

BISTELLAR CLUSTER ALGEBRAS AND PIECEWISE LINEAR INVARIANTS

ALASTAIR DARBY, FANG LI, AND ZHI LÜ

ABSTRACT. Inspired by the ideas and techniques used in the study of cluster algebras we construct a new class of algebras, called *bistellar cluster algebras*, from closed oriented triangulated even-dimensional manifolds by performing middle-dimensional bistellar moves. This class of algebras exhibit the algebraic behaviour of middle-dimensional bistellar moves but do not satisfy the classical cluster algebra axiom: “every cluster variable in every cluster is exchangeable”. Thus the construction of bistellar cluster algebras is quite different from that of a classical cluster algebra.

Secondly, using bistellar cluster algebras and the techniques of combinatorial topology, we construct a direct system associated with a set of PL homeomorphic PL manifolds of dimension 2 or 4, and show that the limit of this direct system is a PL invariant.

1. INTRODUCTION

Finding invariants of manifolds is important in solving problems such as the *smooth 4- dimensional Poincaré conjecture* (see [10]) which asks if there are different smooth structures on the 4-sphere. In this paper we describe a new invariant of Piecewise Linear manifolds, which in the case of 4 dimensional manifolds (and lower), are the same as smooth manifolds. This has the potential of helping to answer the smooth Poincaré conjecture if different candidates for the smooth/PL structures can be shown to have distinct invariants. The invariants we have found for 2- and 4-dimensional smooth/PL manifolds are inspired by the work in the field of cluster algebras along with classical work in PL manifolds as described below.

1.1. Background and motivation. Cluster algebras were first introduced and studied systematically in a series of papers [6, 7, 1, 9]. The original motivation and aim for cluster algebras was to provide an algebraic framework for the study of total positivity phenomena in semisimple Lie groups and of Lusztig’s and Kashiwara’s canonical bases of quantum groups. In recent years, it has been shown that this kind of algebraic structure for cluster algebras can arise in various mathematical settings, such as total positivity, Lie theory, quiver representations, Teichmüller theory, Poisson geometry, discrete dynamical systems, tropical geometry, algebraic combinatorics, topology of surfaces and so on (see, for example, [4, 3, 8]).

Roughly speaking, a cluster algebra \mathcal{A} of rank r is a subalgebra of an ambient field \mathcal{F} of rational functions in r indeterminates, which is defined via a distinguished family of generators. These generators are called *cluster variables* and are grouped into r -subsets called *clusters*. These clusters satisfy the exchange property: for any cluster \mathbf{x} and any element $x \in \mathbf{x}$, there is another cluster \mathbf{x}' and $x' \in \mathbf{x}'$ with $\mathbf{x}' = (\mathbf{x} \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{x'\}$ such that x and x' are related by an *exchange relation*

$$xx' = M^+ + M^-,$$

where M^+ and M^- are two monomials without common divisors in the $r - 1$ variables $\mathbf{x} \cap \mathbf{x}'$, and the exponents in M^+ and M^- are encoded in an $(r \times r)$ integral matrix $B = (b_{ij})$ (usually skew-symmetric) called the *exchange matrix*. The cluster algebra \mathcal{A} can also be obtained from a pair (\mathbf{x}, B) , called a seed, by seed mutations, where \mathbf{x} is an initial cluster and B is an initial exchange matrix, so that all cluster variables can be constructed inductively, and each cluster variable x is a rational function of the variables in the initial cluster \mathbf{x} . With this point of view, the cluster algebra \mathcal{A} becomes a subring of the field formed by all rational functions of the variables in the initial cluster \mathbf{x} .

In their work [5], Fomin, Shapiro and Thurston showed that any triangulation T of a connected oriented Riemann surface S produces a cluster algebra \mathcal{A}_T , which is briefly stated as follows: they regard the set of all edges (or 1-dimensional faces) of T as an initial cluster $\mathbf{x}(T)$ and define a skew-symmetric matrix $B(T)$

Date: May 16, 2024.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 57Q15, 13F60, 57Q25.

by looking at the (signed) adjacencies between the edges of T , which serves as an initial exchange matrix of the cluster algebra \mathcal{A}_T . Then the required cluster algebra \mathcal{A}_T is obtained from the initial seed $(\mathbf{x}(T), B(T))$ by seed mutations. In particular, they showed that mutations of matrices in algebra completely agree with 1-moves (or flips) in combinatorial topology. It is well-known that any connected oriented Riemann surface S has a unique PL structure and any two triangulations with the same number of vertices of S are connected by 1-moves. Thus, for any two triangulations T and T' with the same number of vertices of S , both \mathcal{A}_T and $\mathcal{A}_{T'}$ are isomorphic. This means that this class of cluster algebras are invariant up to isomorphism under the actions of 1-moves.

The following question naturally arises:

Question 1.1. What kinds of analogues of cluster algebras can be produced from high-dimensional oriented triangulated manifolds?

Although the 2-dimensional case provides us with intuition on the study of the higher dimensional cases, we note that the problem is more complicated than it may seem at first glance. This heavily depends upon the combinatorial topology of the various moves in the higher dimensional cases.

Actually, Question 1.1 is directly related to the problem of how to give an algebraic description of various moves (especially bistellar moves) in the higher dimensional cases. Pachner [11, 12] tells us that two PL manifolds are PL homeomorphic if and only if one can be transformed into the other by a finite sequence of bistellar moves. We therefore pay more attention to the case of bistellar moves in general.

1.2. Our work and statements of main results. Let K be a connected oriented triangulated closed manifold of dimension $n \geq 2$. To extend the theory of Fomin, Shapiro and Thurston in the 2-dimensional case to the general case, we need to consider the following questions:

- (1) What will our *cluster variables* will be?
- (2) How should we define the *exchange matrices*?
- (3) How should the *matrix mutations* which correspond to the bistellar moves be defined?
- (4) How can we define the *exchange relations* among seeds?

These questions are closely related to each other. We first investigate how the f -vector of K changes under the action of bistellar moves. Together with a theorem of Pachner [11], we show that the f -vector of K does not change when n is even and we only perform middle-dimensional bistellar moves (see Proposition 2.3). Based upon this, we shall pay more attention to the case which $n = 2h$ is even, and study the algebraic behaviour of performing middle-dimensional bistellar moves on K .

The definition of the exchange matrix of K depends upon the choice of cluster variables. On the other hand, in order to make sure that the definition of the exchange matrix of K is well-defined, we need to fix the orientations of all n -simplices (or lower-dimensional simplices) of K , as shown in [5, Definition 4.1] for the 2-dimensional case. Indeed, we can use an orientation class of $H_n(K)$ to fix the orientations of all n -simplices. However, there is no canonical way to fix orientations of simplices of dimension less than n . This leads us to choose all $(n-1)$ -simplices of K as cluster variables. We give a generalized boundary operator for oriented simplices, and then use it to define the pair orderings among all $(n-1)$ -simplices of an oriented n -simplex. When $n = 2$, Fomin, Shapiro and Thurston use clockwise and counter-clockwise more visually to define such pair orderings among three edges of an oriented triangle, as shown in [5, Definition 4.1]. Furthermore, we can define the exchange matrix $B(K)$ of K . Our definition is a direct generalization of [5, Definition 4.1]. It should be pointed out that our definition can still be carried out even if n is odd.

As we will see, if $n = 2h$, when we perform an h -dimensional bistellar move on K , then we will change $\binom{h+1}{2}$ cluster variables (that is, $(n-1)$ -simplices of K) into $\binom{h+1}{2}$ new cluster variables. When $n = 2$, $\binom{h+1}{2} = 1$ and so we replace a cluster variable by a new one. This is the case of a classical cluster algebra. However, if $n > 2$, we need to replace more cluster variables when we perform an h -dimensional bistellar move on K . This results in an essential difference from the 2-dimensional case.

To define the matrix mutation such that it agrees with the corresponding middle-dimensional bistellar move, we analyze the combinatorial structure of an h -dimensional bistellar move \mathbf{bm}_α on K . This associates to a bistellar pair (α, β) , and two sub-complexes Λ_α and Λ_β of K and $\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K$ respectively (see Definition 2.1 for the meaning of $\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K$). When we perform an h -dimensional bistellar move \mathbf{bm}_α on K , actually the resulting manifold $\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K$ is obtained from K by replacing Λ_α with Λ_β , and in particular, only $\binom{h+1}{2}$ cluster

variables (that is, $(n-1)$ -simplices) in Λ_α will be replaced by $\binom{h+1}{2}$ cluster variables in Λ_β . Note that both Λ_α and Λ_β have $\binom{h+1}{1}\binom{h+1}{1} + \binom{h+1}{2}$ simplices of dimension $n-1$ (that is, cluster variables). Then we can choose a canonical combinatorial equivalence σ between Λ_α and Λ_β , which can be regarded as a permutation of order 2, and sends the $\binom{h+1}{2}$ cluster variables in Λ_α into the $\binom{h+1}{2}$ cluster variables in Λ_β . Moreover, we define the required matrix mutation

$$\mu_\alpha: B(K) \longrightarrow B(\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K)$$

along *multi-directions* (see Definition 4.5), so that the matrix mutation μ_α agrees with the bistellar move \mathbf{bm}_α for exchange matrices, stated as follows:

Proposition 4.7. $\mu_\alpha(B(K)) = B(\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K)$.

When we perform a seed mutation we must know how to define the exchange relations. The canonical combinatorial equivalence σ helps us clearly understand the correspondence between seeds Σ_K and $\Sigma_{\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K}$, so that with the matrix mutation together, we can define the $\binom{h+1}{2}$ exchange relations (see (5.3)), giving further the definition of a seed mutation $\Phi_\alpha: \Sigma_K \rightarrow \Sigma_{\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K}$ (see also Definition 5.3). Since all middle-dimensional moves that we perform are bistellar, we call Φ_α the *bistellar seed mutation*, and call those $\binom{h+1}{2}$ cluster variables in Λ_α and Λ_β the *exchangeable bistellar cluster variables*. We further show that Φ_α is invertible (see Proposition 5.9).

Using what we have shown above, we can define the required bistellar cluster algebra \mathcal{A}_K of K . Briefly speaking, \mathcal{A}_K is obtained from the initial seed Σ_K via bistellar seed mutations by performing all possible bistellar h -moves on K . To give the definition of \mathcal{A}_K more clearly, we introduce the bistellar exchange graph determined by K , which gives the information on all possible middle-dimensional bistellar moves on K . Moreover, in a similar way to classical cluster algebra, we first define the bistellar cluster algebra $\mathcal{A}_{[K]}$ of $[K]$ (see Definition 5.18), where $[K]$ is a set, each of which can be obtained from K by a finite sequence of middle-dimensional bistellar moves. Then we give the definition of \mathcal{A}_K , which is the reduction of $\mathcal{A}_{[K]}$ to the field $\mathbb{F}\mathcal{X}(K)$ with Σ_K as initial seed by using the bistellar seed mutations, where $\mathbb{F}\mathcal{X}(K)$ is the field of all rational functions in all cluster variables given by K .

Now our first main result is stated as follows:

Theorem 5.21. *Let K and K' be two connected oriented triangulated closed manifolds of dimension $2h$. If K' is obtained from K by doing a finite sequence of bistellar h -moves, then $\mathcal{A}_K \cong \mathcal{A}_{K'}$.*

Remark 1.2. Comparing with classical cluster algebras, our bistellar cluster algebras \mathcal{A}_K have the following properties:

- (A) Each \mathcal{A}_K is of finite type, that is, there are only finitely many cluster variables. In particular, all exchangeable bistellar cluster variables may not cover all the cluster variables.
- (B) Generally \mathcal{A}_K is some kind of quotient algebra with an ideal determined by exchange relations. This is an essential difference from classical cluster algebras. The main reason why there is an ideal is because the moves used are bistellar and exchangeable bistellar cluster variables may produce the same exchange relations with each other. So our algebra \mathcal{A}_K , even for $\dim K = 2$, does not satisfy the cluster algebra axiom: every cluster variable in every cluster is exchangeable. Certainly our algebra \mathcal{A}_K is computable (see the example in Section 5.3).

Using the bistellar cluster algebras we have constructed, we further consider the problem of PL invariants for closed PL manifolds. Let K be a closed PL manifold of dimension n . When $n = 2, 4$, we show that a set $[K]$ of all closed PL manifolds PL homeomorphic to K can form a direct system by associating with the bistellar cluster algebras of closed PL manifolds, and then show that the limit \mathcal{A}_K^{PL} of this direct system is a PL invariant. This is the second main result of this paper, which is stated as follows:

Theorem 6.5. *Let K and K' be two closed PL manifolds of dimension $n = 2, 4$, such that they are PL homeomorphic. Then $\mathcal{A}_K^{PL} \cong \mathcal{A}_{K'}^{PL}$.*

2. BISTELLAR MOVES AND PACHNER'S THEOREM

We begin by reviewing some standard background material regarding the combinatorial topology of triangulated and PL manifolds (see [2] for more information).

2.1. Triangulated Manifolds and Bistellar Moves. An *abstract simplicial complex* K on a finite set S is a collection in the power set 2^S such that for each $\alpha \in K$, any subset (including the empty set) of α belongs to K . Each α in K is called a *simplex* (or a *face*) of K and has dimension $|\alpha| - 1$, where $|\alpha|$ is the cardinality of α . The dimension of K is defined as $\max\{\dim \alpha \mid \alpha \in K\}$.

Let K_1 and K_2 be two abstract simplicial complexes on vertex sets S_1 and S_2 respectively. A map $\phi: K_1 \rightarrow K_2$ is said to be *simplicial* if ϕ is an extension of a map $f: S_1 \rightarrow S_2$ such that $\phi(\alpha) = f(\alpha) \in K_2$, for any $\alpha \in K_1$. The two simplicial complexes K_1 and K_2 are said to be *combinatorially equivalent* if there are simplicial maps $\phi: K_1 \rightarrow K_2$ and $\psi: K_2 \rightarrow K_1$ such that $\psi \circ \phi = \text{id}_{K_1}$ and $\phi \circ \psi = \text{id}_{K_2}$.

It is well-known (see [2] for example) that there is a bijection, given by geometric realization, between abstract simplicial complexes up to combinatorial equivalence and geometric simplicial complexes up to homeomorphism. Thus, we may identify abstract simplicial complexes with geometric simplicial complexes.

The *join* of two simplicial complexes K_1 and K_2 on vertex sets S_1 and S_2 is given by

$$K_1 * K_2 := \{\alpha \in S_1 \sqcup S_2 \mid \alpha = \alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2, \alpha_1 \in K_1, \alpha_2 \in K_2\}.$$

Given a face α of a simplicial complex K , the *link* of α in K is the subcomplex given by

$$\text{Link}_K \alpha := \{\alpha' \in K \mid \alpha \cup \alpha' \in K, \alpha \cap \alpha' = \emptyset\}.$$

A *triangulated manifold* is a simplicial complex K whose geometric realization $|K|$ is a topological manifold.

