1}$ and $\psi^{-1} \circ \gamma_{2}$.

Definition 3. If (with the above notation) the graphs $\Lambda_{1}$ and $\Lambda_{2}$ reduce to the two vertices $Q_{1}$ and $Q_{2}$ of $\Gamma_{1}$ and $\Gamma_{2}$ respectively, then $\Gamma_{1} \#_{Q_{1} Q_{2}} \Gamma_{2}$ will be simply called connected sum of $\Gamma_{1}$ and $\Gamma_{2}$.

Figure 2 illustrates the latter operation on crystallisations of $L(3,1)$ and $S^{1} \times S^{2}$, yielding a crystallisation of their connected sum.


Figure 2

## 3. The moves.

Move of type I (Adding or cancelling of a nondegenerate dipole).
Let $(\Gamma, \gamma)$ be an $(n+1)$-coloured graph. Assume $\Gamma$ admits a partial subgraph $\Theta$, composed of two vertices, $X$ and $Y$ say, joined by $h$ edges, where $1 \leqq h \leqq n$, coloured by $c_{0}, c_{1}, \cdots, c_{h-1} \in \mathscr{C}$. Let also $\mathscr{B}=\mathscr{C}-\left\{c_{0}, \cdots, c_{h-1}\right\}$ be the set of the remaining colours, and $C_{\mathscr{A}}(X), C_{\mathscr{O}}(Y)$ the connected components of $\Gamma_{\mathscr{A}}$, containing $X$ and $Y$ respectively.

Definition 4. Such a partial subgraph $\Theta$ is said to be an $n$ dimensional dipole of type $h$, if $C_{\mathscr{O}}(X) \neq C_{\mathscr{S}}(Y)$.

A dipole of type 1 or $n$ will be called degenerate.
Let now ( $\Gamma, \gamma$ ), ( $\Gamma^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}$ ) be two ( $n+1$ )-coloured graphs and $\Theta$ a dipole in $\Gamma$. We can assume, w.l.o.g., that $\mathscr{C}$ is the colour set for both graphs.

Definition 5. We will say that $\Gamma^{\prime}$ is obtained from $\Gamma$ by cancelling the dipole $\Theta$, if:
(a) $\Gamma_{\mathscr{G}}^{\prime}$ is obtained from $\Gamma_{\mathscr{G}}$, by substituting, to $C_{\mathscr{F}}(X) \cup C_{\mathscr{D}}(Y)$, the connected sum $C_{\mathscr{F}}(X) \#_{X Y} C_{\mathscr{F}}(Y)$, accomplished with respect to the identity on $\mathscr{B}$;
(b) two vertices $A, B$ of $\Gamma^{\prime}$ are joined by a $c_{i}$-coloured edge ( $h \leqq i \leqq n$ ) iff the corresponding vertices of $\Gamma$ so are.

We will also say that $\Gamma$ is obtained from $\Gamma^{\prime}$ by adding the dipole $\Theta$.

Observe that if $\Theta$ is a non-degenerate dipole, then $(\Gamma, \gamma)$ is contracted iff ( $\Gamma^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}$ ) is. This is not true if $\Theta$ is degenerate.

The move of type I on a contracted ( $n+1$ )-coloured graph is defined to be the adding or cancelling of a nondegenerate dipole.

Figure 3a shows the adding of a dipole of type 2 to a crystallisation of $\boldsymbol{R P} .^{3}$


Figure 3b
Move of type II (simple cut-and-glue).
Let ( $\Gamma, \gamma$ ), ( $\left.\Gamma^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}\right)$ be two contracted ${ }^{3}(n+1)$-coloured graphs.

[^1]As before, we can assume that $\mathscr{C}$ is the common colour set.
Definition 6. We will say that $\Gamma^{\prime}$ is obtained from $\Gamma$ by a simple cut-and-glue move, or move of type II (and conversely) if there exist a noncontracted $(n+1)$-coloured $\operatorname{graph}(\bar{\Gamma}, \bar{\gamma})$ and a colour $c \in \mathscr{C}$, such that:
(a) $\bar{\Gamma}$ is obtained from $\Gamma$ (resp. from $\Gamma^{\prime}$ ) by adding a degenerate dipole $\Theta$ (resp. $\Theta^{\prime}$ ) of type 1.
(b) the edges of both dipoles are $c$-coloured.

In other words, $\bar{\Gamma}_{\hat{c}}$ must have two connected components, $\Gamma_{1}$ and $\Gamma_{2}$ say, and there must exist two pairs of vertices ( $P_{1}, P_{2}$ ), $\left(Q_{1}, Q_{2}\right)$ joined by a $c$-coloured edge, with $P_{i}, Q_{i} \in \Gamma_{i}(i=1,2)$, such that $\Gamma_{\hat{c}}=\Gamma_{1} \#_{P_{1} P_{2}} \Gamma_{2}, \Gamma_{\hat{c}}^{\prime}=\Gamma_{1} \#_{Q_{1} Q_{2}} \Gamma_{2}$, both connected sums being accomplished with respect to the identity on $\mathscr{C}-\{c\}$. Moreover, two vertices $A, B \neq P_{1}, P_{2}$ (resp. $A, B \neq Q_{1}, Q_{2}$ ) of $\bar{\Gamma}$ are joined by a $c$-coloured edge iff the corresponding vertices of $\Gamma$ (resp. $\Gamma^{\prime}$ ) so are.

The pass from $\Gamma$ (resp. $\Gamma^{\prime}$ ) to $\bar{\Gamma}$ will be called also a simple cut; the inverse pass a simple glueing, Figure 4 shows two crystalli-


Figure 4
sations of the 2-torus (compare [8]) which are obtained from each other by a simple cut-and-glue.

