

FRAMING LATTICES AND FLOW POLYTOPES

MATIAS VON BELL AND CESAR CEBALLOS

ABSTRACT. Flow polytopes of acyclic oriented graphs arise naturally in combinatorial optimization, and the study of their volumes and triangulations has revealed intriguing connections across combinatorics, geometry, algebra, and representation theory.

In this work, we introduce the framing lattice associated with a framed graph, whose Hasse diagram is dual to a framed triangulation of the corresponding flow polytope. Framing lattices are remarkable in that they provide a unifying framework encompassing many classical and well-studied lattice structures, including the Boolean lattice, the Tamari lattice, and the weak order on permutations. They further subsume a broad array of examples such as all type- A Cambrian lattices, the Grassmann and grid-Tamari lattices, the $\text{alt-}\nu$ -Tamari and cross-Tamari lattices, the permutree lattices, and the τ -tilting posets of certain gentle algebras.

We show, among several foundational structural properties, that the framing lattice is a semidistributive, congruence uniform, and polygonal lattice, with its polygons consisting of squares, pentagons, and hexagons. We study its connections to noncrossing partitions via Reading's core label orders, simple representations of its join and meet irreducible elements, and several of its lattice congruences and quotients induced by a graph operation called an M-move.

Key words and phrases: Framing lattice, flow polytope, DKK triangulation, weak order, Tamari lattice, Cambrian lattice, cross-Tamari lattice.

CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Acknowledgements	6
Part 1. Framing lattices	6
1.1. Background and terminology	6
1.1.1. Flow polytopes	6
1.1.2. Framing triangulations	8
1.1.3. Some useful lemmas	11
1.2. The Framing poset	15
1.2.1. The framing poset	15
1.2.2. Some graph operations	18
1.2.3. The existence of a ccw rotation	21

1.2.4.	Characterization of the partial order	23
1.3.	Lattice properties	28
1.3.1.	The framing poset is a polygonal lattice	28
1.3.2.	Meets and joins	36
1.3.3.	Semidistributivity	40
1.3.4.	\mathcal{HH} -lattice property and congruence uniformity	42
1.4.	The framing core label order and noncrossing partitions	43
1.4.1.	The path- and extended path labeling	43
1.4.2.	Join irreducibles and meet irreducibles	47
1.4.3.	The core label order of a congruence uniforme lattice	51
1.4.4.	The framing core label order	52
1.5.	Lattice congruences and quotients	55
1.5.1.	An equivalence relation via M -moves	55
1.5.2.	Lattice congruences	57
1.5.3.	Lattice quotients	59
1.5.4.	A distributive quotient	60
1.6.	Open questions and conjectures	62
Part 2.	The zoo of framing lattices	65
2.1.	The Boolean lattice	65
2.2.	Cambrian lattices of type A	65
2.3.	The lattice of multipermutations	66
2.4.	The cross-Tamari lattice	67
2.4.1.	Cross-shaped grids.	68
2.4.2.	The cross-Tamari lattice	68
2.4.3.	The cross-Tamari lattice as a framing lattice	70
2.5.	Further Species	73
References		73

INTRODUCTION

Flow polytopes model the space of flows in directed acyclic graphs. They form an important family of polytopes in combinatorial optimization, with connections to several other areas, including representation theory [1], toric geometry [22], diagonal harmonics [26], and gentle algebras [6, 9]. Flow polytopes include many interesting renowned examples, such as Tesler polytopes [26], Gelfand–Tsetlin polytopes [23], certain order polytopes and faces of the alternating sign matrix polytope [25], the Chan–Robbins–Yuen polytope [16], and the Pitman–Stanley polytope [33].

The flow polytopes we consider are limited to those with unit flows, that is, those with an inflow of size one in the unique source, an outflow of size one at the unique sink, and a netflow zero at each other vertex. An important class of triangulations of flow polytopes with unit flow are its framing triangulations (also called DKK triangulations) due to Danilov–Karzanov–Koshevoy [17]. These triangulations arise from assigning a framing F to the underlying directed acyclic graph G , which is a linear order on incoming and outgoing edges at each vertex. A directed acyclic graph G with a framing F is denoted (G, F) . Hasse diagrams of various combinatorially interesting lattices have appeared as dual graphs of framing triangulations of flow polytopes in the recent literature [5, 6, 21]. These include the ν -Tamari lattices of Préville–Ratelle and Viennot [34], principal order ideals in Young’s lattice, the s -weak order of Ceballos and Pons [15], and τ -tilting posets of certain gentle algebras [6]. In each of these cases, the lattice structure on the dual graph was inherited from a previously known lattice, and no unifying partial order on the facets of the triangulation was given. It is thus natural to wonder if the lattice structures arise directly from the unifying objects, namely, the underlying framed graphs that determine the framing triangulations.

In this paper, we propose a unified framework for studying the previously discussed lattice structures, as well as many other notable lattices, within the context of framing lattice theory. Quite remarkably, it turns out that the facets in a framing triangulation of a flow polytope can always be partially ordered to form a lattice, with the lattice structure arising from the underlying framed graph. We call such lattices *framing lattices*, as each framing of a directed acyclic graph induces such a framing lattice on the corresponding framing triangulation. We note that independent progress to answer the same question was made by Berggren and Serhiyenko [9, Corollary 4.9], who proved the lattice property in the special case that the exceptional paths in the framed graph are incident to a source or a sink, which they call rooted framed graphs. These rooted framed graphs generalize the amply framed graphs of [6], but do not generally include the framed graphs with more than two edges (or paths) between two inner vertices, such as the second framed graph in Figure 1. To simplify our exposition, we assume that a directed acyclic graph G has a unique source and sink. While this assumption can be omitted without affecting our results, which are combinatorial and lattice theoretic, we keep it to retain the direct connection to triangulated flow polytopes.

This article serves as the full version of our extended abstract [3], and it is split into two parts. In Part I, we develop the theory of framing lattices in detail, while Part II is reserved for showcasing some interesting examples of framing lattices; see Figures 1 and 2. In part I, we define the framing poset, characterize the partial order (Theorem 1.2.15), and develop various useful lemmas for proving our main results. Combining Theorem 1.3.4

(lattice property and polygonality), Theorem 1.3.11 (semidistributivity), and Theorem 1.3.14 (\mathcal{HH} -lattice property), we have the following theorem.

Theorem A. *Given a framed graph (G, F) , the framing poset $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ is an \mathcal{HH} -lattice. Hence it is semidistributive, congruence uniform, and polygonal. Furthermore, its polygons consist only of squares, pentagons or hexagons.*

The proofs given are purely combinatorial. We also show how to algorithmically obtain the meet and join of a pair of elements (Theorem 1.3.8), and provide simple descriptions for the meet irreducible and join irreducible elements (Theorem 1.4.4).




FIGURE 1. Four framed graphs and the Hasse diagrams of their framing lattices. The first is the Boolean lattice \mathcal{B}_3 . The second is the lattice of multipermutations of $1^2 2^2 3$. The third is the ε -cambrian lattice with $\varepsilon = (-, -, +, -)$. The fourth is a cross-Tamari lattice of the cross-shaped grid shown below the right-most graph.

Next, we introduce the core label order of a framing lattice, which serves as the natural analog of the poset of noncrossing partitions for framing lattices.

Theorem B. *The core label order of the framing lattice $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ is isomorphic to the poset of ccw-core label sets $\psi_{\mathcal{L}}^{\text{ccw}}(x)$ ordered by inclusion.*

We also consider a certain family of lattice congruences of framing lattices. From a framed graph (G, F) , one obtains a modified graph $M(G, e)$ by a certain edge cutting operation known as an M-move on an inner edge e (an edge not incident to the source or sink of G). We show that there is a split map Φ_e taking maximal cliques in G to those in $M(G, e)$, whose fibers define a lattice congruence on $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ (Corollary 1.5.8). The framing lattice of the resulting graph $M(G, e)$ (with a framing F_e naturally inherited from F) is isomorphic to a quotient of $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ (Corollary 1.5.10). Furthermore, we show that if $M(G)$ denotes the graph obtained from (G, F) by repeated M-moves until no more can be done, then $\mathcal{L}_{M(G)}$ is a distributive lattice independent of the framing F (Theorem 1.5.12). This is summarized in the following theorem.

Theorem C. *For a framed graph (G, F) , and any inner edge e of G , we have $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}/\alpha(e) \equiv \mathcal{L}_{M(G,e),F_e}$. Furthermore, if $M(G)$ is the graph obtained from G by repeatedly performing M-moves until no more are possible, the lattice $\mathcal{L}_{M(G)}$ is a distributive lattice quotient of $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ that is independent of the choice of F .*




FIGURE 2. Some popular exhibitions at the zoo of framing lattices.

In Part II of the article, we give a tour of the zoo of framing lattices, highlighting various interesting species. At the time of writing, we know of the following species of framing lattices:

- the Tamari lattice (Example 1.2.6);
- ν -Tamari lattices of Préville-Ratelle and Viennot [34];
- alt ν -Tamari lattices of Ceballos and Chenevière [11];
- type A Cambrian lattices of Reading [35];
- $(\varepsilon, I, \overline{J})$ -cambrian lattices (Remark 2.2.2) of Pilaud [29], which generalize the type A Cambrian lattices;
- the Dyck lattice (Example 1.2.7);
- principal order ideals in Young's lattice (also known as the ν -Dyck lattice [11] or Stanley's distributive lattice). This is a direct consequence of [5];
- cross-Tamari lattices (Theorem 2.4.2) introduced in Section 2.4, which generalize the lattice families above;
- the Boolean lattice (Section 2.1.1);
- the weak order on permutations (Example 1.2.4);
- the s -weak order of Ceballos and Pons, which is a direct consequence of [21];
- the lattice of multipermutations (Theorem 2.3.1);
- permutree lattices of Pilaud and Pons [30], which unify the weak order and the Boolean, Tamari, and Cambrian lattices. This is a direct consequence of the connection to flow polytopes given by Tamayo [42].
- τ -tilting posets for certain gentle algebras, which follows directly from [6];
- the Grassmann-Tamari order of Santos-Stump-Welker [40].
- the Grid-Tamari lattices of McConville [24], which generalize the Grassman-Tamari order;

Thus, our work serves to unify these lattices under one combinatorial framework, namely, as lattices on maximal cliques of coherent routes in framed graphs. In this sense, the lattices are independent from the geometry of flow polytopes, however this geometric approach brings up many new insights. In addition to the known examples listed above, we expect more interesting species to emerge.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors were partially supported by the Austrian Science Fund FWF, grants P 33278 and I 5788. We are especially grateful for discussions with Jonah Berggren, Clément Chenevière, Sergio Fernandez de soto, Rafael Gozález D'León, Eva Philippe, Germain Poullot, Daniel Tamayo Jiménez, and Martha Yip.

Part 1. Framing lattices

In this first part, we present the seminal theory of framing lattices. We start with some preliminary background on flow polytopes and framing triangulation (Section 1.1), followed by the introduction of the framing poset (Section 1.2) and the proof of several lattice properties, including polygonality, semidistributivity and congruence uniformity (Section 1.3). We also propose a framing generalization of the poset of noncrossing partitions via the core label order (Section 1.4), and study certain lattice quotients of the framing lattice (Section 1.5).

1.1. BACKGROUND AND TERMINOLOGY

In this section we recall some preliminaries about flow polytopes and their triangulations, and present some useful lemmas that will be used throughout the paper. We refer to [2, 17, 25] for further details and background on flow polytopes.

1.1.1. Flow polytopes. Let G be a directed acyclic graph on vertex set $V(G) = [n]$ and edge multiset $E(G)$ such that all edges are directed from smaller vertices to larger vertices and G has a unique source $s = 1$ and sink $t = n$. We call such a graph G a **flow graph**. A path from the source to the sink is said to be a **route**.

Given a flow graph G with vertex set $[n]$, a **unit flow** on G is a tuple $(x_e)_{e \in E(G)} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{|E(G)|}$ satisfying

$$\sum_{e \in \text{Out}(j)} x_e - \sum_{e \in \text{In}(j)} x_e = u_j,$$

where $u_1 = 1$, $u_n = -1$, and $u_j = 0$ for $1 < j < n$. The **flow polytope** of G is the set \mathcal{F}_G of unit flows on G . The dimension of a flow polytope \mathcal{F}_G is given by the formula $|E(G)| - |V(G)| + 1$. The vertices of \mathcal{F}_G can be characterized as the unit flows on G which have value one on the edges of a route and value zero on the remaining edges. Thus \mathcal{F}_G can be described as the convex hull of the indicator vectors of the routes of G .

Example 1.1.1 (The oruga graph and the cube). Let $G_n = \text{oru}(n)$ be the **oruga graph** on the vertex set $[n+1]$ containing two edges between i and $i+1$ for $i \in [n]$. These two edges are oriented from smallest vertex to largest and we label them by e_{2i-1} and e_{2i} . Some

examples of the oruga graph are illustrated on the top of Figure 3. The name “oruga” was given in [21], meaning caterpillar in Spanish.




FIGURE 3. Some examples of the oruga graph and their flow polytopes.