Definition 2.1 ([11, 2]). Let K be a triangulated manifold of dimension n . Suppose that $\alpha \in K$ is an $(n - h)$ -simplex such that $\text{Link}_K \alpha = \partial\beta$, where $\beta \notin K$. Then the operation

$$\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K := (K \setminus (\alpha * \partial\beta)) \cup (\partial\alpha * \beta)$$

is called the *bistellar h -move at α* . Note that $\dim \beta = h$.

The pair (α, β) plays an important role in performing the operation $\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K$ and we call the ordered pair (α, β) a *bistellar pair* of type h in K . Clearly, if (α, β) is a bistellar pair of type h in K , then (β, α) is a bistellar pair of type $n - h$ in $\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K$ and we can perform a bistellar $(n - h)$ -move at β on $\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K$; in particular,

$$\mathbf{bm}_\beta \mathbf{bm}_\alpha K = K.$$

Thus, \mathbf{bm}_β is the inverse operation of \mathbf{bm}_α . It should be pointed out that there may not be a bistellar pair of a certain type in a triangulated manifold, for example, the boundary complex of an $(n + 1)$ -simplex has no bistellar pairs of type h , for all $h > 0$. However, we can always perform a bistellar 0-move on any triangulated manifold.

It is easy to see that a bistellar 0-move adds a new vertex, a bistellar n -move deletes a vertex, and all other bistellar moves do not change the number of vertices of K .

We now study the relation between the numbers of faces of K and $\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K$. By \mathcal{F}_i^K we denote the set of all i -dimensional simplices of K and also set $\mathcal{F}(K) := \mathcal{F}_{\dim K - 1}^K$ for the codimension 1 faces. Each n -dimensional simplicial complex K determines an integral vector $f(K) = (f_0, f_1, \dots, f_n)$, called the *f -vector* of K , where $f_i = |\mathcal{F}_i^K|$ is the number of i -dimensional simplices in K . The *f -vector* of K defines the *h -vector* $h(K) = (h_0, h_1, \dots, h_{n+1})$ by

$$h_0 t^{n+1} + h_1 t^n + \dots + h_{n+1} = (t - 1)^{n+1} + f_0(t - 1)^n + \dots + f_n.$$

In addition, the *h -vector* of K also defines the *g -vector* $g(K) = (g_0, g_1, \dots, g_{\lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor})$ by

$$g_0 = 1 \text{ and } g_i = h_i - h_{i-1}, \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, \left\lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

Theorem 2.2 (Pachner [11]). *Let K be a triangulated manifold of dimension n . Assume that (α, β) is a bistellar pair of type h with $0 \leq h \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ in K . If $h \leq \lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor$, then*

$$g_i(\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K) = \begin{cases} g_i(K) + 1, & \text{if } i = h + 1; \\ g_i(K), & \text{if } i \neq h + 1. \end{cases}$$

If $n = 2h$, then $g_i(\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K) = g_i(K)$ for all i .

For our purpose we need to further analyze when $f(\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K) = f(K)$.

Proposition 2.3. *Let K be a triangulated manifold of dimension n . Assume that (α, β) is a bistellar pair of type h in K . Then $f(\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K) = f(K)$ if and only if $n = 2h$.*

Proof. First it is easy to see that if $g_i(\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K) = g_i(K)$ for all i , then $f(\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K) = f(K)$. Thus, if $n = 2h$, by Theorem 2.2 we find that $f(\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K) = f(K)$.

Assume that $f(\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K) = f(K)$. By the definition of bistellar moves, the bistellar h -move at α on K only changes the local structure of K . Actually, since $\text{Link}_K \alpha = \partial\beta$, we have that $\alpha \cap \beta = \emptyset$. We write $\alpha = (v_0, \dots, v_{n-h})$ and $\beta = (v_{n-h+1}, \dots, v_{n+1})$. Then there are the following $h+1$ simplices of dimension n in K

$$F_i := \alpha \cup \beta \setminus \{v_{n+1-i}\}, \quad i = 0, \dots, h,$$

where $\alpha = \bigcap_{i=0}^h F_i$, and there are the following $n-h+1$ simplices of dimension n in $\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K$

$$H_j := \alpha \cup \beta \setminus \{v_j\}, \quad j = 0, \dots, n-h,$$

where $\beta = \bigcap_{j=0}^{n-h} H_j$. Since $\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K = (K \setminus (\alpha * \partial\beta)) \cup (\partial\alpha * \beta)$, we see that

$$\mathcal{F}_n^K \setminus \{F_0, \dots, F_h\} = \mathcal{F}_n^{\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K} \setminus \{H_0, \dots, H_{n-h}\}.$$

Moreover, it follows from $f_n(\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K) = f_n(K)$ that $h+1 = n-h+1$, so $n = 2h$. \square

We also see from the proof of Proposition 2.3 that $f_n(\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K) = f_n(K)$ if and only if $n = 2h$. Using a similar argument to the proof of Proposition 2.3, we also find that $f_{n-1}(\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K) = f_{n-1}(K)$ if and only if $n = 2h$. Thus we have:

Corollary 2.4. *Let K be a triangulated manifold of dimension n and assume that (α, β) is a bistellar pair of type h in K . Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) $f(\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K) = f(K)$;
- (2) $f_n(\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K) = f_n(K)$;
- (3) $f_{n-1}(\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K) = f_{n-1}(K)$;
- (4) $n = 2h$.

In addition, we also see from the proof of Proposition 2.3 that the bistellar h -move \mathbf{bm}_α on K only changes the subcomplex $\Lambda_\alpha := \alpha * \partial\beta$ of K , determined by the $h+1$ simplices of dimension n in $\mathbf{F}_\alpha := \{F_0, \dots, F_h\}$, which is exactly transformed into the subcomplex $\mathbf{bm}_\alpha \Lambda_\alpha = \Lambda_\beta := \partial\alpha * \beta$ of $\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K$, determined by the $n-h+1$ simplices of dimension n in $\mathbf{H}_\beta := \{H_0, \dots, H_{n-h}\}$.

Corollary 2.5. *The subcomplexes Λ_α and Λ_β are combinatorially equivalent if and only if $n = 2h$.*

Remark 2.6. If $n = 2h$, since $\dim \alpha = \dim \beta = h$, an easy observation shows that for each $0 \leq i < h$, $\mathcal{F}_i^{\Lambda_\alpha} = \mathcal{F}_i^{\Lambda_\beta}$, and for each $h \leq i \leq n$, $\mathcal{F}_i^{\Lambda_\alpha} \neq \mathcal{F}_i^{\Lambda_\beta}$ but that $|\mathcal{F}_i^{\Lambda_\alpha}| = |\mathcal{F}_i^{\Lambda_\beta}|$.

2.2. PL Manifolds and Pachner's Theorem. Two triangulated manifolds K_1 and K_2 are said to be *PL homeomorphic* if there exist subdivisions K'_1 and K'_2 of K_1 and K_2 such that K'_1 and K'_2 are combinatorially equivalent.

A *PL manifold* of dimension n is a special triangulated manifold K of dimension n such that $\text{Link}_K \alpha$ is a *PL sphere* of dimension $n - |\alpha|$ for every nonempty simplex $\alpha \in K$, where a PL sphere is a triangulated sphere which is PL homeomorphic to the boundary of a simplex.

The following theorem, due to Pachner, gives a description of PL homeomorphisms in terms of bistellar moves.

Theorem 2.7 (Pachner [11, 12]). *Two PL manifolds K_1, K_2 are PL homeomorphic if and only if K_1 can be transformed into K_2 by a finite sequence of bistellar moves.*

It is well-known that in dimensions ≤ 3 , the categories of PL, topological and smooth manifolds are the same. However, the situation in dimensions > 3 is quite different. A Theorem of Whitney tells us that a smooth manifold of any dimension always admits a PL structure. In dimension 4, there exist topological manifolds that admit no PL structure, and even worse, admit no triangulation. However, the categories of PL and smooth manifolds in dimension 4 agree. Namely, there is exactly one smooth structure on every PL 4-manifold. This means that the classification of smooth 4-manifolds is equivalent to the classification of PL 4-manifolds. But so far, the classification problem is still quite difficult and remains wide open.

3. EXCHANGE MATRICES

Let \mathbb{TM}_n denote the set of all closed oriented triangulated manifolds of dimension $n > 1$. For each closed oriented triangulated manifold K , since K is compact, it has finitely many vertices as a simplicial complex. Without the loss of generality, we assume that K is a simplicial complex on vertex set $[m] = \{1, \dots, m\}$, so K is a subcomplex of $2^{[m]}$, where $2^{[m]}$ is the $(m-1)$ -dimensional simplicial complex whose geometric realization is a ball of dimension $m-1$.

3.1. Pair Ordering. Using the ordering $1 < \dots < m$ on the vertices, we may impose the lexicographical ordering $<$ on $2^{[m]}$. For example, when $m = 3$, we have that

$$\emptyset < \{1\} < \{2\} < \{3\} < \{1, 2\} < \{1, 3\} < \{2, 3\} < \{1, 2, 3\}.$$

By convention we will always assume a natural lexicographical ordering $<$ on all faces of $2^{[m]}$. For each nonempty subset α in $[m]$, clearly 2^α admits a lexicographical ordering $<$ which agrees with that on $2^{[m]}$.

For each simplex α with vertices $\{\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\} \subseteq [m]$, by $(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ we denote the simplex α with its orientation determined by the order of its vertices. By $-(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ we denote the oriented simplex $(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ with the opposite orientation. We can also give a *canonical orientation* of α in such a way that the orientation of α agrees with the lexicographical ordering of $\{\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$. For example, if $\alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_n$, then the corresponding oriented simplex $(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ has the canonical orientation. Clearly, each simplex in $2^{[m]}$ can be naturally equipped with the canonical orientation.

Let $\alpha = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ be an oriented simplex in $2^{[m]}$ where $n \geq 0$. The boundary operator ∂ on α is defined as follows:

$$(3.1) \quad \partial(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) = \sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^i (\alpha_0, \dots, \widehat{\alpha_i}, \dots, \alpha_n).$$

We may generalize the formula (3.1) as follows: for any k with $1 \leq k \leq n+1$, define

$$\partial^{(k)}(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) = \sum_{0 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq n} (-1)^{i_1 + \dots + i_k} (\dots, \widehat{\alpha_{i_1}}, \dots, \widehat{\alpha_{i_k}}, \dots).$$

Obviously $\partial^{(1)}$ is exactly the boundary operator ∂ as mentioned in (3.1).

With this understanding, now let us define a *pair ordering* \prec of all d -faces in a simplex $\alpha = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$, where $0 \leq d \leq n$.

Note that when $n = 0$ or $d = n$, the collection of d -faces \mathcal{F}_d^α of α only contains a single face, so in this case, we don't need to consider the pair ordering. Without the loss of generality, we assume that $n \geq 1$ and $0 \leq d < n$. In addition, we assume that all faces of dimension less than n are always equipped with the canonical orientation.

Definition 3.1. Take two d -faces f and g in \mathcal{F}_d^α such that $f < g$. If $f \cap g = \emptyset$, we say that there is no pair ordering between f and g . Assume that $f \cap g \neq \emptyset$ and $|f \cap g| = k+1$. Consider the coefficient c_{fg} of the face $(f \cup g) \setminus (f \cap g)$, with its canonical orientation, in the expression of $\partial^{(n-2(d-k)+1)}\alpha$. Then the *pair ordering* between f and g is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} g &\prec f, & \text{if } c_{fg} &= +1; \\ f &\prec g, & \text{if } c_{fg} &= -1. \end{aligned}$$

If $d = 0$, then there is no pair ordering on \mathcal{F}_0^α since any two 0-faces in \mathcal{F}_0^α have empty intersection. If $\dim \alpha = n = 2h$, then any two faces in \mathcal{F}_h^α have a nonempty intersection because any middle-dimensional face f in α contains $h + 1$ vertices.

Example 3.2. For example, when $n = 2$, take $\alpha = (1, 2, 3)$. In this case, we have that $\mathcal{F}_1^\alpha = \{(12), (13), (23)\}$ with the lexicographical ordering $(12) < (13) < (23)$. From the formula $\partial^{(1)}(1, 2, 3) = (23) - (13) + (12)$, we can obtain the pair orderings for all faces in \mathcal{F}_1^α as follows:

$$(2, 3) \prec (1, 3); \quad (1, 3) \prec (1, 2); \quad (1, 2) \prec (2, 3).$$

Example 3.3. When $n = 3$ we take $\alpha = (1, 2, 3, 4)$. On \mathcal{F}_2^α , one has the lexicographical ordering

$$(1, 2, 3) < (1, 2, 4) < (1, 3, 4) < (2, 3, 4).$$

From the formula

$$\partial^{(2)}(1, 2, 3, 4) = -(3, 4) + (2, 4) - (2, 3) - (1, 4) + (1, 3) - (1, 2)$$

we can obtain the pair orderings for all 2-faces of α as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (1, 3, 4) \prec (2, 3, 4); \quad (1, 2, 3) \prec (2, 3, 4); \quad (2, 3, 4) \prec (1, 2, 4); \\ (1, 2, 4) \prec (1, 3, 4); \quad (1, 3, 4) \prec (1, 2, 3); \quad (1, 2, 3) \prec (1, 2, 4). \end{aligned}$$

If we take $\alpha = -(1, 2, 3, 4)$, then all 2-faces of α have the reverse pair orderings.

3.2. Exchange Matrices. Throughout the following, we use a convention of orientations and orderings on all simplices in each closed oriented triangulated manifold K (as a subcomplex of $2^{[m]}$) of TM_n . This convention is called the *orientation-ordering convention*, which is stated as follows:

- (1) we orient all n -dimensional simplices in K such that their sum is a cycle chain in the chain group $C_n(K)$;
- (2) all other simplices of dimension less than n are equipped with the canonical orientation as defined before;
- (3) there is a natural lexicographical ordering $<$ on all simplices in $K \subseteq 2^{[m]}$.

Given a $K \in \text{TM}_n$, following the idea of [5, Definition 4.1], we are going to define a skew-symmetric integer square matrix $B(K)$ of size $f_{n-1}(K) = |\mathcal{F}(K)|$ with entries corresponding to all $(n-1)$ -dimensional simplices in K .

Definition 3.4. Take any oriented n -simplex $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_n^K$. We first define a skew-symmetric integer square matrix $B^\alpha(K) = (b_{fg}^\alpha)_{f,g \in \mathcal{F}(K)}$ of size $f_{n-1}(K)$ by setting

$$b_{fg}^\alpha = \begin{cases} +1, & \text{if } f, g \in \mathcal{F}(\alpha) \text{ such that } g \prec f \text{ in } \mathcal{F}(\alpha); \\ -1, & \text{if } f, g \in \mathcal{F}(\alpha) \text{ such that } f \prec g \text{ in } \mathcal{F}(\alpha); \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then the matrix $B(K)$ is defined by

$$B(K) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_n^K} B^\alpha(K).$$

Note that the entries of the matrix $B(K)$ belong to $\{-1, 0, +1\}$. Definition 3.4 is a generalization of [5, Definition 4.1].

Remark 3.5. For an oriented n -simplex $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_n^K$, if we define $c_{gf} := -c_{fg}$, for $f < g$, then we see that $b_{fg}^\alpha = c_{fg}$, for all $f, g \in \mathcal{F}(\alpha)$.