Definition 7. Two contracted ( $n+1$ )-coloured graphs ( $\Gamma, \gamma$ ) and ( $\Gamma^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}$ ) will be said to be (I-II)-equivalent if there exists a finite sequence $\left\{\left(\Xi_{j}, \rho_{j}\right)\right\}_{j \in \Lambda_{s}}{ }^{4}$ of contracted $(n+1)$-coloured graphs, such that

$$
\left(\Xi_{0}, \rho_{0}\right)=(\Gamma, \gamma) ; \quad\left(\Xi_{s}, \rho_{s}\right)=\left(\Gamma^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}\right)
$$


$\bar{\Gamma}$

${ }^{4}$ We denote by $\Delta_{s}, s$ a positive integer, the set $\{i \in \boldsymbol{Z} \mid 0 \leqq i \leqq s\}$.
and $\Xi_{i}$ is obtained from $\Xi_{i-1}$ by a move of type I (adding or cancelling of a nondegenerate dipole) or of type II (simple cut-andglue).

Move of type A (polyhedral cut-and-glue).
Definition 8. With the same notations as in Definitions 2 and 6 we will say that $\Gamma^{\prime}$ is obtained from $\Gamma$ by a polyhedral cut-andglue move or move of type A (and conversely) if there exists a noncontracted $(n+1)$-coloured graph $(\bar{\Gamma}, \bar{\gamma})$ and a colour $c \in \mathscr{C}$, such that:
(a) $\bar{\Gamma}_{\hat{c}}$ has two connected components, $\Gamma_{1}$ and $\Gamma_{2}$ say, and $\Gamma_{\hat{c}}=$ $\Gamma_{1} \#_{A_{1} \Lambda_{2}} \Gamma_{2}, \Gamma_{\hat{c}}^{\prime}=\Gamma_{1} \#_{\bar{A}_{1} \bar{A}_{2}} \Gamma_{2}$, where both connected sums are accomplished with respect to two isomorphisms $\varphi: \Lambda_{1} \rightarrow \Lambda_{2}, \bar{\varphi}: \bar{\Lambda}_{1} \rightarrow \bar{\Lambda}_{2}$ compatible with the identity on $\mathscr{C}-\{c\}$;
(c) every vertex $A$ (resp. $B$ ) of $\Lambda_{1}$ (resp. of $\bar{\Lambda}_{1}$ ) is joined with $\varphi(A)($ resp. $\varphi(B))$ by a $c$-coloured edge;
(c) two vertices $P, Q$ not in $\Lambda_{1} \cup \Lambda_{2}$ (resp. $\bar{\Lambda}_{1} \cup \bar{\Lambda}_{2}$ ) are joined by a c-coloured edge iff the corresponding vertices of $\Gamma$ (resp. $\Gamma^{\prime}$ ) so are;

Definitions of polyhedral cut, polyhedral glueing and A-equivalence are analogous to the ones of simple cut, simple glueing and (I, II)-equivalence respectively. A polyhedral cut-and-glue binding two crystallisations of the Dodecahedral-spherical space is shown in Figure 5, where $\bar{\Lambda}_{1}\left(\right.$ resp. $\left.\bar{\Lambda}_{2}\right)$ is the edge $Q_{1} Q_{2}\left(\right.$ resp. $\left.Q_{1}^{\prime} Q_{2}^{\prime}\right)$ and $\Lambda_{1}$ (resp. $\Lambda_{2}$ ) is the subgraph spanned by the vertices $P_{1}, P_{2}, P_{3}$ (resp. $\left.P_{1}^{\prime}, P_{2}^{\prime}, P_{3}^{\prime}\right)$.

## 4. Main theorem.

Theorem. Let $(\Gamma, \gamma)$ and $\left(\Gamma^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}\right)$ be crystallisations of two $n$ dimensional, closed, connected manifolds $M$ and $M^{\prime}$. The following three sentences are equivalent:
(i) $M$ and $M^{\prime}$ are homeomorphic;
(ii) ( $\Gamma, \gamma$ ) and ( $\Gamma^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}$ ) are (I, II)-equivalent;
(iii) $(\Gamma, \gamma)$ and $\left(\Gamma^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}\right)$ are A-equivalent.

Proof. (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii). The proof is trivial for $n \leqq 2$. It is also evident that, for $n>2$, a simple cut-and-glue is a particular case of a polyhedral cut-and-glue. Finally, cancelling of a nondegenerate dipole $\Theta$ corresponds to a polyhedral cut-and-glue accomplished by (1) isolating a vertex of $\Theta$ by means of a simple cut and (2) doing a polyhedral glueing. Figure 3 b illustrates, as an example, how the move of Figure 3a can be obtained by such an operation, $c$ being
the "dashed" colour, with $\Gamma_{\hat{o}}^{\prime}=\Gamma_{1} \#_{P_{1} P_{0}^{\prime}} \Gamma_{2}, \Gamma_{\hat{6}}^{\prime}=\Gamma_{1} \#_{1 A^{\prime}} \Gamma_{2}$.
(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i). Assume that $(\Gamma, \gamma),\left(\Gamma^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}\right)$ are obtainable from each other by a polyhedral cut-and-glue. Set $K=K(\Gamma), K^{\prime}=K\left(\Gamma^{\prime}\right)$, and let $v_{c}$ be the vertex of $K$ (resp. $v_{c}^{\prime}$ the vertex of $K^{\prime}$ ), corresponding to the colour $c$.
$\Gamma_{\hat{c}}$ (resp. $\Gamma_{\hat{c}}^{\prime}$ ) represents the pseudocomplex Lkd $\left(v_{c}, K\right)$ (resp. Lkd ( $v_{c}^{\prime}, K^{\prime}$ )), disjoined link of $v_{c}$ in $K$ (resp. of $v_{c}^{\prime}$ in $K^{\prime}$ ), which is an ( $n-1$ )-sphere. $M$ (resp. $M^{\prime}$ ) can be obtained from the $n$-ball $\left|\operatorname{Std}\left(v_{c}, K\right)\right|$ (resp. $\left.\left|\operatorname{Std}\left(v_{c}^{\prime}, K^{\prime}\right)\right|\right)$, space of the disjoined star of $v_{c}$ in $K$ (resp. of $v_{c}^{\prime}$ in $K^{\prime}$ ), by pairwise identification of the ( $n-1$ )simplexes of its boundary $\left|\operatorname{Lkd}\left(v_{c}, K\right)\right|\left(\right.$ resp. $\left.\left|\operatorname{Lkd}\left(v_{c}^{\prime}, K^{\prime}\right)\right|\right)$ and of all their faces. These identifications are represented in $\Gamma$ (resp. in $\Gamma^{\prime}$ ) by the $c$-coloured edges.