The flow polytope \mathcal{F}_{G_n} is the set of points $(x_1, \dots, x_{2n}) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{2n}$ (that is $x_i \geq 0$ for all i) such that $x_{2i-1} + x_{2i} = 1$ for every $i \in [n]$. Combinatorially, this flow polytope is a cube of dimension n in \mathbb{R}^{2n} . Its vertices are of the form

$$e_{i_1} + \dots + e_{i_n},$$

where $e_i \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ denote the standard basis vectors and i_k has two possibilities, $i_k = 2k - 1$ or $i_k = 2k$, for each value $k \in [n]$. These are precisely the indicator vectors of the routes of G_n consisting of the edges e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_n} .

For instance, the flow polytope \mathcal{F}_{G_1} of the oruga graph for $n = 1$ is the convex hull

$$\mathcal{F}_{G_1} = \text{conv}\{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}.$$

It is a one dimensional segment in \mathbb{R}^2 , and is illustrated on the bottom left of Figure 3. In general, \mathcal{F}_{G_n} is the product of n segments, an n -dimensional cube. For $n = 2$ we get a square

$$\mathcal{F}_{G_2} = \text{conv}\{(1, 0, 1, 0), (1, 0, 0, 1), (0, 1, 1, 0), (0, 1, 0, 1)\}.$$

For $n = 3$ we get a cube

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{G_3} = \text{conv}\{ & (1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0), (1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1), \\ & (1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0), (1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1), \\ & (0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1), \\ & (0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0), (0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

These flow polytopes are also illustrated on the bottom of Figure 3, where we omit parentheses and commas for the coordinates of the vertices for simplicity.

1.1.2. Framing triangulations. A substantial amount of research on flow polytopes in the literature has been focused on their volumes and triangulations. A remarkable family of known triangulations are the framing triangulations (also called DKK triangulations), which are induced by a framing on the underlying graph. We briefly recall these triangulations in this section and refer to [17] for more details.

Let G be a flow graph as above. For each vertex v , let $\text{In}(v)$ and $\text{Out}(v)$ respectively denote the (possibly empty) sets of incoming and outgoing edges at v . A **framing** at the vertex v is a pair of linear orders $(\leq_{\text{In}(v)}, \leq_{\text{Out}(v)})$ on the incoming and outgoing edges at v . A **framed graph**, denoted (G, F) , is a flow graph with a framing F at every vertex. Two different framings of the $\text{oru}(2)$ graph are shown in Figure 4, where the labels indicate the order of the incoming and outgoing edges at every vertex.




FIGURE 4. Two framings of the $G_2 = \text{oru}(2)$ graph and the framing triangulations of the corresponding flow polytope \mathcal{F}_{G_2} .

For a path P containing a vertex v , let Pv (resp. vP) denote the maximal subpath of P ending (resp. beginning) at v . Furthermore, let $\mathcal{I}(v)$ (resp. $\mathcal{O}(v)$) denote the set of paths in G ending (resp. beginning) at v . Our notation \mathcal{I} stands for Incoming and \mathcal{O} for Outgoing. We consider $\mathcal{I}(s)$ as containing only the path of length 0 at vertex s , and $\mathcal{O}(t)$ as containing only the path of length 0 at vertex t . We define the **relations** $\leq_{\mathcal{I}(v)}$ and $\leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)}$ on $\mathcal{I}(v)$ and $\mathcal{O}(v)$ as follows.

Given paths $Pv, Qv \in \mathcal{I}(v)$, let $w \leq v$ be the first vertex after which Pv and Qv coincide. If w is the first vertex of Pv or Qv , we say that $Pv =_{\mathcal{I}(v)} Qv$. Otherwise let e_P be the edge of P entering w and let e_Q be the edge of Q entering w . Then $Pv <_{\mathcal{I}(v)} Qv$ if and only if $e_P <_{\text{In}(w)} e_Q$. Similarly for $vP, vQ \in \mathcal{O}(v)$, let $w' \geq v$ be the last vertex before which vP and vQ coincide. If w' is the largest vertex of vP or vQ , then $vP =_{\mathcal{O}(v)} vQ$. Otherwise let e'_P be the edge of P leaving w' and let e'_Q be the edge of Q leaving w' . Then $vP <_{\mathcal{O}(v)} vQ$ if and only if $e'_P <_{\text{Out}(w')} e'_Q$.

Note that if Rv is a subpath of Pv , then $Rv =_{\mathcal{I}(v)} Pv$. But, if they do not start at the same vertex, then they are different paths. Therefore, the relation $\leq_{\mathcal{I}(v)}$ is not even a partial order. For example, in Figure 5 we have $Pv =_{\mathcal{I}(v)} Rv =_{\mathcal{I}(v)} Qv$, but $Pv <_{\mathcal{I}(v)} Qv$. However, if we restrict $\leq_{\mathcal{I}(v)}$ (resp. $\leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)}$) to the set of paths starting at the source s (resp. v) and ending at v (resp. the sink t), then we get a linear order.




FIGURE 5. The relation $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)}$ is a partial order on incoming paths to v only if they all begin at the source.

Lemma 1.1.2. *The following hold:*

- (1) *The restriction of $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)}$ to the set of paths starting at the source s and ending at v is a linear order.*
- (2) *The restriction of $\leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)}$ to the set of paths starting at v and ending at the sink t is a linear order.*

Proof. For the proof of (1), it is straight forward to check that the restriction of $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)}$ to the set of paths starting at the source s and ending at v is reflexive, transitive and antisymmetric, which implies that the relation is a partial order. The transitivity is illustrated in Figure 6. Furthermore, since every pair of paths Pv and Qv starting at the source s are comparable in the order $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)}$, we deduce that $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)}$ is a linear order. A similar argument shows part (2). \square



FIGURE 6. Two cases in the proof of the transitivity of $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)}$ in Lemma 1.1.2.

We say that a vertex v of a path P is an *inner vertex* if v is not the first or last vertex of the path. If v is an inner vertex of paths P and Q , we say that P and Q are *incoherent at v* if $Pv <_{\mathcal{J}(v)} Qv$ and $vQ <_{\mathcal{O}(v)} vP$, or if $Qv <_{\mathcal{J}(v)} Pv$ and $vP <_{\mathcal{O}(v)} vQ$, and we say that they are *coherent at v* otherwise. Paths P and Q are then said to be *coherent* if they are coherent at each common inner vertex and they are *incoherent* otherwise. A set of pairwise coherent routes is called a *clique*. We denote by \mathcal{C} the *collection of maximal cliques*. Examples of these concepts are illustrated in Figure 7.

Given a framed graph (G, F) , the convex hull of the indicator vectors of the routes in a maximal clique induced by the framing form a simplex inside the flow polytope \mathcal{F}_G . In the example in Figure 7, there are exactly two maximal cliques; they correspond to the two triangles of the triangulation of \mathcal{F}_{G_2} on the left of Figure 4. Changing the framing changes the coherence relation and therefore the triangles. The right of Figure 4 shows the two triangles corresponding to the maximal cliques induced by the other shown framing of the graph.

The motivation for the definition of a framed graph (G, F) and the induced coherent relation in the set of routes of G , is that the collection of simplices associated to cliques




FIGURE 7. Examples of coherent, incoherent routes, and a maximal clique for the given framing of the $\text{oru}(2)$ graph.

give a nice triangulation of the flow polytope \mathcal{F}_G . This is stated in the following proposition, where Δ_C denotes the convex hull of the indicator vectors of the routes in a maximal clique C .

Proposition 1.1.3 (Danilov et al. [17]). *Let (G, F) be a framed graph. The set $\{\Delta_C \mid C \in \mathcal{C}\}$ is the set of the top-dimensional simplices in a regular unimodular triangulation of \mathcal{F}_G . \square*

Corollary 1.1.4. *Every codimension 1 clique is contained in at most two maximal cliques. In particular, if $C, C' = C \setminus R \cup R'$, and $C'' = C \setminus R \cup R''$ are maximal cliques, then $C' = C''$ and $R' = R''$. \square*

Recall that the **dual graph** of a triangulation is the graph whose vertices are the facets of the triangulation, with edges between facets sharing a codimension 1 face. The following corollary then follows from the previous corollary.

Corollary 1.1.5. *The dual graph of a framing triangulation of \mathcal{F}_G is triangle-free. \square*

A triangulation of \mathcal{F}_G whose facets are the maximal cliques of (G, F) for some framing F is called a **framing triangulation of \mathcal{F}_G** . The routes appearing in every maximal clique of (G, F) are called the **exceptional routes**, and we use \mathcal{E} to denote the set of exceptional routes. The exceptional routes of (G, F) correspond to cone points in the framing triangulation, i.e. points contained in every facet of the triangulation.

From now on, unless otherwise specified, we draw the framed graphs (G, F) in such a way that the order of the framing of the incoming and outgoing edges at every vertex is **increasing from top to bottom**; for example, as in Figure 4 (left) and not as in Figure 4 (right)).

This has two advantages. First, we do not need to include the labels of a framing for the incoming and outgoing edges to the figure because they are just ordered from top to bottom. Second, the coherence relation becomes very intuitive because two paths are coherent at a vertex v if they “**do not cross**” at v , as illustrated in Figure 8.

This convention motivates the following definition. We say that a route R is **clockwise (cw)** from R' at v if $Rv <_{\mathcal{J}(v)} R'v$ and $vR' <_{\mathcal{O}(v)} vR$. We use the **notation** $R <_v^{\text{cw}} R'$ when R is cw from R' at v , see an illustration in Figure 8 (right). In particular, R and R' are incoherent at v if and only if $R <_v^{\text{cw}} R'$ or $R' <_v^{\text{cw}} R$.

Lemma 1.1.6. *The relation $<_v^{\text{cw}}$ is transitive. That is, if $R <_v^{\text{cw}} R'$ and $R' <_v^{\text{cw}} R''$, then $R <_v^{\text{cw}} R''$.*

Example 1.1.7 (A framing triangulation of the oruga graph). Let $G_n = \text{oru}(n)$ be the oruga graph from Example 1.1.1, and let F be the framing that orders the incoming and outgoing



FIGURE 8. The coherent relation coincides with non-crossing relation when the framing of incoming and outgoing edges increases from top to bottom at every vertex. If two routes R, R' are incoherent at v as shown on the right, we say that R is clockwise (cw) from R' at v .

edges of G_n from top to bottom. The maximal cliques of (G, F) are in correspondence with permutations of $[n]$ as follows.

Given a permutation $[i_1, \dots, i_n]$ of $[n]$, construct a maximal clique consisting of $n + 1$ routes R_0, \dots, R_n , where R_k is the route containing the top edges e_{2i_j-1} for $1 \leq j \leq k$, and the bottom edges e_{2i_j} for $k < j \leq n$. That is, R_k is the route with top edges at positions i_1, \dots, i_k and bottom edges at the positions i_{k+1}, \dots, i_n . An example is illustrated in Figure 9; see Figure 16 for a bigger example.




FIGURE 9. Maximal cliques of the $\text{oru}(n)$ graph are in bijection with permutations of $[n]$.

It is not hard to see that the resulting set of routes is a maximal clique, and that all the maximal cliques are of this form. Therefore, the maximal simplices of the framing triangulation of \mathcal{F}_{G_n} induced by the framing F are naturally labeled by permutations of $[n]$. Moreover, two facets are adjacent if and only if the corresponding permutations can be obtained from each other by swapping two consecutive numbers. Thus, the dual graph of this framing triangulation of \mathcal{F}_{G_n} is the Hasse diagram of the classical weak order of permutations of $[n]$.

1.1.3. Some useful lemmas. The purpose of this paper is to introduce and study a partial order structure whose Hasse diagram is the dual graph of a framing triangulation of a flow polytope, for any flow graph and any framing on it. For this, we present a toolkit of useful lemmas in this section that will be used throughout the paper.

Lemma 1.1.8 (Extending coherent paths). *If a path P is coherent with all the routes in a clique C , then P can be extended to a route that is coherent with all the routes in C . In particular, if C is a maximal clique, then every edge is contained in some route of C .*

Proof. If P is a route, then we are done, so we assume that either P does not begin at s or P does not end at t . We consider first the latter case. Let v be the largest vertex of P and

suppose that $v \neq t$. Let e be an edge $(v, w) \in E(G)$ where $v < w$. Consider $P \cup \{e\}$. If $P \cup \{e\}$ is coherent with all routes in C , then we extend P by append e to it. If $P \cup \{e\}$ is incoherent with a route R in C , they must be incoherent at v . If $Pv <_{\mathcal{J}(v)} Rv$ and $vR <_{\mathcal{O}(v)} vP$ we can assume that Rv is maximal with respect to $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)}$ and then assume that vR is minimal with respect to $\leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)}$. Now if w' is the first vertex of R after v , then by construction, appending the edge $e' = (v, w')$ to P results in a path coherent with all routes in C . Similarly, if $Rv <_{\mathcal{J}(v)} Pv$ and $vP <_{\mathcal{O}(v)} vR$, we take R to be minimal with respect to $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)}$ and then assume that vR is maximal with respect to $\leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)}$. In this case, we again extend P by the edge $e' = (v, w')$ where w' is the first vertex of R after v .

In the same way, if the first vertex of P is not s , then we can extend it by an edge towards the source. The argument can be repeated until P has been extended to a route. \square

Two facets in a framing triangulation of \mathcal{F}_G are adjacent if and only if their corresponding maximal cliques differ by a single pair of routes. The following lemma gives a necessary condition on such a pair of routes.