Example 3.6. Let K be the boundary complex of $2^{[5]}$, which is 3-dimensional. Orient the five 3-simplices of K by

$$\partial^{(1)}(1, 2, 3, 4, 5) = (2, 3, 4, 5) - (1, 3, 4, 5) + (1, 2, 4, 5) - (1, 2, 3, 5) + (1, 2, 3, 4).$$

So K has the following five oriented 3-simplices

$$\alpha_1 = (2, 3, 4, 5), \alpha_2 = -(1, 3, 4, 5), \alpha_3 = (1, 2, 4, 5), \alpha_4 = -(1, 2, 3, 5), \alpha_5 = (1, 2, 3, 4)$$

such that the sum $\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_5$ is a cycle chain. Also, K contains ten 2-simplices

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & (1, 2, 3) < (1, 2, 4) < (1, 2, 5) < (1, 3, 4) < (1, 3, 5) \\ & < (1, 4, 5) < (2, 3, 4) < (2, 3, 5) < (2, 4, 5) < (3, 4, 5) \end{aligned}$$

ordered by the lexicographical ordering, so $B(K)$ is a skew-symmetric integer square matrix of size 10, with all rows and columns ordered by (3.2). First we can write out $B^{\alpha_i}(K)$ by using Example 3.3, and then obtain

$$B(K) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & +1 & +1 & -1 & 0 & -1 & +1 & 0 & 0 \\ +1 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 0 & +1 & +1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & +1 & 0 & 0 & +1 & -1 & 0 & -1 & +1 & 0 \\ -1 & +1 & 0 & 0 & +1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & +1 \\ +1 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 0 & +1 & 0 & +1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & +1 & +1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & +1 \\ +1 & -1 & 0 & +1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & +1 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & +1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & +1 & 0 & -1 & +1 \\ 0 & +1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & +1 & -1 & +1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & +1 & -1 & +1 & -1 & +1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

4. MATRIX MUTATIONS UNDER BISTELLAR MOVES

Given a closed oriented triangulated manifold K of $\mathbb{T}\mathbb{M}_n$ we regard K as a subcomplex of $2^{[m]}$ where m is the number of vertices of K .

Throughout this section, we assume that we can perform a bistellar h -move \mathbf{bm}_α on K at an $(n-h)$ -dimensional simplex α , that is, there exists a bistellar pair (α, β) such that $\text{Link}_K \alpha = \partial\beta$ but $\beta \notin K$. We write

$$L := \mathbf{bm}_\alpha K.$$

By Definition 3.4, we see that

$$B(K) = (b_{fg}^K)_{f,g \in \mathcal{F}(K)}, \quad \text{where we write } \mathcal{F}(K) := \mathcal{F}_{n-1}^K,$$

is of size $f_{n-1}(K)$ and $B(L) = (b_{fg}^L)_{f,g \in \mathcal{F}(L)}$ is of size $f_{n-1}(L)$. On the other hand, we know from Corollary 2.4 that $f_{n-1}(K) = f_{n-1}(L)$ if and only if $n = 2h$. Thus, we will now concentrate on the case $f_{n-1}(K) = f_{n-1}(L)$ and consider how $B(K)$ changes into $B(L) = B(\mathbf{bm}_\alpha K)$ under the bistellar move \mathbf{bm}_α .

4.1. Defining the Matrix Mutation. In the case of $f_{n-1}(K) = f_{n-1}(L)$, we have $n = 2h$, and then $\dim \alpha = \dim \beta = h$. Without loss of generality, assume that

$$\alpha = (v_0, v_1, \dots, v_h) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta = (v_{h+1}, v_{h+2}, \dots, v_{n+1}),$$

and the oriented n -simplex $(v_0, v_1, \dots, v_n) \in K$ is compatible with the given orientations of the n -simplices of K . Then $\mathbf{F}_\alpha = \mathcal{F}_n^{\Lambda_\alpha}$ must consist of the following $h+1$ oriented simplices of dimension n :

$$F_i = (-1)^i (v_0, v_1, \dots, v_h, v_{h+1}, \dots, \widehat{v_{n+1-i}}, \dots, v_{n+1}), \quad \text{for } i = 0, \dots, h,$$

such that α is the intersection of the F_i , for $i = 0, \dots, h$. Since \mathbf{bm}_α only changes Λ_α into $\mathbf{bm}_\alpha \Lambda_\alpha = \Lambda_\beta$ the unchanged n -simplices

$$\mathcal{F}_n^K \setminus \mathbf{F}_\alpha = \mathcal{F}_n^L \setminus \mathbf{H}_\beta,$$

will keep their orientations, and the $h+1$ oriented simplices of dimension n in $\mathbf{H}_\beta = \mathcal{F}_n^{\Lambda_\beta}$ will be

$$H_i = (-1)^i (v_0, v_1, \dots, \widehat{v_i}, \dots, v_h, v_{h+1}, \dots, v_{n+1}), \quad \text{for } i = 0, \dots, h,$$

such that β is the intersection of the H_i , for $i = 0, \dots, h$. This makes sure that $L = \mathbf{bm}_\alpha K$ satisfies the orientation-ordering convention.

Lemma 4.1. *For any $F \in \mathcal{F}_n^K \setminus \mathbf{F}_\alpha$ and any $f, g \in \mathcal{F}(F)$, we have that $b_{fg}^K = b_{fg}^L$. Furthermore,*

$$\sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_n^K \setminus \mathbf{F}_\alpha} B^F(K) = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_n^L \setminus \mathbf{H}_\beta} B^F(L).$$

Proof. This is because $\mathcal{F}_n^K \setminus \mathbf{F}_\alpha = \mathcal{F}_n^L \setminus \mathbf{H}_\beta$. □

By Lemma 4.1, it remains to study how $\sum_{F \in \mathbf{F}_\alpha} B^F(K)$ changes into $\sum_{F \in \mathbf{H}_\beta} B^F(L)$. To do this, we need to further analyze the structures of both subcomplexes Λ_α and Λ_β . An easy observation shows that both Λ_α and Λ_β have $\binom{h+1}{1}\binom{h+1}{1} + \binom{h+1}{2}$ simplices of dimension $n-1$, and there are $\binom{h+1}{1}\binom{h+1}{1}$ simplices of dimension $n-1$ that lie in both Λ_α and Λ_β . Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_\alpha &:= \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\beta) \\ &= \{(v_0, v_1, \dots, v_h, v_{h+1}, \dots, \widehat{v_{h+1+i}}, \dots, \widehat{v_{h+1+j}}, \dots, v_{n+1}) \mid 0 \leq i < j \leq h\} \end{aligned}$$

which consists of $\binom{h+1}{2}$ simplices of dimension $n-1$ in Λ_α . Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_\beta &:= \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\beta) \setminus \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \\ &= \{(v_0, v_1, \dots, \widehat{v_i}, \dots, \widehat{v_j}, \dots, v_h, v_{h+1}, \dots, v_{n+1}) \mid 0 \leq i < j \leq h\} \end{aligned}$$

consists of $\binom{h+1}{2}$ simplices of dimension $n-1$ in Λ_β . Obviously, $\mathcal{D}_\alpha \cap \mathcal{D}_\beta = \emptyset$. Then we have that

$$(4.1) \quad \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\alpha = \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\beta) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\beta$$

which contains exactly $\binom{h+1}{1}\binom{h+1}{1}$ $(n-1)$ -simplices.

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose $g \notin \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha)$. Then for any $f \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha$, $b_{fg}^K = 0$ in $B(K)$, and for any $f \in \mathcal{D}_\beta$, $b_{fg}^L = 0$ in $B(L)$.*

Proof. This is because each $(n-1)$ -simplex in \mathcal{D}_α is not a face of any n -simplex in $\mathcal{F}_n^K \setminus \mathbf{F}_\alpha$ and each $(n-1)$ -simplex in \mathcal{D}_β is not a face of any n -simplex in $\mathcal{F}_n^L \setminus \mathbf{H}_\beta$. \square

By Corollary 2.5, Λ_α and Λ_β are combinatorially equivalent.

Lemma 4.3. *Let σ be a permutation on $[n+2]$ such that $\sigma(\alpha) = \beta$. Then σ induces a combinatorial equivalence between Λ_α and Λ_β .*

Proof. This is because Λ_α and Λ_β have the same vertex set $[n+2]$, and $\alpha = \bigcap_{i=0}^h F_i$ and $\beta = \bigcap_{i=0}^h H_i$. \square

Remark 4.4. If σ is a permutation on $[n+2]$ such that $\sigma(\alpha) = \beta$, then it is easy to see that σ not only gives a bijection from $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\beta)$, but is also invariant on $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\alpha$ and maps \mathcal{D}_α onto \mathcal{D}_β bijectively. Note that the permutation σ on $[n+2]$ with $\sigma(\alpha) = \beta$ is, of course, not unique.

We fix the following permutation in the symmetric group \mathcal{S}_{n+2} :

$$\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & \cdots & n+1 & n+2 \\ n+2 & n+1 & \cdots & 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{S}_{n+2}.$$

Note that $\sigma(\alpha) = \beta$.

Definition 4.5. We define the *matrix mutation*

$$\mu_\alpha(B(K)) = (\bar{b}_{fg})_{f,g \in \mathcal{F}(L)}$$

along α as follows:

$$\bar{b}_{fg} = \begin{cases} -b_{\sigma(f)\sigma(g)}^K, & \text{if } f, g \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\beta); \\ b_{fg}^K, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Remark 4.6. The permutation $\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & \cdots & n+1 & n+2 \\ n+2 & n+1 & \cdots & 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ in \mathcal{S}_{n+2} is of order 2.

Proposition 4.7. *If $L = \mathbf{bm}_\alpha K$, where $K \in \mathbf{TM}_{2h}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_h^K$, then*

$$\mu_\alpha(B(K)) = B(L).$$

Proof. Suppose that $f < g$ in $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha)$ and that $f \cup g = F_i$, for some $i = 0, \dots, h$. Then $\sigma(g) < \sigma(f)$ and $\sigma(F_i) = H_i$. The coefficient c_{fg} appears in $\partial^{(n-1)} F_i$. If $v_i \in f \cap g$ appears in an even position in F_i , then so will $\sigma(v_i)$ in H_i (and similarly for odd positions) since $\dim F_i = n$ is even. Therefore, $c_{fg} = c_{\sigma(g)\sigma(f)}$ which gives the result.

If either f or g is not in $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha)$, then this follows from Lemma 4.1. \square

Remark 4.8. Since $\mathbf{bm}_\beta L = \mathbf{bm}_\beta \mathbf{bm}_\alpha K = K$, it is easy to see that μ_α has an inverse μ_β , that is,

$$\mu_\beta(\mu_\alpha(B(K))) = \mu_\beta(B(L)) = B(K).$$

4.2. Examples. Let us now look at the special cases of $h = 1$ and 2.

The case $h = 1$. When $h = 1$, we have that $\alpha = (1, 2)$ and $\beta = (3, 4)$, so

$$\mathbf{F}_\alpha = \{F_0 = (1, 2, 3), F_1 = -(1, 2, 4)\}, \quad \mathbf{H}_\beta = \{H_0 = (2, 3, 4), H_1 = -(1, 3, 4)\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) = \{(1, 2), (1, 3), (1, 4), (2, 3), (2, 4)\}, \quad \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\beta) = \{(1, 3), (1, 4), (2, 3), (2, 4), (3, 4)\}.$$

Also, $\mathcal{D}_\alpha = \{(1, 2)\}$ and $\mathcal{D}_\beta = \{(3, 4)\}$. Furthermore, $B(\Lambda_\alpha)$ and $B(\Lambda_\beta)$ determine nontrivial 5×5 matrices. By a direct calculation, we have that

$$B(\Lambda_\alpha) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

with all rows and columns ordered by $(1, 2), (1, 3), (1, 4), (2, 3), (2, 4)$, and

$$B(\Lambda_\beta) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

with all rows and columns ordered by $(3, 4), (1, 3), (1, 4), (2, 3), (2, 4)$.

Here $\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 4 & 3 & 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, and σ maps $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha)$ bijectively onto $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\beta)$, as shown in the following table:

f	$(1, 2)$	$(1, 3)$	$(1, 4)$	$(2, 3)$	$(2, 4)$
$\sigma(f)$	$(3, 4)$	$(2, 4)$	$(1, 4)$	$(2, 3)$	$(1, 3)$

Then we can read out that

$$b_{\sigma(f)\sigma(g)}^L = -b_{fg}^K.$$

The case $h = 2$. When $h = 2$, we have that $\alpha = (1, 2, 3)$ and $\beta = (4, 5, 6)$, so

$$\mathbf{F}_\alpha = \{F_0 = (1, 2, 3, 4, 5), F_1 = -(1, 2, 3, 4, 6), F_2 = (1, 2, 3, 5, 6)\}$$

and

$$\mathbf{H}_\beta = \{H_0 = (2, 3, 4, 5, 6), H_1 = -(1, 3, 4, 5, 6), H_2 = (1, 2, 4, 5, 6)\}.$$

Furthermore, $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha)$ consists of twelve 3-simplices

$$(1, 2, 3, 4), (1, 2, 3, 5), (1, 2, 3, 6), (1, 2, 4, 5), (1, 2, 4, 6), (1, 2, 5, 6), \\ (1, 3, 4, 5), (1, 3, 4, 6), (1, 3, 5, 6), (2, 3, 4, 5), (2, 3, 4, 6), (2, 3, 5, 6)$$

in $\Lambda_\alpha \subset K$, and $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\beta)$ consists of twelve 3-simplices

$$(1, 4, 5, 6), (2, 4, 5, 6), (3, 4, 5, 6), (1, 2, 4, 5), (1, 2, 4, 6), (1, 2, 5, 6), \\ (1, 3, 4, 5), (1, 3, 4, 6), (1, 3, 5, 6), (2, 3, 4, 5), (2, 3, 4, 6), (2, 3, 5, 6)$$

in $\Lambda_\beta \subset L$. Also,

$$\mathcal{D}_\alpha = \{(1, 2, 3, 4), (1, 2, 3, 5), (1, 2, 3, 6)\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_\beta = \{(1, 4, 5, 6), (2, 4, 5, 6), (3, 4, 5, 6)\}.$$

In this case, $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\alpha = \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\beta) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\beta$ contains nine 3-simplices

$$(1, 2, 4, 5), (1, 2, 4, 6), (1, 2, 5, 6), (1, 3, 4, 5), (1, 3, 4, 6), (1, 3, 5, 6), (2, 3, 4, 5), (2, 3, 4, 6), (2, 3, 5, 6)$$

in Λ_α and Λ_β . Both $B(\Lambda_\alpha)$ and $B(\Lambda_\beta)$ determine 12×12 skew-symmetric matrices. A direct calculation shows that

$$B(\Lambda_\alpha) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

with all rows and columns ordered by $(1, 2, 3, 4)$, $(1, 2, 3, 5)$, $(1, 2, 3, 6)$, $(1, 2, 4, 5)$, $(1, 2, 4, 6)$, $(1, 2, 5, 6)$, $(1, 3, 4, 5)$, $(1, 3, 4, 6)$, $(1, 3, 5, 6)$, $(2, 3, 4, 5)$, $(2, 3, 4, 6)$, $(2, 3, 5, 6)$, and

$$B(\Lambda_\beta) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

with all rows and columns ordered by $(1, 4, 5, 6)$, $(2, 4, 5, 6)$, $(3, 4, 5, 6)$, $(1, 2, 4, 5)$, $(1, 2, 4, 6)$, $(1, 2, 5, 6)$, $(1, 3, 4, 5)$, $(1, 3, 4, 6)$, $(1, 3, 5, 6)$, $(2, 3, 4, 5)$, $(2, 3, 4, 6)$, $(2, 3, 5, 6)$.