In order to show that $M$ and $M^{\prime}$ are homeomorphic, it suffices to prove that both are homeomorphic to the manifold $\bar{M}=|K(\bar{\Gamma})|$. This comes from explicit construction of $K(\bar{\Gamma})$, if one starts from the pair of disjoint balls, which are bounded by $\left|K\left(\Gamma_{1}\right)\right|$ and $\left|K\left(\Gamma_{2}\right)\right|$ respectively, where $\bar{\Gamma}_{\hat{c}}=\Gamma_{1} \cup \Gamma_{2}$.

Remark. Notice that the hypotheses on the graphs $\Gamma$ and $\Gamma^{\prime}$ can be weakened, the implication (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) still remaining true. In particular, if $\Gamma$ (resp. $\Gamma^{\prime}$ ) is not contracted, or, more precisely, if $\Gamma_{\hat{c}}$ (resp. $\Gamma_{\hat{c}}^{\prime}$ ) is nonconnected, the implication still holds, and the proof is the same, in its general lines. If, further, $\Gamma$ (resp. $\Gamma^{\prime}$ ) does not represent a manifold, the move can still be applied, provided that $\Gamma_{\hat{c}}$ (resp. $\Gamma_{\dot{c}}^{\prime}$ ) represents an $(n-1)$-sphere, if connected, or a disjoint union of ( $n-1$ )-spheres, one for each connected component. This condition implies that all vertices associated with the components of $\Gamma_{\hat{c}}$ (resp. $\Gamma_{\hat{c}}^{\prime}$ ) have neighborhoods in $|K(\Gamma)|$ (resp. $\left|K\left(\Gamma^{\prime}\right)\right|$ ), which are homeomorphic with closed $n$-balls.

The proof of the last implication $($ (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii)) needs some notation and some lemmas.

1. If $\Theta$ is a dipole in $(\Gamma, \gamma)$, we will say that the pseudocomplex $\mathscr{D}=K(\Theta)$ is itself a dipole in $K(\Gamma)$ (of type $h$ if such is $\Theta$ ). $\mathscr{D}$ obviously satisfies the two following properties:
(a) $\mathscr{D}$ consists of two $n$-simplexes $X^{n}, Y^{n}$ of $K$, which have $h$ common ( $n-1$ )-faces;
(b) if $A^{n-h}$ is the intersection of such common faces, and $X^{h-1}$ and $Y^{h-1}$ are the $(h-1)$-faces of $X^{n}$ and $Y^{n}$ respectively, opposite to $A^{n-h}$, then $X^{h-1} \neq Y^{h-1}$.

We will further call a subcomplex $\mathscr{D}$ of a pseudocomplex $K$ a dipole if $\mathscr{D}$ satisfies (a) and (b), even if $K$ is not associated with any $(n+1)$-coloured graph. Two pseudocomplexes $K$ and $K^{\prime}$, both
triangulating closed manifolds, will be called equal up to dipoles if one can be obtained from the other by adding and/or cancelling a finite number of dipoles.

On the same line, we will say that $K^{\prime}$ is obtained from $K$ by a simple cut-and-glue move if $K^{\prime}$ is obtained from $K$ by adding a dipole of type 1 and cancelling one in the resulting pseudocomplex.

Note that in dimension 2 this is nothing but the elementary move used for normalisation, from which the idea itself of cut-andglue is taken. Actually there is a classical (Dehn's) normal form (see [19], §12) which consists of a contracted triangulation.

Lemma 1. If $K$ and $L$, both triangulating closed manifolds, are equal up to dipoles, then $|K| \cong|L|$.

Proof. It follows from $|\mathscr{D}|$ being a ball.
Notice that, if $\mathscr{D}$ is a dipole of type $h$ in $K$, which consists of two $n$-simplexes $X^{n}$ an $Y^{n}$, and $\mathscr{D}^{\prime}$ is a further dipole of type $n+1-h$, consisting of the $n$-simplexes $Y^{n}$ and $Z^{n}$, then $\mathscr{D} \cup \mathscr{D}^{\prime}$ provides a contracted triangulation of an $n$-simplex $A^{n}$. Elimination of $\mathscr{D}$ or of $\mathscr{D}^{\prime}$ from $K$ is then equivalent to the substitution of $X^{n}, Y^{n}, Z^{n}$ by $A^{n}$.
2. A vertex $w$ of an $n$-pseudocomplex $K$ will be called a conevertex, if it belongs to all $n$-simplexes of $K$, or, equivalently, if $\operatorname{St}(w, K)=K$.

Let now $M$ be an $n$-dimensional, closed, connected manifold. We indicate by ${ }^{5}{ }^{q}$, with $q \in \Delta_{n+1}$, the set of all pseudocomplexes $L$ having $q$ cone-vertices, and such that $|L| \cong M$. Obviously, every pseudocomplex triangulating $M$ belongs to at least one of such sets, and $\mathfrak{C}^{n+1}$ is the set of the contracted complexes triangulating $M$ (in fact, if $L \in \Im^{n+1}$, it cannot have any other vertices than its $n+1$ cone-vertices).

We will call cone-algorithm any process $\mathscr{A}$, which associates to $L \in \mathscr{S}^{i}$ the pseudocomplex $L^{\prime}=\mathscr{A}(L) \in \bigodot^{i+1}$ in the following way:
(a) Call $w_{0}, \cdots, w_{i-1}$ the cone-vertices of $L$. One can form (in many ways) a tree ( $\varepsilon, \zeta$ ), whose "vertex"-set $\varepsilon$ consists of all disjoined stars of the $(n-i)$-simplexes of $L$ not containing any of $w_{0}, \cdots, w_{i-1}$, and where an "edge" of $\zeta$ is an $(n-1)$-simplex which is a common face, in $K$, of the two stars at its "end-points". Choose such a tree, and orient the $\zeta$-edges so, as to make $(\varepsilon, \zeta)$ an out-tree (with arbitrary source) (see [10], p. 201).
(b) Consider the disjoined stars of $\varepsilon$, and attach any two of them which are joined by a $\zeta$-edge (an ( $n-1$ )-simplex), by re-
identifying the two copies of this $(n-1)$-simplex. The pseudocomplex $D$ so built is an $n$-ball, and all of its vertices lie on the boundary $\Sigma=\partial D$, excepted for the case $i=n$; in such a case, anyway, none of the inner vertices is a cone-vertex. Identification of suitable pairs of ( $n-1$ )-simplexes of $\Sigma$ and of all their faces gets $L$ out of $D$. The ( $n-1$ )-simplexes of $\Sigma$ which have to be identified, in order to get $L$, will be said to be twin.
(c) Re-triangulate $|D|$, leaving the triangulation of the boundary unaltered, by making the join $w_{i} * \Sigma$ from an arbitrarily chosen, inner point $w_{i}$.
(d) Build the complex $L^{\prime}=\mathscr{R}(L)$ by re-identification of the twin simplexes of $\Sigma$.