Lemma 1.1.9. *Let $C_1 \neq C_2$ be two adjacent maximal cliques satisfying $C_2 = (C_1 \setminus R_1) \cup R_2$, then the following hold.*

- (i) *The routes R_1 and R_2 incoherent at some vertex v . Furthermore, they are incoherent at every vertex in the maximal path P_v in $R_1 \cap R_2$ that contains v .*
- (ii) *The routes R_1vR_2 and R_2vR_1 are contained in $C_1 \cap C_2$.*
- (iii) *The routes R_1 and R_2 are incoherent only on the vertices of P_v .*



FIGURE 10. The routes R_1 , R_2 , R_1vR_2 , and R_2vR_1 of Lemma 1.1.9.

Proof. We first prove (i). If the routes R_1 and R_2 are coherent, then since R_2 is coherent with all the routes in $C_1 \cap C_2$, we have that $C_1 \cup R_2$ is a clique larger than C_1 . However, this contradicts the maximality of C_1 , and so R_1 and R_2 must be incoherent at some v . It follows from the definition of incoherent routes that R_1 and R_2 are also incoherent at every vertex of P_v . We assume without loss of generality that $R_1 <_v^{cw} R_2$ as shown in Figure 10.

Next, we prove (ii). First we prove that $R_1vR_2 \in C_1 \cap C_2$. Since R_1vR_2 is different to R_1 and R_2 , by Corollary 1.1.4, it is sufficient to show that R_1vR_2 is coherent with every route in $C_1 \cap C_2$. Suppose toward a contradiction that there is a route $R \in C_1 \cap C_2$ that is incoherent with R_1vR_2 at some x . Let P_x be the maximal path in $R_1vR_2 \cap R$ containing x . We consider three cases (see Figure 11): (1) $\min(P_x) \leq \max(P_x) < v$, (2) $\min(P_x) \leq v \leq \max(P_x)$, and (3) $v < \min(P_x) \leq \max(P_x)$. In case (1), R is incoherent with R_1 . In case (3), R is incoherent with R_2 . In case (2), we consider two sub-cases: (2a) if $R_1vR_2 <_x^{cw} R$, then R is incoherent with R_1 , and (2b) if $R <_x^{cw} R_1vR_2$, then R is incoherent with R_2 . However, R cannot be incoherent with R_1 or R_2 since $R \in C_1$ and $R \in C_2$. The proof for R_2vR_1 is similar, and so (ii) follows.




FIGURE 11. Examples of the three cases in the proof of Lemma 1.1.9.

For (iii), we let $y \in R_1 \cap R_2$ such that $y \notin P_v$. Note that R_1 and R_2 must be coherent at y , as otherwise $R_1 v R_2$ and $R_2 v R_1$ would be incoherent at y , which is not possible by (ii). Hence we have (iii). \square


The following proposition characterizes precisely the condition under which a route in a maximal clique can be replaced by another route to form an adjacent maximal clique in a framing triangulation.

Definition 1.1.10. Let $R_1 <_v^{\text{cw}} R_2$ be incoherent routes at a vertex v . We say that a route R is *weakly in between R_1 and R_2 at v* if

- (i) $R_1 v \leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)} R v \leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)} R_2 v$ and $v R_2 \leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)} v R \leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)} v R_1$.


Furthermore, R is *in between R_1 and R_2 at v* if one of the following conditions holds.

- (i) $R_1 v <_{\mathcal{J}(v)} R v <_{\mathcal{J}(v)} R_2 v$ and $v R_2 \leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)} v R \leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)} v R_1$; or
- (ii) $R_1 v \leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)} R v \leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)} R_2 v$ and $v R_2 <_{\mathcal{O}(v)} v R <_{\mathcal{O}(v)} v R_1$.

FIGURE 12. The route R is in between R_1 and R_2 at v . The same is true for routes $R v R_1$, $R v R_2$, $R_1 v R$, and $R_2 v R$.

Proposition 1.1.11. Let R_1 be a route in a maximal clique C_1 , and let R_2 be a route such that $R_1 <_v^{\text{cw}} R_2$ for some v . Then $C_2 = (C_1 \setminus R_1) \cup R_2$ is a maximal clique if and only if the following statements hold.

- (i) (The “Top-Bottom Property”) The routes $\text{Top}(R_1, R_2) := R_1 v R_2$ and $\text{Bot}(R_1, R_2) := R_2 v R_1$ are contained in $C_1 \cap C_2$.
- (ii) (The “In Between Property”) No route in C_1 is in between R_1 and R_2 at v .

FIGURE 13. Routes R_1 , R_2 , $\text{Top}(R_1, R_2)$, and $\text{Bot}(R_1, R_2)$ in Proposition 1.1.11.

Proof. First, we show that properties (i) and (ii) imply that $C_2 = (C_1 \setminus R_1) \cup R_2$ is a maximal clique. We proceed by contradiction. Suppose that there is a route $R \in C_1 \cap C_2$ that is incoherent with R_2 at some x . Let P_x be the maximal path in $R \cap R_2$ containing x . Similarly, as in the proof of the previous lemma, we consider three cases: (1) $\min(P_x) \leq \max(P_x) < v$, (2) $\min(P_x) \leq v \leq \max(P_x)$, and (3) $v < \min(P_x) \leq \max(P_x)$. In case (1), R is incoherent with $\text{Bot}(R_1, R_2)$. In case (3), R is incoherent with $\text{Top}(R_1, R_2)$. In case (2), note that if $R_1 <_v^{\text{cw}} R_2 <_v^{\text{cw}} R$ then R would be incoherent with R_1 , which is not possible. Therefore we can assume that $R <_v^{\text{cw}} R_2$, that is

$$Rv <_{\mathcal{J}(v)} R_2v \text{ and } vR_2 <_{\mathcal{O}(v)} vR.$$

We consider three sub-cases (see Figure 14):

$$(2a) \quad Rv <_{\mathcal{J}(v)} R_1v$$

$$(2b) \quad vR_1 <_{\mathcal{O}(v)} vR$$

$$(2c) \quad R_1v \leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)} Rv <_{\mathcal{J}(v)} R_2v \text{ and } vR_2 <_{\mathcal{O}(v)} vR \leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)} vR_1$$

In case (2a), R is incoherent with $\text{Top}(R_1, R_2)$. In case (2b), R is incoherent with $\text{Bot}(R_1, R_2)$. In case (2c), one of the two weak inequalities must be strict (otherwise $R = R_1$), and therefore R would be a route in between R_1 and R_2 , which is not possible by assumption of the In Between Property (ii). In either case we have a contradiction, since R can not be incoherent with $\text{Top}(R_1, R_2)$ or $\text{Bot}(R_1, R_2)$ because of the Top-Bottom Property (i). This finishes the proof of the backward direction.




FIGURE 14. Examples of the cases (2a), (2b) and (2c) in the proof of Proposition 1.1.11.

For the proof of the other direction assume that $C_2 = (C_1 \setminus R_1) \cup R_2$ is a maximal clique. By Lemma 1.1.9 (ii), the Top-Bottom Property (i) in this lemma holds. For part (ii), consider a route R in between R_1 and R_2 at v . Then, R is necessarily incoherent with either R_1 or R_2 at v . But every route in $C_1 \cap C_2$ is coherent with R_1 and R_2 , and so $R \notin C_1 \cap C_2$. Since $R \neq R_1$, we have that $R \notin C_1$. This proves the In Between Property (ii). \square

Remark 1.1.12. Under the conditions of Proposition 1.1.11, no route in C_1 is between R_1 and R_2 . However, we remark that this does not necessarily holds for routes not in C_1 . Figure 15 shows two maximal cliques C_1 and C_2 satisfying $C_2 = (C_1 \setminus R_1) \cup R_2$ with $R_1 <_v^{\text{cw}} R_2$, and a route $R' \notin C_1$ in between R_1 and R_2 . In this case, the route $R' \in C_1$ is incoherent with R' .




FIGURE 15. Example of a route $R' \notin C_1$ that is in between the routes R_1 and R_2 involved in a rotation.

1.2. THE FRAMING POSET

In this section, we introduce the main object of study of this paper, the framing poset. This poset is indexed by a framed graph (G, F) , and its Hasse diagram is dual to the corresponding framing triangulation.

1.2.1. The framing poset. Let $C \neq C'$ be two maximal cliques in (G, F) such that $C' = (C \setminus R) \cup R'$. Then R and R' are incoherent at some vertex v . If $R <_v^{\text{cw}} R'$, then we say that R' is obtained from R by a ccw rotation at v . In this case we also say that C' is obtained from C by a ccw rotation. Define the cover relation $C \prec_{\text{rot}}^{\text{ccw}} C'$ if C' is obtainable from C by a ccw rotation. The **framing poset** $\mathcal{L}_{G,F} = (\mathcal{C}, \leq_{\text{rot}}^{\text{ccw}})$ is the poset of ccw rotations of maximal cliques induced by the transitive closure of the cover relation $\prec_{\text{rot}}^{\text{ccw}}$. We simply write $C \leq C'$ when the partial order is clear from context. Reflexivity and transitivity are immediate, and antisymmetry follows from the next lemma.

Lemma 1.2.1. *Let C and C' be maximal cliques such that $C \leq C'$ and let R be a route in C . If R^* is a route in (G, F) satisfying $R^* <_v^{\text{cw}} R$ for some v , then there exists a route $R' \in C'$ such that $R^* <_w^{\text{cw}} R'$ at some node w in the maximal path in $R \cap R^*$ containing v .*

Proof. Let P be the maximal path in $R \cap R^*$ containing v . Let e be the incoming edge of R to P and let f be the outgoing edge of P to R . Let R_2 be a ccw rotation of a route R_1 containing ePf . If $R_1 <_w^{\text{cw}} R_2$ for some $w \notin P$, then $\text{Top}(R_1, R_2)$ or $\text{Bot}(R_1, R_2)$ contains ePf . If $R_1 <_w^{\text{cw}} R_2$ for some $w \in P$, then let P_w be the maximal path in $R_1 \cap R_2$ containing w , and let $w_1 = \min P_w$ and $w_2 = \max P_w$. We consider three cases: (1) If

$w_1 \in P$, then $R^* <_{w_1}^{cw} R_1 <_{w_1}^{cw} R_2$. (2) If $w_2 \in P$, then $R^* <_{w_2}^{cw} R_1 <_{w_2}^{cw} R_2$. (3) If $w_1 \notin P$ and $w_2 \notin P$, then ePf is contained in P_w , and so both $\text{Top}(R_1, R_2)$ and $\text{Bot}(R_1, R_2)$ contain ePf . It follows that any maximal clique of routes obtained from C by ccw rotations must contain a route R' for which $R^* <_w^{cw} R'$ for some node $w \in P$. \square

Corollary 1.2.2. *If $C \leq C'$ and $C' \leq C$, then $C = C'$.*

Proof. Suppose toward a contradiction that $C \neq C'$. Then, there are routes $R \in C$ and $R' \in C'$ such that $R' <_v^{cw} R$ or $R <_v^{cw} R'$ at some v . If $R' <_v^{cw} R$, then since $C \leq C'$ it follows by Lemma 1.2.1 that there is a route $R'' \in C'$ such that $R' <_w^{cw} R''$ at some node w . However, then R' and R'' are incoherent routes in C' , which is a contradiction. If $R <_v^{cw} R'$, then we similarly reach a contradiction. \square

Corollary 1.2.3. $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ is a poset. \square

Example 1.2.4 (The weak order). Let $G_n = \text{oru}(n)$ from Example 1.1.1 and let F be the framing of G_n in Example 1.1.7. The poset $\mathcal{L}_{G_n,F}$ is the weak order on permutations of length n . The case when $n = 3$ is shown in Figure 16.





FIGURE 16. The weak order as a framing lattice.

Example 1.2.5. Let G be the graph $\text{oru}(3)$ but with the added edge $(1, 3)$. Let the framing F be induced by the drawing in Figure 17. The poset $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ is shown on the right of Figure 17

The length of an edge (i, j) is $|j - i|$. For a graph G define the *length framing* as the framing induced by ordering the incoming and outgoing edges at each vertex in increasing order of length.

Example 1.2.6 (The Tamari lattice). The *caracol graph* $\text{car}(n)$ is the path graph on n vertices with the added edges $(1, i)$ for $2 < i \leq n - 1$ and (j, n) for $2 \leq j < n - 1$. Let F be

FIGURE 17. A framed graph (G, F) and its framing poset.

the length framing of $\text{car}(n)$, as drawn on the left of Figure 18. The framing poset $\mathcal{L}_{\text{car}(n), F}$ is the **Tamari lattice** $\text{Tam}(n-3)$, whose elements are triangulations of a convex $(n-1)$ -gon and cover relations are increasing slope diagonal flips.

This connection can be argued as follows. Each route of the $(\text{car}(n), F)$ is uniquely determined by its first and last edge. Label the outgoing edges of the source from top to bottom by the numbers $1, 2, 3, \dots, n-2$, and the incoming edges of the sink from top to bottom by $n-1, \dots, 2$. Label each route by the pair (i, j) of its first and last edges. This gives a correspondence between routes of the graph and edges and diagonals of the $(n-1)$ -gon, with the exceptional routes corresponding to the edges of the $(n-1)$ -gon. Under this correspondence, two routes are incoherent if and only if the corresponding segments in the $(n-1)$ -gon cross, so maximal cliques of $(\text{car}(n), F)$ correspond to triangulations of the $(n-1)$ -gon. Moreover, ccw rotations correspond to increasing slope diagonal flips. Thus, the framing poset $\mathcal{L}_{\text{car}(n), F}$ is the Tamari lattice $\text{Tam}(n-3)$.