The permutation $\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 6 & 5 & 4 & 3 & 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ then maps $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha)$ bijectively to $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\beta)$ similarly to the previous case. Then we can easily read out that

$$b_{\sigma(f)\sigma(g)}^L = -b_{fg}^K, \quad \text{for } f, g \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha).$$

5. BISTELLAR CLUSTER ALGEBRAS

This section is dedicated to defining a class of algebras from closed oriented triangulated manifolds, which we call *bistellar cluster algebras*.

Given a closed oriented triangulated manifold $K \in \mathbb{TM}_n$, assume that K is a simplicial complex on the vertex set $[m]$, so K is a subcomplex of $2^{[m]}$. We shall mainly be concerned with the case in which n is even and study the algebraic behaviour of middle-dimensional bistellar moves on K . We write $n = 2h$ and assume that we can perform a bistellar h -move on $\alpha \in K$ and set $L := \mathbf{bm}_\alpha K$.

Now we are going to construct an algebra \mathcal{A}_K associated to K . Our construction differs from the one of a classical cluster algebra (see [6, 5]), but the basic idea of our construction follows closely.

5.1. Seeds and Bistellar Seed Mutations. Let $(\mathbb{P}, \oplus, \cdot)$ be a semifield, that is, (\mathbb{P}, \oplus) is a commutative semigroup and (\mathbb{P}, \cdot) is an abelian group such that multiplication distributes over the auxiliary addition \oplus . By $\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{P}$ we denote the group ring of (\mathbb{P}, \cdot) with integer coefficients.

Definition 5.1. Let K be a closed oriented triangulated manifold in \mathbb{TM}_n . Let $\mathbb{F}\mathcal{X}(K)$ denote the field of rational functions over $\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{P}$ with independent variables given by $\mathcal{X}(K)$, where $\mathcal{X}(K) = \{x_f \mid f \in \mathcal{F}(K)\}$ is called a *cluster*.

Associated to K , we get a triple $\Sigma_K = (\mathcal{X}(K), \mathbf{p}_K, B(K))$, called a *seed*, where

- (1) $\mathcal{X}(K)$ is the cluster corresponding to K , as defined above;
- (2) the coefficient tuple $\mathbf{p}_K = (p_{K,x}^\pm)_{x \in \mathcal{X}(K)}$ is a $2d$ -tuple of elements of \mathbb{P} satisfying the normalization condition $p_{K,x}^+ \oplus p_{K,x}^- = 1$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}(K)$, where $d = f_{n-1}(K)$;
- (3) $B(K)$ is the exchange matrix of K .

First let us analyse the behaviour of the seeds under the actions of bistellar h -moves. Let (α, β) be a bistellar pair in K of type h . Set $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{D}_\alpha) = \{x_f \mid f \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha\}$ and $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{D}_\beta) = \{x_f \mid f \in \mathcal{D}_\beta\}$. Then $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{D}_\alpha)$ and $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{D}_\beta)$ are subsets of $\mathcal{X}(K)$ and $\mathcal{X}(L)$, respectively. Note that by Corollary 2.4, we have $f_{n-1}(L) = f_{n-1}(K) = d$, so $|\mathcal{X}(K)| = |\mathcal{X}(L)|$.

Definition 5.2. Elements in $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{D}_\alpha)$ and $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{D}_\beta)$ are said to be *exchangeable bistellar cluster variables* in $\mathcal{X}(K)$ and $\mathcal{X}(L)$, respectively.

With this convention, for the bistellar pair (α, β) in K , we have the following relations between the seeds $\Sigma_K = (\mathcal{X}(K), \mathbf{p}_K, B(K))$ and $\Sigma_L = (\mathcal{X}(L), \mathbf{p}_L, B(L))$ as follows:

- (1) Firstly, we see that between the two clusters $\mathcal{X}(K)$ and $\mathcal{X}(L)$ we have the following:

$$\mathcal{X}(L) = (\mathcal{X}(K) \setminus \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{D}_\alpha)) \cup \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{D}_\beta) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{X}(K) = (\mathcal{X}(L) \setminus \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{D}_\beta)) \cup \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{D}_\alpha),$$

which exactly corresponds to

$$L = \mathbf{bm}_\alpha K = (K \setminus \Lambda_\alpha) \cup \Lambda_\beta \quad \text{and} \quad K = \mathbf{bm}_\beta L = (L \setminus \Lambda_\beta) \cup \Lambda_\alpha$$

respectively. Since $\sigma(\mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha)) = \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\beta)$, we can use σ to define a bijection $\varphi_\alpha^K: \mathcal{X}(K) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}(L)$ by

$$(5.1) \quad \varphi_\alpha^K(x_f) = \begin{cases} x_{\sigma(f)}, & \text{if } f \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha); \\ x_f, & \text{if } f \notin \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha), \end{cases}$$

satisfying $\varphi_\alpha^K(\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{D}_\alpha)) = \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{D}_\beta)$ since $\sigma(\mathcal{D}_\alpha) = \mathcal{D}_\beta$. Conversely, since $\mathcal{F}(K) \setminus \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) = \mathcal{F}(L) \setminus \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\beta)$ and σ is an involution, we can also use σ to define a bijection $\varphi_\beta^L: \mathcal{X}(L) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}(K)$ similarly satisfying $\varphi_\beta^L(\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{D}_\beta)) = \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{D}_\alpha)$. Clearly, φ_β^L is the inverse of φ_α^K . So $\varphi_\beta^L(\varphi_\alpha^K(\mathcal{X}(K))) = \mathcal{X}(K)$.

- (2) Secondly, φ_α^K and φ_β^L determine two bijections

$$c_K: \mathbf{p}_K \longrightarrow \mathbf{p}_L \quad \text{given by } p_{K,x}^\pm \longmapsto p_{L, \varphi_\alpha^K(x)}^\pm$$

and

$$c_L: \mathbf{p}_L \longrightarrow \mathbf{p}_K \quad \text{given by } p_{L,x}^\pm \longmapsto p_{K, \varphi_\beta^L(x)}^\pm.$$

Obviously, $c_L(c_K(\mathbf{p}_K)) = \mathbf{p}_K$.

- (3) Finally, by Proposition 4.7, the matrix mutation μ_α satisfies the property that $\mu_\alpha(B(K)) = B(L)$. We have, for each $b_{fg}^K \in B(K)$,

$$(5.2) \quad \mu_\alpha(b_{fg}^K) = \begin{cases} -b_{fg}^K = b_{\sigma(f)\sigma(g)}^L, & \text{if } f, g \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha); \\ b_{fg}^K = b_{fg}^L, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $\mathbf{bm}_\beta L = \mathbf{bm}_\beta \mathbf{bm}_\alpha K = K$ and σ is an involution, we have that $\mu_\beta(B(L)) = B(K)$, so

$$\mu_\beta(\mu_\alpha(B(K))) = B(K).$$

We now set up some notation. Suppose that $K \in \text{TM}_n$ with bistellar pair (α, β) of type h with $n = 2h$. Then for $f \in \mathcal{F}(K)$ we write

$$u_f^K := p_{K,x_f}^+ / p_{K,x_f}^-.$$

It then follows from $p_{K,x_f}^+ \oplus p_{K,x_f}^- = 1$ that

$$p_{K,x_f}^+ = \frac{u_f^K}{1 \oplus u_f^K} \quad \text{and} \quad p_{K,x_f}^- = \frac{1}{1 \oplus u_f^K}.$$

We also write

$$\pi_{\alpha,f}^K := \prod_{g \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha} (p_{K,x_g}^+)^{[b_{gf}^K]_+} (p_{K,x_g}^-)^{-[-b_{gf}^K]_+},$$

where $[b]_+ := \max\{b, 0\}$.

Definition 5.3. With the above understanding, we define the *bistellar seed mutation*

$$\Phi_\alpha: \Sigma_K = (\mathcal{X}(K), \mathbf{p}_K, B(K)) \longrightarrow \Sigma_L = (\mathcal{X}(L), \mathbf{p}_L, B(L))$$

as follows:

- (1) On $\mathcal{X}(K)$, $\varphi_\alpha^K(\mathcal{X}(K)) = \mathcal{X}(L) = (\mathcal{X}(K) \setminus \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{D}_\alpha)) \cup \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{D}_\beta)$ such that there are *exchange relations* between exchangeable bistellar cluster variables of $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{D}_\alpha)$ and $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{D}_\beta)$ as follows: for $f \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha$,

$$(5.3) \quad x_f x_{\sigma(f)} = \frac{1}{D_{\alpha,f}^K} \left(p_{K,x_f}^+ \operatorname{lcm} \left(\prod_{g \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\alpha} x_g^{[b_{fg}^K]_+}, \prod_{g \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\alpha} x_{\sigma(g)}^{[b_{fg}^K]_+} \right) \right. \\ \left. + p_{K,x_f}^- \operatorname{lcm} \left(\prod_{g \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\alpha} x_g^{[-b_{fg}^K]_+}, \prod_{g \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\alpha} x_{\sigma(g)}^{[-b_{fg}^K]_+} \right) \right)$$

and

$$(5.4) \quad D_{\alpha,f}^K := \prod_{\substack{g \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\alpha \\ b_{fg}^K > 0, b_{f\sigma(g)}^K < 0}} x_g^{b_{fg}^K} x_{\sigma(g)}^{b_{fg}^K} = \prod_{\substack{g \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\alpha \\ b_{fg}^K < 0, b_{f\sigma(g)}^K > 0}} x_g^{-b_{fg}^K} x_{\sigma(g)}^{-b_{fg}^K},$$

which follows from $\sigma(\mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\alpha) = \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\alpha$ and σ being of order 2.

There are $\binom{h+1}{2}$ exchange relations since $|\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{D}_\alpha)| = |\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{D}_\beta)| = \binom{h+1}{2}$.

- (2) On \mathbf{p}_K , $c_K(\mathbf{p}_K) = \mathbf{p}_L = (p_{L,x_f}^\pm)_{f \in \mathcal{F}(L)}$ is uniquely determined by the normalization condition $p_{L,x_f}^+ \oplus p_{L,x_f}^- = 1$ together with

$$u_f^L = \begin{cases} (u_{\sigma(f)}^K)^{-1}, & \text{if } f \in \mathcal{D}_\beta; \\ \pi_{\alpha,\sigma(f)}^K u_{\sigma(f)}^K, & \text{if } f \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\beta) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\beta; \\ u_f^K, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- (3) On $B(K)$, $\mu_\alpha(B(K)) = B(L)$.

Remark 5.4. Since $\mathbf{bm}_\beta L = \mathbf{bm}_\beta \mathbf{bm}_\alpha K = K$, in a similar way as above we also can define the bistellar seed mutation

$$\Phi_\beta: \Sigma_L = (\mathcal{X}(L), \mathbf{p}_L, B(L)) \longrightarrow \Sigma_K = (\mathcal{X}(K), \mathbf{p}_K, B(K)).$$

From Definition 5.3(1), we write

$$M_{K,\alpha,f}^+ = \frac{p_{K,x_f}^+}{D_{\alpha,f}^K} \operatorname{lcm} \left(\prod_{g \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\alpha} x_g^{[b_{fg}^K]_+}, \prod_{g \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\alpha} x_{\sigma(g)}^{[b_{fg}^K]_+} \right)$$

and

$$M_{K,\alpha,f}^- = \frac{p_{K,x_f}^-}{D_{\alpha,f}^K} \operatorname{lcm} \left(\prod_{g \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\alpha} x_g^{[-b_{fg}^K]_+}, \prod_{g \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\alpha} x_{\sigma(g)}^{[-b_{fg}^K]_+} \right),$$

so $x_f x_{\sigma(f)} = M^+ + M^-$.

Then it is easy to see, using equation (5.4), that:

Lemma 5.5. *The two monomials $M_{K,\alpha,f}^+$ and $M_{K,\alpha,f}^-$ have no common divisor.*

Lemma 5.6. *Following from Definition 5.3(2) we have the following relations:*

$$p_{L,x_f}^+ = \begin{cases} p_{K,\sigma(f)}^-, & \text{if } f \in \mathcal{D}_\beta; \\ \frac{\pi_{\alpha,\sigma(f)}^K u_{\sigma(f)}^K}{1 \oplus \pi_{\alpha,\sigma(f)}^K u_{\sigma(f)}^K}, & \text{if } f \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\beta) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\beta; \\ p_{K,x_f}^+, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad p_{L,x_f}^- = \begin{cases} p_{K,\sigma(f)}^+, & \text{if } f \in \mathcal{D}_\beta; \\ \frac{1}{1 \oplus \pi_{\alpha,\sigma(f)}^K u_{\sigma(f)}^K}, & \text{if } f \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\beta) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\beta; \\ p_{K,x_f}^-, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. If $f \in \mathcal{D}_\beta$, since $p_{L,x_f}^+/p_{L,x_f}^- = p_{K,x_{\sigma(f)}}^-/p_{K,x_{\sigma(f)}}^+$ and $p_{K,x_{\sigma(f)}}^+ \oplus p_{K,x_{\sigma(f)}}^- = 1$, then $p_{K,x_{\sigma(f)}}^+ = \frac{1}{1 \oplus u_f^L}$ and $p_{K,x_{\sigma(f)}}^- = \frac{u_f^L}{1 \oplus u_f^L}$, so $p_{L,x_f}^\pm = p_{K,x_{\sigma(f)}}^\mp$ as required.

If $f \in \mathcal{F}(L) \setminus \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\beta)$, since $p_{L,x_f}^+/p_{L,x_f}^- = p_{K,x_{\sigma(f)}}^+/p_{K,x_{\sigma(f)}}^-$, then clearly $p_{L,x_f}^\pm = p_{K,x_{\sigma(f)}}^\pm$.

