

Simplicial Complex Emergence on Directed Hypergraphs

Christian Kuehn^{1,2,3} and Fergal Murphy^{*1}

¹Technical University of Munich, Department of Mathematics, Munich, Germany

²Munich Data Science Institute (MDSI), Munich, Germany

³Complexity Science Hub Vienna (CSH), Vienna, Austria

December 2, 2025

Abstract

We study when co-evolving (or adaptive) higher-order networks defined on directed hypergraphs admit a simplicial description. Binary and triadic couplings are modelled by time-dependent weight tensors. Using representation theory of the symmetric group S_k , we decompose these tensors into fully symmetric, fully antisymmetric, and mixed isotypic components, and track their Frobenius norms to define three asymptotic regimes and a quantitative notion of convergence. In the symmetric (resp. antisymmetric) limit, we certify emergence and stability of simplicial complexes via a local boundary test and interior drift conditions that enforce downward-closure; in the mixed limit, we show that the minimal faithful object is a semi-simplicial set. We illustrate the theory with simulations that track the isotypic Frobenius norms and the higher-order structure. Practically, our work provides rigorous conditions under which homological tools are justified for adaptive higher-order systems.

1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation and Overview

Complex networks have been immensely successful in modelling a variety of systems; however, many real-world systems involve higher-order interactions that extend beyond pairwise couplings [3], [4], [7]. Biological, social, and technological networks frequently exhibit group interactions, where collective effects emerge from triadic or even higher-order relationships. For example, in social systems, contagion and opinion dynamics often require group influence (so-called complex contagion) rather than just dyadic contacts [20], [25], [26] [31], [29]. Similarly, in neural systems, cognitive functions can involve the coordinated co-activation of groups of neurons, a phenomenon that cannot be captured by pairwise connections alone [35, 36]. In response to the need to account for such multi-node dependencies, higher-order network models have been developed. One prominent example is the generalisation of the Kuramoto model to incorporate multi-body coupling: beyond the classical all-to-all sinusoidal coupling, higher-order Kuramoto models include terms coupling three or more oscillators at a time. These extensions lead to novel synchronisation patterns not present in pairwise network models, such as abrupt (explosive) transitions to synchronisation and multi-scale phase-locking behaviour [13, 16, 19, 34, 40].

While hypergraphs provide a very general representation for any collection of multi-node interactions, simplicial complexes impose an important constraint reflecting many real systems: if a group interaction (simplex) exists, then all lower-order interactions among that group’s members also exist. In other words, a 2-simplex (triangle) in a simplicial complex implies its three edges are present, a 3-simplex (tetrahedron) implies all its triangles and edges are present, and so on. This “downward closure” property mirrors many real hierarchical structures. For instance, functional assemblies of neurons tend to have all pairwise connections among them, and in smaller social groups, if a triad interacts collectively, usually the constituent pairs also interact. By modelling higher-order interactions with simplicial complexes, one can enforce that group interactions are built atop their sub-interactions, which is both conceptually appealing and mathematically powerful. It enables the use of algebraic-topological tools to characterise structure and dynamics. For example, one can study the homology of simplicial complexes to identify high-dimensional holes or cycles in network data (invisible to edge-only analysis). Likewise, the Hodge

*Email: fergal.murphy@tum.de

Laplacian (a higher-order generalisation of the graph Laplacian) governs diffusion and synchronisation on k -simplices (groups of nodes), capturing dynamical modes involving loops and multi-node coordination beyond simple pairwise paths [10, 9, 27, 33, 32]. Recent studies have shown that the presence of a simplicial complex structure (as opposed to an arbitrary hypergraph) can qualitatively alter collective dynamics. For instance, higher-order interactions may enhance or impede synchronisation in markedly different ways depending on whether the network has the simplicial inclusion property or not. These insights highlight that modelling choices at the higher-order level (hypergraph vs. simplicial complex) profoundly influence system behaviour, providing one motivation for our focus on when and how simplicial complex structures can emerge in adaptive hypergraph dynamics [28, 41].

Indeed, another critical aspect of many complex systems is adaptivity: the network topology itself co-evolves with the node dynamics. In an adaptive network, links can appear, disappear, or change weight based on the state of the nodes, creating a feedback loop between structure and dynamics. This co-evolution is widely observed. In epidemics, susceptible individuals rewire contacts to avoid infection, thereby rewiring the network as the disease spreads [22]. In neural circuits, synaptic connections strengthen or weaken depending on activity (Hebbian plasticity and other forms of learning) [30]. In infrastructure and transportation networks, heavily used routes are built or reinforced while under-utilised connections decay [39]. Adaptive network models capture this by allowing the graph's edges to change as a function of node states, which can yield rich phenomena such as the formation of robust network communities, oscillatory dynamics, or sudden tipping points in network topology, [5, 6, 21, 23]. However, most existing adaptive network models have considered only pairwise interactions, focusing on the creation or deletion of links between individual nodes. Classic examples include adaptive epidemics on networks, where links rewire based on infection status, or adaptive consensus and oscillator networks, where connection weights adjust according to synchronisation error, [6]. These studies demonstrated that adaptivity can produce assortative link patterns, multi-stability, and abrupt transitions even in pairwise networks. Yet they neglect the possibility that higher-order group interactions (hyperedges) might also form or dissolve in response to the system's state. In reality, structural changes can occur at multiple scales: entire group interactions (a meeting, a team, a synchronised neural ensemble) may appear or break apart depending on the dynamics. For example, during a contagion event, not only might individuals sever contacts, but group gatherings could be cancelled, removing higher-order contagion pathways beyond pairwise contacts. Likewise, in a learning brain, a cohort of neurons might wire together or disband as a group. Ignoring these higher-order topological adaptations leaves out an important dimension of co-evolution. By studying simplicial complex formation in an adaptive setting, we aim to capture how both individual links and multi-node interaction patterns reorganise in concert with nodal dynamics. This provides a more comprehensive view of phenomena like epidemics (where avoidance of group events is as important as breaking individual contacts) and neural learning (where ensembles of neurons rewire en masse).

In the following, we build a modelling framework to investigate adaptive higher-order networks and identify the conditions under which their self-organised dynamics give rise to an emergent simplicial complex structure. For example, in works such as [2, 15, 37], a unifying goal is to study Kuramoto-type dynamics on assumed higher-order structures such as simplicial complexes. It is the chief aim of this work to give a structural and dynamical foundation for when these higher-order simplicial structures exist at all.

1.2 Outline and Summary of Main Results

Our aim is to unify three axes that are often treated separately: higher-order interactions, adaptivity of the coupling structure, and rigorous simplicial complex emergence. We adopt a tensor-first viewpoint on directed hypergraphs and use representation theory of the symmetric group to track how symmetry and adaptivity co-produce combinatorial structure.

The main contributions of this work are as follows:

- We define adaptive triadic dynamical systems $(\mathbf{x}, A^{(1)}, A^{(2)})$ and introduce directed hypergraphs as tensorial objects, together with a representation-theoretic splitting of adjacency tensors into symmetric, antisymmetric, and mixed components.
- By monitoring the Frobenius norms of these components, we identify three long-term symmetry regimes and show that each determines a distinct class of emergent simplicial object.
- **Main Theorems.** We prove three main emergence results, which can be summarised informally as

follows:

1. *Theorem 3.9 (Symmetric regime)*: once the system enters the symmetric regime, it retains an unoriented simplicial complex structure for all future time.
2. *Theorem 4.6 (Antisymmetric regime)*: once in the antisymmetric regime, it retains an oriented simplicial complex structure.
3. *Theorem 4.15 (Mixed regime)*: in the absence of symmetry, the minimal faithful combinatorial object is a semi-simplicial set, and retention holds under analogous conditions.

The proofs combine local boundary tests with interior drift estimates to enforce downward closure, providing sufficient conditions under which the emergent simplicial structure remains invariant. Moreover, by using Frobenius-norm order parameters tied to representation-theoretic components, we provide a quantitative notion of convergence toward each regime. Numerical simulations are used to practically demonstrate and cross-validate the analytic predictions. In the numerics we also track the evolution of the symmetry norms across regimes. Taken together, these results give the first rigorous demonstration of emergent simplicial structure in adaptive higher-order network dynamics.

Section 2 introduces the model and tensor decomposition. Section 3 develops the symmetric theory and illustrates with examples. Section 4 studies the antisymmetric and mixed regime. Section 5 concludes with a discussion and outlook.

2 Asymptotic Regimes of Coevolving Hypergraphs.

2.1 Background and Canonical Model

The general structure of a coevolving network dynamical system with $n \in \mathbb{N}$ particles on a hypergraph with higher-order interactions can be described as follows. Each particle $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ carries a dynamical state $x_i(t) \in \mathcal{M}$, where \mathcal{M} is a smooth manifold (often $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{S}^1$ in Kuramoto-type models, or $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^d$ in Euclidean cases). Each particle also has an intrinsic parameter $\omega_i \in \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$; in the most common case $d = 1$, so ω_i is simply a scalar frequency. For every order $m \geq 1$ we introduce a time-dependent weight tensor

$$A^{(m)}(t) = (A_{i_0 \dots i_m}^{(m)}(t))_{1 \leq i_0, \dots, i_m \leq N} \in (\mathbb{R}^N)^{\otimes(m+1)},$$

with no a-priori symmetry, where $t \in \mathbb{R}$ denotes time. Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_N)^\top$. Such systems are governed by ordinary differential equations (ODEs) on the nodes and tensor entries as follows,

$$\dot{x}_i = f_i(\omega_i, \mathbf{x}, \{A^{(m)}\}_{m \geq 1}), \quad \dot{A}_{i_0 \dots i_m}^{(m)} = g_{i_0 \dots i_m}^{(m)}(A^{(m)}, \mathbf{x}),$$

where overdot denotes the time derivative, f_i are vector fields for the phase space dynamics of each node, and the functions g_m describe the evolution of the network topology. Throughout, we will mainly deal with systems where $1 \leq m \leq 2$. Thus, the dynamical systems of main interest to us are defined on a network with higher-order interactions encoded in the matrix $A^{(1)}$ and tensor $A^{(2)}$. Since these tensors change dynamically, the underlying hypergraph will therefore also have a coevolving topology.

Definition 2.1 (Adaptive, Triadic, Network Dynamical System). By an adaptive, triadic network dynamical system, we mean a system as above but with $1 \leq m \leq 2$. That is, there are $N \geq 3$ nodes on an evolving hypergraph, with dynamical states given by $x_i \in \mathcal{M}$, where \mathcal{M} is a smooth manifold, and hypergraph binary and triadic connections encoded in a weighted matrix $A^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ and a tensor $A^{(2)} \in (\mathbb{R}^N)^{\otimes 3}$, governed by equations

$$\dot{x}_i = f_i(\omega_i, \mathbf{x}, A^{(1)}, A^{(2)}), \quad \dot{A}_{ij}^{(1)} = g_{ij}^{(1)}(A^{(1)}, \mathbf{x}), \quad \dot{A}_{ijk}^{(2)} = g_{ijk}^{(2)}(A^{(2)}, \mathbf{x}),$$

where each $\omega_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is an intrinsic parameter depending on x_i . We denote such an adaptive, triadic, network dynamical system by a triple $\mathcal{H}(t) = (\mathbf{x}, A^{(1)}, A^{(2)})$, where $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ are the node variables, and $A^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$, $A^{(2)} \in (\mathbb{R}^N)^{\otimes 3}$ are the weighted adjacency matrix and tensor respectively.

Remark 2.2. Unless stated otherwise, we assume that the initial data $(\mathbf{x}(0), A^{(1)}(0), A^{(2)}(0))$ is randomly distributed according to a probability measure μ on $\mathcal{X} := \mathbb{R}^N \times (\mathbb{R}^N)^{\otimes 2} \times (\mathbb{R}^N)^{\otimes 3}$ which is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure. Equivalently, μ admits a Radon-Nikodym derivative

$f \in L^1$, so that $d\mu = f d\lambda$ with λ the product Lebesgue measure. The standard example is the Gaussian distribution, or uniform distribution on bounded subsets of \mathcal{X} .

Furthermore, in general, we restrict the adaptive laws $g_{ij}^{(1)}$ and $g_{ijk}^{(2)}$ to depend only on local variables, i.e. the states and interactions associated with the participating nodes (i, j) or (i, j, k) .

The prototypical example of such an adaptive triadic network dynamical system is given by a variant of the Kuramoto model, and is ubiquitous in our study since it is the easiest non-trivial, adaptive, triadic higher-order network dynamical system to define.

Example 2.3 (Generalised, Adaptive, Triadic Higher-Order Kuramoto Model). Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\theta = \theta_i(t) \in \mathbb{S}^1$ denote the position of particle i . The dynamics of the particles and the time-evolving binary and triadic coupling tensors are given by

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\theta}_i = \omega_i + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N A_{ij}^{(1)} f_1(\theta_i, \theta_j) + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^N A_{ijk}^{(2)} f_2(\theta_i, \theta_j, \theta_k), \\ \dot{A}_{ij}^{(1)} = g^{(1)}(A^{(1)}, A^{(2)}, \theta), \\ \dot{A}_{ijk}^{(2)} = g^{(2)}(A^{(1)}, A^{(2)}, \theta), \end{cases}$$

where $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_N) \in (\mathbb{S}^1)^N$ and:

- $\omega_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is the intrinsic frequency of oscillator i ;
- $f_1 : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $f_2 : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are coupling functions;
- $A^{(1)}(t) = (A_{ij}^{(1)}(t))_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} \cong (\mathbb{R}^N)^{\otimes 2}$ is the time-evolving weighted adjacency matrix;
- $A^{(2)}(t) = (A_{ijk}^{(2)}(t))_{1 \leq i, j, k \leq N} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N \times N} \cong (\mathbb{R}^N)^{\otimes 3}$ is the time-evolving rank-3 tensor of triadic weights;
- $g^{(1)}$ and $g^{(2)}$ are the componentwise adaptation maps on the binary and triadic connections.

If we assume $A^{(2)} = 0$ and that $A_{ij}^{(1)} = K$ for all $i \neq j$, where $K > 0$ is a constant coupling parameter, then the model reduces to the classical Kuramoto system with all-to-all interactions,

$$\dot{\theta}_i = \omega_i + \frac{K}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N f_1(\theta_i, \theta_j).$$

In the standard case $f_1(\theta_i, \theta_j) = \sin(\theta_j - \theta_i)$ this is precisely the well-studied Kuramoto model. To quantify the degree of collective synchrony among the oscillators, the complex order parameter is used, given by

$$r e^{i\psi} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N e^{i\theta_j}.$$

Here, r represents the magnitude of the macroscopic coherence ($0 \leq r \leq 1$) and ψ is the average phase of the population of oscillators. If $r \approx 0$, the phases are uniformly distributed corresponding to an incoherent or desynchronised state, and if $r = 1$, the oscillators are perfectly in phase, representing full synchronisation. As $N \rightarrow \infty$, one may describe the system in terms of the continuum distribution of oscillator phases, leading to a nonlinear McKean–Vlasov type (or Vlasov/Fokker–Planck) equation for the probability density of phases [1, 38]. In this mean-field formulation, Kuramoto conjectured that for unimodal, symmetric frequency distributions $g(\omega)$, there exists a sharp critical coupling

$$K_c = \frac{2}{\pi g(0)},$$

such that the incoherent (uniform) state is stable for $K < K_c$, while for $K > K_c$ a branch of partially synchronised states bifurcates. This conjecture was rigorously established by Chiba [11], who applied

center manifold reduction to the continuum PDE, thereby providing the first proof of the Kuramoto transition in the large N limit.