Now, $|\mathscr{A}(L)| \cong|L| \cong M$. Moreover $L^{\prime}=\mathscr{A}(L)$ has a new cone vertex $w_{i}$, hence it belongs to $\mathbb{5}^{i+1}$.

Iterated application of $n+1-i$ cone-algorithms, starting from a pseudocomplex in $\mathscr{C}^{i}$ (in particular, $n+1$ cone-algorithms starting from a simplicial complex) provides a construction of a contracted triangulation of $M$. As every ( PL )-manifold admits a simplicial triangulation, this process sketches a proof of Pezzana's theorem. For further details, and for the formalisation, see [14] and [6].

To every pseudocomplex $L \in \mathbb{C}^{i}, i \in \Delta_{n}$, there corresponds a set $\mathfrak{A}(L) \subseteq 厅^{i+1}$ consisting of all pseudocomplexes obtainable from $L$ by a cone-algorithm.
3. Let now $\mathscr{A}$ be a cone-algorithm on $L,(\varepsilon, \zeta)$ and $D$ respectively the out-tree and the $n$-ball of its construction. Build a different cone-algorithm $\mathscr{A}^{\prime}$ as follows.
(a') Consider a disjoined star $S \in \varepsilon$ and call $\left(\varepsilon_{S}, \zeta_{S}\right)$ the sub-outtree of $(\varepsilon, \zeta)$ determined by $S$ and by all of its "descendants"; further call $\left(\varepsilon_{S}^{\prime}, \zeta_{s}^{\prime}\right)$ the sub-out-tree determined by $\varepsilon_{S}^{\prime}=\varepsilon-\varepsilon_{S}$.
( $\mathrm{b}^{\prime}$ ) Consider the ball $D_{1}$, bounded by $\Sigma_{1}$, built on the out-tree $\left(\varepsilon_{s}, \zeta_{s}\right)$, and the ball $D_{2}$, bounded by $\Sigma_{2}$, built on the out-tree $\left(\varepsilon_{s}^{\prime}, \zeta_{s}^{\prime}\right)$.
( $c^{\prime}$ ) Identify a pair of twin ( $n-1$ )-simplexes $B_{1}^{n-1} \in \Sigma_{1}$ and $B_{2}^{n-1} \in \Sigma_{2}$, so getting a ball $D^{\prime}$ with boundary $\Sigma^{\prime}$.
( $\mathrm{d}^{\prime}$ ) Proceed as in (c) and (d) to get $L^{\prime \prime}=\mathscr{L}^{\prime}(L)$ from $D^{\prime}$ and $\Sigma^{\prime}$ (noting that $\Sigma^{\prime}$ contains two new ( $n-1$ )-simplexes to be considered twin).

Observe that if $L^{\prime}=\mathscr{A}(L)$ and $L^{\prime \prime}=\mathscr{A}^{\prime}(L)$, then $L^{\prime \prime}$ is obtained from $L^{\prime}$ by a simple cut-and-glue move.

Lemma 2. Let $K \in \mathbb{C}^{i}$, $i \in \Delta_{n}$. If $K^{\prime}, K^{\prime \prime} \in \mathfrak{Z}(K)$, then $K^{\prime \prime}$ (resp. $K^{\prime}$ ) is obtained from $K^{\prime}$ (resp. from $K^{\prime \prime}$ ) by a finite sequence of cut-and-glue moves.

Proof. By induction on the cardinality of $\zeta_{2}-\zeta_{1}$, where $\left(\varepsilon_{1}, \zeta_{1}\right)$, $\left(\varepsilon_{2}, \zeta_{2}\right)$ are respectively the out-trees of the construction of $K^{\prime}$ and $K^{\prime \prime}$ 。
4. Now consider $L \in \mathfrak{C}^{i}, i \in \Delta_{n}$, and let $K \in \mathfrak{A}(L)$ be the pseudocomplex obtained from the ball $w_{i} * \Sigma$ by identification of twin simplexes of $\Sigma$. Let then $p: w_{i} * \Sigma \rightarrow K$ be the canonical projection.

Let $\mathscr{D}$ be a dipole of type $h(1 \leqq h \leqq n-1)$ in $\Sigma$, and $\Sigma^{\prime}$ the pseudocomplex obtained from $\Sigma$ by cancelling $\mathscr{D}$.

Lemma 3. If the two $(n-1)$-simplexes forming $\mathscr{D}$ are twin, then $p\left(w_{i} * \mathscr{D}\right)$ is a dipole of type $h+1$ in K. Moreover, the pseudocomplex $K^{\prime}$ obtained from $K$ by cancelling $p\left(w_{i} * \mathscr{D}\right)$ is $p\left(w_{i} * \Sigma^{\prime}\right)$.

Proof. Straightforward.
Observe that $K^{\prime}$ belongs to $๒^{i+1}$ too.
Lemma 4a. If $K \in \bigodot^{i+1}, i \in \Delta_{n}$, then there exist $L \in \mathbb{C}^{i}$ and $K^{\prime} \in$ $\mathfrak{A}(L)$, such that $K$ and $K^{\prime}$ are equal up to dipoles of type $h \geqq 2$. In particular, if $i=n, K, L, K^{\prime}$ coincide.