If $f \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\beta) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\beta$, by (5.2), by direct calculation

$$p_{L,x_f}^+ = \frac{u_f^L}{1 \oplus u_f^L} = \frac{\pi_{\alpha,\sigma(f)}^K u_{\sigma(f)}^K}{1 \oplus \pi_{\alpha,\sigma(f)}^K u_{\sigma(f)}^K} \quad \text{and} \quad p_{L,x_f}^- = \frac{1}{1 \oplus u_f^L} = \frac{1}{1 \oplus \pi_{\alpha,\sigma(f)}^K u_{\sigma(f)}^K}.$$

□

Remark 5.7. We also have that

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{\alpha,\sigma(f)}^K &= \prod_{g \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha} (p_{K,x_g}^+)^{[b_{g\sigma(f)}^K]_+} (p_{K,x_g}^-)^{-[-b_{g\sigma(f)}^K]_+} = \prod_{g \in \mathcal{D}_\beta} (p_{K,x_{\sigma(g)}}^+)^{[b_{\sigma(g)\sigma(f)}^K]_+} (p_{K,x_{\sigma(g)}}^-)^{-[-b_{\sigma(g)\sigma(f)}^K]_+} \\ &= \prod_{g \in \mathcal{D}_\beta} (p_{L,x_g}^-)^{[-b_{gf}^L]_+} (p_{L,x_g}^+)^{-[b_{gf}^L]_+} = \left(\prod_{g \in \mathcal{D}_\beta} (p_{L,x_g}^+)^{[b_{gf}^L]_+} (p_{L,x_g}^-)^{-[-b_{gf}^L]_+} \right)^{-1} = (\pi_{\beta,f}^L)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.8. For $f \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha$, $M_{K,\alpha,f}^\pm = M_{L,\beta,\sigma(f)}^\mp$. Furthermore,

$$M_{L,\beta,\sigma(f)}^+ + M_{L,\beta,\sigma(f)}^- = M_{K,\alpha,f}^- + M_{K,\alpha,f}^+ = x_f x_{\sigma(f)}.$$

Proof. For $f, g \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha)$, we have by (5.2) that $b_{\sigma(f)\sigma(g)}^L = -b_{fg}^K$. For $f \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha$, by Lemma 5.6 we have that $p_{L,x_{\sigma(f)}}^\pm = p_{K,x_f}^\mp$. We note that σ is an involution, $\sigma(\mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\alpha) = \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\alpha = \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\beta) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\beta$ and $\sigma(\mathcal{D}_\alpha) = \mathcal{D}_\beta$. Thus, for $f \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha$,

$$\begin{aligned} M_{L,\beta,\sigma(f)}^\mp &= \frac{p_{L,x_{\sigma(f)}}^\mp}{D_{\beta,\sigma(f)}^L} \text{lcm} \left(\prod_{g \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\beta) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\beta} x_g^{[\mp b_{\sigma(f)g}^L]_+}, \prod_{g \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\beta) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\beta} x_{\sigma(g)}^{[\mp b_{\sigma(f)\sigma(g)}^L]_+} \right) \\ &= \frac{p_{K,x_f}^\pm}{D_{\beta,\sigma(f)}^L} \text{lcm} \left(\prod_{g \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\alpha} x_{\sigma(g)}^{[\mp b_{\sigma(f)\sigma(g)}^L]_+}, \prod_{g \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\alpha} x_{\sigma^2(g)}^{[\mp b_{\sigma(f)\sigma(g)}^L]_+} \right) \\ &= \frac{p_{K,x_f}^\pm}{D_{\beta,\sigma(f)}^L} \text{lcm} \left(\prod_{g \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\alpha} x_g^{[\pm b_{fg}^K]_+}, \prod_{g \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\alpha} x_{\sigma(g)}^{[\pm b_{fg}^K]_+} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$D_{\beta,\sigma(f)}^L = \prod_{\substack{g \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\beta) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\beta \\ b_{\sigma(f)g}^L > 0, b_{\sigma(f)\sigma(g)}^L < 0}} b_{\sigma(f)g}^L x_g b_{\sigma(f)\sigma(g)}^L = \prod_{\substack{g \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\alpha \\ -b_{fg}^K > 0, -b_{f\sigma(g)}^K < 0}} x_{\sigma(g)}^{-b_{fg}^K} x_g^{-b_{f\sigma(g)}^K} = D_{\alpha,f}^K$$

using equation (5.4). Thus, we have that $M_{K,\alpha,f}^\pm = M_{L,\beta,\sigma(f)}^\mp$. □

The above arguments imply that:

Proposition 5.9. The bistellar seed mutation $\Phi_\alpha: \Sigma_K \rightarrow \Sigma_L$ is invertible, and its inverse is Φ_β .

The seed mutation Φ_α also determines a natural \mathbb{ZP} -linear field isomorphism $\mathcal{L}_{(K,L)}: \mathbb{F}\mathcal{X}(K) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}\mathcal{X}(L)$ given by

$$(5.5) \quad \mathcal{L}_{(K,L)}(x_f) = \varphi_\alpha^K(x_f) = \begin{cases} x_f & \text{if } f \in \mathcal{F}(K) \setminus \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha); \\ x_{\sigma(f)} & \text{if } f \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\alpha; \\ x_{\sigma(f)} = \frac{M_{K,\alpha,f}^+ + M_{K,\alpha,f}^-}{x_f} & \text{if } f \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{L}_{(K,L)}$ is invertible and $\mathcal{L}_{(L,K)} = \mathcal{L}_{(K,L)}^{-1}$. Since $\mathcal{X}(K) \setminus \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{D}_\alpha) = \mathcal{X}(L) \setminus \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{D}_\beta)$ and

$$\frac{M_{K,\alpha,f}^+ + M_{K,\alpha,f}^-}{x_f} \in \mathbb{F}\mathcal{X}(L)$$

for $f \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha$, this gives:

Corollary 5.10. *Under the action of the seed mutation Φ_α (or Φ_β), $\mathbb{FX}(K)$ can be identified with $\mathbb{FX}(L)$.*

We can now actually define the required bistellar cluster algebra \mathcal{A}_K from the initial seed Σ_K via bistellar seed mutations by performing all possible bistellar h -moves on K , as in the definition of a classical cluster algebra. To understand the structure of \mathcal{A}_K more clearly, we would like to give more details in the next subsection.

5.2. Bistellar Exchange Graphs and Bistellar Cluster Algebras. We define an equivalence relation on \mathbb{TM}_{2h} by saying that $K_1 \sim K_2$ if and only if K_2 can be obtained from K_1 by a finite sequence of bistellar h -moves (including the empty sequence). This is clearly an equivalence relation and we denote by $[K]$ the equivalence class containing K .

Note that it is possible that $[K]$ only contains K itself. For example, if K is the boundary complex of an $(2h+1)$ -simplex, then we cannot perform any bistellar h -moves on K , so $[K] = \{K\}$. If $|[K]| > 1$, then by Corollary 2.4, any triangulated manifold $L \in [K]$ is also a subcomplex of $2^{[m]}$, so $[K]$ is finite. Throughout the following, we assume that $|[K]| > 1$.

Definition 5.11. A finite sequence of pairs $(\alpha_1, \beta_1), \dots, (\alpha_l, \beta_l)$ in $\mathcal{F}_h^{2[m]}$ is called a *bistellar sequence* of $[K]$ if there exists $L', L'' \in [K]$ such that $L'' = \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha_l} \cdots \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha_1} L'$.

A pair (α, β) in $\mathcal{F}_h^{2[m]}$ is said to be a *bistellar pair* of $[K]$ if there is a bistellar sequence of $[K]$, $(\alpha_1, \beta_1), \dots, (\alpha_l, \beta_l)$, such that (α, β) is one of $(\alpha_1, \beta_1), \dots, (\alpha_l, \beta_l)$.

Obviously, if $(\alpha_1, \beta_1), \dots, (\alpha_l, \beta_l)$ is a bistellar sequence of $[K]$, then so is its reverse.

By $\mathcal{S}_{bp}^{[K]}$ we denote the set of all bistellar pairs of $[K]$, and for each $L \in [K]$, by \mathcal{S}_{bp}^L we denote the subset of $\mathcal{S}_{bp}^{[K]}$ consisting of bistellar pairs in L . Obviously, each \mathcal{S}_{bp}^L is nonempty. On the other hand, given a pair $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{S}_{bp}^{[K]}$, it is easy to see that there must be a triangulated manifold $L \in [K]$ such that (α, β) is a bistellar pair in L , that is, $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{S}_{bp}^L$. Thus,

$$\mathcal{S}_{bp}^{[K]} = \bigcup_{L \in [K]} \mathcal{S}_{bp}^L.$$

Note that generally, for two $L, L' \in [K]$, the intersection $\mathcal{S}_{bp}^L \cap \mathcal{S}_{bp}^{L'}$ may not be empty.

Lemma 5.12. *The set of bistellar pairs $\mathcal{S}_{bp}^{[K]}$ has the following properties:*

- (1) $\mathcal{S}_{bp}^{[K]}$ is a finite set.
- (2) $\mathcal{S}_{bp}^{[K]}$ is nonempty if and only if $|[K]| > 1$.
- (3) $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{S}_{bp}^{[K]}$ if and only if $(\beta, \alpha) \in \mathcal{S}_{bp}^{[K]}$.
- (4) Let $L \in [K]$ and $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{S}_{bp}^{[K]}$. Then $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{S}_{bp}^L$ if and only if $(\beta, \alpha) \in \mathcal{S}_{bp}^{\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} L}$.
- (5) If $(\alpha, \beta), (\alpha', \beta') \in \mathcal{S}_{bp}^L$ are distinct pairs, then $\mathcal{D}_\alpha \cap \mathcal{D}_{\alpha'} = \emptyset$.

Proof. Properties (1)–(4) are immediate. It only remains to show that the property (5) holds.

Assume that $\mathcal{D}_\alpha \cap \mathcal{D}_{\alpha'} \neq \emptyset$. Then there is at least one $(n-1)$ -simplex $f \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha \cap \mathcal{D}_{\alpha'}$ such that

- (a) $\alpha \subseteq f$ and $\alpha' \subseteq f$ (since $\alpha = \bigcap_{I \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha} I$ and $\alpha' = \bigcap_{J \in \mathcal{D}_{\alpha'}} J$); and furthermore
- (b) there are two vertices $v, w \in \beta$ and two vertices $v', w' \in \beta'$ such that

$$f = (\alpha \cup \beta) \setminus \{v, w\} = (\alpha' \cup \beta') \setminus \{v', w'\}.$$

Since (α, β) and (α', β') are different, at most one of v' and w' is in β . Without the loss of generality, assume that $v' \notin \beta$. Since $F = (\alpha' \cup \beta') \setminus \{w'\}$ is an n -simplex of L and $\alpha \subset f \subset F$, we have that $F \setminus \alpha$ is a simplex in $\text{Link}_L \alpha = \partial\beta$, so $v' \in F$ is a 0-simplex of $\partial\beta$, that is, $v' \in \beta$. This is a contradiction. Thus $\mathcal{D}_\alpha \cap \mathcal{D}_{\alpha'} = \emptyset$ as desired. \square

Example 5.13. Let K be a triangulation with five vertices of the 2-sphere, as shown in Figure 1. Then there are ten elements in $[K]$ and thirty bistellar pairs in $\mathcal{S}_{bp}^{[K]}$, which are described with their bistellar moves in Figure 2.




FIGURE 1. Triangulation of the 2-sphere with five vertices




FIGURE 2. Bistellar pairs and moves in $[K]$.




FIGURE 3. Bistellar exchange graph.

Definition 5.14. The *bistellar exchange graph* $\mathbb{G}_{[K]}$ of $[K]$ is defined as follows:

- (1) The vertex set of $\mathbb{G}_{[K]}$ is $[K]$.
- (2) Each edge corresponds to a bistellar h -move and its inverse. In other words, for $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{S}_{bp}^{[K]}$, if (α, β) is a bistellar pair in $L \in [K]$, then both (α, β) and (β, α) define an edge between L and $\mathbf{bm}_\alpha L$.

The bistellar exchange graph $\mathbb{G}_{[K]}$ of $[K]$ indicates how all triangulated manifolds in $[K]$ exchange amongst themselves by performing bistellar h -moves.

Example 5.15. The bistellar exchange graph of $[K]$ in Example 5.13 is a trivalent graph with ten vertices shown in Figure 3.

Proposition 5.16. The bistellar exchange graph $\mathbb{G}_{[K]}$ is connected.

Proof. This immediately follows from $[K]$ being an equivalence class. \square

Remark 5.17. Generally, the bistellar exchange graph $\mathbb{G}_{[K]}$ may not be regular.

Now, to each vertex $L \in \mathbb{G}_{[K]}$ (that is, a triangulated manifold in $[K]$), we can associate two pieces of data: a bistellar seed $\Sigma_L = (\mathcal{X}(L), \mathbf{p}_L, B(L))$ and a field $\mathbb{F}\mathcal{X}(L)$. To each edge $\overline{LL'}$ in $\mathbb{G}_{[K]}$ (that is, there is a bistellar pair $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{S}_{bp}^{[K]}$ such that $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{S}_{bp}^L$ and $(\beta, \alpha) \in \mathcal{S}_{bp}^{L'}$, so $L' = \mathbf{bm}_\alpha L$ and $L = \mathbf{bm}_\beta L'$), we can associate the seed mutation $\Phi_\alpha: \Sigma_L \rightarrow \Sigma_{L'}$ and its inverse $\Phi_\beta: \Sigma_{L'} \rightarrow \Sigma_L$. We know from (5.5) that the seed mutation Φ_α determines a $\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{P}$ -linear field isomorphism $\mathcal{L}_{(L, L')}: \mathbb{F}\mathcal{X}(L) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}\mathcal{X}(L')$ given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{(L, L')}(x_f) = \varphi_\alpha^L(x_f) = \begin{cases} x_f, & \text{if } f \in \mathcal{F}(L) \setminus \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha); \\ x_{\sigma(f)}, & \text{if } f \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{D}_\alpha; \\ x_{\sigma(f)} = \frac{M_{L, \alpha, f}^+ + M_{L, \alpha, f}^-}{x_f}, & \text{if } f \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha, \end{cases}$$

and the isomorphism $\mathcal{L}_{(L', L)}$ determined by Φ_β is exactly $\mathcal{L}_{(L, L')}^{-1}$. By Corollary 5.10, $\mathbb{F}\mathcal{X}(L)$ can be identified with $\mathbb{F}\mathcal{X}(L')$. Since $\mathbb{G}_{[K]}$ is connected, all the fields $\mathbb{F}\mathcal{X}(L)$, for $L \in [K]$, can be identified with each other, and then they can be regarded as a single field \mathbb{F} such that:

- (1) \mathbb{F} contains all the elements in $\mathcal{X}_{[K]} = \bigcup_{L \in [K]} \mathcal{X}(L)$;
- (2) there are the exchange relations (5.3) in \mathbb{F} for exchangeable bistellar variables

$$\mathcal{E}\mathcal{X}_{[K]} = \left\{ x_f \mid f \in \bigcup_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{S}_{bp}^{[K]}} \mathcal{D}_\alpha \cup \mathcal{D}_\beta \right\}.$$

Definition 5.18. The *bistellar cluster algebra* $\mathcal{A}_{[K]}$ of $[K]$ is the subalgebra of \mathbb{F} , generated by all cluster variables $x_f \in \mathcal{X}_{[K]}$ with the exchange relations given by (5.3).

Definition 5.18 is still suitable for the case of $||[K]|| = 1$. In this case, $\mathcal{A}_{[K]}$ is just a polynomial ring generated by all variables $x_f \in \mathcal{X}(K)$.