Remark 2.4 (Directed hypergraph conventions). In the combinatorial and computer science literature, a directed hypergraph is usually defined in a set-theoretic fashion: each hyperedge is a pair (T, H) , where T is a set of tail (input) nodes and H is a set of head (output) nodes, with possible variants that also allow auxiliary or intermediate nodes. This convention is well-suited to problems in logic, database theory, and transportation analysis, where the distinction between inputs and outputs is fundamental, [18].

There are other, differing definitions of what it means for a hypergraph to be directed, usually depending on the application considered. For instance, in [14] a directed hypergraph is taken to mean an ordered pair $\vec{H} = (V, \vec{E})$, where V is a finite set of vertices and $\vec{E} = \{\vec{e}_i : i \in I\}$ is a set of hyperarcs indexed by a finite set $I = \{1, \dots, M\}$, with $M = |\vec{E}|$. Each hyperarc \vec{e}_i is written as $\vec{e}_i = (e_i^+, e_i^-)$, where $e_i^+ \subseteq V$ is the tail of the hyperarc, and $e_i^- \subseteq V$ is the head of the hyperarc. Moreover, the authors require that $e_i^+ \neq \emptyset$, $e_i^- \neq \emptyset$, and $e_i^+ \cap e_i^- = \emptyset$. The vertices of a hyperarc are $e_i = e_i^+ \cup e_i^-$. One can recover the corresponding undirected hypergraph by simply taking $H = (V, E)$ with $E = \{e_i \mid i \in I\}$. It is shown in [14] that a formulation of random walks on these directed hypergraphs can be introduced that is relevant to image processing. One sees that this definition of directed hypergraph and the traditional set-theoretic one from [18] are closely related but not identical.

Given a triadic, adaptive dynamical system $\mathcal{H} = (\mathbf{x}, A^{(1)}, A^{(2)})$ as in Definition 2.1, it is not exactly clear how one can recover a directed Hypergraph one commonly finds in the literature, such as the ones detailed above. The problem lies in the mismatch between our tensor based formalism, and the set-theoretic formalism commonly used in the existing hypergraph literature. Indeed, this lack of convertibility between the tensor based approach and a set-theoretic description was also discussed in [12], where, motivated by eigenvector centrality equations, the authors introduce the notion of *heterogeneous* hypergraphs. These are hypergraphs that are defined algebraically, that is, through a tensor. Importantly, they contain the set-theoretic definitions above as a special cases under certain symmetry requirements. Since our adaptive network dynamical systems $(\mathbf{x}, A^{(1)}, A^{(2)})$ are tensors, which we want to treat as directed hypergraphs and study simplicial complex emergence on, we therefore make the following definition that will be used throughout this paper.

Definition 2.5 (Directed hypergraph; algebraic form). Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $V = \{1, \dots, N\}$. A *directed hypergraph* on V is specified by a collection of adjacency tensors

$$A^{(m)} \in (\mathbb{R}^N)^{\otimes m+1}, \quad m = 1, 2, 3, \dots,$$

where the entry $A_{i_1 \dots i_m}^{(m)}$ represents the weight of an m -ary hyperedge between the vertices (i_1, \dots, i_m) .

No symmetry is assumed on the indices of $A^{(m)}$.

- If $A^{(m)}$ is invariant under all index permutations, then the hyperedges are *undirected*.
- If $A^{(m)}$ is not fully symmetric, we call the resulting hyperedges *directed*, the directedness being encoded by which permutations preserve or break equality of tensor entries.

Remark 2.6 (Adaptive triadic systems as algebraic directed hypergraphs). The adaptive triadic network dynamical system $\mathcal{H}(t) = (\mathbf{x}, A^{(1)}, A^{(2)})$ of Definition 2.1 naturally gives rise to a directed hypergraph in the algebraic sense. At each time t , the weighted adjacency matrix $A^{(1)}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ and the triadic adjacency tensor $A^{(2)}(t) \in (\mathbb{R}^N)^{\otimes 3}$ specify the collection of binary and ternary hyperedges through their tensor entries.

In this framework, a directed hypergraph is nothing more than the data of these tensors, with *directedness* encoded by the lack of full permutation symmetry in their indices:

- if $A^{(m)}$ is invariant under all permutations of indices, the corresponding hyperedges are undirected;
- if $A^{(m)}$ is not fully symmetric, the hyperedges are directed, with the asymmetry specifying how roles are distinguished among the vertices.

Thus our adaptive dynamics do not produce just one fixed type of directed hypergraph (such as the classical head-tail version), but a whole family of algebraically defined directed hypergraphs whose structure can evolve over time. In particular, depending on which symmetry class the tensors flow

into, one recovers unoriented simplicial complexes (symmetric regime), oriented simplicial complexes (antisymmetric regime), or more general simplicial sets (mixed regime).

Example 2.7. Suppose we have an adaptive coevolving network dynamical system with the following dynamics on the edges.

$$\dot{A}_{ij}^{(1)} = \begin{cases} -\delta_1 (A_{ij}^{(1)} - \cos(\theta_i - \theta_j)) & i \neq j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $\delta_1 > 0$ is some parameter. Let Δ_{ij} be the difference between $A_{ij}^{(1)}$ and $A_{ji}^{(1)}$, i.e. $\Delta_{ij}(t) := A_{ij}^{(1)}(t) - A_{ji}^{(1)}(t)$. Differentiating and using the fact that $\cos(\theta_i - \theta_j) = \cos(\theta_j - \theta_i)$ gives

$$\dot{\Delta}_{ij} = \dot{A}_{ij}^{(1)} - \dot{A}_{ji}^{(1)} = -\delta_1 (A_{ij}^{(1)} - \cos(\theta_i - \theta_j)) + \delta_1 (A_{ji}^{(1)} - \cos(\theta_j - \theta_i)) = -\delta_1 \Delta_{ij}.$$

Hence $\Delta_{ij}(t) = \Delta_{ij}(0) e^{-\delta_1 t}$, and so the difference decays to zero. In this case, the best we can say is that $A_{ij}^{(1)}$ and $A_{ji}^{(1)}$ converge to one another. However, unless the initial conditions are the same, they will not be exactly equal for all time $t \geq 0$.

Remark 2.8. The above example shows that on the level of binary interactions, the directed graph will enter an eventually symmetric regime, that is, one in which the difference between $A_{ij}^{(1)}$ and $A_{ji}^{(1)}$ becomes negligible in the limit. If one replaces $\cos(\theta_i - \theta_j)$ above with a $\sin(\theta_i - \theta_j)$, then due to \sin being an odd function, one can see that as $t \rightarrow \infty$, we would have $A_{ij}^{(1)}(t) \rightarrow -A_{ji}^{(1)}(t)$. The graph would in this case enter an antisymmetric regime. If we were simply interested in the formation of 1-simplices and thereby only looking at the directed graph structure, one sees from this example the importance of entering either an eventually *symmetric* or *antisymmetric* regime. In the former, one can study standard (unoriented) simplicial complex emergence; in the latter, one can study oriented simplicial complex emergence.

The higher-order case amplifies this point: for $k \geq 3$ there is no canonical input-output labelling, so conclusions must be invariant under permutations of tensor slots. This naturally leads us to organise $A^{(k)}$ by the S_{k+1} -symmetries of its indices. In the next section, we set up the S_k action on our directed hypergraphs and introduce the canonical components that will serve as relabelling-invariant order parameters for the subsequent convergence and simplicial representation results.

2.2 Tensor Spaces and Symmetric Group Actions

We begin by formally defining the spaces that contain our edge and hyperedge data, and the natural actions of symmetric groups on them.

The set of all possible edges between N vertices is described by a matrix

$$A^{(1)} = \left(A_{ij}^{(1)} \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}.$$

This space of $N \times N$ real matrices is isomorphic to the tensor product of the vector space \mathbb{R}^N with itself, which we denote as V_2 :

$$V_2 := \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} \cong (\mathbb{R}^N)^{\otimes 2}.$$

Similarly, the set of all possible triangular hyperedges (or 2-simplices) is described by a rank-3 tensor

$$A^{(2)} = \left(A_{ijk}^{(2)} \right)_{1 \leq i, j, k \leq N},$$

which resides in the space we denote by V_3 :

$$V_3 := (\mathbb{R}^N)^{\otimes 3}.$$

For the space V_2 , the indices (i, j) can be permuted by the symmetric group on two elements, $S_2 = \{e, (12)\}$, where e is the identity and (12) is the transposition swapping 1 and 2. We define a map $\rho^2 : S_2 \rightarrow GL(V_2)$ that describes how a permutation $\pi \in S_2$ acts on a matrix $A^{(1)} \in V_2$. For a given π , the action on $A^{(1)}$

produces a new matrix whose (i, j) -th entry is determined by permuting the indices of $A^{(1)}$ according to π^{-1} :

$$\rho^2(\pi) \left(A^{(1)} \right)_{ij} := A^{(1)}_{\pi^{-1}(i)\pi^{-1}(j)}.$$

This map ρ^2 is a *group representation*, which is a homomorphism from S_2 to the general linear group of V_2 . The use of π^{-1} is a standard convention to ensure that we define a left action.

Analogously, for the space V_3 , the indices (i, j, k) can be permuted by the symmetric group on three elements, S_3 . We define a representation $\rho^3 : S_3 \rightarrow GL(V_3)$ in the exact same manner:

$$\rho^3(\pi) \left(A^{(2)} \right)_{ijk} := A^{(2)}_{\pi^{-1}(i)\pi^{-1}(j)\pi^{-1}(k)}.$$

Definition 2.9 (Representation and Irreducibility). A *representation* of a group G on a vector space V is a group homomorphism $\rho : G \rightarrow GL(V)$. A subspace $W \subseteq V$ is called a *subrepresentation* if it is invariant under the action of G , i.e., $\rho(g)w \in W$ for all $g \in G$ and $w \in W$. A representation V is said to be *irreducible* if its only subrepresentations are $\{0\}$ and V itself.

From the representation theory of S_k and Schur-Weyl duality, it is known V_k decomposes into a direct sum of irreducible representations of S_k , [17], §6.1. For V_2 , the decomposition (up to isomorphic copies - also known as the isotypic decomposition), is given by

$$V_2 = \text{Sym}^2(\mathbb{R}^N) \oplus \Lambda^2 \mathbb{R}^N,$$

with idempotent projections given by

$$A_{\text{sym}} := P_{\text{sym}} A = \frac{1}{2}(A + A^\top) \in \text{Sym}^2(\mathbb{R}^N), \quad A_{\text{alt}} := P_{\text{alt}} A = \frac{1}{2}(A - A^\top) \in \Lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

We see that this decomposes a matrix into a purely symmetric component and a purely skew-symmetric component. Similarly, for V_3 the decomposition is given by

$$V_3 = \underbrace{\text{Sym}^3(\mathbb{R}^N)}_{\text{fully symmetric}} \oplus \underbrace{\Lambda^3(\mathbb{R}^N)}_{\text{fully antisymmetric}} \oplus \underbrace{V^{(2,1)}}_{\text{mixed symmetry}}.$$

If we write

$$A_{\text{sym}}^{(2)} := P_{\text{sym}} A^{(2)}, \quad A_{\text{alt}}^{(2)} := P_{\text{alt}} A^{(2)}, \quad A_{\text{mix}}^{(2)} := P_{\text{mix}} A^{(2)}.$$

for the projection operators then the explicit formulas can for these operators can be given by

$$\begin{aligned} (A_{\text{sym}}^{(2)})_{ijk} &= \frac{1}{6}(A_{ijk} + A_{jik} + A_{kij} + A_{ikj} + A_{jki} + A_{kji}), \\ (A_{\text{alt}}^{(2)})_{ijk} &= \frac{1}{6}(A_{ijk} - A_{jik} - A_{kij} - A_{ikj} + A_{jki} + A_{kji}), \\ (A_{\text{mix}}^{(2)})_{ijk} &= \frac{2}{3}A_{ijk} - \frac{1}{3}(A_{ikj} + A_{jki}) \end{aligned}$$




Figure 1: Diagrams illustrating the orthogonal splitting of V_2 and V_3 into their isotypic components.

To quantify the symmetry properties of our tensors we employ the *Frobenius inner product*, which is orthogonal with respect to the splittings above. For $V_2 = \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$, the Frobenius inner product is given by

$$\langle A, B \rangle_F = \sum_{i,j=1}^N A_{ij} B_{ij} = \text{Tr}(A^\top B).$$

For $V_3 = (\mathbb{R}^N)^{\otimes 3}$ we use

$$\langle A, B \rangle_F = \sum_{i,j,k=1}^N A_{ijk} B_{ijk}.$$

The induced norm is the *Frobenius norm*, $\|A\|_F := \sqrt{\langle A, A \rangle_F}$. A key fact is that the isotypic components are orthogonal with respect to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_F$; e.g. for any $S \in \text{Sym}^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $L \in \Lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ we have $\langle S, L \rangle_F = 0$. The same holds for the $k = 3$ splitting. Orthogonality implies, via the Pythagorean theorem, that the squared norm of a tensor equals the sum of the squared norms of its symmetry components. For $A^{(1)}(t) = A_{\text{sym}}^{(1)}(t) + A_{\text{alt}}^{(1)}(t)$,

$$\|A^{(1)}(t)\|_F^2 = \|A_{\text{sym}}^{(1)}(t)\|_F^2 + \|A_{\text{alt}}^{(1)}(t)\|_F^2.$$

Likewise, for $A^{(2)}(t) = A_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}(t) + A_{\text{alt}}^{(2)}(t) + A_{\text{mix}}^{(2)}(t)$,

$$\|A^{(2)}(t)\|_F^2 = \|A_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}(t)\|_F^2 + \|A_{\text{alt}}^{(2)}(t)\|_F^2 + \|A_{\text{mix}}^{(2)}(t)\|_F^2.$$

Given the above orthogonal decompositions, can now classify the long-term behaviour of our hypergraph by tracking how the Frobenius norm is distributed among the symmetry components as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Definition 2.10 (Asymptotic Regime). Suppose we have an adaptive, triadic network dynamical system such as in Definition 2.3. We then say the hypergraph is either asymptotically symmetric, asymptotically antisymmetric, or mixed, depending on which of the following mutually exclusive criteria happen as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

- **Asymptotically Undirected/Symmetric.** The system is dominated by fully symmetric interactions; all antisymmetric and mixed parts vanish:

$$\|A_{\text{alt}}^{(1)}(t)\|_F \rightarrow 0, \quad \|A_{\text{alt}}^{(2)}(t)\|_F \rightarrow 0, \quad \|A_{\text{mix}}^{(2)}(t)\|_F \rightarrow 0.$$

- **Asymptotically Oriented/Antisymmetric.** The system is dominated by fully antisymmetric interactions; all symmetric and mixed parts vanish:

$$\|A_{\text{sym}}^{(1)}(t)\|_F \rightarrow 0, \quad \|A_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}(t)\|_F \rightarrow 0, \quad \|A_{\text{mix}}^{(2)}(t)\|_F \rightarrow 0.$$

- **Mixed regime.** At least one of the mixed-symmetry norms remains non-zero asymptotically.