Proof. Recall that if $K \in \bigodot^{i+1}$, then $K \in \mathbb{C}^{j}$ for each $j \leqq i$. Then consider $L=K$ as belonging to $\mathbb{C}^{i}$ by the cone-vertices $w_{1}, \cdots, w_{i}$. $L$ has a further cone-vertex $w_{i+1}$, whose disjoined star, $\operatorname{Std} w_{i+1}=$ $w_{i+1} * \Sigma$ say, is strongly connected. Consider the graph whose "vertices" are the disjoined stars of ( $n-i$ )-simplexes of $L$ not containing $w_{1}, \cdots, w_{i}$, and whose "edges" are the ( $n-1$ )-simplexes joining them in Std $w_{i+1}$. This graph is connected, and one can get a tree $(\varepsilon, \zeta)$ from it by neglecting a set of edges. The ball $D^{\prime}$ built on $(\varepsilon, \zeta)$ has a boundary $\Sigma^{\prime}$ equal to $\Sigma$ up to as many dipoles as the neglected edges. Note that, for $i=n$, the graph reduces to the single vertex corresponding to $\operatorname{Std} w_{i+1}$ itself, thus no edge is erased, and no dipole arises.

Now, application of Lemma 3 proves the statement.
Lemma 4b. If $K, L \in \mathbb{C}^{0}$, then there exist $K^{\prime} \in \mathfrak{A}(K), L^{\prime} \in \mathfrak{H}(L)$ which are equal up to dipoles of type $h \geqq 2$.

Proof. $K$ and $L$ are in stellar equivalence, as one can take them to their barycentric subdivisions, which are simplicial complexes, by elementary stellar subdivision.

It is then sufficient to consider the case of $L$ being obtained from $K$ by an elementary stellar subdivision. But in this case a
construction similar to the one of Lemma 4a proves the statement.

Lemma 4c. If $K, L \in \mathfrak{C}^{i}, i \in \Lambda_{n}$, are equal up to dipoles of type $h \geqq 2$, then there exist $K^{\prime} \in \mathfrak{A}(K)$ and $L^{\prime} \in \mathfrak{Z}(L)$, which are equal up to dipoles of type $h \geqq 2$ if $i<n$, up to dipoles of type $h, 2 \leqq h \leqq$ $n-1$ (i.e., nondegenerate), if $i=n$.

Proof. Let us assume that $K, L \in \mathbb{E}^{i}, i \in \Lambda_{n}$, and that $K$ is obtained from $L$ by cancelling a dipole $\mathscr{D}$ of type $h \geqq 2$ formed by two $n$-simplexes $X^{n}$ and $Y^{n}$ meeting at $h(n-1)$-faces $F_{1}^{n-1}, \cdots, F_{h}^{n-1}$.

If $\mathscr{D}$ is degenerate, i.e., if $h=n$, set $w=\bigcap_{j=1}^{n} F_{j}^{n-1} ; w$ is a vertex, which is not a cone-vertex for $L$. Cancelling $\mathscr{D}$ from $L$ can be thought of as follows: dig the inside of $|\mathscr{D}|$ out of $|L|$, so setting a manifold $\bar{M}$ with a boundary, which is the sphere formed by the two ( $n-1$ )-simplexes $X^{n-1}$ and $Y^{n-1}$ opposite to $w$ in $X^{n}$ and $Y^{n}$ respectively; then identify $X^{n-1}$ and $Y^{n-1}$ to produce $|K|$.

As $\bar{M}$ is strongly connected, one can build an out-tree ( $\varepsilon, \zeta$ ) for $K$, so that no $\zeta$-edge represents the $(n-1)$-simplex $Z^{n-1}$ arisen from the identification of $X^{n-1}$ with $Y^{n-1}$. Call $D$ the ball, bounded by $\Sigma$, built on ( $\varepsilon, \zeta$ ), and $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{A}(K)$ the out-coming pseudocomplex.

We must now distinguish the three cases $i=n, 0<i<n$, $i=0$.

If $i=n$, the only noncone-vertex belonging to $\mathscr{D}$ is $w$, and its disjoined star is $\mathscr{D}$ itself. Hence, one can build an out-tree ( $\varepsilon^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}$ ) on $L$ by adding to $(\varepsilon, \zeta)$ a new edge ending in a new vertex which represents $\mathscr{D}$. Call $D^{\prime}$ the ball, bounded by $\Sigma^{\prime}$, relative to ( $\varepsilon^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}$ ), and $L^{\prime} \in \mathfrak{A}(L)$ the pseudocomplex obtained from it. Now, $\Sigma^{\prime}$ is isomorphic with $\Sigma$ by an isomorphism, which is compatible with the projections $D \rightarrow K^{\prime}, D^{\prime} \rightarrow L^{\prime}$. Therefore $K^{\prime}$ and $L^{\prime}$ are equal.

If $0<i<n$, the only ( $n-i$ )-simplex of $\mathscr{D}$ not containing any cone-vertices is a join $w * F^{n-i-1}$, where $F^{n-i-1}$ is that face of $\partial \mathscr{D}$, common to $X^{n}$ and $Y^{n}$, which contains no cone-vertices. The disjoined star of $w * F^{n-i-1}$ in $L$ is obtained from $\mathscr{D}$ by doubling the ( $n-1$ )-faces of $X^{n}$ and $Y^{n}$ not containing $w * F^{n-i-1}$. The ball $D^{\prime}$ built as for $i=n$ has boundary $\Sigma^{\prime}$, equal to $\Sigma$ up to dipoles (as many as the doubled faces). Lemma 3 then implies that $K^{\prime}$ and $L^{\prime}$ are equal up to dipoles of type $h \geqq 2$.

Finally, if $i=0$, an out-tree $\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}\right)$ can be built by adding to $(\varepsilon, \zeta)$ a new vertex corresponding to $X^{n}$ and $Y^{n}$ attached together by a common ( $n-1$ )-face, and a new edge corresponding to a noncommon ( $n-1$ )-face. The result comes again from Lemma 3.

Let now $\mathscr{D}$ be nondegenerate, i.e., of type $h<n$, and set $F^{n-h}=$
$\bigcap_{j=1}^{h} F_{j}^{n-1}$; let then $X_{1}^{n-1}, \cdots, X_{n-h+1}^{n-1}, Y_{1}^{n-1}, \cdots, Y_{n-h+1}^{n-1}$ be the noncommon ( $n-1$ )-faces of $X^{n}$ and $Y^{n}$, where faces with equal lower index are opposite to the same vertex; set $Q=\mathbf{U}_{k} X_{k}^{n-1}, R=\mathbf{U}_{k} Y_{k}^{n-1}$.