Example 1.2.7 (The Dyck lattice). Consider the caracol graph $\text{car}(n)$ as in the previous example, but with the framing \tilde{F} obtained from length framing F by reversing the order of the incoming edges at each inner vertex. The case $n = 6$ is depicted on the right in Figure 18. The framing poset $\mathcal{L}_{\text{car}(n), \tilde{F}}$ is the **Dyck lattice** $\text{Dyck}(n-3)$, whose elements are lattice paths in an $(n-3) \times (n-3)$ grid using north and east steps from the left-bottom corner to the top-right corner that stay weakly above the main diagonal, i.e. **Dyck paths** in an $(n-3) \times (n-3)$ square. A path π_2 covers π_1 in the Dyck lattice if π_2 can be obtained from π_1 by adding one box.

The bijection between maximal cliques of $(\text{car}(n), \tilde{F})$ and Dyck paths in an $(n-3) \times (n-3)$ grid is given as follows. As before, the routes of $(\text{car}(n), \tilde{F})$ are determined by their first and last edges. Label the outgoing edges of the source from bottom to top by the numbers $0, 1, \dots, n-3$, and the incoming edges of the sink from top to bottom by $n-3, \dots, 0$. Label a route by the pair (i, j) of its first and last edges. Such a pair satisfies $0 \leq i \leq j \leq n-3$.

Therefore, the pair (i, j) can also be regarded as a lattice point weakly above the main diagonal of the $(n - 3) \times (n - 3)$ square, where i denotes the column number (from left to right) and j the row number (from bottom to top). Thus, we have a bijection between routes of $(\text{car}(n), \tilde{F})$ and lattice points weakly above the main diagonal of an $(n - 3) \times (n - 3)$ grid. Taking the image of the routes of a maximal clique gives the set of lattice points of a Dyck path. Moreover, two maximal cliques are related by a ccw rotation if and only if the corresponding two paths are related by adding one box. As a consequence, the framing poset $\mathcal{L}_{\text{car}(n), \tilde{F}}$ is the **Dyck lattice** $\text{Dyck}(n - 3)$.

Remark 1.2.8. The caracol graph $\text{car}(n)$ has been considered several times in the literature in connection with flow polytopes and Catalan structures, see for example [5, 7, 25]. Its name comes from the resemblance of the drawing of $(\text{car}(n), \tilde{F})$ to a snail, which is referred to as “caracol” in Spanish (see the right of Figure 18).

Remark 1.2.9. The Tamari lattice and Dyck lattice are particular cases of a more general family of lattices that we call cross-Tamari lattices, which are studied in depth in Section 2.4. The graphs we use in Section 2.4 are slightly different to the caracol graph, and have the advantage of making the description a bit clearer.

Example 1.2.10. Consider the directed complete graph K_6 with edges directed toward the larger vertex. Its corresponding framing poset under the length framing is shown in Figure 19.

1.2.2. Some graph operations. There are two natural operations that we can apply to a directed graph G and a framing F of it. We denote by G^{rev} the directed acyclic graph G but with the direction of its edges reversed. The framing F of G naturally induces a framing on G^{rev} , which by abuse of notation we also denote by F , producing a framed graph (G^{rev}, F) . On the other hand, we denote by F^{rev} the framing of G obtained from F by reversing the orders of the incoming and outgoing edges at each vertex. These operations and the corresponding framing posets are illustrated for an example in Figure 20.

Lemma 1.2.11. *The following hold:*

- (1) $\mathcal{L}_{G^{\text{rev}}, F} \cong \text{dual}(\mathcal{L}_{G, F});$
- (2) $\mathcal{L}_{G, F^{\text{rev}}} \cong \text{dual}(\mathcal{L}_{G, F});$ and
- (3) $\mathcal{L}_{G^{\text{rev}}, F^{\text{rev}}} \cong \mathcal{L}_{G, F}.$

Proof. Observe that reversing the flow in G preserves the pairwise coherence of routes. Thus it does not change the maximal cliques beyond reversing the direction of the routes in the maximal cliques. However, counterclockwise rotations of maximal cliques in (G, F) become clockwise rotations in (G^{rev}, F) (and vice versa), and hence (1) follows.

Reversing the orders of the incoming and outgoing edges at each vertex preserves the pairwise coherence of routes, and hence the maximal cliques in (G, F) and (G, F^{rev}) are the same. The counterclockwise rotations of maximal cliques in (G, F) then become clockwise rotations in (G, F^{rev}) (and vice versa), and hence (2) follows.

Finally, (3) follows from (1) and (2). □

An edge (v, w) in G is said to be **idle** if v has out-degree one or w has in-degree one. If a graph G' is obtained from G by contracting an idle edge, then the flow polytopes \mathcal{F}_G




FIGURE 18. The Tamari lattice and the Dyck lattice as framing lattices of the caracol graph $\text{car}(6)$ (with two different framings).

and $\mathcal{F}_{G'}$ are integrally equivalent, meaning they are affinely equivalent and have the same Ehrhart polynomial [27, Lemma 2.2]. Contracting idle edges in G also preserves the framing poset, along with the operations mentioned in the following lemma.

Lemma 1.2.12. *The following operations of (G, F) are poset isomorphisms between framing posets.*

- (1) Contracting an idle edge in G .
- (2) Changing the framing at the source s or sink t of G .
- (3) Reversing the incoming order of two edges $e = (s, v)$ and $e' = (s, v)$ at a vertex v that are consecutive in $\leq_{\text{In}(v)}$.
- (4) Reversing the outgoing order of two edges $e = (w, t)$ and $e' = (w, t)$ at a vertex w that are consecutive in $\leq_{\text{Out}(v)}$.

Proof. Operations (1) and (2) are immediate. We consider (3), as (4) is shown analogously. Let F_1 denote the original framing with order $\leq_{\text{In}(v)}$ and let F_2 be the framing otherwise the same as F_1 but with $\leq_{\text{In}(v)}^{\text{rev}}$ instead of $\leq_{\text{In}(v)}$. The φ be the map sending a route R to the route R' obtained from R by replacing e with e' . Observe that two routes are coherent




FIGURE 19. The graph K_6 drawn with the length framing, its six exceptional routes, nine non-exceptional routes, and framing poset.




FIGURE 20. An example of the graph operations in Lemma 1.2.11 and the corresponding framing lattices.

at v under F_1 if and only if their images under φ are coherent at v under F_2 . Thus φ extends to a bijection Φ between maximal cliques. Furthermore, it is easy to verify that Φ is order-preserving. \square

1.2.3. The existence of a ccw rotation. The following lemma gives a sufficient condition for the existence of a ccw rotation in a maximal clique. It is an helpful tool that we will use later in order to give a global characterization of the partial order of the framing poset.

Lemma 1.2.13. *Let R be a route in a maximal clique C_1 . If there is a route R^* such that $R <_v^{\text{cw}} R^*$ at some v , then there exists routes $R_1 \in C_1$ and $R_2 \notin C_1$ with $R_1 <_w^{\text{cw}} R^*$ for some $w \in R^*$ such that $C_2 = (C_1 \setminus R_1) \cup R_2$ is a maximal clique and $C_1 \prec_{\text{rot}}^{\text{ccw}} C_2$.*

Proof. Of the routes in C_1 containing vR consider the route R' minimal with respect to $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)}$. Then from the routes in C_1 containing $R'v$ take Q to be the route maximal with respect to $\leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)}$. Now $Q \in C_1$ and by construction $Q <_v^{\text{cw}} R^*$. Moreover:

- (A) There is no $Q' \in C_1$ such that $Qv = Q'v$ and $vQ <_{\mathcal{O}(v)} vQ'$.
- (B) There is no $Q' \in C_1$ such that $vQ = vQ'$ and $Q'v <_{\mathcal{J}(v)} Qv$.

Item (A) follows by construction. The proof of (B) requires further arguments. We proceed by contradiction, assuming that there is $Q' \in C_1$ such that $vQ = vQ'$ and $Q'v <_{\mathcal{J}(v)} Qv$. First, note that under this assumption we have that Q is the only route in C_1 that contains $R'v = Qv$, because by the $\leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)}$ -maximality of Q any other such a route would be incoherent with Q' . This means that $Q = R'$ and $vQ = vR' = vR$ by construction. But then, Q' contradicts the $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)}$ -minimality of $R' = Q$.

Now, We consider the following three possible cases,

- (1) There are routes V and V' in C_1 through v such that $Qv <_{\mathcal{J}(v)} Vv$ and $vV' <_{\mathcal{O}(v)} vQ$.
- (2) There does not exist a route V in C_1 through v such that $Qv <_{\mathcal{J}(v)} Vv$.
- (3) There does not exist a route V' in C_1 through v such that $vV' <_{\mathcal{O}(v)} vQ$.

First consider Case (1). We can assume that V is minimal with respect to $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)}$, and that V' is maximal with respect to $\leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)}$. Then take $w = v$, and let $R_1 = Q$ and $R_2 = VwV'$, as depicted in Figure 21. The following properties hold:

- (i) $R_1 \in C_1$.

This is clear because $R_1 = Q \in C_1$.

- (ii) $\text{Top}(R_1, R_2) = R_1vR_2 \in C_1$.

We will show that $R_1vR_2 = QvV'$ is coherent with every route in C_1 ; since C_1 is a maximal clique, this implies that $QvV' \in C_1$ as desired. We proceed by contradiction. Assume that there exist $Q' \in C_1$ that is incoherent with QvV' . Then, they must be incoherent at v , otherwise Q' would be incoherent with either $Q \in C_1$ or $V' \in C_1$.

If $QvV' <_v^{\text{cw}} Q'$ then $Q <_v^{\text{cw}} Q'$ which is a contradiction. Therefore, $Q' <_v^{\text{cw}} QvV'$. But then $vQ = vQ'$, otherwise by the $\leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)}$ -maximality of V' we would have $vQ <_{\mathcal{O}(v)} vQ'$ which implies that Q' is incoherent with Q . Thus we have $vQ = vQ'$, but also $Q'v <_{\mathcal{J}(v)} Qv$, contradicting Item (B) above.

- (iii) $\text{Bot}(R_1, R_2) = R_2vR_1 \in C_1$.

Again, we need to show that $R_2vR_1 = VvQ$ is coherent with every route in C_1 . We proceed by contradiction. If there is $Q' \in C_1$ incoherent with VvQ then they must be incoherent at v , otherwise it would be incoherent with either $V \in C_1$ or $Q \in C_1$. If $VvQ <_v^{\text{cw}} Q'$ then $Q <_v^{\text{cw}} Q'$ which is a contradiction. Therefore, $Q' <_v^{\text{cw}} VvQ$. But then $Qv = Q'v$, otherwise by the $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)}$ -minimality of V we would have $Q'v <_{\mathcal{J}(v)} Qv$ which

implies that Q' is incoherent with Q . Thus we have $Qv = Q'v$, but also $vQ <_{\mathcal{O}(v)} vQ'$, contradicting Item (A) above.

- (iv) There is not route in C_1 in between $R_1 = Q$ and $R_2 = VvV'$.

We proceed by contradiction. Assume that there is $Q' \in C_1$ in between Q and VvV' . Then either $Qv = Q'v$ or $vQ = vQ'$, otherwise Q' would be incoherent with Q . If $Qv = Q'v$, then Q' contradicts the $\leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)}$ -maximality of V' . If $vQ = vQ'$, then Q' contradicts the $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)}$ -minimality of V .

Properties (i)-(iv) show that the Top-Bottom Property and the In Between Property of Proposition 1.1.11 hold for R_1 and R_2 . Thus, $C_2 = (C_1 \setminus R_1) \cup R_2$ is a maximal clique. Since $R_2 <_w^{\text{cw}} R_1$, we have that $C_1 \prec_{\text{rot}}^{\text{ccw}} C_2$. We also have $R_1 <_w^{\text{cw}} R^*$ because $Q = R_1$.

Next we consider Case (2). Let P_v be the maximal path containing v in $Q \cap R^*$, and let w be the minimal vertex in P_v . By Lemma 1.1.8, there is a route in C_1 through the edge of R^* incoming to w . In particular, there is a route W in C_1 such that $Qw <_{\mathcal{J}(w)} Ww$. We assume that W is a minimal such route with respect to $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(w)}$, and that of such routes W is the minimal route with respect to $\leq_{\mathcal{O}(w)}$. Note that W cannot pass through v , as otherwise we would have $Qv <_{\mathcal{J}(v)} Wv$, which contradicts our assumption for Case (2). Thus $w < v$ and $wQ <_{\mathcal{O}(w)} wW$.

Let w' be the maximal vertex in the path of $W \cap Q$ containing w . Let e be the edge of Q incoming to w and let e' be the edge of W outgoing from w' . Let \hat{P} be the path of $W \cap Q$ containing w , together with the edges e and e' .