Figure 2: Schematic representation of the asymptotic regimes for adaptive triadic hypergraphs (Definition 2.10). The outer rectangle denotes the mixed regime, in which symmetric and antisymmetric parts coexist with mixed components. The two large circles correspond to the asymptotically symmetric (left) and asymptotically antisymmetric (right) regimes, each containing an inner core of exactly symmetric or antisymmetric hypergraphs. All four circles meet at the zero hypergraph in the centre.

Example 2.11. Suppose we have the adaptive, triadic Kuramoto model from Definition 2.3 given by

$$\dot{\theta}_i = \omega_i + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N A_{ij}^{(1)} f_1(\theta_i, \theta_j) + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N A_{ijk}^{(2)} f_2(\theta_i, \theta_j, \theta_k),$$

with the following dynamics on the adjacency matrix and tensor,

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{A}_{ij}^{(1)} &= -\delta_1 \left(A_{ij}^{(1)} + \cos(\theta_i - \theta_j) \right), \\ \dot{A}_{ijk}^{(2)} &= -\delta_2 \left(A_{ijk}^{(2)} + \cos(\theta_i + \theta_j + \theta_k) \right),\end{aligned}$$

where δ_1, δ_2 are some positive constants. We show this system converges to the asymptotic undirected regime. First let $A^{(1)} = \left(A_{ij}^{(1)} \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq N}$ and let $M = (\cos(\theta_i - \theta_j))_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$. Then we can rewrite the binary interaction ODEs into one matrix form, given by $\dot{A}^{(1)} = -\delta_1 (A^{(1)} + M)$. Since cosine is an even function, M is a symmetric matrix, hence $P_{sym}(M) = M$. Applying the symmetric and antisymmetric projection operators to the binary matrix evolution equation therefore yields

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{A}_{sym}^{(1)} &= -\delta_1 (A_{sym}^{(1)} + M), \\ \dot{A}_{anti}^{(1)} &= -\delta_1 A_{anti}^{(1)}.\end{aligned}$$

We see that $A_{anti}^{(1)} = A_{anti}^{(1)}(0) e^{-\delta_1 t}$ and so $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} A_{anti}^{(1)} = 0$. In fact, the symmetric component can be solved, yielding

$$A_{sym}^{(1)}(t) = e^{-\delta_1 t} A_{sym}^{(1)}(0) - \delta_1 \int_0^t e^{-\delta_1(t-s)} M(s) ds, \quad (2.1)$$

For the triadic interactions, introduce the tensors $A^{(2)} = (A_{ijk}^{(2)})_{1 \leq i, j, k \leq N}$, $T_{ijk} := \cos(\theta_i + \theta_j + \theta_k)$. The evolution law for the triadic terms can consequently be written as $\dot{A}^{(2)} = -\delta_2 (A^{(2)} + T)$. Because the argument $\theta_i + \theta_j + \theta_k$ is invariant under every permutation of (i, j, k) , i.e. $T_{ijk} = T_{\sigma(i)\sigma(j)\sigma(k)}$ for all $\sigma \in S_3$, we have that $T \in \text{Sym}^3(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Consequently $P_{sym}(T) = T$, $P_{alt}(T) = 0$, $P_{mix}(T) = 0$.

Applying the Young-symmetriser projections $(P_{sym}, P_{alt}, P_{mix})$ to the tensor ODE therefore yields

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{A}_{sym}^{(2)} &= -\delta_2 (A_{sym}^{(2)} + T), \\ \dot{A}_{alt}^{(2)} &= -\delta_2 A_{alt}^{(2)}, \\ \dot{A}_{mix}^{(2)} &= -\delta_2 A_{mix}^{(2)}.\end{aligned}$$

The antisymmetric and mixed parts have solutions which decay to zero given by $A_{alt}^{(2)}(t) = A_{alt}^{(2)}(0) e^{-\delta_2 t}$, $A_{mix}^{(2)}(t) = A_{mix}^{(2)}(0) e^{-\delta_2 t}$. We can solve for the symmetric part, yielding


$$A_{sym}^{(2)}(t) = e^{-\delta_2 t} A_{sym}^{(2)}(0) - \delta_2 \int_0^t e^{-\delta_2(t-s)} T(s) ds,$$

and just like in the binary case, this does not necessarily decay to zero. Just as on the level of binary interactions, the symmetric term Frobenius strength has the following estimate,

$$0 \leq \|A_{sym}^{(2)}(t)\| \leq e^{-\delta_2 t} \|A_{sym}^{(2)}(0)\| + (1 - e^{-\delta_2 t}) \sup_{s \geq 0} \|T(s)\|.$$

From this we see that our hypergraph converges to the undirected (symmetric) regime, in the sense of Definition 2.10. Furthermore, suppose we choose specific functions for f_1 and f_2 given by

$$\begin{aligned}f_1(\theta_i, \theta_j) &= \sin(\theta_i - \theta_j), \\ f_2(\theta_i, \theta_j, \theta_k) &= \sin(2\theta_i - \theta_j - \theta_k).\end{aligned}$$



(a) Binary layer. Time series of the Frobenius norms $\|A_{\text{sym}}^{(1)}\|_F$ and $\|A_{\text{alt}}^{(1)}\|_F$ obtained by projecting $A^{(1)}$ onto the symmetric and antisymmetric subspaces of $V_2 = M_N(\mathbb{R})$. The antisymmetric energy decays like $e^{-\delta_1 t}$ with $\delta_1 = 0.1$, while the symmetric part saturates at the norm of the driver $M = \cos(\theta_i - \theta_j)$, consistent with (2.1).

(b) Triadic layer. Frobenius norms of the symmetric, antisymmetric, and mixed components of $A^{(2)}$. Both $\|A_{\text{alt}}^{(2)}\|_F$ and $\|A_{\text{mix}}^{(2)}\|_F$ decay like $e^{-\delta_2 t}$ with $\delta_2 = 0.1$, whereas the symmetric energy converges to the norm of the driver $T = \cos(\theta_i + \theta_j + \theta_k)$, in agreement with (2.11).

Figure 3: Symmetry-component norms in the binary and triadic layers.

We numerically simulate the Frobenius norms and observe that everything but the symmetric parts converge to zero, confirming our analytic findings, see figures 3a and 3b. The simulations were run over $t \in [0, 50]$ with 500 evaluation points. We used $N = 5$ oscillators with natural frequencies $\omega_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, initial phases drawn uniformly from $[0, 2\pi)$, and random initial weights. Both δ_1 , and δ_2 were set to 0.1. The full implementation is available in the code repository.

Example 2.12 (Antisymmetric case study). We construct a system that flows into the oriented (antisymmetric) regime, in the sense of Definition 2.10. First we recall the Levi-Civita symbol.

Definition 2.13 (Generalised Levi-Civita symbol). For any three indices $i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ (with $N \geq 3$) define

$$\varepsilon_{ijk} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i = j \text{ or } j = k \text{ or } k = i, \\ +1 & \text{if } (i, j, k) \text{ is an even permutation of its ascending reordering } (i', j', k'), \\ -1 & \text{if } (i, j, k) \text{ is an odd permutation of } (i', j', k'). \end{cases}$$

Here (i', j', k') is the unique ordering of $\{i, j, k\}$ with $i' < j' < k'$, and the parity is taken with respect to that ascending triple. Thus ε_{ijk} is totally antisymmetric, i.e. $\varepsilon_{\sigma(i)\sigma(j)\sigma(k)} = \text{sgn}(\sigma) \varepsilon_{ijk}$ for every $\sigma \in S_3$.

We allow our model to have the following dynamics on the nodes, edges, and hyperedges.

$$\dot{\theta}_i = \omega_i + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N A_{ij}^{(1)} f_1(\theta_i, \theta_j) + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N A_{ijk}^{(2)} f_2(\theta_i, \theta_j, \theta_k),$$

with the following dynamics on the heterogeneous hypergraph,

$$\dot{A}_{ij}^{(1)} = -\delta_1 (A_{ij}^{(1)} + \sin(\theta_i - \theta_j)), \quad \dot{A}_{ijk}^{(2)} = -\delta_2 (A_{ijk}^{(2)} + \varepsilon_{ijk} \sin(\theta_i + \theta_j + \theta_k)).$$

On the level of binary interactions, first define the matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ as $(Q_{ij}) = (\sin(\theta_i - \theta_j))_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} = (-Q_{ji})$. Because $P_{\text{alt}}(N) = N$ and $P_{\text{sym}}(N) = 0$, projection yields the decoupled equations

$$\dot{A}_{\text{alt}}^{(1)} = -\delta_1 (A_{\text{alt}}^{(1)} - N), \quad \dot{A}_{\text{sym}}^{(1)} = -\delta_1 A_{\text{sym}}^{(1)}.$$

The symmetric bit decays to zero, and similarly to the previous example we have that

$$A_{alt}^{(1)}(t) = e^{-\delta_1 t} A_{alt}^{(1)}(0) - \delta_1 \int_0^t e^{-\delta_1(t-s)} Q(s) ds. \quad (2.2)$$

For the triadic interactions, introduce the totally antisymmetric driver


$$H_{ijk} = \varepsilon_{ijk} \sin(\theta_i + \theta_j + \theta_k),$$

and let $H \in (\mathbb{R}^N)^{\otimes 3}$ be defined as $H = (H_{ijk})_{1 \leq i,j,k \leq N}$. Because $P_{alt}(H) = H$ while $P_{sym}(H) = P_{mix}(H) = 0$, projecting onto the triadic system of ODEs gives

$$\dot{A}_{alt}^{(2)} = -\delta_2 (A_{alt}^{(2)} - H), \quad \dot{A}_{sym}^{(2)} = -\delta_2 A_{sym}^{(2)}, \quad \dot{A}_{mix}^{(2)} = -\delta_2 A_{mix}^{(2)}.$$

It follows the symmetric and mixed terms decay to zero, and the mixed term does not necessarily.

Since both the binary and triadic layers lose every component outside the fully antisymmetric subspaces in the limit, the directed hypergraph converges to the antisymmetric regime. Similar to the symmetric case, we simulate these dynamics over $t \in [0, 50]$ with 500 evaluation points. We used $N = 5$ oscillators with frequencies ω_i equally spaced in $[-1, 1]$, random initial weights, initial phases sampled uniformly from $[0, 1]$, and set $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = 0.1$, see 4a and 4b. The full implementation is available in the code repository.



(a) Binary layer. Frobenius norms of the symmetric and antisymmetric components of the evolving edge matrix $A^{(1)}(t)$ under the antisymmetric driver $N_{ij} = \sin(\theta_i - \theta_j)$. As shown analytically, $\|A_{alt}^{(1)}\|_F$ does not decay to zero, unlike $\|A_{sym}^{(1)}\|_F$, which decays like $e^{-\delta_1 t}$ for $\delta_1 = 0.1$.

(b) Triadic layer. Frobenius norms of the fully symmetric, fully antisymmetric, and mixed parts of $A^{(2)}(t)$ driven by $H_{ijk} = \varepsilon_{ijk} \sin(\theta_i + \theta_j + \theta_k)$. Both $\|A_{sym}^{(2)}\|_F$ and $\|A_{mix}^{(2)}\|_F$ vanish exponentially (like $e^{-\delta_2 t}$ with $\delta_2 = 0.1$).

Figure 4: Convergence to the antisymmetric regime. (a) Binary layer. (b) Triadic layer.

Remark 2.14. The two examples above show that the weight tensors encoding our hypergraph asymptotically collapse onto distinct S_2 and S_3 isotypic components. These regimes have consequences in terms of which types of simplicial complexes we can and cannot study the emergence of, on our heterogeneous hypergraphs. Such a classification is summarised as follows.

- **Symmetric regime:** When the hypergraph enters the symmetric regime, the antisymmetric and mixed terms become negligible. Hence after a sufficient interval of time, the matrix and tensor encoding our hypergraph is fully symmetric (up to some small ε .) Thus, each interaction depends solely on the unordered vertex set. In this case, we can study the emergence of standard, unoriented simplicial complexes. We do this using an δ boundary test in the next section. Once a simplicial complex has been established and is stable, the classical tools such as simplicial and persistent homology are thereafter valid.
- **Oriented regime:** When the hypergraph settles into the antisymmetric regime, the symmetric and mixed contributions fall below the tolerance ε . All surviving interactions are alternating, so they are encoded by ordered vertex tuples, up to an overall sign. From here, we employ a threshold test, now with orientation, to certify that every active oriented p -simplex carries all of its $p - 1$ faces. Once this is done, we can employ (oriented) simplicial homology.

- **Mixed regime:** If mixed-symmetry terms persist, or if symmetric and antisymmetric parts coexist above ε , no ordering collapses the data into a downward-closed family. Hence, neither unoriented nor oriented simplicial complexes emerge. The minimal language that still captures the higher-order structure is that of simplicial sets or Δ -sets, whose construction and invariants we postpone to a later section.

3 Simplicial Complex Emergence in the Symmetric Regimes.

In this section, we formulate results that guarantee invariance and formation of simplicial complexes for hypergraphs that converge to the symmetric and antisymmetric regimes.

3.1 Retention and Emergence of Simplicial Structure

Suppose we have an adaptive higher order model such as in Definition 2.3 with a pairwise weighted adjacency matrix $A^{(1)}(t)$ and weighted rank-3 tensor $A^{(2)}(t)$ encoding the higher order interactions. Suppose that it converges to the symmetric regime, in the sense of Definition 2.10. Thus, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a time t_0 such that for all $t \geq t_0$ we have that all the antisymmetric and mixed parts decay to zero, and both $|A_{ij}^{(1)}(t) - A_{ji}^{(1)}(t)| < \varepsilon$ and $|A_{ijk}^{(2)}(t) - A_{\sigma(i)\sigma(j)\sigma(k)}^{(2)}(t)| < \varepsilon$ for all $\sigma \in S_3$. In such a case, we create equivalence classes and view $A_{ij}^{(1)}$ and $A_{ji}^{(1)}$ as the same object. Similarly, $A_{ijk}^{(2)}$ will be the representative for all other permutations of its indices, which is a well-defined notion since they also differ only by a small ε , which we have total control over.