Elimination of the inside of $|\mathscr{D}|$ from $|L|$ yields the manifold $\bar{M}$ with the sphere $Q \cup R$ as boundary. Identification of each $X_{k}^{n-1}$ with $Y_{k}^{n-1}$ produces $|K|$.

Now, let $(\varepsilon, \zeta)$ be an out-tree for $K$, such that the ball $D$ built on it has all simplexes of $R$ (hence also of $Q$ ) on its boundary $\Sigma$. These simplexes will not in general form an ( $n-1$ )-ball isomorphic with $Q$; but, if ( $\varepsilon, \zeta$ ) is carefully built, elimination of nondegenerate dipoles will yield a sphere $\Sigma$ in which this happens. Let $v_{1}, \cdots, v_{i}$ be the cone-vertices of $L$, and let $F_{X}^{n-i}, F_{Y}^{n-i}$ be the faces of $X^{n}$ and $Y^{n}$ respectively, not containing $v_{1}, \cdots, v_{i}$. If $F_{X}^{n-i}=F_{Y}^{n-i}=F^{n-h}$, then its disjoined star is $\mathscr{D}$ itself. The ball $D^{\prime}$ obtained by attaching $\mathscr{D}$ to $D$ by one of the simplexes of $R$, has a sphere $\Sigma^{\prime}$ as boundary, such that $\bar{\Sigma}$ can be obtained from $\Sigma^{\prime}$ by cancelling nondegenerate dipoles. This leads to the result.

Analogous constructions prove the statement in the cases $F_{X}^{n-i}=F_{Y}^{n-i} \neq F^{n-h}$ and $F_{X}^{n-i} \neq F_{Y}^{n-i}$.

Lemma 4d. Let $L, L^{\prime} \in \Vdash^{i}$, $i \in \Delta_{n}-\{0\}$, be obtained from each other by a simple cut-and-glue move, and let $H \in \mathfrak{A}(L), H^{\prime} \in \mathfrak{A}\left(L^{\prime}\right)$. Then $H$ and $H^{\prime}$ are obtained from each other by a finite sequence of simple cut-and-glue moves and of addings and cancellings of nondegenerate dipoles.

Proof. First, assume $n>2$. Let $\bar{L} \in \complement^{i-1}$ be the pseudocomplex obtained from $L$ (resp. from $L^{\prime}$ ) by adding the dipole of type $1 \mathscr{D}$ (resp. $\mathscr{D}^{\prime}$ ), formed by two $n$-simplexes $X^{n}, Y^{n}$ meeting at the ( $n-1$ )-face $F^{n-1}\left(X^{\prime n}, Y^{\prime n}, F^{\prime n-1}\right.$ resp.). Let $v_{1}, \cdots, v_{i}$ be the conevertices of $L$ (and of $L^{\prime}$ ); $v_{1}, \cdots, v_{i-1}$, say, will be cone-vertices also for $\bar{L}$. Call $w, w^{\prime}$ the vertices common to $\mathscr{D}$ and $\mathscr{D}^{\prime}$, which are opposite to $F^{n-1}$ in $\mathscr{D}$, to $F^{\prime n-1}$ in $\mathscr{D}^{\prime}$.

If $\mathscr{D} \cap \mathscr{D}^{\prime}$ is not contained in the ( $n-3$ )-skeleton of $\bar{L}$, adding of a suitable nondegenerate dipole yields a pseudocomplex $L^{\ddagger}$, in which this happens. Call $K^{\#}$ and $K^{\prime \#}$ the pseudocomplexes obtained by adding the same dipole in $L$ and $L^{\prime}$ respectively.

The pseudocomplex $\overline{\bar{L}}$, closure of $L^{\sharp}-\left(\mathscr{O} \cup \mathscr{D}^{\prime}\right)$ is then strongly connected. In order to show this, let $A_{0}^{n}, A_{t}^{n}$ be two $n$-simplexes of $\overline{\bar{L}}$, joined in $L^{*}$ by a sequence of $n$-simplexes $A_{0}^{n}, \cdots, A_{t}^{n}$, where $A_{j-1}^{n}, A_{j}^{n}$ meet at an $(n-1)$-face $A_{j}^{n-1}$, for each $j \in A_{t}$. Let $A_{k}^{n}$ be the first simplex of the sequence which belongs to $\mathscr{D} \cup \mathscr{D}^{\prime} . A_{k-1}^{n}$ and $A_{k+1}^{n}$ meet at a face $A^{n-2}=A_{k}^{n-1} \cap A_{k+1}^{n-1}$ of $A_{k}^{n}$. Now, the star of $A^{n-2}$ is cyclic, so we can substitute $A_{k}^{n}$ by a sequence $B_{0}^{n}=A_{k-1}^{n}$,
$B_{1}^{n}, \cdots, B_{k+1}^{n}$, where all $B^{\prime}$ 's are adjacent and belong, $B_{r}^{n}$ possibly excluded, to $\overline{\bar{L}}$. $A$ finite number of such substitutions shows the strong connectedness.

Therefore one can build an out-tree $(\bar{\varepsilon}, \bar{\zeta})$ for $L^{\#}$ so that
(1) each $\bar{\varepsilon}$-vertex represents the disjoined star of an $(n-i)$ simplex of $L$ not containing $v_{1}, \cdots, v_{i-1}, w, w^{\prime}$;
(2) if $i>1$, no $\bar{\zeta}$-edge represents faces of $\mathscr{D} \cup \mathscr{D}^{\prime}$;
(3) if $i=1$, the $\bar{\varepsilon}$-vertices representing the dipoles themselves are terminal in the out-tree.