Remark 5.19. Since $\mathbb{G}_{[K]}$ is connected, all exchangeable bistellar variables $x_f \in \mathcal{EX}_{[K]}$ can be reduced to being rational functions in $\mathbb{F}\mathcal{X}(K)$ by using the exchange relations. So the bistellar cluster algebra $\mathcal{A}_{[K]}$ can be regarded as a subalgebra of $\mathbb{F}\mathcal{X}(K)$ with $\Sigma_L = (\mathcal{X}(K), \mathbf{p}_K, B(K))$ as an initial bistellar seed.

Definition 5.20. For each $L \in [K]$, \mathcal{A}_L is defined as the subalgebra in $\mathbb{F}\mathcal{X}(L)$ with $\Sigma_L = (\mathcal{X}(L), \mathbf{p}_L, B(L))$ as an initial bistellar seed.

Theorem 5.21. Let $K, K' \in \mathbb{TM}_{2h}$ be two triangulated manifolds. If K' is obtained from K by a finite sequence of bistellar h -moves, then $\mathcal{A}_K \cong \mathcal{A}_{K'}$.

Proof. This is because $[K] = [K']$. □

5.3. A Simple 2-dimensional Example. Let K be the triangulation of the 2-sphere with five vertices in Example 5.13. So there are ten elements in $[K]$ and thirty bistellar pairs in $\mathcal{S}_{bp}^{[K]}$, as shown in Example 5.13. First we see easily that

- (1) The union $\bigcup_{L \in [K]} \mathcal{F}(L)$ is equal to $\mathcal{F}_1^{2[5]}$. So $\mathcal{X}_{[K]}$ consists of ten elements. More precisely,

$$\mathcal{X}_{[K]} = \{x_{(1,2)}, x_{(1,3)}, x_{(1,4)}, x_{(1,5)}, x_{(2,3)}, x_{(2,4)}, x_{(2,5)}, x_{(3,4)}, x_{(3,5)}, x_{(4,5)}\}.$$

- (2) The set $\mathcal{EX}_{[K]}$ of all exchangeable bistellar variables is the same as $\mathcal{X}_{[K]}$. So $\mathcal{A}_{[K]}$ is the subalgebra of \mathbb{F} , generated by the ten elements in $\mathcal{X}_{[K]}$.

To determine the structure of $\mathcal{A}_{[K]}$, let us look at the exchange relations between exchangeable bistellar variables. Since $\mathcal{S}_{bp}^{[K]}$ contains thirty bistellar pairs, there are 15 exchange relations. These exchange relations with the relations among the \mathbf{p}_L , for $L \in [K]$, are stated as follows:

- (1) There is the following exchange relation between $\mathcal{X}(K)$ and $\mathcal{X}(K_1)$.

$$\begin{aligned} x_{(1,2)}x_{(4,5)} &= p_{K,x_{(1,2)}}^+ x_{(1,4)}x_{(2,5)} + p_{K,x_{(1,2)}}^- x_{(1,5)}x_{(2,4)} \\ &= p_{K_1,x_{(4,5)}}^- x_{(1,4)}x_{(2,5)} + p_{K_1,x_{(4,5)}}^+ x_{(1,5)}x_{(2,4)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{with } p_{K,x_{(1,2)}}^\pm = p_{K_1,x_{(4,5)}}^\mp.$$

- (2) There is the following exchange relation between $\mathcal{X}(K)$ and $\mathcal{X}(K_2)$.

$$\begin{aligned} x_{(1,3)}x_{(4,5)} &= p_{K,x_{(1,3)}}^+ x_{(1,4)}x_{(3,5)} + p_{K,x_{(1,3)}}^- x_{(1,5)}x_{(3,4)} \\ &= p_{K_2,x_{(4,5)}}^- x_{(1,4)}x_{(3,5)} + p_{K_2,x_{(4,5)}}^+ x_{(1,5)}x_{(3,4)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{with } p_{K,x_{(1,3)}}^\pm = p_{K_2,x_{(4,5)}}^\mp.$$

- (3) There is the following exchange relation between $\mathcal{X}(K)$ and $\mathcal{X}(K_3)$.

$$\begin{aligned} x_{(2,3)}x_{(4,5)} &= p_{K,x_{(2,3)}}^+ x_{(2,4)}x_{(3,5)} + p_{K,x_{(2,3)}}^- x_{(2,5)}x_{(3,4)} \\ &= p_{K_3,x_{(4,5)}}^- x_{(2,4)}x_{(3,5)} + p_{K_3,x_{(4,5)}}^+ x_{(2,5)}x_{(3,4)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{with } p_{K,x_{(2,3)}}^\pm = p_{K_3,x_{(4,5)}}^\mp.$$

- (4) There is the following exchange relation between $\mathcal{X}(K_1)$ and $\mathcal{X}(K_{11})$.

$$\begin{aligned} x_{(1,2)}x_{(3,5)} &= p_{K_{11},x_{(1,2)}}^+ x_{(1,3)}x_{(2,5)} + p_{K_{11},x_{(1,2)}}^- x_{(1,5)}x_{(2,3)} \\ &= p_{K_1,x_{(3,5)}}^- x_{(1,3)}x_{(2,5)} + p_{K_1,x_{(3,5)}}^+ x_{(1,5)}x_{(2,3)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{with } p_{K_{11},x_{(1,2)}}^\pm = p_{K_1,x_{(3,5)}}^\mp.$$

- (5) There is the following exchange relation between $\mathcal{X}(K_1)$ and $\mathcal{X}(K_{12})$.

$$\begin{aligned} x_{(1,2)}x_{(3,4)} &= p_{K_{12},x_{(1,2)}}^+ x_{(1,3)}x_{(2,4)} + p_{K_{12},x_{(1,2)}}^- x_{(1,4)}x_{(2,3)} \\ &= p_{K_1,x_{(3,4)}}^- x_{(1,3)}x_{(2,4)} + p_{K_1,x_{(3,4)}}^+ x_{(1,4)}x_{(2,3)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{with } p_{K_{12},x_{(1,2)}}^\pm = p_{K_1,x_{(3,4)}}^\mp.$$

(6) There is the following exchange relation between $\mathcal{X}(K_2)$ and $\mathcal{X}(K_{21})$.

$$\begin{aligned} x(1,3)x(2,5) &= p_{K_{21},x(1,3)}^+ x(1,2)x(3,5) + p_{K_{21},x(1,3)}^- x(1,5)x(2,3) \\ &= p_{K_2,x(2,5)}^- x(1,2)x(3,5) + p_{K_2,x(2,5)}^+ x(1,5)x(2,3) \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{with } p_{K_{21},x(1,3)}^\pm = p_{K_2,x(2,5)}^\mp.$$

(7) There is the following exchange relation between $\mathcal{X}(K_2)$ and $\mathcal{X}(K_{22})$.

$$\begin{aligned} x(1,3)x(2,4) &= p_{K_{22},x(1,3)}^+ x(1,2)x(3,4) + p_{K_{22},x(1,3)}^- x(1,4)x(2,3) \\ &= p_{K_2,x(2,4)}^- x(1,2)x(3,4) + p_{K_2,x(2,4)}^+ x(1,4)x(2,3) \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{with } p_{K_{22},x(1,3)}^\pm = p_{K_2,x(2,4)}^\mp.$$

(8) There is the following exchange relation between $\mathcal{X}(K_3)$ and $\mathcal{X}(K_{31})$.

$$\begin{aligned} x(1,4)x(2,3) &= p_{K_3,x(1,4)}^+ x(1,2)x(3,4) + p_{K_3,x(1,4)}^- x(1,3)x(2,4) \\ &= p_{K_{31},x(2,3)}^- x(1,2)x(3,4) + p_{K_{31},x(2,3)}^+ x(1,3)x(2,4) \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{with } p_{K_{31},x(2,3)}^\pm = p_{K_3,x(1,4)}^\mp.$$

(9) There is the following exchange relation between $\mathcal{X}(K_3)$ and $\mathcal{X}(K_{32})$.

$$\begin{aligned} x(1,5)x(2,3) &= p_{K_3,x(1,5)}^+ x(1,2)x(3,5) + p_{K_3,x(1,5)}^- x(1,3)x(2,5) \\ &= p_{K_{32},x(2,3)}^- x(1,2)x(3,5) + p_{K_{32},x(2,3)}^+ x(1,3)x(2,5) \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{with } p_{K_{32},x(2,3)}^\pm = p_{K_3,x(1,5)}^\mp.$$

(10) There is the following exchange relation between $\mathcal{X}(K_{11})$ and $\mathcal{X}(K_{31})$.

$$\begin{aligned} x(1,4)x(3,5) &= p_{K_{11},x(1,4)}^+ x(1,3)x(4,5) + p_{K_{11},x(1,4)}^- x(1,5)x(3,4) \\ &= p_{K_{31},x(3,5)}^- x(1,3)x(4,5) + p_{K_{31},x(3,5)}^+ x(1,5)x(3,4) \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{with } p_{K_{11},x(1,4)}^\pm = p_{K_{31},x(3,5)}^\mp.$$

(11) There is the following exchange relation between $\mathcal{X}(K_{11})$ and $\mathcal{X}(K_{22})$.

$$\begin{aligned} x(2,4)x(3,5) &= p_{K_{11},x(2,4)}^+ x(2,3)x(4,5) + p_{K_{11},x(2,4)}^- x(2,5)x(3,4) \\ &= p_{K_{22},x(3,5)}^- x(2,3)x(4,5) + p_{K_{22},x(3,5)}^+ x(2,5)x(3,4) \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{with } p_{K_{11},x(2,4)}^\pm = p_{K_{22},x(3,5)}^\mp.$$

(12) There is the following exchange relation between $\mathcal{X}(K_{12})$ and $\mathcal{X}(K_{21})$.

$$\begin{aligned} x(2,5)x(3,4) &= p_{K_{12},x(2,5)}^+ x(2,3)x(4,5) + p_{K_{12},x(2,5)}^- x(2,4)x(3,5) \\ &= p_{K_{21},x(3,4)}^- x(2,3)x(4,5) + p_{K_{21},x(3,4)}^+ x(2,4)x(3,5) \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{with } p_{K_{12},x(2,5)}^\pm = p_{K_{21},x(3,4)}^\mp.$$

(13) There is the following exchange relation between $\mathcal{X}(K_{12})$ and $\mathcal{X}(K_{32})$.

$$\begin{aligned} x(1,5)x(3,4) &= p_{K_{12},x(1,5)}^+ x(1,3)x(4,5) + p_{K_{12},x(1,5)}^- x(1,4)x(3,5) \\ &= p_{K_{32},x(3,4)}^- x(1,3)x(4,5) + p_{K_{32},x(3,4)}^+ x(1,4)x(3,5) \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{with } p_{K_{12},x(1,5)}^\pm = p_{K_{32},x(3,4)}^\mp.$$

(14) There is the following exchange relation between $\mathcal{X}(K_{21})$ and $\mathcal{X}(K_{31})$.

$$\begin{aligned} x(1,4)x(2,5) &= p_{K_{21},x(1,4)}^+ x(1,2)x(4,5) + p_{K_{21},x(1,4)}^- x(1,5)x(2,4) \\ &= p_{K_{31},x(2,5)}^- x(1,2)x(4,5) + p_{K_{31},x(2,5)}^+ x(1,5)x(2,4) \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{with } p_{K_{21},x(1,4)}^\pm = p_{K_{31},x(2,5)}^\mp.$$

(15) There is the following exchange relation between $\mathcal{X}(K_{22})$ and $\mathcal{X}(K_{32})$.

$$\begin{aligned} x_{(1,5)}x_{(2,4)} &= p_{K_{22},x_{(1,5)}}^+ x_{(1,2)}x_{(4,5)} + p_{K_{22},x_{(1,5)}}^- x_{(1,4)}x_{(2,5)} \\ &= p_{K_{32},x_{(2,4)}}^- x_{(1,2)}x_{(4,5)} + p_{K_{32},x_{(2,4)}}^+ x_{(1,4)}x_{(2,5)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{with } p_{K_{22},x_{(1,5)}}^\pm = p_{K_{32},x_{(2,4)}}^\mp.$$

Lemma 5.22. *We have the following relations:*

$$(5.6) \quad x_{(1,2)}x_{(4,5)} = x_{(1,4)}x_{(2,5)} = x_{(1,5)}x_{(2,4)}$$

$$(5.7) \quad x_{(1,3)}x_{(4,5)} = x_{(1,4)}x_{(3,5)} = x_{(1,5)}x_{(3,4)}$$

$$(5.8) \quad x_{(2,3)}x_{(4,5)} = x_{(2,4)}x_{(3,5)} = x_{(2,5)}x_{(3,4)}$$

$$(5.9) \quad x_{(1,2)}x_{(3,5)} = x_{(1,3)}x_{(2,5)} = x_{(1,5)}x_{(2,3)}$$

$$(5.10) \quad x_{(1,2)}x_{(3,4)} = x_{(1,3)}x_{(2,4)} = x_{(1,4)}x_{(2,3)}.$$

Proof. We only prove that (5.6) holds since the proofs of other cases (5.7)–(5.10) are similar. Let

$$p_{K,x_{(1,2)}}^+/p_{K,x_{(1,2)}}^- = u, \quad p_{K_{21},x_{(1,4)}}^+/p_{K_{21},x_{(1,4)}}^- = v \quad \text{and} \quad p_{K_{22},x_{(1,5)}}^+/p_{K_{22},x_{(1,5)}}^- = w.$$

Since $p_{K,x_{(1,2)}}^+ \oplus p_{K,x_{(1,2)}}^- = 1$, one has that $p_{K,x_{(1,2)}}^+ = \frac{u}{1 \oplus u}$ and $p_{K,x_{(1,2)}}^- = \frac{1}{1 \oplus u}$. Similarly, one has that $p_{K_{21},x_{(1,4)}}^+ = \frac{v}{1 \oplus v}$ and $p_{K_{21},x_{(1,4)}}^- = \frac{1}{1 \oplus v}$, and $p_{K_{22},x_{(1,5)}}^+ = \frac{w}{1 \oplus w}$ and $p_{K_{22},x_{(1,5)}}^- = \frac{1}{1 \oplus w}$. Thus we rewrite (1), (14) and (15) as follows:

$$(5.11) \quad x_{(1,2)}x_{(4,5)} = \frac{u}{1 \oplus u} x_{(1,4)}x_{(2,5)} + \frac{1}{1 \oplus u} x_{(1,5)}x_{(2,4)}$$

$$(5.12) \quad x_{(1,4)}x_{(2,5)} = \frac{v}{1 \oplus v} x_{(1,2)}x_{(4,5)} + \frac{1}{1 \oplus v} x_{(1,5)}x_{(2,4)}$$

$$(5.13) \quad x_{(1,5)}x_{(2,4)} = \frac{w}{1 \oplus w} x_{(1,2)}x_{(4,5)} + \frac{1}{1 \oplus w} x_{(1,4)}x_{(2,5)}.$$

From (5.11) and (5.12) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} x_{(1,2)}x_{(4,5)} &= \frac{u}{1 \oplus u} \cdot \frac{v}{1 \oplus v} x_{(1,2)}x_{(4,5)} + \left(\frac{u}{1 \oplus u} \cdot \frac{1}{1 \oplus v} \oplus \frac{1}{1 \oplus u} \right) x_{(1,5)}x_{(2,4)} \\ &= \frac{uv}{(1 \oplus u)(1 \oplus v)} x_{(1,2)}x_{(4,5)} + \frac{1 \oplus u \oplus v}{(1 \oplus u)(1 \oplus v)} x_{(1,5)}x_{(2,4)} \end{aligned}$$

so $(1 \oplus u \oplus v)x_{(1,2)}x_{(4,5)} = (1 \oplus u \oplus v)x_{(1,5)}x_{(2,4)}$. Thus, $x_{(1,2)}x_{(4,5)} = x_{(1,5)}x_{(2,4)}$. In a similar way as above, one can obtain from (5.11) and (5.13) that $x_{(1,2)}x_{(4,5)} = x_{(1,4)}x_{(2,5)}$. This shows that (5.6) holds. \square

Remark 5.23. The relation (5.7) is determined by (2), (10) and (13); (5.8) is determined by (3), (11) and (12); (5.9) is determined by (4), (6) and (9); (5.10) is determined by (5), (7) and (8). In addition, it is easy to see that (5.9) and (5.10) can be induced from (5.6)–(5.8).