Suppose towards a contradiction that there is a route $R'' \in C_1$ that is incoherent with the path \hat{P} . Since R'' must be coherent with Q and W , it must be in between QwW and WwQ at w . However, if $R''w <_{\mathcal{J}(w)} Ww$, then that contradicts the minimality of the choice of W with respect to $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(w)}$. Similarly, if $wR'' <_{\mathcal{O}(w)} wW$, then that contradicts the minimality of the choice of W with respect to $\leq_{\mathcal{O}(w)}$.

Thus the path \hat{P} is coherent with all routes in C_1 and by Lemma 1.1.8, it can be extended to a route $\hat{Q} \in C_1$. Furthermore, since \hat{Q} cannot be in between QwW and WwQ , it follows that $\hat{Q}w = Qw$ and $w\hat{Q} = wW$.

Now, since $Q, W \in C_1$ must be coherent with \hat{Q} , we have that \hat{Q} satisfies conditions (A) and (B) above at w . Since \hat{Q} is clockwise from R^* at w , We can now repeat the argument in Case (1) using \hat{Q} instead of Q , w instead of v , and $V := W \in C_1$ and $V' := Q \in C_1$.

Case (3) can be argued symmetrically to Case (2). □




FIGURE 21. Cases (1) and (2) in the proof of Lemma 1.2.13.

For completeness, we also include the analog of Lemma 1.2.13 for the existence of cw rotation, which follows by symmetry.

Lemma 1.2.14. *Let R be a route in a maximal clique C_1 . If there is a route R^* such that $R^* <_v^{\text{cw}} R$ at some v , then there exists routes $R_1 \in C_1$ and $R_2 \notin C_1$ with $R^* <_w^{\text{cw}} R_1$ for some $w \in R^*$ such that $C_2 = (C_1 \setminus R_1) \cup R_2$ is a maximal clique and $C_2 \prec_{\text{rot}}^{\text{ccw}} C_1$.*

1.2.4. Characterization of the partial order. The purpose of this section is to prove the following characterization of the partial order relation of the framing poset.

Given two sets of pairwise coherent paths (for example two maximal cliques) C and C' , we say that C **is cw from** C' if for all paths $P \in C$, $P' \in C'$, and $v \in P \cap P'$, we have that P and P' are coherent at v or $P <_v^{\text{cw}} P'$.

Theorem 1.2.15 (Characterization of the partial order). *Let C and C' be maximal cliques. Then $C \leq C'$ if and only if C is cw from C' .*

In order to show this, we will introduce two algorithms that we call the C_{\max} algorithm and the C_{\min} algorithm. These algorithms will also be very useful later to prove that the framing poset is a lattice.

1.2.4.1. The C_{\max} and C_{\min} algorithms. Let S be a set of pairwise coherent paths. We construct a maximal clique $C_{\max}(S)$ containing the ccw-most routes that are coherent with S . Informally, this is done by adding the ccw-most routes that are coherent with S recursively at each vertex until a maximal clique is formed. If S is a set of pairwise coherent *routes*, then S will be contained in $C_{\max}(S)$; this case will be very important for us. The formal construction is described in Algorithm 1, where $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)}^{\text{rev}}$ denotes the reverse order to $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)}$.

Algorithm 1 The construction of $C_{\max}(S)$

```


1:  $C_{\max}(S) := \emptyset$ 
2: for  $v \in V(G)$  (in increasing order) do
3:   for  $Pv \in \mathcal{J}(v)$  (in the order  $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)}^{\text{rev}}$ ) do                                ▷  $Pv$  possibly empty
4:     for  $vQ \in \mathcal{O}(v)$  (in the order  $\leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)}$ ) do                                ▷  $vQ$  possibly empty
5:       if  $PvQ$  is coherent with all paths in  $C_{\max}(S) \cup S$  then
6:          $C_{\max}(S) := C_{\max}(S) \cup \{PvQ\}$ 
7:       break                                                                    ▷ This terminates the innermost loop
8:     end if
9:   end for
10: end for
11: end for

```

It is worth emphasizing that the same route may be added to $C_{\max}(S)$ several times during its construction, making the algorithm inefficient. It should also be noted that whenever a route PvQ is coherent with S and all routes already added to $C_{\max}(S)$, the innermost loop terminates regardless of whether PvQ is already in the set $C_{\max}(S)$ or not. The following example illustrates these points explicitly.

Example 1.2.16. We apply Algorithm 1 to the graph $\text{oru}(3)$ in Example 1.1.1 with $S = \emptyset$. At vertex 1, $P1$ is the empty path, and $1Q$ is the path $e_1e_3e_5$. Thus the first path added to

Computing $C_{\max}(\emptyset)$:



Computing $C_{\min}(\emptyset)$:




FIGURE 22. Computing $C_{\max}(\emptyset)$ and $C_{\min}(\emptyset)$ for the graph $\text{oru}(3)$.

$C_{\max}(S)$ is $e_1e_3e_5$. We have considered all paths incoming to 1, so we proceed to vertex 2. The path $e_2e_3e_5$ is considered first and added to $C_{\max}(S)$. The next path to be considered is the path $e_1e_3e_5$, which is already contained in $C_{\max}(S)$. Nevertheless, it is added again and the innermost loop in the algorithm terminates, and we proceed to vertex 3. The first route considered at vertex 3 is $e_2e_4e_5$, which is added. The routes $e_2e_3e_5$ and $e_1e_3e_5$ are added again, and no more new routes are added at vertex 3. Finally, at vertex 4 every route is considered, but the only new route added is $e_2e_4e_6$. We have that $C_{\max}(\emptyset) = \{e_1e_3e_5, e_2e_3e_5, e_2e_4e_5, e_2e_4e_6\}$. See the top row in Figure 22 for the order in which each route is added.

In a similar way, we construct a maximal clique $C_{\min}(S)$ whose routes are as clockwise as possible while coherent with S . The algorithm is otherwise the same, but the orders in which $\mathcal{J}(v)$ and $\mathcal{O}(v)$ are read in Algorithm 1 are reversed. That is, we replace $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)}^{\text{rev}}$ with $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)}$ and replace $\leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)}$ with $\leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)}^{\text{rev}}$, where $\leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)}^{\text{rev}}$ denotes the reverse order to $\leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)}$. The precise construction is described in Algorithm 2.

Similar to Example 1.2.16, we demonstrate Algorithm 2 on the graph $\text{oru}(3)$ below.

Example 1.2.17. We apply Algorithm 2 to the graph $\text{oru}(3)$ in Example 1.1.1 with $S = \emptyset$. At vertex 1, $P1$ is the empty path, and $1Q$ is the path $e_2e_4e_6$. Thus the first path added to $C_{\min}(S)$ is $e_2e_4e_6$. We have considered all paths incoming to 1, so we proceed to vertex 2. The path $e_1e_4e_6$ is considered first and added to $C_{\min}(S)$. The next path to be considered is the path $e_2e_4e_6$, which is already contained in $C_{\min}(S)$. Nevertheless, the innermost loop in the algorithm terminates, and we proceed to vertex 3. The first route considered at vertex 3 is $e_1e_3e_6$, which is added. The routes $e_1e_4e_6$ and $e_2e_4e_6$ are added again, and no more new routes are added at vertex 3. Finally, at vertex 4 every route is considered, but only the new route $e_1e_3e_5$ is added. We have that $C_{\min}(\emptyset) = \{e_2e_4e_6, e_1e_4e_6, e_1e_3e_6, e_1e_3e_5\}$. See the bottom row of Figure 22 for the order in which each route is added.

Algorithm 2 The construction of $C_{\min}(S)$

```

1:  $C_{\min}(S) := \emptyset$ 
2: for  $v \in V(G)$  (in increasing order) do
3:   for  $Pv \in \mathcal{J}(v)$  (in the order  $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)}$ ) do  $\triangleright Pv$  possibly empty
4:     for  $vQ \in \mathcal{O}(v)$  (in the order  $\leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)}^{\text{rev}}$ ) do  $\triangleright vQ$  possibly empty
5:       if  $PvQ$  is coherent with all paths in  $C_{\max}(S) \cup S$  then
6:          $C_{\min}(S) := C_{\min}(S) \cup \{PvQ\}$ 
7:         break  $\triangleright$  This terminates the innermost loop
8:       end if
9:     end for
10:   end for
11: end for

```

Lemma 1.2.18. *The cliques $C_{\max}(S)$ and $C_{\min}(S)$ are the unique maximal cliques with the following properties. If a route R is coherent with all paths in S , then*

- (1) *for any $R' \in C_{\max}(S)$ and $v \in R \cap R'$ either R and R' are coherent at v or $R <_v^{\text{cw}} R'$.*
- (2) *for any $R' \in C_{\min}(S)$ and $v \in R \cap R'$ either R and R' are coherent at v or $R' <_v^{\text{cw}} R$.*

Proof. We prove property (1) for $C_{\max}(S)$. The proof of property (2) for $C_{\min}(S)$ is similar.

First note that $C_{\max}(S)$ is a maximal clique since all routes are considered in the for-loop in Line 4 of Algorithm 1 when vQ is the empty path with $v = t$. Suppose toward a contradiction that there is a route R such that R is coherent with all paths of S but incoherent with a route $R' \in C_{\max}(S)$ such that $R' <_v^{\text{cw}} R$ at some $v \in R \cap R'$. We assume that R' is the first route added in the algorithm that is not coherent with R and take v to be the minimal point at which R and R' are incoherent. Let v' be the vertex in Algorithm 1 at which the route R' is added. We consider two cases, namely when $v < v'$ and when $v \geq v'$. These cases are depicted in Figure 23.

First, if $v < v'$, then consider the step in the algorithm where the extensions of the path Rv are considered. At this point R' has not been added since $v < v'$. Since the extension $R = RvR$ is considered before RvR' and R is coherent with all the routes added before this step and the paths in S , it follows that in this step we add a route $\tilde{R} = Rv\tilde{R}$ to $C_{\max}(S)$ where $v\tilde{R} \leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)} vR$. However, this route \tilde{R} is incoherent with R' , which contradicts the fact that R' is added to $C_{\max}(S)$ at a later step.

Next, if $v \geq v'$, then consider the step in the algorithm when R' is added. Since R and R' are coherent with all the previously added routes to $C_{\max}(S)$ and the paths in S , the route $R'vR$ must also be coherent with all the routes previously added to $C_{\max}(S)$ and the paths in S . However, $v'R$ is read before $v'R'$ in the order $\leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)}$, which contradicts the fact that R' is added to $C_{\max}(S)$ at this step.

It remains to check uniqueness. Let $C \neq C_{\max}(S)$ be another maximal clique satisfying property (1). Then, there is a route $R_1 \in C$ and $R_2 \in C_{\max}(S)$ such that R_1 and R_2 are coherent with all paths in S , but they are incoherent at some v . Note that R_1 and R_2 cannot be in S and thus we must have $R_1 <_v^{\text{cw}} R_2$ and $R_2 <_v^{\text{cw}} R_1$, which is a contradiction. It follows that $C_{\max}(S)$ is unique. \square



FIGURE 23. The two cases in the proof of Lemma 1.2.18.

When $S = \emptyset$, the next lemma implies that the framing poset $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ has a unique minimal element $\hat{0}$ and a unique maximal element $\hat{1}$.

Lemma 1.2.19. *Let S be a set of pairwise coherent paths and C be a maximal clique whose routes are coherent with the paths in S . The following hold:*

- (1) *If $C \neq C_{\max}(S)$ then there is a maximal clique C' whose routes are coherent with the paths in S such that $C \prec_{\text{rot}}^{\text{ccw}} C'$.*
- (2) *If $C \neq C_{\min}(S)$ then there is a maximal clique C' whose routes are coherent with the paths in S such that $C' \prec_{\text{rot}}^{\text{ccw}} C$.*

In particular, $C_{\min} := C_{\min}(\emptyset)$ and $C_{\max} := C_{\max}(\emptyset)$ are respectively the $\hat{0}$ and $\hat{1}$ of $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$.

Proof. We prove property (1) for $C_{\max}(S)$. The proof of property (2) for $C_{\min}(S)$ is similar.

Since $C \neq C_{\max}(S)$, it follows from Lemma 1.2.18 that there is a route $R \in C \setminus S$, a route $R' \in C_{\max}(S)$, and a vertex $v \in R \cap R'$ such that $R <_v^{\text{cw}} R'$. By Lemma 1.2.13, there exists a route $R_1 \in C$ such that $R_1 <_w^{\text{cw}} R'$ for some w and a route $R_2 \notin C$ such that $C' = (C \setminus R_1) \cup R_2$ is a maximal clique. Since R' is coherent with the paths in S and $R_1 <_w^{\text{cw}} R'$, we have that $R_1 \notin S$. We need to show that R_2 is coherent with all paths in S . Assume to the contrary that R_2 is incoherent with a path P in S . Since P is coherent with C , it is coherent with R_1 , $\text{Top}(R_1, R_2)$, and $\text{Bot}(R_1, R_2)$, and therefore P must be weakly in between R_1 and R_2 at w . If $P \subseteq R_1$, then P is incoherent with $R' \in C_{\max}(S)$, which is a contradiction. If $P \not\subseteq R_1$, then P is in between R_1 and R_2 . Then, by Lemma 1.1.8 the path P is extendable to a route $R_P \in C$ that is in between R_1 and R_2 , which is again a contradiction. \square

The following corollaries are straight forward consequences of Lemma 1.2.19.