Call $\bar{D}$ the ball obtained as in point (b) of the construction of a cone-algorithm relative to $(\bar{\varepsilon}, \bar{\zeta})$. Set $W=F^{n-1} \cap \partial \bar{D}, W^{\prime}=F^{\prime n-1} \cap$ $\partial \bar{D}$. Accomplish point (c) by means of a new vertex $v_{i+1}$; set $\bar{W}=$ $v_{i+1} * W, \bar{W}^{\prime}=v_{i+1} * W^{\prime}$. Carry out the identifications of point (d) to get a pseudocomplex $\bar{K}$.

Let $(\varepsilon, \zeta),\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}\right)$ be the analogous out-trees for $K^{\ddagger}, K^{\prime \#}$ respectively (isomorphic with ( $\bar{\varepsilon}, \bar{\zeta}$ ) if $i>1$, only homeomorphic if $i=1$ ); call $K, K^{\prime}$ respectively the out-coming pseudocomplexes. Let $S, S^{\prime}$ be the disjoined stars of $w, w^{\prime}$, respectively, in $\bar{K}$.

Now, the ball obtained from $S$ and $S^{\prime \prime}$ by re-identifying the pairs of copies of the ( $n-1$ )-simplexes of $\bar{W}$, has boundary isomorphic with the disjoined link of $v_{i}$ in $K$; re-triangulation of the ball as a join from $v_{i}$ then gets the disjoined star of $v_{i}$ in $K$. Similarly, one gets the disjoined star of $v_{i}$ in $K^{\prime}$ by using $\bar{W}^{\prime}$. In $\bar{K}$, each of these operations is equivalent to: a simple glueing (corresponding to the re-identification of the first ( $n-1$ )-simplex), and cancelling of $n-2$ dipoles if $i=1(n-i$ if $i>1)$, which, by Lemma 3, are nondegenerate.

Resuming, the passage from $K$ to $K^{\prime}$ consists of: adding of nondegenerate dipoles, one simple cut-and-glue, and cancelling of nondegenerate dipoles. Now, apply Lemma 4 c to $L$ and $L^{*}$ (to $L^{\prime}$ and $L^{\prime \prime}$ ), then Lemma 2 to the out-coming pseudocomplexes, to $H$, and to $K$ (to $H^{\prime}$, and to $K^{\prime}$ resp.) to get the final result.

In dimension 2, the analogous of $\overline{\bar{L}}$ may be non strongly connected, but then the cut-and-glue can be substituted by adding and cancelling of a finite sequence of (obviously degenerate) dipoles (i.e., by a finite sequence of cut-and-glues) in which any pair of consecutive dipoles does not disconnect.

Proof of $(\mathrm{i}) \Rightarrow$ (ii). The statement will be proved as last step of an inductive argument.

Let $K_{1}, L_{1} \in \mathfrak{C}^{1}$. By Lemma 4a, there exist $K_{0}, L_{0} \in \mathfrak{C}^{0}, K_{1}^{\prime} \in \mathfrak{A}\left(K_{0}\right)$, $L_{1}^{\prime} \in \mathfrak{A}\left(L_{0}\right)$, such that $K_{1}$ and $K_{1}^{\prime}\left(L_{1}\right.$ and $L_{1}^{\prime}$ respectively) are equal up to dipoles of type $h \geqq 2$. On the other hand, Lemma 4 b assures
that there exist $K_{1}^{\prime \prime} \in \mathfrak{A}\left(K_{0}\right), L_{1}^{\prime \prime} \in \mathfrak{A}\left(L_{0}\right)$, which are equal up to dipoles of type $h \geqq 2$. Now, by Lemma $2, K_{1}^{\prime}$ and $K_{1}^{\prime \prime}$ ( $L_{1}^{\prime}$ and $L_{1}^{\prime \prime}$ respectively) are obtained from each other by a finite sequence of cut-andglue moves; therefore, $K_{1}$ and $L_{1}$ are obtained from each other by a finite sequence of cut-and-glues and addings and/or cancellings of dipoles of type $h \geqq 2$.

Now, let $K_{i}, L_{i} \in \mathbb{E}^{i}, 2 \leqq i \leqq n$. Application of Lemma 4a yields pseudocomplexes $K_{i-1}, L_{i-1} \in \mathbb{C}^{i-1}, K_{i}^{\prime}, L_{i}^{\prime} \in \mathbb{C}^{i}$ analogous to the previous $K_{0}, L_{0}, K_{1}^{\prime}, L_{1}^{\prime}$ and with the same properties. The inductive hypothesis that $K_{i-1}, L_{i-1}$ are obtained from each other by a finite sequence of cut-and-glues and addings and/or cancellings of dipoles of type $h \geqq 2$, together with Lemmas $2,4 \mathrm{c}$ and 4 d , assure again that $K_{i}$ and $L_{i}$ are obtained from each other in the same way.

Finally, the same argument applies for $K, L \in \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ with the following stronger inductive thesis, due to the particular form which Lemmas 4 a and 4 c assume for $\mathbb{~}^{n+1}: K$ and $L$ are obtained from each other by a finite sequence of cut-and-glue moves and addings and/or cancellings of nondegenerate dipoles. This means that the corresponding crystallisations are (I, II)-equivalent.
5. Dimension 3: generalised dipoles. We now describe a further move for dimension 3 , which, however redundant, often turns useful. In the natural correspondence between crystallisations of 3 -manifolds and Heegaard diagrams, a "genus" can be assigned to such crystallisations. This move permits to lower the genus even in cases when a (standard) dipole of type 2 is not present. Actually, it is the closest analogous, in crystallisation theory, of the stabilisation move of Reidemeister and Singer for Heegaard diagrams.

Let $(\Gamma, \gamma)$ be a 4-coloured graph, $\mathscr{C}=\left\{c_{i}\right\}_{i \in \Lambda_{3}}$ being its colour set. Assume that for two colours ( $c_{0}$ and $c_{1}$ say) there are a connected component $C$ of $\Gamma_{\left\{c_{0}, c_{1}\right\}}$ and a connected component $C^{\prime}$ of $\Gamma_{\left\{c_{2}, c_{3}\right\}}$ with only one common vertex. Let $\left\{x_{0}, x_{1}, \cdots, x_{m}\right\},\left\{x_{0}, y_{1}, \cdots, y_{n}\right\}$ be the sets of vertices of $C$ and $C^{\prime}$ respectively (see Figure 6a for $m=3, n=5$ ).