Proposition 5.24. *As a subalgebra of \mathbb{F} , $\mathcal{A}_{[K]}$ is the quotient algebra of the polynomial algebra*

$$\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{P}[x \mid x \in \mathcal{X}_{[K]}] = \mathbb{Z}\mathbb{P}[x_{(1,2)}, x_{(1,3)}, x_{(1,4)}, x_{(1,5)}, x_{(2,3)}, x_{(2,4)}, x_{(2,5)}, x_{(3,4)}, x_{(3,5)}, x_{(4,5)}]$$

as follows:

$$\mathcal{A}_{[K]} = \mathbb{Z}\mathbb{P}[x \mid x \in \mathcal{X}_{[K]}] / \mathcal{I},$$

where \mathcal{I} is the ideal determined by those relations (5.6)–(5.8).

As a subalgebra in $\mathbb{F}\mathcal{X}(K)$ with $(\mathcal{X}(K), \mathbf{p}_K, B(K))$ as an initial bistellar seed, $\mathcal{A}_K \cong \mathcal{A}_{[K]}$ is generated by $x_{(1,2)}, x_{(1,3)}, x_{(1,4)}, x_{(1,5)}, x_{(2,3)}, x_{(2,4)}, x_{(2,5)}, x_{(3,4)}, x_{(3,5)}$ and

$$\frac{x_{(1,4)}x_{(2,5)}}{x_{(1,2)}} = \frac{x_{(1,5)}x_{(2,4)}}{x_{(1,2)}} = \frac{x_{(1,4)}x_{(3,5)}}{x_{(1,3)}} = \frac{x_{(1,5)}x_{(3,4)}}{x_{(1,3)}} = \frac{x_{(2,4)}x_{(3,5)}}{x_{(2,3)}} = \frac{x_{(2,5)}x_{(3,4)}}{x_{(2,3)}}.$$

6. ALGEBRAS AS PL INVARIANTS

In this section, our purpose is to construct PL invariants by using bistellar cluster algebras. We shall work in the setting of PL manifolds. Let \mathbb{PL}_n be the set consisting of all n -dimensional PL manifolds in \mathbb{TM}_n . We shall mainly be concerned with the case in which n is even, especially for $n = 4$.

Write $n = 2h$ and take a PL manifold $K \in \mathbb{PL}_n$. Let \mathfrak{S}_K be the set consisting of all PL manifolds that are PL homeomorphic to K . Then we can write

$$\mathfrak{S}_K = \bigcup_{m \geq m_0} \mathfrak{S}_K^m,$$

where m_0 is the minimal number of vertex numbers of all PL manifolds in \mathfrak{S}_K , and \mathfrak{S}_K^m consists of those PL manifolds with m vertices in \mathfrak{S}_K .

Consider the equivalence relation \sim on \mathfrak{S}_K as follows: for $K_1, K_2 \in \mathfrak{S}_K$, $K_1 \sim K_2$ if and only if one of K_1 and K_2 can be transformed into the other by only doing a finite sequence of bistellar h -moves (including the empty sequence). By $\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_K$ we denote the quotient set \mathfrak{S}_K / \sim . Since the bistellar h -moves do not change the number of vertices, the equivalence relation \sim is graded on $\mathfrak{S}_K = \bigcup_{m \geq m_0} \mathfrak{S}_K^m$, so

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_K = \bigcup_{m \geq m_0} \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_K^m.$$

For a PL manifold L in \mathfrak{S}_K , the equivalence class of L in $\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_K$ is denoted by $[L]$.

We define a binary relation \preceq on $\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_K$ as follows: for two elements $[K_1], [K_2] \in \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_K$ we say

$$[K_1] \preceq [K_2] \iff K_2 \text{ is obtained from } K_1 \text{ by doing a finite sequence of bistellar moves } \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha_1}, \dots, \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha_l}, \text{ where } \dim \alpha_i \geq h.$$

Note that for $[K'] \in \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_K$, if $||[K']|| = 1$, then we use the convention that $[K'] \preceq [K']$.

Lemma 6.1. *When $h = 1, 2$, $(\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_K, \preceq)$ forms a directed set.*

Proof. When $h = 1$, let $[L] \in \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_K$. Clearly, $[L] \preceq [L]$. It is well-known that for any $m \geq m_0$ and any two $L_1, L_2 \in \mathfrak{S}_K^m$, that L_1 can be obtained from L_2 by performing a finite sequence of bistellar 1-moves (this can also be seen by simplifying the case for $h = 2$ below). So $\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_K^m$ contains exactly one element. It then follows easily from this that $(\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_K, \preceq)$ forms a directed set.

When $h = 2$, let $[L] \in \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_K$. First, clearly one has that $[L] \preceq [L]$. Let $[L_1], [L_2], [L_3] \in \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_K$ be such that $[L_1] \preceq [L_2]$ and $[L_2] \preceq [L_3]$. Then L_2 is obtained from L_1 by performing finitely many bistellar 0-moves, 1-moves or 2-moves, and L_3 is obtained from L_2 similarly. So L_3 is obtained from L_1 by performing finitely many bistellar 0-moves, 1-moves or 2-moves. Thus, $[L_1] \preceq [L_3]$. It remains to show that for any two $[L_1], [L_2] \in \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_K$, there is an $[L] \in \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_K$ such that $[L_1] \preceq [L]$ and $[L_2] \preceq [L]$.

Clearly if either L_1 is obtained from L_2 by performing finitely many bistellar 0-moves, 1-moves or 2-moves or L_2 is obtained from L_1 in a similar fashion, then we can choose $[L]$ as $[L_1]$ or $[L_2]$ such that $[L_1] \preceq [L]$ and $[L_2] \preceq [L]$. Generally, by Pachner's Theorem [12], there always exists a finite sequence of bistellar pairs $(\alpha_1, \beta_1), \dots, (\alpha_l, \beta_l)$ such that

$$(6.1) \quad \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha_l} \cdots \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha_1} L_1 = L_2,$$

where $0 \leq \dim \alpha_i \leq 4$. Such a sequence $(\alpha_1, \beta_1), \dots, (\alpha_l, \beta_l)$ is not unique in general. To complete the proof, it suffices to show that there exists such a sequence $(\alpha_1, \beta_1), \dots, (\alpha_l, \beta_l)$, satisfying (6.1) and the property that there is some $1 \leq u \leq l$ such that for $1 \leq i \leq u$, $\dim \alpha_i \geq 2$ and for $u < i \leq l$, $\dim \alpha_i < 2$, so that we can obtain $L = \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha_u} \cdots \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha_1} L_1 = \mathbf{bm}_{\beta_{u+1}} \cdots \mathbf{bm}_{\beta_l} L_2$ as desired.

For this we let $L \in [K]$, and then it suffices to show that for any two bistellar pairs (α, β) with $\dim \alpha < 2$ and (α', β') with $\dim \alpha' \geq 2$, if we can perform the operation $\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'} \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha}$ on L , then $\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'} \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} L$ can be written as $\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha_l} \cdots \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha_u} \cdots \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha_1} L$ such that for $1 \leq i \leq u$, $\dim \alpha_i \geq 2$ and for $u < i \leq l$, $\dim \alpha_i < 2$. We divide this into two cases: (I) $\dim \alpha = 0$; (II) $\dim \alpha = 1$.

(I) Without loss of generality, we assume that $\alpha = (1)$ and $\beta = (2, 3, 4, 5, 6)$, so $\alpha * \partial \beta \subset L$. Then $\beta = \partial \alpha * \beta \subset \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} L$.

If $\dim \alpha' = 4$ and $\alpha' = \beta$ (i.e., $|\alpha' \cap \beta| = 5$), then $\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'} \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} L = L$. In this case, first we do a bistellar 0-move at $(1, 2, 3, 4, 5)$ on L , so that $(1, 2, 3, 4, 5)$ becomes a missing face of $\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4,5)} L$, and let $(6') \in \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4,5)} L$ such that $\text{Link}_L(1, 2, 3, 4, 5) = \partial(6')$. Then we do the inverse operation of $\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4,5)}$, so that

$$\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'} \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} L = \mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5,6)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1)} L = L = \mathbf{bm}_{(6')} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4,5)} L.$$

If $\dim \alpha' = 4$ and $|\alpha' \cap \beta| \leq 4$, without loss of generality, we may assume that $\alpha' = (2, 3, 4, 5, 6')$ or $(2, 3, 4, 5', 6')$ or $(2, 3, 4', 5', 6')$ or $(2, 3', 4', 5', 6')$ or $(2', 3', 4', 5', 6')$. Clearly, α' is a simplex of L so $\text{Link}_L \alpha'$ is the boundary of a ghost vertex $\beta' = v$ (i.e., $\beta' \notin L$). Thus $\alpha \in \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'} L$ and $\alpha' \in \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} L$. It is easy to check that

$$\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'} \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} L = \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'} L$$

as required.

If $\dim \alpha' = 3$ and $|\alpha' \cap \beta| = 4$, without loss of generality, assume that $\alpha' = (2, 3, 4, 5)$, then we can write $\beta' = (6, 6') \notin \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} L$. We easily check that $\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'} \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} L$ must contain the following four 4-simplices $(2, 3, 4, 6, 6')$, $(2, 3, 5, 6, 6')$, $(2, 4, 5, 6, 6')$ and $(3, 4, 5, 6, 6')$. Now let us perform the following bistellar moves on L .

- (a) Firstly we see that $(1, 6') \notin L$ and $\text{Link}_L(2, 3, 4, 5) = \partial(1, 6')$, so we can do a bistellar 1-move at $(2, 3, 4, 5)$ on L .
- (b) Secondly we have that $(6, 6') \notin \mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)} L$ and $\text{Link}_{\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)} L}(1, 2, 3, 4) = \partial(6, 6')$, so we can do a bistellar 1-move at $(1, 2, 3, 4)$ on $\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)} L$, and in particular, we have $(2, 3, 4, 6, 6') \in \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)} L$.
- (c) Thirdly we have that $(5, 6, 6') \notin \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)} L$ and

$$\text{Link}_{\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)} L}(1, 3, 4) = \partial(5, 6, 6').$$

Then we perform a bistellar 2-move at $(1, 3, 4)$ on $\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)} L$, so that $(3, 4, 5, 6, 6') \in \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)} L$.

- (d) Next it is easy to see that $(2, 5, 6, 6') \notin \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)} L$ and

$$\text{Link}_{\mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)} L}(1, 4) = \partial(2, 5, 6, 6').$$

After we perform a bistellar 3-move at $(1, 4)$ on $\mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)} L$, we have

$$(2, 4, 5, 6, 6') \in \mathbf{bm}_{(1,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)} L.$$

- (e) Finally we can check that

$$\text{Link}_{\mathbf{bm}_{(1,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)} L}(1) = \partial(2, 3, 5, 6, 6')$$

but $(2, 3, 5, 6, 6') \notin \mathbf{bm}_{(1,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)} L$. After performing a bistellar 4-move at (1) on $\mathbf{bm}_{(1,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)} L$, we obtain that

$$(2, 3, 5, 6, 6') \in \mathbf{bm}_{(1)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)} L.$$

Moreover, an easy argument shows

$$\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'} \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} L = \mathbf{bm}_{(1)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)} L$$

as required.

If $\dim \alpha' = 3$ and $|\alpha' \cap \beta| \leq 3$, without loss of generality, we may assume that $\alpha' = (2, 3, 4, 5')$ or $(2, 3, 4', 5')$ or $(2, 3', 4', 5')$ or $(2', 3', 4', 5')$. Similarly to the argument of the case $\dim \alpha' = 4$ and $|\alpha' \cap \beta| \leq 4$, we have the following equation

$$\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'} \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} L = \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'} L$$

as required.

As in the above case, if $\dim \alpha' = 2$ and $|\alpha' \cap \beta| \leq 2$, then we easily see that

$$\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'} \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} L = \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'} L.$$

If $\dim \alpha' = 2$ and $|\alpha' \cap \beta| = 3$, we may assume that $\alpha' = (2, 3, 4)$. We see that $\text{Link}_L \alpha'$ is a square formed by four edges $(1, 5)$, $(1, 6)$, $(5, 6')$ and $(6, 6')$. This implies that $\beta' = (5, 6, 6')$, which is a 2-simplex of $\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'} \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} L$ but not a 2-simplex of L and $\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} L$. A direct check gives that $\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'} \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} L$

must contain the following three 4-simplices $(2, 3, 5, 6, 6')$, $(2, 4, 5, 6, 6')$ and $(3, 4, 5, 6, 6')$. Now for our purpose, we perform the following bistellar moves on L :

- (a) Firstly we perform a bistellar 1-move at $(2, 3, 4, 5)$ on L since $(1, 6') \notin L$ and $\text{Link}_L(2, 3, 4, 5) = \partial(1, 6')$.
- (b) Secondly we can perform a bistellar 2-move at $(2, 3, 4)$ on $\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)}L$. This is because $(1, 6, 6') \notin \mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)}L$ and $\text{Link}_{\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)}L}(2, 3, 4) = \partial(1, 6, 6')$.
- (c) Thirdly we see that $(5, 6, 6') \notin \mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)}L$ and

$$\text{Link}_{\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)}L}(1, 3, 4) = \partial(5, 6, 6').$$

Thus we can perform a bistellar 2-move at $(1, 3, 4)$ on $\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)}L$, so that $(3, 4, 5, 6, 6') \in \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)}L$.

- (d) Next we can check that $(2, 5, 6, 6') \notin \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)}L$ and

$$\text{Link}_{\mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)}L}(1, 4) = \partial(2, 5, 6, 6').$$

After we perform a bistellar 3-move at $(1, 4)$ on $\mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)}L$, we have

$$(2, 4, 5, 6, 6') \in \mathbf{bm}_{(1,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)}L.$$

- (e) Finally we can see that $\text{Link}_{\mathbf{bm}_{(1,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)}L}(1) = \partial(2, 3, 5, 6, 6')$ but

$$(2, 3, 5, 6, 6') \notin \mathbf{bm}_{(1,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)}L.$$

Thus, after performing a bistellar 4-move at (1) on

$$\mathbf{bm}_{(1,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)}L,$$

we conclude that

$$(2, 3, 5, 6, 6') \in \mathbf{bm}_{(1)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)}L.$$

Together with the above arguments, we may obtain the required equation

$$\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'}\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha}L = \mathbf{bm}_{(1)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(2,3,4,5)}L.$$

(II) Without loss of generality, we assume that $\alpha = (1, 2)$ and $\beta = (3, 4, 5, 6)$.