We are interested in the formation of a simplicial complex structure on our hypergraph. We first note that the nodal variables $x_i(t)$ describe the internal state (e.g. phase or activity) of each agent rather than its structural presence. Consequently, the set of 0-simplicies is taken to be fixed, with adaptivity acting only on higher-order simplicies. Hence, when trying to see whether or not we have a simplicial complex, we need not concern ourselves with the behaviour of the 0-simplicies, i.e. vertices. Therefore, to ensure a simplicial complex structure, we require that all subfaces of a degree 2 face are non-zero; that is, we require that if $A_{ijk}^{(2)} \neq 0$, for some i, j, k then $A_{\ell p}^{(1)} \neq 0$ for all $\{\ell, p\} \subseteq \{i, j, k\}$. Thus, we want to examine the set that violates the simplicial complex structure, which is given by

$$M_{ijk} := \{(A_{ijk}^{(2)}, A_{ij}^{(1)}, A_{ik}^{(1)}, A_{jk}^{(1)}) \in \mathbb{R}^4 \mid A_{ij}^{(1)} A_{ik}^{(1)} A_{jk}^{(1)} = 0 \text{ and } A_{ijk}^{(2)} \neq 0\}. \quad (3.1)$$

In practice, the all-or-nothing condition

$$A_{ijk}^{(2)} \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad A_{ij}^{(1)} \cdot A_{ik}^{(1)} \cdot A_{jk}^{(1)} = 0$$

is too rigid for deciding whether a genuine 2-simplex is present on the nodes i, j, k . Consider the extreme case in which $A_{ijk}^{(2)} \gg 1$ but, for instance, $A_{ij}^{(1)} = 10^{-5}$. Under any realistic notion of presence, that triangle should still be regarded as absent. To encode this intuition we introduce a tolerance parameter $\delta > 0$: interactions below δ are treated as effectively zero, while interactions exceeding δ are treated as present. We therefore make the following definition.

Definition 3.1. We say the triadic connection strength $A_{ijk}^{(2)}$ respects the downward closure property with parameter $\delta > 0$, if and only if

$$|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta \implies |A_{ij}^{(1)}| \geq \delta, |A_{ik}^{(1)}| \geq \delta, |A_{jk}^{(1)}| \geq \delta. \quad (3.2)$$

We say a 2-simplex is present on the nodes i, j and k with parameter δ , if and only if $|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta$ and $A_{ijk}^{(2)}$ respects the downward closure property.

We say a 1-simplex is present on the nodes i and j , with parameter δ , if $|A_{ij}^{(1)}| \geq \delta$. Since the vertices are assumed vacuously present (and of strength greater than δ), we assume the 1-simplices respect the downward closure property automatically.

Definition 3.2. Given a directed hypergraph $\mathcal{H}(t) = (\mathbf{x}(t), A^{(1)}(t), A^{(2)}(t))$ that converges to the symmetric regime as in Definition 2.10, we say $\mathcal{H}(t)$ is a simplicial complex with parameter $\delta > 0$, if for all $i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, the downward closure property 3.2 is not violated.

This softened rule provides a more faithful measure of when simplicial dynamics should, or should not, be deemed observable. We now want to study when a simplicial complex is present on our hypergraph, and under what conditions is it stable. As such, we study the following modified subset of \mathbb{R}^4 .

Definition 3.3. Let $i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. Then the set of points where we do not have a simplicial complex with parameter δ on these nodes, denoted by $M_{ijk}^{2,\delta} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^4$, is given by

$$M_{ijk}^{2,\delta} = \left\{ (A_{ijk}^{(2)}, A_{ij}^{(1)}, A_{ik}^{(1)}, A_{jk}^{(1)}) \in \mathbb{R}^4 \mid |A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta \text{ and } \left(|A_{ij}^{(1)}| < \delta \text{ or } |A_{ik}^{(1)}| < \delta \text{ or } |A_{jk}^{(1)}| < \delta \right) \right\}. \quad (3.3)$$




Figure 5: Violation of downward closure: the triad (i, j, k) is above threshold ($|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta$), edges (i, j) and (i, k) are above threshold, but (j, k) falls below threshold ($|A_{jk}^{(1)}| < \delta$), so this is not a simplicial complex.

In order for a simplicial complex to emerge, we seek to find conditions on our dynamics so that the above set, equation 3.3, is negatively time-invariant.

Definition 3.4 (Invariance). Let $\dot{x} = g(x)$ be a dynamical system on \mathbb{R}^n with flow ϕ_t . A set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is called *invariant* for ϕ_t if

$$x_0 \in S \implies \phi_t(x_0) \in S \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

It is called *positively invariant* if this implication holds for all $t \geq 0$, and *negatively invariant* if it holds for all $t \leq 0$.

To this end, it would at first appear tempting to try and find a smooth function $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4)$ whose vanishing set, given by $f^{-1}(0) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^4 \mid f(x) = 0\}$, equals the boundary of $M_{ijk}^{2,\delta}$, i.e. $\partial M_{ijk}^{2,\delta}$. One could then calculate the outward-pointing normal vector from $M_{ijk}^{2,\delta}$ by simply calculating the gradient of f , i.e. ∇f . If the flow on the space is given by $\dot{x} = g(x)$, one could then take the Lie derivative with the flow, given by

$$\nabla f \cdot g,$$

to determine if particles are exiting or entering the region, depending on the sign of the Lie derivative. This approach is global in nature as one such theoretical function f could provide all the information required to analyse the boundary. However, the boundary $\partial M_{ijk}^{2,\delta}$ is defined piecewise by different inequalities (for example, parts where $|A_{ij}^{(1)}| < \delta$ and parts where $|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta$). As a result, these pieces do not glue together to form a single smooth manifold. Consequently, the regular value theorem* implies that the gradient of such a hypothetical function f would vanish everywhere on $\partial M_{ijk}^{2,\delta}$, i.e. $\nabla f|_{\partial M_{ijk}^{2,\delta}} = 0$. This approach therefore provides no information on the Lie derivative, and so such a global approach fails.

As such, we attempt a local approach, and first calculate the boundary $\partial M_{ijk}^{2,\delta}$ explicitly, before deriving the necessary conditions for outward flow from the boundary.

We first recall that

$$\partial M_{ijk}^{2,\delta} = \overline{M_{ijk}^{2,\delta}} \setminus \text{int}(M_{ijk}^{2,\delta}).$$

*Recall the **Regular Value Theorem**: If $f: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is smooth and $c \in \mathbb{R}$ is a regular value (meaning that for every $x \in f^{-1}(c)$ the derivative $Df(x)$ has full rank), then $f^{-1}(c)$ is a smooth submanifold of \mathbb{R}^n with dimension $n - m$, provided it is non-empty.

Next, we note that

$$\overline{M_{ijk}^{2,\delta}} = \{|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta, |A_{ij}^{(1)}| \leq \delta\} \cup \{|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta, |A_{ik}^{(1)}| \leq \delta\} \cup \{|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta, |A_{jk}^{(1)}| \leq \delta\},$$

and that

$$\text{int}(M_{ijk}^{2,\delta}) = \left\{ |A_{ijk}^{(2)}| > \delta \text{ and } \left(|A_{ij}^{(1)}| < \delta \text{ or } |A_{ik}^{(1)}| < \delta \text{ or } |A_{jk}^{(1)}| < \delta \right) \right\}.$$

One can then see that

$$\begin{aligned} \{|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta, |A_{ij}^{(1)}| \leq \delta\} \setminus \text{int}(M_{ijk}^{2,\delta}) &= \{|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| = \delta, |A_{ij}^{(1)}| \leq \delta\} \\ &\cup \{|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta, |A_{ij}^{(1)}| = \delta, |A_{ik}^{(1)}| \geq \delta, |A_{jk}^{(1)}| \geq \delta\}. \end{aligned}$$

By symmetry, similar expressions hold for the other two sets making up the closure. Therefore, the full boundary is:

$$\partial M_{ijk}^{2,\delta} = \underbrace{\{|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| = \delta, \min(|A_{ij}^{(1)}|, |A_{ik}^{(1)}|, |A_{jk}^{(1)}|) \leq \delta\}}_{=: X_1} \quad (3.4)$$

$$\cup \underbrace{\{|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta, |A_{ij}^{(1)}| = \delta, |A_{ik}^{(1)}| \geq \delta, |A_{jk}^{(1)}| \geq \delta\}}_{=: X_2} \quad (3.5)$$

$$\cup \underbrace{\{|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta, |A_{ik}^{(1)}| = \delta, |A_{ij}^{(1)}| \geq \delta, |A_{jk}^{(1)}| \geq \delta\}}_{=: X_3} \quad (3.6)$$

$$\cup \underbrace{\{|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta, |A_{jk}^{(1)}| = \delta, |A_{ij}^{(1)}| \geq \delta, |A_{ik}^{(1)}| \geq \delta\}}_{=: X_4}. \quad (3.7)$$

Thus, we can write $\partial M_{ijk}^{2,\delta} = \cup_{i=1,2,3,4} X_i$ where X_i are mutually disjoint almost everywhere, with the X_i written as in 3.4. From this, we get that the outward-pointing normal vector to our boundary is

$$\begin{aligned} n : \partial M_{ijk}^{2,\delta} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4, \\ n(A_{ijk}^{(2)}, A_{ij}^{(1)}, A_{ik}^{(1)}, A_{jk}^{(1)}) &= \begin{cases} (-\text{sgn}(A_{ijk}^{(2)}), 0, 0, 0) & \text{on } X_1 \\ (0, \text{sgn}(A_{ij}^{(1)}), 0, 0) & \text{on } X_2 \\ (0, 0, \text{sgn}(A_{ik}^{(1)}), 0) & \text{on } X_3 \\ (0, 0, 0, \text{sgn}(A_{jk}^{(1)})) & \text{on } X_4 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.5. If we begin with a simplicial complex and ensure that the above outward normal vector has a non-negative scalar product with the vector field, then we will ensure our hypergraph cannot lose its simplicial complex structure. One technicality lies on the points lying on at least two of the X_i . The collection of all such points lies on intersections of affine hyperplanes and hence forms a set of measure zero. Moreover, they do not admit a unique outward normal vector, and for this reason, we call them *singular*. We can still verify outward flow from the boundary at these singular points as follows. To be more precise, suppose x^* is one such singular point and let $I(x^*) = \{i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \mid x^* \in X_i\}$. The outward normal cone at x^* is then the non-negative hull

$$N_{\partial M}(x^*) = \left\{ \sum_{i \in I(x^*)} \lambda_i n_i(x^*) \mid \lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \right\}.$$

This allows us to formulate a precise definition of outward pointing with respect to the set $M_{ijk}^{2,\delta}$.

Definition 3.6 (Outward-pointing). Suppose $\mathcal{H}(t)$ is an adaptive, triadic network dynamical system encoded by a matrix $A^{(1)}$ and rank-3 tensor $A^{(2)}$, and suppose it converges to the symmetric regime as

in Definition 2.10. Let $F^{(ijk)} := (\dot{A}_{ijk}^{(2)}, \dot{A}_{ij}^{(1)}, \dot{A}_{ik}^{(1)}, \dot{A}_{jk}^{(1)})$. We then say the system is *outward-pointing* at (i, j, k) with threshold δ if

$$n \cdot F^{(ijk)}(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{for every } x \in \partial M_{ijk}^{2,\delta} \text{ and every } n \in N_{\partial M}(x).$$

Equivalently, it suffices to verify the sign-derivative inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \text{on } X_1 : \quad & \text{sgn}(\dot{A}_{ijk}^{(2)}) \dot{A}_{ijk}^{(2)} \leq 0, \\ \text{on } X_2 : \quad & \text{sgn}(\dot{A}_{ij}^{(1)}) \dot{A}_{ij}^{(1)} \geq 0, \quad \text{on } X_3 : \text{sgn}(\dot{A}_{ik}^{(1)}) \dot{A}_{ik}^{(1)} \geq 0, \quad \text{on } X_4 : \text{sgn}(\dot{A}_{jk}^{(1)}) \dot{A}_{jk}^{(1)} \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Importantly, our Definition 3.6 of outward pointing ensures that the singular points on $\partial M_{ijk}^{2,\delta}$ have outward pointing normal cones.

Remark 3.7. In order for the notion of outward-pointing to be well defined, we require that the binary and triadic dynamics admit continuous trajectories. Concretely, we assume throughout that the right-hand sides

$$\dot{A}_{ij}^{(1)} = g_{ij}^{(1)}(t, A^{(1)}, A^{(2)}, x), \quad \dot{A}_{ijk}^{(2)} = g_{ijk}^{(2)}(t, A^{(1)}, A^{(2)}, x)$$

are at least C^1 . However, as we will see later, many examples of such dynamics will involve terms with an absolute value appearing; hence, we only require C^1 away from the vanishing hyperplanes. More precisely, let

$$\mathcal{H}_0 := \bigcup_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \{A_{ij}^{(1)} = 0\} \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq i < j < k \leq N} \{A_{ijk}^{(2)} = 0\};$$

Then we require the dynamics are C^1 on $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathcal{H}_0$ where $d = N + N^2 + N^3$.

Definition 3.8 (Simplicial region at threshold δ). Let $K_{ijk} := \mathbb{R}^4 \setminus M_{ijk}^{2,\delta}$. Define the global simplicial region for our system as

$$\Omega_\delta := \prod_{i < j < k} K_{ijk} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{4\binom{N}{3}}.$$

The ambient space is $\mathbb{R}^{4\binom{N}{3}}$ since each K_{ijk} contains a 4-tuple, and there are $\binom{N}{3}$ such sets K_{ijk} ; this follows because in the symmetric regime each $A_{ijk}^{(2)}$ is invariant under any S_3 permutation of the indices. We can now state our main result of this section.

Theorem 3.9 (Retention of simplicial structure). *Fix a simplicial tolerance parameter $\delta > 0$. Assume $\mathcal{H}(t) = (\mathbf{x}, A^{(1)}, A^{(2)})$ is an adaptive triadic network dynamical system such that:*

1. *the vector field is C^1 on $\mathbb{R}^{N+N^2+N^3} \setminus \mathcal{H}_0$, where the union of vanishing hyperplanes is*

$$\mathcal{H}_0 := \bigcup_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \{A_{ij}^{(1)} = 0\} \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq i < j < k \leq N} \{A_{ijk}^{(2)} = 0\};$$

2. *$\mathcal{H}(t)$ converges to the symmetric regime in time $t_0 \in [0, \infty)$ with parameter $0 < \varepsilon \ll \delta$, so that $A^{(1)}$ and $A^{(2)}$ can be regarded as symmetric in their indices;*
3. *the system is outward pointing at every triple (i, j, k) with threshold δ as in Definition 2.10.*

If at some time $t_1 \geq t_0$ the configuration $(A^{(1)}(t_1), A^{(2)}(t_1))$ lies in Ω_δ , then

$$(A^{(1)}(t), A^{(2)}(t)) \in \Omega_\delta \quad \text{for all } t \geq t_1,$$

i.e. once simplicial at threshold δ , the configuration remains simplicial for all future time.

Proof : Let $K_{ijk} := \mathbb{R}^4 \setminus M_{ijk}^{2,\delta}$ and $\Omega_\delta := \prod_{i < j < k} K_{ijk}$. Assume $(A^{(1)}(t_1), A^{(2)}(t_1)) \in \Omega_\delta$, but suppose for contradiction that there exists $T > t_1$ with $(A^{(1)}(T), A^{(2)}(T)) \notin \Omega_\delta$. Define the first exit time

$$\tau := \inf\{t \geq t_1 : (A^{(1)}(t), A^{(2)}(t)) \notin \Omega_\delta\}.$$

Then for some triple (i, j, k) we have $x^{(ijk)}(t) \in K_{ijk}$ for $t < \tau$ and $x^{(ijk)}(\tau) \in \partial M_{ijk}^{2,\delta}$.