Corollary 1.2.20. *Let S be a set of pairwise coherent paths. The following hold:*

- (1) *$C_{\max}(S)$ is the unique maximal clique that is bigger in the order $\leq_{\text{rot}}^{\text{ccw}}$ than all the maximal cliques whose routes are coherent with the paths in S .*
- (2) *$C_{\min}(S)$ is the unique maximal clique that is smaller in the order $\leq_{\text{rot}}^{\text{ccw}}$ than all the maximal cliques whose routes are coherent with the paths in S .* \square

Corollary 1.2.21. *Let S be a set of pairwise coherent paths. The set of maximal cliques whose routes are coherent with the paths in S is the interval $[C_{\min}(S), C_{\max}(S)]$ of the framing poset $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$.* \square

Specializing to the case where S is a set of pairwise coherent routes we get:

Corollary 1.2.22. *Let S be a set of pairwise coherent routes. The set of maximal cliques containing S is the interval $[C_{\min}(S), C_{\max}(S)]$ of the framing poset $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$.* \square

1.2.4.2. *Proof of Theorem 1.2.15.* We now have all the necessary ingredients to prove the Characterization Theorem 1.2.15 of the partial order of the framing poset, which states that two maximal cliques satisfy $C \leq C'$ if and only if C is cw from C' .

We first show the forward direction and assume $C \leq C'$. Suppose C is not cw from C' , i.e. that there is a route $R \in C$ and $R' \in C'$ such that $R' <_v^{\text{cw}} R$ at some v . By Lemma 1.2.1 there is then a route $R'' \in C'$ such that $R' <_w^{\text{cw}} R''$ at some w . But this would imply that R'' is incoherent with R' , which is a contradiction.

To show the backward direction, we assume that C is cw from C' and show that we can apply a sequence of rotations to C until obtaining C' . If all routes of C are coherent with all routes in C' , then $C = C'$ and we are done. Thus we consider the case when there is a route $R \in C$ and $R' \in C'$ such that $R <_v^{\text{cw}} R'$ for some v . Take $S = C \cap C'$. By Lemma 1.2.18, we have $C \neq C_{\max}(S)$. By Lemma 1.2.19, there are routes R_1 and R_2 through some w with $R_1 <_w^{\text{cw}} R_2$ and $R_1 \in C \setminus S$ such that $(C \setminus R_1) \cup R_2$ is a maximal clique.

Next, we show that $(C \setminus R_1) \cup R_2$ is also cw from C' . Suppose toward a contradiction that R_2 satisfies $\tilde{R}' <_x^{\text{cw}} R_2$ for some \tilde{R}' in C' and $x \in R_2 \cap \tilde{R}'$; see Figure 24 for two examples of such a route \tilde{R}' . Let P_x be the maximal path in $\tilde{R}' \cap R_2$ containing x , and consider $\min(P_x)$ and $\max(P_x)$. We cannot have $\max(P_x) < w$, as then $\tilde{R}' <_w^{\text{cw}} R_2 w R_1$ and $R_2 w R_1 = \text{Bot}(R_1, R_2) \in C$, which contradicts the fact that C is cw from C' . Similarly, we cannot have $w < \min(P_x)$, as then $\tilde{R}' <_x^{\text{cw}} R_1 w R_2$ and $R_1 w R_2 = \text{Top}(R_1, R_2) \in C$, which contradicts the fact that C is cw from C' .




FIGURE 24. Two examples for the route \tilde{R}' in the proof of Theorem 1.2.15.

If $\min(P_x) \leq w \leq \max(P_x)$, observe that since C is cw from C' we cannot have \tilde{R}' be cw from $R_1 w R_2$, $R_2 w R_1$, or R_1 as they are all routes in C . Thus $R_1 w \leq_{\mathcal{J}(w)} \tilde{R}' w <_{\mathcal{J}(w)} R_2 w$ and $w R_2 <_{\mathcal{O}(w)} w \tilde{R}' \leq_{\mathcal{O}(w)} w R_1$. Consider the case when $R_1 w <_{\mathcal{J}(w)} \tilde{R}' w$. Let q be the largest vertex after which $R_1 w$ and $\tilde{R}' w$ coincide. Let Q denote the path formed by the edge of $\tilde{R}' w$ entering q and the subpath of \tilde{R}' from q to w . Now Q must be coherent with all routes in C , as otherwise $Q <_y^{\text{cw}} \tilde{R}$ or $\tilde{R} <_y^{\text{cw}} Q$ for some route $R_1 \neq \tilde{R} \in C$ at some node y ; In the first case, $\tilde{R}' <_y^{\text{cw}} \tilde{R}$ which contradicts that C is cw from C' , and in the second case $\tilde{R} <_y^{\text{cw}} R_2$ which contradicts that the only route of C incoherent with R_2 is R_1 .

Since the path Q is coherent with all the routes in C , by Lemma 1.1.8, Q is extendable to a route R_Q in C . Note that $R_1 w <_{\mathcal{J}(w)} R_Q w <_{\mathcal{J}(w)} R_2 w$, and since R_Q must be coherent with $\text{Top}(R_1, R_2)$ and $\text{Bot}(R_1, R_2)$, then R_Q must be a route in between R_1 and R_2 . This contradicts the In Between Property of Proposition 1.1.11 for R_1 and R_2 at w . Therefore $R_1 w =_{\mathcal{J}(w)} \tilde{R}' w$. By a similar argument, we cannot have $w \tilde{R}' <_{\mathcal{O}(w)} w R_1$, and hence $w \tilde{R}' =_{\mathcal{O}(w)} w R_1$. It follows that $R_1 = \tilde{R}' \in C \cap C'$ and therefore $R_1 \in S$, which is a contradiction.

We have now shown that if $C' \neq C$ and C is cw from C' , then we can apply a rotation to C in order to obtain a maximal clique $C^* := (C \setminus R_1) \cup R_2$ such that $C \prec_{\text{rot}}^{\text{ccw}} C^*$ and C^* is cw from C' . If $C^* = C'$, then we are finished. Otherwise, we can repeat the process until we reach C' . \square

1.3. LATTICE PROPERTIES

1.3.1. The framing poset is a polygonal lattice. To show that $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ is a lattice, we rely on the BEZ lemma, which is stated as follows.

Lemma 1.3.1. (BEZ Lemma [37, Lemma 9-2.2]) *Suppose P is a finite poset with $\hat{0}$. Suppose also that for all x and y in P such that x and y cover a common element z , the join $x \vee y$ exists. Then P is a lattice.* \square

To apply the BEZ lemma on $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$, we investigate the case when two maximal cliques cover a single maximal clique in the following lemmas.

Lemma 1.3.2. *Let Q be a maximal clique covered by two distinct maximal cliques $C_1 = Q \setminus R_1^Q \cup R_1$ and $C_2 = Q \setminus R_2^Q \cup R_2$. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$ let w_i be a point at which R_i^Q and R_i are incoherent and let P_{w_i} denote the maximal path on which R_i^Q and R_i are incoherent. If R_1 and R_2 are incoherent at x and P_x denotes the maximal path containing x at which R_1 and R_2 are incoherent, then one of the following holds.*

- (1) *If $R_1 \prec_x^{\text{cw}} R_2$, then $P_x \cap P_{w_1} = \emptyset$. Furthermore, $R_2^Q = \text{Bot}(R_1^Q, R_1)$ when $x < w_1$ and $R_2^Q = \text{Top}(R_1^Q, R_1)$ when $w_1 < x$.*
- (2) *If $R_2 \prec_x^{\text{cw}} R_1$, then $P_x \cap P_{w_2} = \emptyset$. Furthermore, $R_1^Q = \text{Bot}(R_2^Q, R_2)$ when $x < w_2$ and $R_1^Q = \text{Top}(R_2^Q, R_2)$ when $w_2 < x$.*

Proof. By symmetry it suffices to prove (1). First, suppose toward a contradiction that $P_x \cap P_{w_1} \neq \emptyset$. Then there is a vertex v at which we have $R_1^Q \prec_v^{\text{cw}} R_1 \prec_v^{\text{cw}} R_2$. In particular, R_1^Q and R_2 are incoherent. Since the only route in Q incoherent with R_2 is R_2^Q , it follows that $R_1^Q = R_2^Q$, which contradicts the fact that $C_1 \neq C_2$ (Corollary 1.1.4). Hence $P_x \cap P_{w_1} = \emptyset$.

Now if $x < w_1$, then we have that R_2 is incoherent with $\text{Bot}(R_1^Q, R_1) = R_1 w_1 R_1^Q \in Q$. The only route in Q that is incoherent with R_2 is R_2^Q , and so necessarily $R_2^Q = \text{Bot}(R_1^Q, R_1)$. On the other hand, if $w_1 < x$, then we have that R_2 is incoherent with $\text{Top}(R_1^Q, R_1) = R_1^Q w_1 R_1 \in Q$. Therefore $R_2^Q = \text{Top}(R_1^Q, R_1)$. \square

Proposition 1.3.3. *Let C_1 and C_2 be distinct maximal cliques covering a maximal clique Q in $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ and let $S = C_1 \cap C_2$. Then, the following statements hold.*

- (i) *For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let $R_i = C_i \setminus Q$ and $R_i^Q = Q \setminus C_i$. Then $R_1^Q \in C_2 \setminus C_1$ and $R_2^Q \in C_1 \setminus C_2$.*
- (ii) *The maximal clique Q is the minimal element in the interval $I_S = [C_{\min}(S), C_{\max}(S)]$.*
- (iii) *The interval I_S is the union of two chains K_1 and K_2 , with $C_1 \in K_1$ and $C_2 \in K_2$, such that $K_1 \cap K_2 = \{C_{\min}(S), C_{\max}(S)\}$.*
- (iv) *Furthermore, the chains K_1 and K_2 forming I_S are of length 2 or 3. In other words, I_S is a square, pentagon, or a hexagon.*
- (v) *$C_1 \vee C_2$ exists and is $C_{\max}(S)$.*

Proof. For (i) it suffices to simply observe that $R_1^Q \neq R_2^Q$. By Corollary 1.2.21, I_S is an interval, and $Q \in I_S$ since $S \subseteq Q$. In addition, the routes in $Q \setminus S = \{R_1^Q, R_2^Q\}$ allow only ccw rotations and hence (ii) follows. To see (iii), we note that the routes in S form a codimension 2 inner face of a triangulation of \mathcal{F}_G . Thus projecting along S all the faces containing S gives a triangulated polygon. Alternatively, a purely combinatorial proof follows from our proof of (iv) and (v) below.

Next we show (v) by investigating the possible structures of the interval I_S . Statement (iv) will be proven in the process. There are two cases to consider, namely when

Case (1): R_1 and R_2 are coherent, and

Case (2): when R_1 and R_2 are incoherent.

We will see that Case (1) gives rise to a square, while Case (2) is split in several subcases, some of which give pentagons and some of which are hexagons. In each case, we show that $C_1 \vee C_2$ exists and is $C_{\max}(S)$. We start by considering the first case.

Case (1): R_1 and R_2 are coherent.

In this case, we have necessarily that $C_{\max}(S) \setminus S = \{R_1, R_2\}$, with the interval $[Q, C_{\max}(S)]$ being a square (see Figure 25). The maximal cliques of this square are, Q , C_1 , C_2 and $C_{\max}(S)$.

It remains to show that $C_1 \vee C_2$ exists and is equal to $C_{\max}(S)$. For this, let M be a maximal clique satisfying $C_1 \leq M$ and $C_2 \leq M$. We want to show that $C_{\max}(S) \leq M$. Let R^M be a route in M , R be a route in $C_{\max}(S)$, and $v \in R^M \cap R$. By Theorem 1.2.15, it suffices to show that R^M is coherent with R at v or that $R <_v^{\text{cw}} R^M$. Every route R in $S \cup \{R_1, R_2\}$ satisfies this condition, because $C_1 \leq M$ and $C_2 \leq M$. Since $C_{\max}(S) = S \cup \{R_1, R_2\}$ then we are done.




FIGURE 25. Case (1) in Proposition 1.3.3.

Case (2): R_1 and R_2 are incoherent.

Suppose that R_1 and R_2 are incoherent at a vertex x . Without loss of generality, we can assume that $R_1 <_x^{\text{cw}} R_2$. Let P_x denote the maximal path containing x in $R_1 \cap R_2$ at




FIGURE 26. The eight sub-cases of Case (2) in the proof of Proposition 1.3.3(v). The five cases in the light-blue region give rise to pentagons, the case in the light-orange region gives rise to the hexagon, and the remaining two cases are impossible.

which R_1 and R_2 are incoherent. Let w_1 be a vertex at which R_1^Q and R_1 are incoherent, and let P_{w_1} be the path at which they are incoherent. We assume that $x < w_1$ (the case $w_1 < x$ is symmetric). By Lemma 1.3.2, we have that $P_x \cap P_{w_1} = \emptyset$, and

$$R_2^Q = \text{Bot}(R_1^Q, R_1) = R_1 w_1 R_1^Q.$$

To simplify notation, let P_{w_2} be the path at which R_2^Q and R_2 are incoherent. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$ let $b_i = \min(P_{w_i})$ and $c_i = \max(P_{w_i})$. Let d_2 denote the smallest point after which R_2 and R_2^Q coincide. We consider the following sub-cases, which are depicted in Figure 26:

- (I) $d_2 < b_1$
 - (i) $R_1 d_2 <_{\mathcal{J}(d_2)} R_2 d_2$
 - (ii) $R_2 d_2 <_{\mathcal{J}(d_2)} R_1 d_2$
- (II) $d_2 = b_1$
 - (i) $R_1 d_2 <_{\mathcal{J}(d_2)} R_2 d_2$

- (ii) $R_2 d_2 <_{\mathcal{J}(d_2)} R_1 d_2$
- (III) $b_1 < d_2 \leq c_1$
 - (i) $R_1 d_2 <_{\mathcal{J}(d_2)} R_2 d_2$
 - (ii) $R_2 d_2 <_{\mathcal{J}(d_2)} R_1 d_2$
- (IV) $c_1 < d_2$
 - (i) $R_1^Q d_2 <_{\mathcal{J}(d_2)} R_2 d_2$
 - (ii) $R_2 d_2 <_{\mathcal{J}(d_2)} R_1^Q d_2$

In order to analyze each of these cases, we use the following strategy.