If $\dim \alpha' = 4$ and $|\alpha' \cap (\alpha \cup \beta)| = 5$, then $\alpha' \in \mathbf{H}_{\beta} = \{(1, 3, 4, 5, 6), (2, 3, 4, 5, 6)\}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\alpha' = (1, 2, 3, 4, 5)$. Let $\beta' = (7)$, which is a ghost vertex of L and $\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha}L$. Then $\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'}\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha}L$ must contain the following six 4-simplices $(2, 3, 4, 5, 6)$, $(3, 4, 5, 6, 7)$, $(1, 3, 4, 5, 7)$, $(1, 3, 4, 6, 7)$, $(1, 3, 5, 6, 7)$ and $(1, 4, 5, 6, 7)$. In a similar way to case (I), we perform the following bistellar moves on L :

- (a) Firstly we perform a bistellar 0-move at $(1, 2, 3, 4, 5)$ on L since $\text{Link}_L(1, 2, 3, 4, 5) = \partial(7)$. Then we easily see that $(1, 3, 4, 5, 7) \in \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4,5)}L$.
- (b) Secondly we can perform a bistellar 1-move at $(1, 2, 3, 4)$ on $\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4,5)}L$ since $(6, 7) \notin \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4,5)}L$ and $\text{Link}_{\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4,5)}L}(1, 2, 3, 4) = \partial(6, 7)$, so that we can obtain that

$$(1, 3, 4, 6, 7) \in \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4,5)}L.$$

- (c) Thirdly we see that $(5, 6, 7) \notin \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4,5)}L$ and

$$\text{Link}_{\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4,5)}L}(1, 2, 3) = \partial(5, 6, 7).$$

Thus we can perform a bistellar 2-move at $(1, 2, 3)$ on $\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4,5)}L$, so that $(1, 3, 5, 6, 7) \in \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4,5)}L$.

- (d) Next we can check that $(4, 5, 6, 7) \notin \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4,5)}L$ and

$$\text{Link}_{\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4,5)}L}(1, 2) = \partial(4, 5, 6, 7),$$

we can perform a bistellar 3-move at $(1, 2)$ on $\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4,5)}L$, and then $(1, 4, 5, 6, 7) \in \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4,5)}L$.

- (e) Finally we can see that $\text{Link}_{\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4,5)}L}(2, 7) = \partial(3, 4, 5, 6)$ but $(3, 4, 5, 6) \notin \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4,5)}L$. Thus, after performing a bistellar 3-move at $(2, 7)$ on $\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4,5)}L$, we conclude that

$$(2, 3, 4, 5, 6), (3, 4, 5, 6, 7) \in \mathbf{bm}_{(2,7)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4,5)}L.$$

The above arguments give

$$\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'} \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} L = \mathbf{bm}_{(2,7)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,4,5)} L.$$

If $\dim \alpha' = 4$ and $|\alpha' \cap (\alpha \cup \beta)| \leq 4$, then an easy observation shows that

$$\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'} \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} L = \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'} L.$$

Actually, we can also prove easily that if $\dim \alpha' = i$ and $|\alpha' \cap (\alpha \cup \beta)| \leq i$ for $i = 2, 3$, then

$$\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'} \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} L = \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'} L.$$

Thus it remains to show the case in which $\dim \alpha' = i$ and $|\alpha' \cap (\alpha \cup \beta)| = i + 1$ for $i = 2, 3$.

When $i = 2$, without a loss, we may assume that $\alpha' = (1, 3, 4)$. Then $\beta' = (5, 6, 6')$, and further $\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'} \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} L$ must contain the following three 4-simplices $(1, 3, 5, 6, 6')$, $(1, 4, 5, 6, 6')$ and $(3, 4, 5, 6, 6')$. Next we perform the following bistellar moves on L :

- (a) Firstly we perform a bistellar 1-move at $(1, 3, 4, 5)$ on L since $\text{Link}_L(1, 3, 4, 5) = \partial(2, 6')$.
- (b) Secondly we perform a bistellar 2-move at $(1, 3, 4)$ on $\mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L$ since $(2, 6, 6') \notin \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L$ and $\text{Link}_{\mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L}(1, 3, 4) = \partial(2, 6, 6')$.
- (c) Thirdly we see that $(5, 6, 6') \notin \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L$ and

$$\text{Link}_{\mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L}(1, 2, 3) = \partial(5, 6, 6').$$

Thus we can perform a bistellar 2-move at $(1, 2, 3)$ on $\mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L$, so that $(1, 3, 5, 6, 6') \in \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L$.

- (d) Next we can check that $(4, 5, 6, 6') \notin \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L$ and

$$\text{Link}_{\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L}(1, 2) = \partial(4, 5, 6, 6'),$$

we can perform a bistellar 3-move at $(1, 2)$ on $\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L$, and then

$$(1, 4, 5, 6, 6') \in \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L.$$

- (e) Finally we can see that $\text{Link}_{\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L}(2, 6') = \partial(3, 4, 5, 6)$ but $(3, 4, 5, 6) \notin \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L$. Thus, after performing a bistellar 3-move at $(2, 6')$ on $\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L$, we conclude that

$$(3, 4, 5, 6, 6') \in \mathbf{bm}_{(2,6')} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L.$$

The above arguments give the following equality

$$\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'} \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} L = \mathbf{bm}_{(2,6')} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L.$$

When $i = 3$, without loss of generality, we assume that $\alpha' = (1, 3, 4, 5)$. Then $\beta' = (6, 6')$ and $\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'} \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha} L$ must contain the following three 4-simplices $(2, 3, 4, 5, 6)$, $(1, 3, 4, 6, 6')$, $(1, 3, 5, 6, 6')$, $(1, 4, 5, 6, 6')$ and $(3, 4, 5, 6, 6')$. Now we perform the following bistellar moves on L :

- (a) Firstly we perform a bistellar 1-move at $(1, 3, 4, 5)$ on L since $\text{Link}_L(1, 3, 4, 5) = \partial(2, 6')$.
- (b) Secondly we perform a bistellar 1-move at $(1, 2, 3, 5)$ on $\mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L$ since $(6, 6') \notin \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L$ and $\text{Link}_{\mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L}(1, 2, 3, 5) = \partial(6, 6')$, so that we can obtain that

$$(1, 3, 5, 6, 6') \in \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,5)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L.$$

- (c) Thirdly we see that $(4, 6, 6') \notin \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,5)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L$ and

$$\text{Link}_{\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,5)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L}(1, 2, 3) = \partial(4, 6, 6').$$

Thus we can perform a bistellar 2-move at $(1, 2, 3)$ on $\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,5)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L$, so that $(1, 3, 4, 6, 6') \in \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,5)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L$.

- (d) Next we can check that $(4, 5, 6, 6') \notin \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,5)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L$ and

$$\text{Link}_{\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,5)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L}(1, 2) = \partial(4, 5, 6, 6'),$$

we can perform a bistellar 3-move at $(1, 2)$ on $\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,5)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L$, and then

$$(1, 4, 5, 6, 6') \in \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,5)} \mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)} L.$$

- (e) Finally we see that $\text{Link}_{\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,5)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)}L}(2,6') = \partial(3,4,5,6)$ but $(3,4,5,6) \notin \mathbf{bm}_{(1,2)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,5)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)}L$. Thus, after performing a bistellar 3-move at $(2,6')$ on $\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,5)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)}L$, we conclude that

$$(2,3,4,5,6), (3,4,5,6,6') \in \mathbf{bm}_{(2,6')}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,5)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)}L.$$

Moreover, the above arguments give the following equality

$$\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha'}\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha}L = \mathbf{bm}_{(2,6')}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,2,3,5)}\mathbf{bm}_{(1,3,4,5)}L.$$

□

Proposition 6.2. *For $h = 1, 2$, $\{\mathcal{A}_{[L]}\}_{[L] \in \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_K}$ forms a direct system.*

Proof. When $h = 1$, the proof is not difficult. We would like to leave it as an exercise to the reader.

When $h = 2$, by Lemma 6.1 it suffices to show that for $[L] \preceq [L']$ in $\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_K$, there is a canonical embedding homomorphism $e_{[L][L']} : \mathcal{A}_{[L]} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}_{[L']}$. This is equivalent to showing that when $L' = \mathbf{bm}_{\alpha}L$ with $\dim \alpha = 3, 4$, such a homomorphism $e_{[L][L']}$ exists. We will only prove the case of $\dim \alpha = 3$ since the proof of the case $\dim \alpha = 4$ is similar.

Let $\dim \alpha = 3$. Without loss of generality, assume that $\alpha = (1, 2, 3, 4)$ and $\beta = (5, 6)$. Then

$$\mathcal{X}(L') = (\mathcal{X}(L) \setminus \{x_{(1,2,3,4)}\}) \cup \{x_{(1,2,5,6)}, x_{(1,3,5,6)}, x_{(1,4,5,6)}, x_{(2,3,5,6)}, x_{(2,4,5,6)}, x_{(3,4,5,6)}\}.$$

Define $\varphi_{\alpha} : \mathcal{X}(L) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}(L')$ by

$$\varphi_{\alpha}(x) = \begin{cases} x, & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{X}(L) \setminus \{x_{(1,2,3,4)}\}; \\ x_{(1,2,5,6)}, & \text{if } x = x_{(1,2,3,4)}. \end{cases}$$

Then it is easy to see that φ_{α} induces an embedding homomorphism $\tilde{\varphi}_{\alpha} : \mathbb{F}\mathcal{X}(L) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}\mathcal{X}(L')$.

Lemma 6.3. *Let (α', β') be a bistellar pair of type 2 in L . Then (α', β') must also be a bistellar pair of $\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha}L$.*

Proof. We note that $\text{Link}_L \alpha' = \partial\beta'$. First we show that $\alpha' \subset \alpha \cup \beta$ is impossible. In fact, there are two possibilities: either $\alpha' \subset \alpha$, or $\alpha' \not\subset \alpha$. If $\alpha' \subset \alpha$, assume that $\alpha' = (1, 2, 3)$, then $\text{Link}_L \alpha'$ will not be the boundary of a missing face – so this case is impossible. If $\alpha' \not\subset \alpha$, assume that $\alpha' = (1, 2, 5)$, then $\beta' = (3, 4, 7)$. Since what we have satisfies that $\text{Link}_L \alpha' = \partial\beta'$, this induces that $(1, 2, 3, 5, 7), (1, 2, 4, 5, 7) \in L$. However, $(1, 2, 3, 5, 7) \cap (1, 2, 4, 5, 7) = (1, 2, 5, 7)$, which means that $(3, 4) \notin L$ since L is a closed PL manifold. This is a contradiction. Therefore, $\alpha' \subset \alpha \cup \beta$ is impossible. Next, it is easy to see that $\beta' \subset \alpha \cup \beta$ is impossible.

Now if $|\beta' \cap (\alpha \cup \beta)| \leq 2$, then clearly, whichever $|\alpha' \cap (\alpha \cup \beta)| = 0$ or 1 or 2, we have that (α', β') is a bistellar pair of $\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha}L$. □

By the exchange relations (5.3) in Definition 5.3 and Lemma 6.3 we see that all possible exchange relations in $\mathcal{A}_{[L]}$ are the exchange relations in $\mathcal{A}_{[\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha}L]}$. Furthermore, by Definition 5.18, the embedding homomorphism $\tilde{\varphi}_{\alpha} : \mathbb{F}\mathcal{X}(L) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha}L)$ induces a canonical embedding homomorphism $e_{[L][\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha}L]} : \mathcal{A}_{[L]} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}_{[\mathbf{bm}_{\alpha}L]}$. □

Definition 6.4. Define

$$\mathcal{A}_K^{PL} := \lim_{[L] \in \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_K} \mathcal{A}_{[L]}.$$

Theorem 6.5. *For $n = 2, 4$, assume that K and K' in $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{L}_n$ are PL homeomorphic. Then $\mathcal{A}_K^{PL} \cong \mathcal{A}_{K'}^{PL}$.*

Proof. This is because K and K' determine the same directed set. □

REFERENCES

- [1] Arkady Berenstein, Sergey Fomin, and Andrei Zelevinsky. Cluster Algebras III: Upper Bounds and Double Bruhat Cells. *Duke Math. J.* **126**, 1–52, 2005.
- [2] Victor M. Buchstaber and Taras E. Panov. *Toric Topology*. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, **204**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2015.
- [3] Philippe Caldero and Bernhard Keller. From Triangulated Categories to Cluster Algebras II. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.* **39**(6), 983–1009, 2006.

- [4] Philippe Caldero and Bernhard Keller. From Triangulated Categories to Cluster Algebras. *Invent. Math.* **172**, 161–211, 2008.
- [5] Sergey Fomin, Michael Shapiro, and Dylan Thurston. Cluster Algebras and Triangulated Surfaces. Part I: Cluster Complexes. *Acta Math.* **201**, 83–146, 2008.
- [6] Sergey Fomin and Andrei Zelevinsky. Cluster Algebras I: Foundations. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **15**, 497–529, 2002.
- [7] Sergey Fomin and Andrei Zelevinsky. Cluster Algebras II: Finite Type Classification. *Invent. Math.* **154**, 63–121, 2003.
- [8] Sergey Fomin and Andrei Zelevinsky. Cluster Algebras: notes for the CDM-03 conference. *Current developments in mathematics, Int. Press, Somerville, MA*, 1–34, 2003.
- [9] Sergey Fomin and Andrei Zelevinsky. Cluster Algebras IV: Coefficients. *Compos. Math.* **143**, 112–164, 2007.
- [10] Michael H. Freedman, Robert E. Gompf, Scott Morrison, and Kevin Walker. Man and machine thinking about the smooth 4-dimensional Poincaré conjecture. *Quantum Topol.* **1**(2) 171–208, 2010.
- [11] Udo Pachner. Konstruktionsmethoden und das kombinatorische Homöomorphieproblem für Triangulationen kompakter semilinearer Mannigfaltigkeiten. *Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg* **57** 69–86, 1987.
- [12] Udo Pachner. P. L. Homeomorphic Manifolds are Equivalent by Elementary Shellings. *European Journal of Combinatorics* **12** (2): 129–145, 1991.

DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS, XI'AN JIAOTONG–LIVERPOOL UNIVERSITY, SUZHOU, 215123, P. R. CHINA.
Email address: Alastair.Darby@xjtlu.edu.cn

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ZHEJIANG UNIVERSITY, HANGZHOU, 310027, P. R. CHINA.
Email address: fangli@zju.edu.cn

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, FUDAN UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI, 200433, P. R. CHINA.
Email address: zlu@fudan.edu.cn