By definition of the boundary, $x^{(ijk)}(\tau)$ lies on one of the faces X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4 from 3.4. Thus, there exists an outward normal $n \in N_{\partial M}(x^{(ijk)}(\tau))$. To enter $M_{ijk}^{2,\delta}$ at time τ , at least one active constraint must decrease, i.e. $n \cdot F^{(ijk)}(x^{(ijk)}(\tau)) < 0$ for some such n . However, by the outward-pointing condition (Definition 3.6), we have $n \cdot F^{(ijk)}(x) \geq 0$ for every $x \in \partial M_{ijk}^{2,\delta}$, $n \in N_{\partial M}(x)$. This yields a contradiction. Hence no exit from K_{ijk} is possible, and therefore $x^{(ijk)}(t) \in K_{ijk}$ for all $t \geq t_1$ and every triple (i, j, k) . It follows that $(A^{(1)}(t), A^{(2)}(t)) \in \Omega_\delta$ for all $t \geq t_1$, as claimed. \square

Remark 3.10. Theorem 3.9 is a stability theorem; it requires that a simplicial complex structure is already present on the hypergraph after convergence to the symmetric regime. This, of course, need not necessarily be the case. In order to get emergence of such a simplicial complex, consider the following. If we start without a simplicial complex, it is because there exists a degree 2 simplex $A_{ijk}^{(2)}$ above the δ -threshold, but at least one of the degree 1 subfaces is below the threshold, i.e. $\min(|A_{ij}^{(1)}|, |A_{ik}^{(1)}|, |A_{jk}^{(1)}|) < \delta$. Therefore, to enter the desired region, we require that the global simplicial region Ω_δ is a *global attracting set*.

Definition 3.11 (Global Attracting Set). Let (X, d) be a metric space and let $\{\Phi^t\}_{t \geq 0}$ denote a dynamical system on X . A set $\mathcal{A} \subseteq X$ is called a *global attracting set* if the following conditions hold:

1. **Invariance:** For all time $t \geq 0$, we have that $\Phi^t(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{A}$.
2. **Global attraction:** There exists a time $0 \leq t' < \infty$ such that for all $x_0 \in X$, $\Phi^{t'}(x_0) \in \mathcal{A}$.

If we now suppose our vector field satisfies both the outward pointing condition from Definition 3.6, and the set Ω_δ is a global attracting set, then we now a simplicial complex will arise at some point. We can thus formulate the following corollary to Theorem 3.9.

Corollary 3.12. Let $(\mathbf{x}, A^{(1)}, A^{(2)})$ be an adaptive triadic network dynamical system that gives rise to a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}(t)$. Assume the hypotheses of Theorem 3.9. Suppose furthermore that the global simplicial region Ω_δ is a global attracting set in the sense of Definition 3.11. Then there exists a time $0 \leq t_0 < \infty$ such that for all $t' \geq t_0$, $\mathcal{H}(t')$ is a simplicial complex.

3.2 Examples

Example 3.13. Consider the following example, which satisfies the conditions of Corollary 3.12. We first introduce a non-smooth model, and then smoothen out using known approximations. The general dynamics follow the template of Example 2.3.

$$\dot{\theta}_i = \omega_i + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N A_{ij}^{(1)} \sin(\theta_j - \theta_i) + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j,k=1}^N A_{ijk}^{(2)} \sin(\theta_j + \theta_k - 2\theta_i),$$

$$\dot{A}_{ij}^{(1)} = -\alpha(A_{ij}^{(1)} - \cos(\theta_i - \theta_j)) + \beta J_{ij} \delta \operatorname{sgn}_s(A_{ij}^{(1)}), \quad \dot{A}_{ijk}^{(2)} = -\gamma(A_{ijk}^{(2)} - \delta \cos(\theta_i + \theta_j + \theta_k)),$$

where $\alpha, \gamma, \delta, \beta > 0$, and

$$\operatorname{sgn}_s(A_{ij}^{(1)}) = \operatorname{sgn}\left(\frac{A_{ij}^{(1)} + A_{ji}^{(1)}}{2}\right), \quad J_{ij} = J_{ji} := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \min\{|A_{ij}^{(1)}|, |A_{ji}^{(1)}|\} \leq \delta \text{ and } \exists k : |A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The above dynamics highlight the simplicial preserving nature of this system, in particular, the edge dynamics positively reinforce whenever they are under the simplicial threshold and a parent face lies above it. A technical obstacle is that the above adaptation rules for edges and hyperedges involve nonsmooth maps such as max, min, and an indicator function. This causes an issue, since the vector field fails to be C^1 off the vanishing hyperplanes \mathcal{H}_0 , so our outward-pointing arguments may not necessarily hold. To remedy this, we introduce smooth approximations with a small smoothing scale $0 < \zeta \ll 1$. These approximations can be found in convex analysis and in some machine learning algorithms, among other areas, [8].

1. **Log-sum-exp for max.** For $x = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ we set

$$\max_\zeta(x_1, \dots, x_N) := \zeta \log\left(\sum_{k=1}^N e^{x_k/\zeta}\right).$$

This is convex and C^∞ . As $\zeta \rightarrow 0$, it converges uniformly on compacts to $\max_k x_k$. The error is controlled by

$$0 \leq \max_\zeta(x) - \max_k x_k \leq \zeta \log N.$$

2. **Negative log-sum-exp for min.** Since $\min(a, b) = -\max(-a, -b)$, we define

$$\min_\zeta(a, b) := -\zeta \log(e^{-a/\zeta} + e^{-b/\zeta}).$$

This is smooth and concave, converging to $\min(a, b)$ with bounds

$$\min(a, b) - \zeta \log 2 \leq \min_\zeta(a, b) \leq \min(a, b).$$

3. **Smoothed Heaviside and sign.** The step function $H(z) = \mathbf{1}_{\{z>0\}}$ and $\text{sgn}(z)$ are replaced by

$$H_\zeta(z) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \tanh(z/\zeta)), \quad \text{sgn}_\zeta(z) = \tanh(z/\zeta).$$

Both converge pointwise as $\zeta \rightarrow 0$. Moreover the error away from the switching layer is exponentially small:

$$|\text{sgn}_\zeta(z) - \text{sgn}(z)| \leq 2e^{-2|z|/\zeta}, \quad |H_\zeta(z) - H(z)| \leq e^{-2|z|/\zeta}.$$

4. **Symmetrised sign.** For interactions depending on two arguments one may use the symmetric smoothing

$$\text{sgn}_{s,\zeta}(x, y) = \tanh((x + y)/(2\zeta)),$$

which converges to $\text{sgn}(x) = \text{sgn}(y)$ when both are aligned.

The smoothened dynamics now read as follows,

$$\dot{\theta}_i = \omega_i + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N A_{ij}^{(1)} \sin(\theta_j - \theta_i) + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j,k=1}^N A_{ijk}^{(2)} \sin(\theta_j + \theta_k - 2\theta_i),$$

$$\dot{A}_{ij}^{(1)} = -\alpha(A_{ij}^{(1)} - \cos(\theta_i - \theta_j)) + \beta J_{ij}^{(\zeta)} \delta \text{sgn}_{s,\zeta}(A_{ij}^{(1)}, A_{ji}^{(1)}), \quad \dot{A}_{ijk}^{(2)} = -\gamma(A_{ijk}^{(2)} - \delta \cos(\theta_i + \theta_j + \theta_k)),$$

where

$$J_{ij}^{(\zeta)} := H_\zeta\left(\delta - \min_\zeta(|A_{ij}^{(1)}|, |A_{ji}^{(1)}|)\right) H_\zeta\left(\max_\zeta\{|A_{ij1}^{(2)}|, \dots, |A_{ijN}^{(2)}|\} - \delta\right).$$

By construction, the above dynamics are C^∞ on $\mathbb{R}^{N+N^2+N^3} \setminus \mathcal{H}_0$. Now, we show that our dynamics satisfy the hypotheses of Corollary 3.12. First we show it converges to the symmetric regime. Let $A^{(1)} = A_{\text{sym}}^{(1)} + A_{\text{alt}}^{(1)}$ be the orthogonal decomposition into the symmetric and alternating parts, and define

$$M_{ij} = \cos(\theta_i - \theta_j), \quad B_{ij} = \beta \delta J_{ij}^{(\zeta)} \text{sgn}_{s,\zeta}(A_{ij}^{(1)}, A_{ji}^{(1)}).$$

By construction M is symmetric and $B_{ij} = B_{ji}$, hence B is symmetric. Projecting the edge dynamics gives

$$\dot{A}_{\text{sym}}^{(1)} = -\alpha(A_{\text{sym}}^{(1)} - M) + B, \quad \dot{A}_{\text{alt}}^{(1)} = -\alpha A_{\text{alt}}^{(1)},$$

so $A_{\text{alt}}^{(1)}(t) = e^{-\alpha t} A_{\text{alt}}^{(1)}(0) \rightarrow 0$ exponentially. For the triads, splitting $A^{(2)} = A_{\text{sym}}^{(2)} + A_{\text{alt}}^{(2)} + A_{\text{mix}}^{(2)}$ yields

$$\dot{A}_{\text{sym}}^{(2)} = -\gamma(A_{\text{sym}}^{(2)} - \delta \cos(\theta_i + \theta_j + \theta_k)), \quad \dot{A}_{\text{alt}}^{(2)} = -\gamma A_{\text{alt}}^{(2)}, \quad \dot{A}_{\text{mix}}^{(2)} = -\gamma A_{\text{mix}}^{(2)},$$

hence $A_{\text{alt}}^{(2)}(t), A_{\text{mix}}^{(2)}(t) \rightarrow 0$. Consequently the system converges to the symmetric regime.

Next, we verify that the dynamics satisfy the outward pointing boundary conditions. Let X_1 be as in 3.4. On X_1 ,

$$\text{sgn}(A_{ijk}^{(2)}) \dot{A}_{ijk}^{(2)} = -\gamma(|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| - \delta \text{sgn}(A_{ijk}^{(2)}) \cos(\theta_i + \theta_j + \theta_k)) \leq 0,$$

since $|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| = \delta$ and $|\cos| \leq 1$.

For the binary boundary X_2 , we check after the system has entered the symmetric regime, so $A_{ij}^{(1)} = A_{ji}^{(1)}$. Then

$$\text{sgn}(A_{ij}^{(1)}) \text{sgn}_{s,\zeta}(A_{ij}^{(1)}, A_{ji}^{(1)}) = \tanh\left(\frac{|A_{ij}^{(1)}|}{\zeta}\right) \geq \tanh\left(\frac{\delta}{\zeta}\right) =: m_\zeta \in (0, 1),$$

and, because on X_2 we have $|A_{ij}^{(1)}| = \delta$ and there exists k such that $|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta$,

$$J_{ij}^{(\zeta)} \geq H_\zeta(0) H_\zeta(0) = \frac{1}{4} =: \underline{J}_\zeta.$$

Therefore, on X_2 ,

$$\text{sgn}(A_{ij}^{(1)}) \dot{A}_{ij}^{(1)} \geq -\alpha(\delta + 1) + \beta \delta \underline{J}_\zeta m_\zeta.$$

Choosing

$$\beta > \frac{\alpha(\delta + 1)}{\delta \underline{J}_\zeta m_\zeta} = \frac{4\alpha(\delta + 1)}{\delta \tanh(\delta/\zeta)}$$

ensures $\text{sgn}(A_{ij}^{(1)}) \dot{A}_{ij}^{(1)} \geq 0$ on X_2 ; the same argument applies to X_3 and X_4 .

Thus our dynamics satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 3.9 and thus retain a simplicial complex structure if one is present after convergence to the symmetric regime. To show one will emerge, we must show that the set Ω_δ is a global attracting set for the dynamical system.

To this end, fix a triple (i, j, k) with $|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta$ and suppose some edge, say $|A_{ij}^{(1)}| < \delta$, violates downward closure. Then

$$J_{ij}^{(\zeta)} \geq \frac{1}{4}, \quad \text{sgn}(A_{ij}^{(1)}) \text{sgn}_\zeta(A_{ij}^{(1)}, A_{ji}^{(1)}) = \tanh\left(\frac{|A_{ij}^{(1)}|}{\zeta}\right) \geq m_\zeta := \tanh(\delta/\zeta).$$

Hence


$$\text{sgn}(A_{ij}^{(1)}) \dot{A}_{ij}^{(1)} \geq -\alpha(\delta + 1) + \beta \frac{\delta m_\zeta}{4}.$$

By the parameter condition, the right-hand side is bounded below by some $\eta > 0$. Thus every violating edge under an active parent triad increases in magnitude with uniform speed until it reaches δ , with hitting time bounded by


$$t_{\text{hit}} \leq \frac{\delta - |A_{ij}^{(1)}(0)|}{\eta} < \infty.$$

We numerically simulate these dynamics to illustrate the emergence of a simplicial complex structure and the system's convergence to the symmetric regime. The system was integrated over $t \in [0, 25]$ with 250 evaluation points. The network consisted of $N = 4$ oscillators with natural frequencies $\omega_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.5^2)$, initial phases drawn uniformly from $[0, 2\pi)$, and random initial binary and triadic weights in $(-0.25, 0.25)$. To test the closure property, we introduced a single simplicial violation by setting one edge $(0, 1)$ to be weak while its parent triad $(0, 1, 2)$ was strong. The remaining parameters were chosen as $\alpha = 0.5$, $\beta = 25.0$, $\gamma = 0.8$, $\delta = 0.5$, and $\zeta = 0.05$, which satisfy the analytical conditions for simplicial emergence. The results (Figure 6) confirm that all non-symmetric components decay exponentially, and a simplicial complex structure is observed. The full implementation and initial conditions are detailed in the code repository.

The previous example demonstrates that, although a simplicial complex structure is preserved by the dynamics, this structure can become trivial, effectively collapsing onto a 1-simplicial complex, i.e. a graph. In this regime, the higher-order components decay and the network behaves as if only pairwise interactions were present. This observation aligns with much of the existing network science literature over the past decades, where higher-order effects are often neglected: even when such terms are present in the governing equations, they frequently vanish asymptotically and leave no persistent signature in the higher-order structure. Such a phenomenon was explored in [24], where the authors studied an adaptive voter model explicitly defined on a simplicial complex. This framework included not just pairwise interactions on edges (1-simplices) but also group peer-pressure effects on filled-in triangles (2-simplices). They found that the adaptive rewiring dynamics led to a depletion of the higher-order structures. The model exhibited a multiscale hierarchy where the higher-order 2-simplices die out on a faster time scale, vanishing before the dynamics on the edges had depleted. This sequential decay effectively collapses the



(a) Time series of the Frobenius norms for the isotypic components of the binary tensor $A^{(1)}$ (left) and the triadic tensor $A^{(2)}$ (right). The norms of the antisymmetric part ($\|A_{\text{alt}}^{(1)}\|_F$) and the antisymmetric and mixed parts of the triad ($\|A_{\text{alt}}^{(2)}\|_F$, $\|A_{\text{mix}}^{(2)}\|_F$) decay exponentially to zero, confirming convergence to the symmetric regime.