Strategy. In order find the polygon consisting of all the maximal cliques containing S , and proving that $C_1 \vee C_2$ exists and is $C_{\max}(S)$, carry out the next steps. Let \tilde{G} be the subgraph of G induced by R_1^Q, R_2^Q, R_1 , and R_2 .

Step 1. Find the set \tilde{S} of routes in S inside \tilde{G} .

These are the routes $\tilde{S} = \{\text{Top}_1, \text{Bot}_1, \text{Top}_2, \text{Bot}_2\} \setminus \{R_1^Q, R_2^Q, R_1, R_2\}$, where $\text{Top}_i := \text{Top}(R_i^Q, R_i)$ and $\text{Bot}_i := \text{Bot}(R_i^Q, R_i)$.

Step 2. Find the set \tilde{Z} of routes in \tilde{G} that are coherent with \tilde{S} , but are itself not in \tilde{S} .

These are R_1^Q, R_2^Q, R_1, R_2 and possibly others. (we will see that there are zero, one or two more in each case).

Step 2a. Argue that the routes in \tilde{Z} , from Step 2, are coherent with S .

This step needs to be verified in each case (by a simple argument). If there is a route $R \in S$ incoherent with a route in \tilde{Z} , then it would have to be incoherent with either R_1^Q, R_2^Q, R_1 , or R_2 , which is a contradiction.

Step 3. Find the coherence graph among the routes in \tilde{Z} (or equivalently $\tilde{Z} \cup S$).

This step is straight forward. We will see that for each case this is a triangulated polygon: either a square, pentagon, or hexagon.

Step 3a. Argue that the maximal cliques determined by the polygon in Step 3 are exactly the maximal cliques containing S .

This step is automatic for the following reason. In each case, the maximal cliques containing S determine a 2-dimensional triangulated polygon with a point representing S in the middle. But we know that intersecting the maximal simplices of the framing triangulation of the flow polytope with the 2-dimensional space orthogonal to S gives a triangulated polygon. So, the two triangulated polygons have to be the same.

Step 4. The last step is to find $C_{\max}(S)$ among the maximal cliques in the polygon, and argue that $C_1 \vee C_2 = C_{\max}(S)$.

This step is relatively straightforward.

Now, we proceed to analyze each of the cases using the previous strategy. We do this in an order that is convenient for us. First, we start by discarding an impossible case.

Case I.(ii). Impossible.

Since $d_2 < b_1$, note that we cannot have $R_2 d_2 <_{\mathcal{J}(d_2)} R_1 d_2$ as otherwise $\text{Top}(R_2^Q, R_2) \in Q$ violates the in between property of R_1^Q and R_1 at v_1 . Therefore case I.(i) is not possible.

Case I.(i). Pentagon.




FIGURE 27. Steps 1-3 in the strategy applied to Case (2.I.i).

Next, we consider Case I.(i). The outcome of the steps throughout our strategy are illustrated in Figure 27. In Step 1 of our strategy, we find the set $\tilde{S} = \{\text{Top}_1, \text{Top}_2, \text{Bot}_2\}$; note that $\text{Bot}_1 = \text{Bot}(R_1^Q, R_1) = R_2^Q$ does not appear in this set because $R_2^Q \notin S$. In Step 2, we find the set $\tilde{Z} = \{R_1^Q, R_2^Q, R_1, R_2, R_2 b_2 R_1\}$ of routes in \tilde{G} that are not in \tilde{S} and are coherent with \tilde{S} .

In Step 2a, we need to argue that the routes in \tilde{Z} are coherent with S . Since this holds for R_1^Q, R_2^Q, R_1, R_2 , we only need to check that $R_2 b_2 R_1$ is coherent with S . Suppose there exists a route $R \in S$ that is incoherent with $R_2 b_2 R_1$. Then, they have to be incoherent at b_2 , otherwise $R \in S$ would be incoherent with either R_2 or R_1 which is a contradiction. There are two cases to consider: $R <_{b_2}^{\text{cw}} R_2 b_2 R_1$ or $R_2 b_2 R_1 <_{b_2}^{\text{cw}} R$. In the first case, $R <_{b_2}^{\text{cw}} R_2$ because $R b_2 <_{\mathcal{J}(b_2)} R_2 b_2$ and $b_2 R_2 <_{\mathcal{O}(b_2)} b_2 R_1 <_{\mathcal{O}(b_2)} b_2 R$. This implies that R and R_2 are incoherent,




FIGURE 28. The pentagonal and hexagonal sub-cases and their respective coherence graphs.

which is a contradiction. In the second case, $R_1 <_{b_2}^{cw} R$ because $R_1 b_2 <_{\mathcal{J}(b_2)} R_2 b_2 <_{\mathcal{J}(b_2)} R b_2$ and $b_2 R <_{\mathcal{O}(b_2)} b_2 R_1$. This implies that R and R_1 are incoherent, which is a contradiction.

In Step 3, we find the coherence graph between the routes in $\tilde{Z} \cup S$, which is a triangulated pentagon, with a point in the middle representing the set S . The dashed arrows represent clockwise rotations from the smaller to the larger maximal clique. The pentagon is also illustrated in more detail in Figure 30.

In Step 4, we deduce that $C_{\max(S)} = S \cup \{R_2, R_2 b_2 R_1\}$ just by looking at the direction of the arrows in the triangulated pentagon to determine the largest maximal clique.

It remains to show that $C_1 \vee C_2$ exists and is equal to $C_{\max(S)}$. For this, let M be a maximal clique satisfying $C_1 \leq M$ and $C_2 \leq M$. We want to show that $C_{\max(S)} \leq M$. Let R^M be a route in M , R be a route in $C_{\max(S)}$, and $v \in R^M \cap R$. By Theorem 1.2.15, it suffices to show that R^M is coherent with R at v or that $R <_v^{cw} R^M$. Every route R in $S \cup \{R_1, R_2\}$ satisfies this condition, because $C_1 \leq M$ and $C_2 \leq M$. Since $C_{\max(S)} = S \cup \{R_2, R_2 b_2 R_1\}$ then we only need to check $R_2 b_2 R_1$. We proceed by contradiction. Suppose that $R^M <_v^{cw} R_2 b_2 R_1$. We can assume that $v = b_2$, because otherwise $R^M <_v^{cw} R_1$ or $R^M <_v^{cw} R_2$, which is a contradiction. Now, since $R^M <_{b_2}^{cw} R_2 b_2 R_1$ and $b_2 R_2 <_{\mathcal{O}(b_2)} b_2 R_1$ then $R^M <_{b_2}^{cw} R_2$, which is also a contradiction. This finishes the argument for Step 4.

Cases II.(i), III.(i), IV.(i) and IV.(ii). Pentagons.

The cases II.(i), III.(i), IV.(i), and IV.(ii) are all argued identically to I.(i) above.

Case III.(ii). Impossible.

We consider the Case III.(ii) next. Observe that in this case the routes $\text{Top}(R_2^Q, R_2)$ and R_1 are incoherent at d_2 . Since $\text{Top}(R_2^Q, R_2) \in Q$, and the only route in Q incoherent with R_1

in Q is R_1^Q , we have that $\text{Top}(R_2^Q, R_2) = R_1^Q$. However, this would imply that $d_2 = b_1$, and so Case III.(ii) is impossible.

Case II.(ii). Hexagon.




FIGURE 29. Steps 1-3 in the strategy applied to Case (2.II.ii).

It remains to consider Case II.(ii). Similarly as in the previous case, since $\text{Top}(R_2^Q, R_2) \in Q$ is incoherent with R_1 , we have that $\text{Top}(R_2^Q, R_2) = R_1^Q$. This case is depicted in Figure 28 (bottom).

The outcomes of the steps throughout our strategy are illustrated in Figure 29. Note, in particular, that the graph \tilde{G} looks a bit different to the graph in Figure 26, because of the forced requirement $\text{Top}(R_2^Q, R_2) = R_1^Q$.

In Step 1 of our strategy, we find the set $\tilde{S} = \{\text{Top}_1, \text{Bot}_2\}$; note that $\text{Top}_2 = \text{Top}_2(R_2^Q, R_2) = R_1^Q$ and $\text{Bot}_1 = \text{Bot}(R_1^Q, R_1) = R_2^Q$ do not appear in this set because $R_1^Q, R_2^Q \notin S$. In Step 2, we find the set $\tilde{Z} = \{R_1^Q, R_1, R_2^Q, R_2 b_1 R_1, R_2, R_2 b_2 R_1\}$ of routes in \tilde{G} that are not in \tilde{S} and are coherent with \tilde{S} .

In Step 2a, we need to argue that the routes in \tilde{Z} are coherent with S . Since this holds for R_1^Q, R_2^Q, R_1, R_2 , we only need to check that $R_2 b_1 R_1$ and $R_2 b_2 R_1$ are coherent with S . Suppose




FIGURE 30. The pentagonal sub-cases in the proof of Proposition 1.3.3(v).

there exists a route $R \in S$ that is incoherent with either $R_2 b_1 R_1$ or $R_2 b_2 R_1$. Using similar arguments as in Step 2a for the pentagonal Case I.(i), one can deduce that R is incoherent with R_1 or R_2 , which is a contradiction.

In Step 3, we find the coherence graph between the routes in $\tilde{Z} \cup S$, which is a triangulated hexagon, with a point in the middle representing the set S . The dashed arrows represent clockwise rotations from the smaller to the larger maximal clique. The hexagon is also illustrated in more detail in Figure 31.

In Step 4, we deduce that $C_{\max}(S) = S \cup \{R_2 b_2 R_1, R_2 b_1 R_1\}$ just by looking at the direction of the arrows in the triangulated hexagon to determine the largest maximal clique.

It remains to show that $C_1 \vee C_2$ exists and is equal to $C_{\max}(S)$. For this, let M be a maximal clique satisfying $C_1 \leq M$ and $C_2 \leq M$. We want to show that $C_{\max}(S) \leq M$. As before, let R^M be a route in M , R be a route in $C_{\max}(S)$, and $v \in R^M \cap R$. By Theorem 1.2.15, it suffices to show that R^M is coherent with R at v or that $R <_v^{\text{cw}} R^M$. Every route R in $S \cup \{R_1, R_2\}$ satisfies this condition, because $C_1 \leq M$ and $C_2 \leq M$. Since $C_{\max}(S) = S \cup \{R_2 b_2 R_1, R_2 b_1 R_1\}$ then we only need to check $R_2 b_2 R_1$ and $R_2 b_1 R_1$. Using similar arguments as in the pentagonal Case I.(i), one can deduce that if this would not be the case then either $R^M <_v^{\text{cw}} R_1$ or $R^M <_v^{\text{cw}} R_2$, which is a contradiction. This finishes the argument for Step 4. \square

A **polygon** in a lattice is an interval $[x, y]$ that is the union of two finite maximal chains from x to y that are disjoint except at x and y . A lattice is said to be **polygonal** if the following two conditions hold:

1. If y_1 and y_2 are distinct and cover an element x , then $[x, y_1 \vee y_2]$ is a polygon.
2. If y_1 and y_2 are distinct and are covered by an element x , then $[y_1 \wedge y_2, x]$ is a polygon.




FIGURE 31. The hexagonal sub-case in the proof of Proposition 1.3.3(v).

Theorem 1.3.4. *The framing poset $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ is a polygonal lattice. The polygons are squares, pentagons or hexagons.*


Proof. The fact that $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ is a lattice follows from the BEZ Lemma 1.3.1 and Proposition 1.3.3(v). Polygonality also follows from Proposition 1.3.3(iv) and (v). \square

1.3.2. Meets and joins. In the previous section, the join (resp. meet) of two maximal cliques C and C' in $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ was shown to be $C_{\max}(C \cap C')$ (resp. $C_{\min}(C \cap C')$) in the special case where C and C' cover (resp. are covered by) a common element. Figure 32 shows that this is not true in general; it shows two maximal cliques C and C' satisfying $C \vee C' \neq C_{\max}(C \cap C')$. In contrast, we also have cases where $C \wedge C' \neq C_{\min}(C \cap C')$.

The goal of this subsection is to introduce two modified algorithms to compute joins and meets. When we compute $C_{\max}(C \cap C')$ using Algorithm 1 for the example in Figure 32, we get a route R that does not belong to $C \vee C'$. This problem can be solved by forbidding this route to be added during the algorithm. This idea leads to the definition of a **(ccw) removed set** $\text{Rem}_{\text{ccw}}(C, C')$ that appears naturally in the context of cross-Tamari lattices, a class of framing lattices that will be introduced in Section 2.4 (the points inside the square grids in Figure 32 represent routes in that context). For the computation of the meet we define another **(cw) removed set** $\text{Rem}_{\text{cw}}(C, C')$.