Definition 9. The subgraph $\Theta$ of $\Gamma$ determined by $C$ and $C^{\prime}$ will be called an ( $m, n$ )-dipole.

Assume $x_{1}, x_{m}, y_{1}, y_{n}$ to be the vertices joined with $x_{0}$ by edges of colours $c_{0}, c_{1}, c_{2}, c_{3}$ respectively. Let $\left(\Gamma^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}\right)$ be a further 4coloured graph with $\mathscr{C}$ as colour set.

Definition 10. We shall say that $\Gamma^{\prime}$ is obtained from $\Gamma$ by cancelling the ( $m, n$ )-dipole if:
(1) $\Gamma^{\prime}$ is obtained from $\Gamma$ by substituting to $\Theta$ the product
(see [10], p. 21) $\Xi$ of the subgraphs $C-\left\{x_{0}\right\}$ and $C^{\prime}-\left\{x_{0}\right\}$ (see Figure 6b);
(2) for all $i, i^{\prime} \in A_{m}-\{0\}, j, j^{\prime} \in A_{n}-\{0\}$, an edge joining the vertex $\left(x_{i}, y_{j}\right)$ with the vertex ( $x_{i}, y_{j^{\prime}}$ ) (resp. $\left(x_{i^{\prime}}, y_{j}\right)$ ) in $\Xi$ is coloured like the edge joining $y_{j}$ and $y_{j^{\prime}}$ (resp. $x_{i}$ and $x_{i^{\prime}}$ );

(3) for all $i \in A_{m}-\{0\}, j \in \Delta_{n}-\{0\}$, if a vertex $z$ of $\Gamma-\Theta$ is joined to | $y_{j}$ |
| :--- |
| $x_{i}$ | by a \(\begin{aligned} \& c_{0} <br>

\& c_{1} -coloured <br>
\& c_{2} <br>
\& c_{3}\end{aligned}\) coloured edge in $\Gamma^{\prime}$.


Figure 6a


Figure 6b

Conversely, we will say that $\Gamma$ is obtained from $\Gamma^{\prime}$ by adding the ( $m, n$ )-dipole $\Theta$.

Proposition. Let ( $\Gamma, \gamma),\left(\Gamma^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}\right)$ be crystallisations of two closed, connected, 3-dimensional manifolds $M, M^{\prime}$ respectively. If $\Gamma^{\prime}$ is obtained from $\Gamma$ by cancelling an ( $m, n$ )-dipole, then $M$ and $M^{\prime}$ are homeomorphic.

Sketch of proof. Cancelling of an ( $m, n$ )-dipole, for $m, n>1$, can be accomplished by a sequence of $(n-1) / 2$ (or $(m-1) / 2)$ cut-and-glue moves and cancelling of a dipole of type 2 . For $m=1$ or/and $n=1$, it is just cancelling of a dipole of type 2 .

Note that the $n$-simplexes corresponding to the vertices of an ( $m, n$ )-dipole form a pseudocomplex, the inside of whose space is an open ball; cancelling the ( $m, n$ )-dipole results in re-triangulating this ball.

## References

1. J. Birman, On the equivalence of Heegaard splittings of closed orientable 3-manifolds, Knots, groups and 3-manifolds - Annals of Mathematics Studies, 84 (1975), 137-164.
2. A. Cavicchioli and C. Gagliardi, Crystallizations of PL-manifolds with connected boundary, Boll. Un. Mat. Ital., 17-B (1980), 902-917.
3. R. Fenn and C. Rourke, On Kirby's calculus of links, Topology, 18 (1979), 1-15.
4. M. Ferri, Una rappresentazione delle n-varietà topologiche triangolabili mediante grafi $(n+1)$-colorati, Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. 13-B (1976), 250-260.
5.     - Crystallisations of 2-fold branched coverings of $S^{3}$, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 73 (1979), 271-276.
6. M. Ferri and C. Gagliardi, Alcune proprietà caratteristiche delle triangolazioni contratte, Atti Sem. Mat. Fis. Univ. Modena, 24 (1975), 195-220.
7. C. Gagliardi, A combinatorial characterization of 3-manifold crystallizations, Boll. Un. Mat. Ital., 16-A (1979), 441-449.
8. How to deduce the fundamental group of a closed n-manifold from a contracted triangulation, J. Comb. Inf. \& Syst. Sci., 4 (1979), 237-252.
9. L. C. Glaser, Geometrical Combinatorial Topology, Van Nostrand Reinhold 1970.
10. F. Harary, Graph Theory, Addison Wesley, Reading 1969.
11. P. J. Hilton and S. Wylie, An introduction to algebraic topology - Homology theory, Cambridge Univ. Press 1960.
12. R. Kirby, A calculus for framed links in $S^{3}$, Inv. Math., 44 (1978), 35-56.
13. J. M. Montesinos, Heegaard diagrams for closed 4-manifolds, Geometric topology Proc. Georgia topol. Conference, J. C. Cantrell Ed., Academic Press (1979), 219-237.
14. M. Pezzana, Sulla struttura topologica delle varietà compatte, Atti Sem. Mat. Fis. Univ. Modena, 23 (1974), 269-277.
15. ——, Diagrammi di Heegaard e triangolazione contratta, Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. 12, Suppl. fasc., 3 (1975), 98-105.
16. K. Reidemeister, Heegaarddiagramme und Invarianten von Mannigfaltigkeiten, Hamburg Abh., 10 (1933), 109-118.
17. C. Rourke and B. Sanderson, Introduction to Piecewise-linear topology, SpringerVerlag (1972).
18. J. Singer, Three-dimensional manifolds and their Heegaard diagrams, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 35 (1933), 88-111.
19. W. Threlfall, Gruppenbilder, Abh. Math.-Phys. Kl.Sächs. Akad. Wiss., 41 No. 6 (1932), 1-59.

Received June 4, 1980.
Istituto Mathematico "G. Vitali"
Via Campi 213/B
41100 Modena, Italy
Current address: Istituto di Matematic Facolté di Ingegneria Via Claudio 21 80125 Napoli, Italy


[^0]:    ${ }^{2}$ The theorem holds under much wider hypotheses: see [7], Prop. 8.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ The move can also be defined for noncontracted graphs.