(b) Snapshots of the network structure at different times. The system starts with a simplicial complex violation at $t = 0$, where the triad $(0,1,2)$ is strong (blue shading) but its edge $(0,1)$ is weak (dashed line). The adaptive dynamics reinforce the weak edge, restoring the downward closure property. A persistent triad is observed before decaying.

Figure 6: Simulation of simplicial emergence (transient case). (a) Frobenius norms converging to the symmetric regime. (b) Network snapshots showing restoration of downward closure.

higher-order network onto a simple graph, after which the system evolves as a standard pairwise adaptive model. This result provides a direct justification for treating certain adaptive systems as effectively pairwise, as the higher-order components are shown to be transient and vanish dynamically.

In contrast, the next example illustrates a qualitatively different behaviour, one in which higher-order interactions persist in a non-trivial and structured manner. In this case, the system maintains a subset of 2-simplices over time without filling in all possible higher-order connections, yielding a genuinely simplicial, but not fully saturated, complex.

Example 3.14. Consider the following dissipative, consensus based, adaptive, triadic network dynamical system, defined on N nodes each with a state $x_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}$.

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}_i &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N A_{ij}^{(1)} (x_j - x_i) + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j,k=1}^N A_{ijk}^{(2)} \left(\frac{x_j + x_k}{2} - x_i \right), \\ \dot{A}_{ij}^{(1)} &= -\alpha \left(A_{ij}^{(1)} - \kappa_1 e^{-\lambda_1 (x_i - x_j)^2} \right) + \beta \delta J_{ij}^{(\zeta)} \operatorname{sgn}_{s,\zeta}(A_{ij}^{(1)}, A_{ji}^{(1)}), \\ \dot{A}_{ijk}^{(2)} &= -\gamma \left(A_{ijk}^{(2)} - \kappa_2 e^{-\lambda_2 V_{ijk}} \right),\end{aligned}$$

where $V_{ijk} = \frac{1}{6} \sum_{p,q \in \{i,j,k\}} (x_p - x_q)^2$ and $J_{ij}^{(\zeta)}$ and $\operatorname{sgn}_{s,\zeta}$ are the same as in Example 3.13, $0 < \zeta \ll 1$ is a smoothing parameter.

We make the following observations about the dynamics.

- *Nodes.* The terms $A_{ij}^{(1)}(x_j - x_i)$ implement pairwise diffusion. The triadic term $A_{ijk}^{(2)}(\frac{x_j + x_k}{2} - x_i)$ is a higher-order consensus force pulling node i towards the average of j and k .
- *Triads.* V_{ijk} measures the local variance on $\{i, j, k\}$ and is symmetric in (i, j, k) . Thus $A_{ijk}^{(2)}$ relaxes towards the high target $\kappa_2 \gg 0$ whenever the triple is nearly in consensus ($V_{ijk} \approx 0$), creating a positive feedback that sustains strong triads near consensus.
- *Edges.* $A_{ij}^{(1)}$ follows a relaxation to the symmetric target $\kappa_1 e^{-\lambda_1 (x_i - x_j)^2}$, while the $J_{ij}^{(\zeta)}$ -term enforces simplicial closure by reinforcing weak edges that lie under a strong parent triad.

We now verify that the above satisfies all assumptions of Corollary 3.12.

- (i) *Smoothness.* The right-hand side consists of compositions of smooth functions (e^{-z^2} , smoothed sign $\operatorname{sgn}_{s,\zeta}$, and $J_{ij}^{(\zeta)}$ built from H_ζ and \min_ζ), hence the vector field $(\dot{\mathbf{x}}, \dot{A}^{(1)}, \dot{A}^{(2)})$ is C^∞ on $\mathbb{R}^{N+N^2+N^3} \setminus H_0$. Therefore, the regularity hypothesis of Theorem 3.9 (and thus of Corollary 3.12) holds.
- (ii) *Convergence to the symmetric regime.* The evolution laws for both layers drive antisymmetric and mixed components to zero. Writing $A^{(1)} = A_{\text{sym}}^{(1)} + A_{\text{alt}}^{(1)}$ and $A^{(2)} = A_{\text{sym}}^{(2)} + A_{\text{alt}}^{(2)} + A_{\text{mix}}^{(2)}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{A}_{\text{sym}}^{(1)} &= -\alpha \left(A_{\text{sym}}^{(1)} - M \right) + B, & \dot{A}_{\text{alt}}^{(1)} &= -\alpha A_{\text{alt}}^{(1)}, \\ \dot{A}_{\text{sym}}^{(2)} &= -\gamma \left(A_{\text{sym}}^{(2)} - \kappa_2 e^{-\lambda_2 V} \right), & \dot{A}_{\text{alt}}^{(2)} &= -\gamma A_{\text{alt}}^{(2)}, & \dot{A}_{\text{mix}}^{(2)} &= -\gamma A_{\text{mix}}^{(2)},\end{aligned}$$

where $M_{ij} = \kappa_1 e^{-\lambda_1 (x_i - x_j)^2}$ and $B_{ij} = \beta \delta J_{ij}^{(\zeta)} \operatorname{sgn}_{s,\zeta}(A_{ij}^{(1)}, A_{ji}^{(1)})$ are symmetric.

Hence $A_{\text{alt}}^{(1)}(t), A_{\text{alt}}^{(2)}(t), A_{\text{mix}}^{(2)}(t) \rightarrow 0$ exponentially, and the system converges to the symmetric regime.

- (iii) *Outward-pointing condition.* On the triadic boundary $X_1 = \{|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| = \delta\}$ we have

$$\operatorname{sgn}(A_{ijk}^{(2)}) \dot{A}_{ijk}^{(2)} = -\gamma \left(|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| - \kappa_2 e^{-\lambda_2 V_{ijk}} \operatorname{sgn}(A_{ijk}^{(2)}) \right) \leq 0,$$

since $|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| = \delta$ and $e^{-\lambda_2 V_{ijk}} \leq 1$. On the binary boundary $X_2 = \{|A_{ij}^{(1)}| = \delta\}$ (after the system has reached symmetry), we obtain

$$\operatorname{sgn}(A_{ij}^{(1)}) \dot{A}_{ij}^{(1)} = -\alpha \left(|A_{ij}^{(1)}| - \kappa_1 e^{-\lambda_1 (x_i - x_j)^2} \right) + \beta \delta J_{ij}^{(\zeta)} \geq 0,$$

provided $\kappa_1 \geq \delta$ and $J_{ij}^{(\zeta)} \geq 0$, ensuring the flow is directed inward at all boundary faces. Thus the outward-pointing condition of Definition 3.6 is satisfied.

- (iv) *Global attraction of Ω_δ .* The adaptation dynamics ensure that whenever a simplicial violation occurs, i.e. a triad above threshold sits above a weak edge, the $J_{ij}^{(\zeta)}$ term activates to reinforce the edge until closure is restored. Hence Ω_δ is globally attractive.

Therefore all hypotheses of Corollary 3.12 hold, and there exists $t_0 < \infty$ such that for all $t' \geq t_0$, the hypergraph $\mathcal{H}(t')$ forms a simplicial complex at threshold δ .

We numerically simulate these dynamics to illustrate simplicial emergence with persistence. The simulation uses $N = 4$ nodes with initial conditions $x_0 = (0.10, 0.15, 0.20, 2.00)$ and initial weights $\sim U(-0.25, 0.25)$. A single simplicial violation was set on the $(0,1,2)$ triad (using symmetric entries): $A_{012}^{(2)} = 0.8$, $A_{02}^{(1)} = 0.6$, $A_{12}^{(1)} = 0.7$, and the weak edge $A_{01}^{(1)} = 0.1$. The model parameters are $\zeta = 0.05$, $\alpha = 0.5$, $\beta = 25.0$, $\gamma = 0.8$, $\delta = 0.5$, $\kappa_1 = 1.0$, $\kappa_2 = 1.2$, $\lambda_1 = 2.0$, and $\lambda_2 = 5.0$. The results confirm convergence to the symmetric regime (Figure 7a) and show the restoration of downward closure with a persistent triad (Figure 7b). The full implementation for this example is available in the code repository.

4 Oriented Simplicial Complexes and Semi-Simplicial Sets

4.1 Antisymmetric Regime

We now adapt the δ -threshold philosophy of the previous section to the antisymmetric regime, where every binary interaction is oriented and every triadic interaction is alternating. Suppose our hypergraph $\mathcal{H}(t)$ converges to the antisymmetric regime. Thus, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a time t_0 such that for all $t \geq t_0$ we have that all the symmetric and mixed parts decay to zero, and both $|A_{ij}^{(1)}(t) + A_{ji}^{(1)}(t)| < \varepsilon$ and $|A_{ijk}^{(2)}(t) - \text{sgn}(\sigma)A_{\sigma(i)\sigma(j)\sigma(k)}^{(1)}(t)| < \varepsilon$ for all $\sigma \in S_3$. In such a case, we create equivalence classes and view $A_{ij}^{(1)}$ and $A_{ji}^{(1)}$ as the same object, but differing by a sign, i.e. for all $t \geq t_0$, $A_{ij}^{(1)} = -A_{ji}^{(1)}$. Similarly, $A_{ijk}^{(2)}$ will be the representative for all even permutations of its indices, and it is the negative of any permutation by any odd permutation.

Definition 4.1. We say an oriented triadic connection strength $A_{ijk}^{(2)}$ respects the oriented downward closure property with parameter $\delta > 0$ if and only if

- $|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta \implies |A_{ij}^{(1)}| \geq \delta, |A_{ik}^{(1)}| \geq \delta, |A_{jk}^{(1)}| \geq \delta$.
- The orientation of the triadic and binary connections agree, i.e.

$$\text{sgn}\left(A_{ijk}^{(2)}\right) = \text{sgn}\left(A_{ij}^{(1)}\right) = \text{sgn}\left(A_{jk}^{(1)}\right) = \text{sgn}\left(A_{ik}^{(1)}\right).$$

We say an oriented 2-simplex is present on the nodes i, j and k with parameter δ if $|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta$ and $A_{ijk}^{(2)}$ respects the oriented downward closure property. Similar to the unoriented case, we say an oriented 1-simplex is present on the nodes i and j , with parameter δ , if $|A_{ij}^{(1)}| \geq \delta$ and $\text{sgn}(A_{ij}^{(1)}) = -\text{sgn}(A_{ji}^{(1)})$. The vertices are assumed vacuously present, thus the oriented 1-simplices respect the downward closure property automatically.




Figure 8: Positive orientation






Figure 9: Negative orientation

Definition 4.2. Given an adaptive, triadic, network dynamical system $\mathcal{H}(t)$, encoded by a matrix $A^{(1)} \in M_N(\mathbb{R})$ and rank-3 tensor $A^{(2)} \in (\mathbb{R}^N)^{\otimes 3}$, that converges to the antisymmetric regime, we say



(a) Time series of the Frobenius norms for the isotypic components of the binary tensor $A^{(1)}$ (left) and the triadic tensor $A^{(2)}$ (right). The norms of the antisymmetric part ($\|A_{\text{alt}}^{(1)}\|_F$) and the antisymmetric and mixed parts of the triad ($\|A_{\text{alt}}^{(2)}\|_F$, $\|A_{\text{mix}}^{(2)}\|_F$) decay exponentially to zero, confirming convergence to the symmetric regime.



(b) Snapshots of the network structure at uniformly spaced times. The system is initialised with a simplicial violation on $(0, 1, 2)$ (strong triad, weak edge $(0, 1)$). The adaptive dynamics reinforce the weak edge via the closure term, restoring downward closure. A nontrivial persistent triad is observed.

Figure 7: Simulation of simplicial emergence with persistence. (a) Frobenius norms converging to the symmetric regime. (b) Network snapshots showing restoration of downward closure.

$\mathcal{H}(t)$ is an oriented simplicial complex with parameter $\delta > 0$, if for all $i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, the oriented downward closure property 4.1 is not violated.

Now we want to replicate our results from the symmetric hypergraph case to this oriented case. We begin with the following definition.

Definition 4.3 (Oriented simplicial region at threshold δ). For a triple (i, j, k) write $\sigma_{ijk} := \text{sgn}(A_{ijk}^{(2)}) \in$

$\{-1, 0, 1\}$ and define the oriented edge coordinates as

$$y_{ij} := \sigma_{ijk} A_{ij}^{(1)}, \quad y_{ik} := \sigma_{ijk} A_{ik}^{(1)}, \quad y_{jk} := \sigma_{ijk} A_{jk}^{(1)}.$$

The oriented bad set, i.e. the set that violates the oriented downward closure, is then given by

$$M_{ijk}^{2,\delta,\text{or}} := \left\{ (A_{ijk}^{(2)}, y_{ij}, y_{ik}, y_{jk}) \in \mathbb{R}^4 : |A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta \text{ and } \min(y_{ij}, y_{ik}, y_{jk}) < \delta \right\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^4.$$

Set $K_{ijk}^{\text{or}} := \mathbb{R}^4 \setminus M_{ijk}^{2,\delta,\text{or}}$. The global oriented simplicial region is then given by

$$\Omega_\delta^{\text{or}} := \prod_{i < j < k} K_{ijk}^{\text{or}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{4\binom{N}{3}}.$$

Remark 4.4. The use of the signed coordinates y_{ab} in the definition is $M_{ijk}^{2,\delta,\text{or}}$ captures the orientations of the edges in relation to the triadic connection. If an edge is large in magnitude but has the opposite orientation to the triad, then y_{ab} is negative and hence fails the threshold test. Thus, the single inequality $y_{ab} \geq \delta$ simultaneously enforces magnitude and orientation agreement.

Furthermore, the ambient space remains $\mathbb{R}^{4\binom{N}{3}}$ as in the symmetric case, since each K_{ijk}^{or} contains a 4-tuple, and there are $\binom{N}{3}$ such sets. Because we use the signed coordinates y_{ij}, y_{ik}, y_{jk} , odd permutations of (i, j, k) simply flip all three signs simultaneously, so they do not create extra dimensions. Hence a single K_{ijk}^{or} already captures both orientations of the simplex.

Now, in a similar fashion to the symmetric case, one can compute the boundary $\partial M_{ijk}^{2,\delta,\text{or}}$ as the union of the following four almost-everywhere disjoint sets,

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &= \{ |A_{ijk}^{(2)}| = \delta, \min(y_{ij}, y_{ik}, y_{jk}) \leq \delta \}, \\ X_2 &= \{ |A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta, y_{ij} = \delta, y_{ik} \geq \delta, y_{jk} \geq \delta \}, \\ X_3 &= \{ |A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta, y_{ik} = \delta, y_{ij} \geq \delta, y_{jk} \geq \delta \}, \\ X_4 &= \{ |A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta, y_{jk} = \delta, y_{ij} \geq \delta, y_{ik} \geq \delta \}. \end{aligned}$$

From this, we can make the following definition of outward pointing.

Definition 4.5 (Outward Pointing at Threshold δ (Oriented Case)). Fix a triple (i, j, k) and write $u = (A_{ijk}^{(2)}, y_{ij}, y_{ik}, y_{jk})$ with $y_{ab} := \sigma_{ijk} A_{ab}^{(1)}$, $\sigma_{ijk} = \text{sgn}(A_{ijk}^{(2)})$. Let $G^{(ijk)}(u)$ denote the dynamics in these coordinates. Set the barrier functions

$$b_1 := \delta - |A_{ijk}^{(2)}|, \quad b_2 := y_{ij} - \delta, \quad b_3 := y_{ik} - \delta, \quad b_4 := y_{jk} - \delta.$$

We say the dynamics are *outward-pointing (oriented) at threshold δ* if for every boundary point u^* of

$$M_{ijk}^{2,\delta,\text{or}} = \{ |A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta \text{ and } \min(y_{ij}, y_{ik}, y_{jk}) < \delta \}$$

and for every active constraint $b_\ell(u^*) = 0$, one has

$$\dot{b}_\ell(u^*) = \nabla b_\ell(u^*) \cdot G^{(ijk)}(u^*) \geq 0.$$

Equivalently, at regular boundary points, this is the list of inequalities

$$\text{on } X_1 : \text{sgn}(A_{ijk}^{(2)}) \dot{A}_{ijk}^{(2)} \leq 0, \quad \text{on } X_2 : \dot{y}_{ij} \geq 0, \quad \text{on } X_3 : \dot{y}_{ik} \geq 0, \quad \text{on } X_4 : \dot{y}_{jk} \geq 0.$$

At singular points (several $b_\ell = 0$) the condition must hold for all outward normals in the positive cone generated by the corresponding ∇b_ℓ .

This formulation now allows us to state the main simplicial retention theorem in the oriented case.

Theorem 4.6 (Retention of oriented simplicial structure). *Fix a threshold parameter $\delta > 0$. Assume $\mathcal{H}(t)$ is an adaptive triadic network dynamical system that converges to the antisymmetric regime. Suppose the vector field $(\mathbf{x}, A^{(1)}, A^{(2)})$ is C^1 on $\mathbb{R}^{N+N^2+N^3} \setminus \mathcal{H}_0$, (where \mathcal{H}_0 is the union of vanishing hyperplanes as in Theorem 3.9), and suppose the dynamics are outward-pointing (oriented) at threshold δ for every triple (i, j, k) , as in Definition 4.5. Let*

$$K_{ijk}^{\text{or}} := \{ |A_{ijk}^{(2)}| < \delta \text{ or } y_{ij}, y_{ik}, y_{jk} \geq \delta \}, \quad \Omega_\delta^{\text{or}} := \prod_{i < j < k} K_{ijk}^{\text{or}} \subset \mathbb{R}^{4\binom{N}{3}}.$$

If for some $t_1 \geq t_0$ we have $(A^{(1)}(t_1), A^{(2)}(t_1)) \in \Omega_\delta^{\text{or}}$, then

$$(A^{(1)}(t), A^{(2)}(t)) \in \Omega_\delta^{\text{or}} \text{ for all } t \geq t_1.$$

Proof : Let

$$\tau := \inf\{t \geq t_1 : (A^{(1)}(t), A^{(2)}(t)) \notin \Omega_\delta^{\text{or}}\}.$$

If $\tau < \infty$, then for some triple (i, j, k) the quadruple $u(t) = (A_{ijk}^{(2)}(t), y_{ij}(t), y_{ik}(t), y_{jk}(t))$ satisfies $u(t) \in K_{ijk}^{\text{or}}$ for $t < \tau$ and $u(\tau) \in \partial M_{ijk}^{2, \delta, \text{or}}$. Let $I := \{\ell \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\} : b_\ell(u(\tau)) = 0\}$ be the active set. By continuity and minimality of τ , there exists $\eta > 0$ such that $b_\ell(u(t)) > 0$ for all $\ell \in I$ and all $t \in (\tau - \eta, \tau)$. To enter $M_{ijk}^{2, \delta, \text{or}}$ at τ one must have $\dot{b}_\ell(u(\tau)) \leq 0$ for some $\ell \in I$. But the outward-pointing condition yields $\dot{b}_\ell(u(\tau)) \geq 0$ for every $\ell \in I$, a contradiction. \square

4.2 Mixed Regime

In the asymptotic regime classification, we can study the emergence of either unoriented or oriented simplicial complexes when our hypernetwork converges to either the symmetric or antisymmetric limit. If it converges, however, to the mixed regime limit, we lack the essential properties of symmetry to study the emergence of either type of simplicial complex. Nonetheless, there are other algebraic-topological tools one can use, if instead we shift our attention to the emergence of semi-simplicial sets (also known as Δ -sets), which are the minimal categorical objects that capture these higher-order interactions and maintain techniques and tools from homology theory and computational topology. We first discuss some category-theoretic preliminaries and show why simplicial sets are too specific to encounter problems in this setting. We are forced to preclude part of their definition, leaving semi-simplicial sets as the most suitable object in the mixed regime.

Definition 4.7. Let Δ be the category whose objects are finite, non-empty, totally ordered sets

$$[n] = \{0, 1, \dots, n\},$$

for $n \geq 0$, and morphisms are the order preserving functions. that is, if $i < j$ in $[n]$, then $f(i) < f(j)$ in $[m]$ for any morphism $f: [n] \rightarrow [m]$. Then a *simplicial set* is a contravariant functor from Δ to **Set**, (where **Set** denotes the category of sets). More generally, for any category \mathbf{C} , a *simplicial object* in \mathbf{C} is a functor $X: \Delta^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$.

We can encode the combinatorial data of a simplicial set in a more verifiable way by leveraging the fact that the category Δ has a natural generating set of morphisms. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, there are $n + 1$ injections $\delta^i: [n - 1] \rightarrow [n]$ called the coface maps, and $n + 1$ surjections $\sigma^j: [n + 1] \rightarrow [n]$, called the codegeneracies. Explicitly, these are given by

$$\delta^i(j) = \begin{cases} j & \text{if } j < i \\ j + 1 & \text{if } j \geq i \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^j(i) = \begin{cases} i, & i \leq j \\ i - 1, & i > j. \end{cases}$$

One sees that δ^i is the unique, order-preserving, injective map that omits i , and that σ^i is the unique, surjective, order preserving map that hits i twice. Now, these two maps satisfy the following relations,

called the cosimplicial relations.

$$\delta^j \circ \delta^i = \delta^i \circ \delta^{j-1} \quad \text{for } i < j \quad (4.1)$$

$$\sigma^j \circ \sigma^i = \sigma^i \circ \sigma^{j+1} \quad \text{for } i \leq j \quad (4.2)$$

$$\sigma^j \circ \delta^i = \begin{cases} \delta^i \circ \sigma^{j-1} & \text{if } i < j \\ \text{id} & \text{if } i = j \text{ or } i = j + 1 \\ \delta^{i-1} \circ \sigma^j & \text{if } i > j + 1 \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

One can verify that every morphism of Δ can be expressed as a composition of the coface and codegeneracy maps. If X is a simplicial set, we write $d_i := X(\delta^i)$ and $s_i := X(\sigma^i)$, and call these the face and degeneracy maps respectively. Due to X being contravariant, these maps then satisfy dual relations to the cosimplicial relations in 4.1, called the *simplicial relations*. We can consequently give an alternate definition of a simplicial set as follows.

Definition 4.8. A *simplicial set* X is a collection of sets X_n for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with functions $d_i : X_n \rightarrow X_{n-1}$ and $s_i : X_n \rightarrow X_{n+1}$ for all $0 \leq i \leq n$ and for each n satisfying the following relations,

$$\begin{aligned} d_i d_j &= d_{j-1} d_i, & i < j, \\ s_i s_j &= s_{j+1} s_i, & i \leq j, \\ d_i s_j &= \begin{cases} 1, & i = j \text{ or } i = j + 1, \\ s_{j-1} d_i, & i < j, \\ s_j d_{i-1}, & i > j + 1. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Given an adaptive triadic system $(\mathbf{x}, A^{(1)}, A^{(2)})$, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we define sets X_n as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} X_0 &:= X(\{0\}) = \{1, \dots, N\}, \\ X_1 &:= X(\{0, 1\}) = \left\{ (i, j) \in [N]^2 : \left| A_{ij}^{(1)} \right| \geq \delta \right\}, \\ X_2 &:= X(\{0, 1, 2\}) = \left\{ (i, j, k) \in [N]^3 : \left| A_{ijk}^{(2)} \right| \geq \delta \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

and $X_n := X([n]) = \emptyset$ for all $n > 2$. We now see that if we attempt to define degeneracy maps for all $n \geq 0$, we run into a problem when $n = 3$, because unless X_2 is empty, which it need not necessarily be, there is no map $X_2 \rightarrow \emptyset$. Consequently, the degeneracy maps of a simplicial set cause problems and do not allow us to model a simplicial structure emerging on the hypergraph. If we therefore remove the degeneracy maps, we are instead left with an object known as a semi-simplicial set, or Δ -set.

Definition 4.9 (Semi-simplicial set or Δ -set). A *semi-simplicial set*, or Δ -set X is a collection of sets X_n for each integer $n \geq 0$ together with *face maps*

$$d_i : X_n \longrightarrow X_{n-1}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq n,$$

such that for every $n \geq 1$ they satisfy the simplicial relations

$$d_i d_j = d_{j-1} d_i, \quad i < j \leq n.$$

(Equivalently, X is a contravariant functor $X : \Delta_{\text{inj}}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$, where $\Delta_{\text{inj}} \subseteq \Delta$ is the sub-category whose morphisms are the *injective* order-preserving maps.)

Remark 4.10.

1. Compared with 4.8, a simplicial set has both face maps d_i and degeneracy maps s_i , subject to a larger family of identities. A semi-simplicial set is therefore a strictly weaker or more general object: every simplicial set becomes a Δ -set by forgetting the s_i , but not every Δ -set admits degeneracies that would upgrade it to a simplicial set.
2. For most purposes in homology or persistent-homology, one loses no essential information by dropping the degeneracies, since chain complexes only use face maps.

The following theorem shows that our hypergraph is a semi-simplicial set if it satisfies the downward facing closure condition.

Theorem 4.11. *Let $\delta > 0$, and suppose $\mathcal{H}(t)$ is a triadic, adaptive network dynamical system encoded by the weighted adjacency matrices $A^{(1)}$ and $A^{(2)}$. Define sets X_n as in (4.4).*

Define face maps by

$$\begin{aligned} d_0, d_1 : X_1 &\rightarrow X_0, \quad d_0(i, j) = j, \quad d_1(i, j) = i, \\ d_0, d_1, d_2 : X_2 &\rightarrow X_1, \quad d_0(i, j, k) = (j, k), \quad d_1(i, j, k) = (i, k), \quad d_2(i, j, k) = (i, j). \end{aligned}$$

For $n \geq 3$ put $d_i = \emptyset : \emptyset \rightarrow \emptyset$. Then the sets and face maps $\{X_n, d_i\}$ form a semi-simplicial set (at time t , and with parameter $\delta > 0$), if and only if, for all $i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$,

$$|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta \implies |A_{ij}^{(1)}|, |A_{ik}^{(1)}|, |A_{jk}^{(1)}| \geq \delta.$$

Proof: (\implies) First, suppose that the sets and face maps derived from \mathcal{H} forms a semi-simplicial set. It then follows that the face maps are well defined, so $d_i(X_2) \subseteq X_1$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$. Take $(i, j, k) \in X_2$; then $|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta$. Since $d_2(i, j, k) = (i, j) \in X_1$, we have $|A_{ij}^{(1)}| \geq \delta$, and similarly for (i, k) and (j, k) . Hence, we have that

$$|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta \implies |A_{ij}^{(1)}|, |A_{ik}^{(1)}|, |A_{jk}^{(1)}| \geq \delta.$$

(\impliedby) Conversely, suppose we have that for all $i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, we have that $|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta$ implies that $|A_{ij}^{(1)}|, |A_{ik}^{(1)}|, |A_{jk}^{(1)}|$ are all greater than or equal to δ . Then every boundary edge of a triangle in X_2 lies in X_1 , so d_0, d_1, d_2 land in X_1 . All higher X_n are empty; thus, all other face maps are the unique maps $\emptyset \rightarrow \emptyset$. The only non-vacuous simplicial identity is $d_0 d_1 = d_0 d_0$ on X_2 , and a direct check shows both sides send (i, j, k) to k . Therefore the sets and face maps $\{X_n, d_i\}$ form a semi-simplicial set. \square

Just as in symmetric and antisymmetric cases, we follow a similar procedure as before and produce the bad set where a simplicial complex structure breaks down.

Definition 4.12 (Semi-simplicial region at threshold δ). For each ordered triple (i, j, k) with i, j, k pairwise distinct, define the bad set

$$M_{ijk}^{2, \delta, \text{ss}} := \left\{ (A_{ijk}^{(2)}, A_{ij}^{(1)}, A_{ik}^{(1)}, A_{jk}^{(1)}) : |A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta \text{ and } \min(A_{ij}^{(1)}, A_{ik}^{(1)}, A_{jk}^{(1)}) < \delta \right\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^4.$$

Set

$$K_{ijk}^{\text{ss}} := \mathbb{R}^4 \setminus M_{ijk}^{2, \delta, \text{ss}},$$

and define the global semi-simplicial region by the product over all ordered triples without repetition

$$\Omega_\delta^{\text{ss}} := \prod_{(i, j, k) \in [N]_{i \neq j \neq k}^3} K_{ijk}^{\text{ss}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{4N(N-1)(N-2)} = \mathbb{R}^{4 \frac{N!}{(N-3)!}}.$$

Remark 4.13. In the semi-simplicial setting there is no relationship between $A_{ijk}^{(2)}$ and any S_3 permutation of its indices, so each ordered triple contributes an independent 4-tuple. There are $N \cdot (N-1) \cdot (N-2)$ such tuples. Consequently, the ambient space is $\mathbb{R}^{4N(N-1)(N-2)}$.

In a similar fashion to the symmetric and antisymmetric regimes from earlier, the boundary of $M_{ijk}^{2, \delta, \text{ss}}$ decomposes (up to measure-zero overlaps) into four pieces X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4 :

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &:= \{|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| = \delta, \min\{|A_{ij}^{(1)}|, |A_{ik}^{(1)}|, |A_{jk}^{(1)}|\} \leq \delta\}, \\ X_2 &:= \{|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta, |A_{ij}^{(1)}| = \delta, |A_{ik}^{(1)}| \geq \delta, |A_{jk}^{(1)}| \geq \delta\}, \\ X_3 &:= \{|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta, |A_{ik}^{(1)}| = \delta, |A_{ij}^{(1)}| \geq \delta, |A_{jk}^{(1)}| \geq \delta\}, \\ X_4 &:= \{|A_{ijk}^{(2)}| \geq \delta, |A_{jk}^{(1)}| = \delta, |A_{ij}^{(1)}| \geq \delta, |A_{ik}^{(1)}| \geq \delta\}. \end{aligned}$$

On the regular points of X_ℓ , the outward unit normal $n : \partial M_{ijk}^{2, \delta, \text{ss}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$, can be chosen as

$$n(A_{ijk}^{(2)}, A_{ij}^{(1)}, A_{ik}^{(1)}, A_{jk}^{(1)}) = \begin{cases} (-\text{sgn}(A_{ijk}^{(2)}), 0, 0, 0) & \text{on } X_1 \\ (0, \text{sgn}(A_{ij}^{(1)}), 0, 0) & \text{on } X_2 \\ (0, 0, \text{sgn}(A_{ik}^{(1)}), 0) & \text{on } X_3 \\ (0, 0, 0, \text{sgn}(A_{jk}^{(1)})) & \text{on } X_4 \end{cases}$$

At singular points $x^* \in X_p \cap X_q$ we take the outward normal cone

$$N_{\partial M}(x^*) := \left\{ \sum_{r \in I(x^*)} \lambda_r n_r(x^*) \mid \lambda_r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \right\}, \quad I(x^*) := \{\ell : x^* \in X_\ell\}.$$

Definition 4.14 (Outward-pointing at threshold δ for the mixed regime). Let $F^{(ijk)} : \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$ denote the vector field of the reduced (i, j, k) -subsystem

$$F^{(ijk)}(x) = (\dot{A}_{ijk}^{(2)}, \dot{A}_{ij}^{(1)}, \dot{A}_{ik}^{(1)}, \dot{A}_{jk}^{(1)}).$$

We say the hypergraph is *outward-pointing at threshold δ* if for every triple (i, j, k) and every $x \in \partial M_{ijk}^{2, \delta}$ we have

$$n \cdot F^{(ijk)}(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } n \in N_{\partial M}(x).$$

Equivalently, it suffices to verify the following sign-derivative inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{on } X_1 : \quad & \text{sgn}(A_{ijk}^{(2)}) \dot{A}_{ijk}^{(2)} \leq 0, \\ \text{on } X_2 : \quad & \text{sgn}(A_{ij}^{(1)}) \dot{A}_{ij}^{(1)} \geq 0, \\ \text{on } X_3 : \quad & \text{sgn}(A_{ik}^{(1)}) \dot{A}_{ik}^{(1)} \geq 0, \\ \text{on } X_4 : \quad & \text{sgn}(A_{jk}^{(1)}) \dot{A}_{jk}^{(1)} \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This allows us to state our semi-simplicial set retention theorem.

Theorem 4.15 (Retention of Semi-Simplicial Structure). *Fix a simplicial tolerance parameter $\delta > 0$. Assume $H(t)$ is an adaptive triadic network dynamical system and consider the semi-simplicial regime with no symmetry identifications. Suppose the vector field $(\mathbf{x}, A^{(1)}, A^{(2)})$ is C^1 on $\mathbb{R}^{N+N^2+N^3} \setminus \mathcal{H}_0$, (where \mathcal{H}_0 is the union of vanishing hyperplanes as in Theorem 3.9), and suppose the system is outward-pointing at every ordered triple (i, j, k) with threshold δ in the sense of Definition 4.14. If at some time $t_1 \geq 0$ the configuration $(A^{(1)}(t_1), A^{(2)}(t_1))$ lies in $\Omega_\delta^{\text{ss}}$, then*

$$(A^{(1)}(t), A^{(2)}(t)) \in \Omega_\delta^{\text{ss}} \quad \text{for all } t \geq t_1,$$

i.e. once semi-simplicial at threshold δ , the configuration remains semi-simplicial for all future time.

Proof : The argument follows identically to the symmetric and oriented cases. Consider the first-exit time from $\Omega_\delta^{\text{ss}} = \prod_{(i,j,k)} K_{ijk}^{\text{ss}}$ into some bad set $M_{ijk}^{2, \delta, \text{ss}} \subset \mathbb{R}^4$. As before, an exit at time τ would require the local vector field

$$F^{(ijk)} := (\dot{A}_{ijk}^{(2)}, \dot{A}_{ij}^{(1)}, \dot{A}_{ik}^{(1)}, \dot{A}_{jk}^{(1)})$$

to point strictly inward, i.e. $n \cdot F^{(ijk)} < 0$ for some outward normal n on $\partial M_{ijk}^{2, \delta, \text{ss}}$. The outward-pointing condition, however, precludes this, hence no exit is possible and $(A^{(1)}(t), A^{(2)}(t)) \in \Omega_\delta^{\text{ss}}$ for all $t \geq t_1$. \square

5 Conclusion and Outlook

We have developed a tensor based framework for adaptive higher-order network dynamics on directed hypergraphs, guided by a generalised Kuramoto model as a prototype. By combining the representation theory of the symmetric group with Frobenius norm order parameters, we identified three asymptotic symmetry regimes, symmetric, antisymmetric, and mixed, and showed that each yields a distinct stable combinatorial object: unoriented, oriented, or semi-simplicial. The resulting theorems provide the first rigorous conditions for simplicial complex emergence in adaptive triadic systems.

The framework generalises naturally to higher interaction orders. The following generalised adaptive Kuramoto model serves as a prototypical example:

$$\dot{\theta}_i = \omega_i + \sum_{m=1}^K \frac{1}{N^m} \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_m=1}^N A_{ii_1 \dots i_m}^{(m)} f_m(\theta_i, \theta_{i_1}, \dots, \theta_{i_m}),$$

where each interaction tensor $A^{(m)}(t)$ evolves according to a local adaptation law $\dot{A}^{(m)} = g^{(m)}(A^{(m)}, \theta)$. Each tensor can be decomposed into isotypic components under the action of S_{m+1} , and the same local boundary and drift criteria can be formulated to detect simplicial emergence at order m . Although the combinatorial complexity grows rapidly with m , the representation-theoretic machinery remains formally identical. Several directions emerge for future work:

1. **Topological analysis.** With rigorous conditions ensuring simplicial structure, one can now compute homological invariants (e.g. Betti numbers or persistent homology) for adaptive higher-order systems, tracking the creation and destruction of higher-dimensional features.
2. **Analytical limits.** Studying the dense large- N limit will link the discrete tensor formalism to continuum objects such as hypergraphons, yielding coupled mean-field equations for the evolving kernels and node densities.
3. **Applications and data.** The framework could be applied to empirical adaptive systems—such as neural ensembles, multi-agent coordination, or group contagion—where higher-order structure co-evolves with dynamics.

Code Availability

The Python code used to generate all simulations and figures in this paper is publicly available on GitHub. The code relies on standard libraries and can be found at https://github.com/fergal-murphy/simplicial_emergence_hypergraphs

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the European Union’s Horizon Europe Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions under the “BeyondTheEdge: Higher-Order Networks and Dynamics” project (Grant Agreement No. 101120085).

References

- [1] Juan A Acebrón, Luis L Bonilla, Conrad J Pérez Vicente, Félix Ritort, and Renato Spigler. “The Kuramoto model: A simple paradigm for synchronization phenomena”. In: *Reviews of Modern Physics* 77.1 (2005), pp. 137–185.
- [2] Md Sayeed Anwar, S Nirmala Jenifer, Paulsamy Muruganandam, Dibakar Ghosh, and Timoteo Carletti. “Synchronization in adaptive higher-order networks”. In: *Physical Review E* 110.6 (2024), p. 064305.
- [3] Federico Battiston, Giulia Cencetti, Iacopo Iacopini, Vito Latora, Maxime Lucas, Alice Patania, Jean-Gabriel Young, and Giovanni Petri. “Networks beyond pairwise interactions: Structure and dynamics”. In: *Physics reports* 874 (2020), pp. 1–92.
- [4] Federico Battiston and Giovanni Petri. *Higher-order systems*. Springer, 2022.
- [5] Tom Bdoelach, Jürgen Kurths, and Serhiy Yanchuk. “Tipping in an adaptive climate network model”. In: *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* 35.5 (2025).
- [6] Rico Berner, Thilo Gross, Christian Kuehn, Jürgen Kurths, and Serhiy Yanchuk. “Adaptive dynamical networks”. In: *Physics Reports* 1031 (2023), pp. 1–59.
- [7] Christian Bick, Elizabeth Gross, Heather A Harrington, and Michael T Schaub. “What are higher-order networks?” In: *SIAM Review* 65.3 (2023), pp. 686–731.
- [8] Stephen P Boyd and Lieven Vandenbergh. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.
- [9] Timoteo Carletti, Federico Battiston, Giulia Cencetti, and Duccio Fanelli. “Random walks on hypergraphs”. In: *Physical review E* 101.2 (2020), p. 022308.

- [10] Timoteo Carletti, Duccio Fanelli, and Renaud Lambiotte. “Random walks and community detection in hypergraphs”. In: *Journal of Physics: Complexity* 2.1 (2021), p. 015011.
- [11] Hayato Chiba. “A proof of the Kuramoto conjecture for a bifurcation structure of the infinite-dimensional Kuramoto model”. In: *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems* 35.3 (2015), pp. 762–834.
- [12] Gonzalo Contreras-Aso, Regino Criado, and Miguel Romance. “Beyond directed hypergraphs: heterogeneous hypergraphs and spectral centralities”. In: *Journal of Complex Networks* 12.4 (2024), cnae037.
- [13] Robin Delabays. “Dynamical equivalence between Kuramoto models with first-and higher-order coupling”. In: *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* 29.11 (2019).
- [14] Aurélien Ducournau and Alain Bretto. “Random walks in directed hypergraphs and application to semi-supervised image segmentation”. In: *Computer Vision and Image Understanding* 120 (2014), pp. 91–102.
- [15] Sangita Dutta, Prosenjit Kundu, Pitambar Khanra, Chittaranjan Hens, and Pinaki Pal. “Transition to synchronization in the adaptive Sakaguchi-Kuramoto model with higher-order interactions”. In: *Physical Review E* 110.6 (2024), p. 064317.
- [16] Sangita Dutta, Abhijit Mondal, Prosenjit Kundu, Pitambar Khanra, Pinaki Pal, and Chittaranjan Hens. “Impact of phase lag on synchronization in frustrated Kuramoto model with higher-order interactions”. In: *Physical Review E* 108.3 (2023), p. 034208.
- [17] William Fulton and Joe Harris. *Representation Theory: A First Course*. Vol. 129. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [18] Giorgio Gallo, Giustino Longo, Stefano Pallottino, and Sang Nguyen. “Directed hypergraphs and applications”. In: *Discrete applied mathematics* 42.2-3 (1993), pp. 177–201.
- [19] Z Gao, D Ghosh, HA Harrington, JG Restrepo, and D Taylor. “Dynamics on networks with higher-order interactions”. In: *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* 33.4 (2023).
- [20] Anastasia Golovin, Jan Mölter, and Christian Kuehn. “Polyadic opinion formation: the adaptive voter model on a hypergraph”. In: *Annalen der Physik* 536.7 (2024), p. 2300342.
- [21] Thilo Gross and Bernd Blasius. “Adaptive coevolutionary networks: a review”. In: *Journal of the Royal Society Interface* 5.20 (2008), pp. 259–271.
- [22] Thilo Gross, C J D D’Lima, and Bernd Blasius. “Epidemic dynamics on an adaptive network”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 96.20 (2006), p. 208701.
- [23] Seung-Yeal Ha, Se Eun Noh, and Jinyeong Park. “Synchronization of Kuramoto oscillators with adaptive couplings”. In: *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems* 15.1 (2016), pp. 162–194.
- [24] Leonhard Horstmeier and Christian Kuehn. “Adaptive voter model on simplicial complexes”. In: *Physical Review E* 101.2 (2020), p. 022305.
- [25] Iacopo Iacopini, Giovanni Petri, Alain Barrat, and Vito Latora. “Simplicial models of social contagion”. In: *Nature Communications* 10 (2019), p. 2485.
- [26] Hildeberto Jardón-Kojakhmetov and Christian Kuehn. “On fast-slow consensus networks with a dynamic weight”. In: *Journal of Nonlinear Science* 30.6 (2020), pp. 2737–2786.
- [27] Jürgen Jost and Raffaella Mulas. “Normalized Laplace operators for hypergraphs with real coefficients”. In: *Journal of Complex Networks* 9.1 (2021), cnab009.
- [28] Ana P Millán, Joaquín J Torres, and Ginestra Bianconi. “Explosive higher-order Kuramoto dynamics on simplicial complexes”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 124.21 (2020), p. 218301.
- [29] Bjarke Mønsted, Piotr Sapieżyński, Emilio Ferrara, and Sune Lehmann. “Evidence of complex contagion of information in social media: An experiment using Twitter bots”. In: *PloS one* 12.9 (2017), e0184148.
- [30] Abigail Morrison, Markus Diesmann, and Wulfram Gerstner. “Phenomenological models of synaptic plasticity based on spike timing”. In: *Biological cybernetics* 98.6 (2008), pp. 459–478.
- [31] Mehdi Moussaid, Juliane E Kämmer, Pantelis P Analytis, and Hansjörg Neth. “Social influence and the collective dynamics of opinion formation”. In: *PloS one* 8.11 (2013), e78433.
- [32] Raffaella Mulas, Christian Kuehn, Tobias Böhle, and Jürgen Jost. “Random walks and Laplacians on hypergraphs: When do they match?” In: *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 317 (2022), pp. 26–41.
- [33] Raffaella Mulas and Dong Zhang. “Spectral theory of Laplace operators on oriented hypergraphs”. In: *Discrete mathematics* 344.6 (2021), p. 112372.
- [34] Vyacheslav O Munyayev, Maxim I Bolotov, Lev A Smirnov, Grigory V Osipov, and Igor Belykh. “Cyclops states in repulsive Kuramoto networks: The role of higher-order coupling”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 130.10 (2023), p. 107201.

- [35] Giovanni Petri, Paul Expert, Federico Turkheimer, Robin Carhart-Harris, David Nutt, Peter J Hellyer, and Francesco Vaccarino. “Homological scaffolds of brain functional networks”. In: *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* 11.101 (2014), p. 20140873.
- [36] Michael W Reimann, Max Nolte, Martina Scolamiero, Katharine Turner, Rodrigo Perin, Giuseppe Chindemi, Paweł Dłotko, Ran Levi, Kathryn Hess, and Henry Markram. “Cliques of neurons bound into cavities provide a missing link between structure and function”. In: *Frontiers in computational neuroscience* 11 (2017), p. 266051.
- [37] Per Sebastian Skardal and Alex Arenas. “Higher order interactions in complex networks of phase oscillators promote abrupt synchronization switching”. In: *Communications Physics* 3.1 (2020), p. 218.
- [38] Steven H Strogatz. “From Kuramoto to Crawford: exploring the onset of synchronization in populations of coupled oscillators”. In: *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* 143.1-4 (2000), pp. 1–20.
- [39] Yan-Bo Xie, Wen-Xu Wang, and Bing-Hong Wang. “Modeling the coevolution of topology and traffic on weighted technological networks”. In: *Physical Review E—Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics* 75.2 (2007), p. 026111.
- [40] Can Xu and Per Sebastian Skardal. “Spectrum of extensive multiclusters in the Kuramoto model with higher-order interactions”. In: *Physical Review Research* 3.1 (2021), p. 013013.
- [41] Yuanzhao Zhang, Maxime Lucas, and Federico Battiston. “Higher-order interactions shape collective dynamics differently in hypergraphs and simplicial complexes”. In: *Nature communications* 14.1 (2023), p. 1605.