Let P be a path and let $\text{ccw}(P)$ denote the set of routes ccw from P , i.e.


$$\text{ccw}(P) := \{R \mid P <_v^{\text{cw}} R \text{ for some } v \in G\}.$$

FIGURE 32. Two maximal cliques satisfying $C \vee C' \neq C_{\max}(C \cap C')$.

Similarly, let $\text{cw}(P)$ denote the set of routes clockwise from P , i.e.

$$\text{cw}(P) := \{R \mid R <_v^{cw} P \text{ for some } v \in G\}.$$

Note that if P is of length less than 2, then $\text{ccw}(P)$ and $\text{cw}(P)$ are necessarily empty. An example is shown in Figure 33.

FIGURE 33. Example of $\text{ccw}(P)$.

For two maximal cliques C and C' , we define the following sets of routes:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Rem}_{\text{ccw}}(C, C') &:= \bigcup_{\substack{P \text{ is a path} \\ \text{ccw}(P) \cap (C \cup C') = \emptyset}} \text{ccw}(P), \text{ and} \\ \text{Rem}_{\text{cw}}(C, C') &:= \bigcup_{\substack{P \text{ is a path} \\ \text{cw}(P) \cap (C \cup C') = \emptyset}} \text{cw}(P). \end{aligned}$$

Here Rem stands for “removed”, as the routes in $\text{Rem}_{\text{ccw}}(C, C')$ and $\text{Rem}_{\text{cw}}(C, C')$ will be removed from consideration in the construction of the join and meet. For the join, we construct the clique $C_{\max}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$ with an algorithm similar to Algorithm 1, but add an extra condition in line 5 that $PvQ \notin \text{Rem}_{\text{ccw}}(C, C')$.

Also note that in line 1 we start with $C_{\max}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C') := C \cap C'$ instead of the empty set, because $S = C \cap C'$ is included in $C_{\max}(S)$ at the end of Algorithm 1 anyway, so this small change does not alter the outcome of the algorithm. The algorithm is given below in Algorithm 3, and we will show that $C_{\max}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C') = C \vee C'$. An example of $\text{Rem}_{\text{ccw}}(C, C')$ and $C_{\max}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$ is shown in Figure 32.

Algorithm 3 The construction of $C_{\max}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$

```

1:  $C_{\max}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C') := C \cap C'$ 
2: for  $v \in V(G)$  (in increasing order) do
3:   for  $Pv \in \mathcal{J}(v)$  (in the order  $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)}^{\text{rev}}$ ) do ▷  $Pv$  possibly empty
4:     for  $vQ \in \mathcal{O}(v)$  (in the order  $\leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)}$ ) do ▷  $vQ$  possibly empty
5:       if  $PvQ$  is coherent with  $C_{\max}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$  and  $PvQ \notin \text{Rem}_{\text{ccw}}(C, C')$  then
6:          $C_{\max}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C') := C_{\max}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C') \cup \{PvQ\}$ 
7:         break ▷ This terminates the innermost loop
8:       end if
9:     end for
10:   end for
11: end for

```

We construct a maximal clique $C_{\min}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$ similarly, but in Algorithm 3 we replace $\text{Rem}_{\text{ccw}}(C, C')$ with $\text{Rem}_{\text{cw}}(C, C')$. We also reverse the orders in which $\mathcal{J}(v)$ and $\mathcal{O}(v)$ are read. That is, we replace $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)}^{\text{rev}}$ with $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)}$ and replace $\leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)}$ with $\leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)}^{\text{rev}}$. See Algorithm 4 below.

We will show that $C_{\min}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C') = C \wedge C'$. However, we first verify that $C_{\max}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C') = C \vee C'$ and $C_{\min}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C') = C \wedge C'$ are in fact maximal cliques.

Algorithm 4 The construction of $C_{\min}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$

```

1:  $C_{\max}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C') := C \cap C'$ 
2: for  $v \in V(G)$  (in increasing order) do
3:   for  $Pv \in \mathcal{J}(v)$  (in the order  $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)}$ ) do ▷  $Pv$  possibly empty
4:     for  $vQ \in \mathcal{O}(v)$  (in the order  $\leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)}^{\text{rev}}$ ) do ▷  $vQ$  possibly empty
5:       if  $PvQ$  is coherent with  $C_{\max}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$  and  $PvQ \notin \text{Rem}_{\text{ccw}}(C, C')$  then
6:          $C_{\max}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C') := C_{\max}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C') \cup \{PvQ\}$ 
7:         break ▷ This terminates the innermost loop
8:       end if
9:     end for
10:   end for
11: end for

```




FIGURE 34. Some routes and paths involved in the proof of Lemma 1.3.5.

Lemma 1.3.5. *The cliques $C_{\max}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$ and $C_{\min}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$ are maximal.*

Proof. We prove only the statement for $C_{\max}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$ as the proof for $C_{\min}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$ is symmetric. Suppose toward a contradiction that $C_{\max}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$ is not maximal. Then, there is a route R^* that is coherent with all routes in $C_{\max}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$, but not in it. Note that when $v = t$ (the sink), Algorithm 3 runs over all the routes of the graph (P runs over all routes and Q is empty). Since R^* is not added during the algorithm, then R^* must be in $\text{Rem}_{\text{ccw}}(C, C')$, i.e. $R^* \in \text{ccw}(P)$ for some path P such that $\text{ccw}(P) \cap (C \cup C') = \emptyset$. In other words, $P <_v^{\text{cw}} R^*$ for some v and any route in $C \cup C'$ is coherent with P or clockwise from P . We can assume that the only vertices of P not in $P \cap R^*$ are $\min(P)$ and $\max(P)$.

By the choice of P , there cannot be a route in $C \cap C'$ that is clockwise from P at v (otherwise it would be incoherent with R^*). Since $\text{ccw}(P) \subseteq \text{Rem}_{\text{ccw}}(C, C')$, it follows that P is coherent with all routes in $C \cap C'$. Since in the construction of $C_{\max}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$ we can never add a route clockwise from P (otherwise it would be incoherent with R^*) and any route in $\text{ccw}(P)$ is in $\text{Rem}_{\text{ccw}}(C, C')$, it follows that P is coherent with all routes in $C_{\max}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$. By Lemma 1.1.8, P can be extended to a route R_P that is coherent with all routes in $C_{\max}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$. We can assume that $R_P v$ is minimal with respect to $\leq_{\text{In}(v)}$, and among those routes containing $R_P v$, $v R_P$ is maximal with respect to $\leq_{\text{Out}(v)}$. See Figure 34 for a schematic illustration.

Since R_P was not added to $C_{\max}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$, it must be in $\text{Rem}_{\text{ccw}}(C, C')$. Thus there is some path P' such that $\text{ccw}(P') \cap (C \cup C') = \emptyset$ and $P' <_w^{\text{cw}} R_P$ for some w . As in the case with P , we assume that the only vertices of P' not in $P' \cap R_P$ are $\min(P')$ and $\max(P')$. Let w_1 and w_2 respectively be the minimal and maximal elements in $P' \cap R_P$. We consider two cases separately: $w \leq v$ and $v \leq w$. If $w \leq v$, then since $R_P v$ is minimal with respect to $\leq_{\text{In}(v)}$, there must exist a route $\tilde{R} \in C_{\max}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$ incoherent with $P' w R_P$. This route \tilde{R}

satisfies $P'w_1 <_{\text{In}(w_1)} \tilde{R}w_1 <_{\text{In}(w_1)} R_Pw_1$, otherwise \tilde{R} would be incoherent with R_P . Since \tilde{R} is coherent with R_P , we also have $w_1\tilde{R} \leq_{\text{Out}(w_1)} w_1R_P <_{\text{Out}(w_1)} w_1P'$. It follows that $\tilde{R} \in \text{ccw}(P')$, and thus $\tilde{R} \in \text{Rem}_{\text{ccw}}(C, C')$, which contradicts the fact that $\tilde{R} \in C_{\text{max}}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$. A contradiction is similarly reached in the case when $v \leq w$. \square

Lemma 1.3.6. *The cliques $C_{\text{max}}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$ and $C_{\text{min}}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$ are the unique maximal cliques with the following properties. If a route $R \notin \text{Rem}(C, C')$ is not in $C \cap C'$ but coherent with all routes in $C \cap C'$, then*

- (1) *for any $R' \in C_{\text{max}}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$ and $v \in R \cap R'$ either R and R' are coherent at v or $R <_v^{\text{cw}} R'$.*
- (2) *for any $R' \in C_{\text{min}}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$ and $v \in R \cap R'$ either R and R' are coherent at v or $R' <_v^{\text{cw}} R$.*

Proof. The proof is nearly identical to that of Lemma 1.2.18. In the case when $v < v'$, one needs to guarantee the existence of $\tilde{R} \notin \text{Rem}(C, C')$, which follows from the fact that $R \notin \text{Rem}(C, C')$. In the case when $v \geq v'$, one needs to guarantee that $R'vR \notin \text{Rem}(C, C')$, which follows directly from the fact that neither R nor R' is in $\text{Rem}(C, C')$. We leave the full details to the reader. \square

Proposition 1.3.7. *The following hold:*

- (1) *$C_{\text{max}}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$ is the unique maximal clique that is bigger in the order $\leq_{\text{rot}}^{\text{ccw}}$ than all the maximal cliques containing $C \cap C'$ and no routes from $\text{Rem}(C, C')$.*
- (2) *$C_{\text{min}}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$ is the unique maximal clique that is smaller in the order $\leq_{\text{rot}}^{\text{ccw}}$ than all the maximal cliques containing $C \cap C'$ and no routes from $\text{Rem}(C, C')$.* \square

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Lemma 1.3.6 and the Characterization Theorem 1.2.15. \square

Theorem 1.3.8. *The maximal cliques $C_{\text{min}}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$ and $C_{\text{max}}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$ are respectively the meet $C \wedge C'$ and the join $C \vee C'$ in $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$.*

Proof. We show only the case of the join, as the meet is argued analogously. It follows from Proposition 1.3.7 that $C \leq C_{\text{max}}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$ and $C' \leq C_{\text{max}}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$. Suppose toward a contradiction that $C_{\text{max}}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$ is not the join of C and C' . Then, there is a maximal clique $C^* < C_{\text{max}}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$ such that $C \leq C^*$ and $C' \leq C^*$. Furthermore, there is a route $R^* \in C^*$ and $R \in C_{\text{max}}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$ such that $R^* <_v^{\text{cw}} R$ for some v . In particular, $R \in \text{ccw}(R^*)$. Note that since $C \leq C^*$ we have that $\text{ccw}(R^*) \cap C = \emptyset$. Similarly, $\text{ccw}(R^*) \cap C' = \emptyset$, and hence $\text{ccw}(R^*) \cap (C \cup C') = \emptyset$. It follows that $R \in \text{Rem}_{\text{ccw}}(C, C')$, and so $R \notin C_{\text{max}}^{\text{Rem}}(C, C')$, which is a contradiction. \square

As a consequence of Proposition 1.3.7 and Theorem 1.3.8, $C \vee C'$ can be obtained from either C or C' by counter-clockwise rotations of routes that are not in $C \cap C'$ and do not result in a route in $\text{Rem}(C, C')$.

1.3.3. Semidistributivity. Recall that a lattice L is *join-semidistributive* if any elements x, y , and z in L with $z \vee x = z \vee y$ also satisfy $z \vee (x \wedge y) = z \vee x$. Similarly, L is *meet-semidistributive* if the dual condition holds, i.e. $z \wedge (x \vee y) = z \wedge x$ whenever $z \wedge x = z \wedge y$. A lattice is *semidistributive* if it is both meet- and join-semidistributive.

Lemma 1.3.9. (BEZ Lemma for semidistributivity [37, Lemma 9-2.6]) *Let L be a finite lattice and let x, y, z be elements of L . Consider the following criteria:*

- (i) *If x and y are covered by a common element and $z \vee x = z \vee y$, then $z \vee (x \wedge y) = z \vee x = z \vee y$.*
- (ii) *If x and y cover a common element and $z \wedge x = z \wedge y$, then $z \wedge (x \vee y) = z \wedge x = z \wedge y$.*

If L satisfies (i) then it is join-semidistributive, if L satisfies (ii) then it is meet-semidistributive, and if L satisfies both (i) and (ii) then it is semidistributive. \square

To show that framing lattices are semidistributive, we make use of the following lemma.

Proposition 1.3.10. *Let $C_1 \prec C_2$ be maximal cliques such that $C_2 = C_1 \setminus R_1 \cup R_2$. Let P be the path at which R_1 and R_2 are incoherent, and let \tilde{P}_1 (resp. \tilde{P}_2) be the path obtained from P by adding the edge of R_1 (resp. R_2) incoming to P and the edge of R_1 (resp. R_2) outgoing from P . Then for a maximal clique C^* the following hold:*

- (1) $C_1 \vee C^* = C_2 \vee C^*$ if and only if there exists a route $R^* \in C^*$ such that $\tilde{P}_1 <_v^{\text{cw}} R^*$ for some $v \in P$.
- (2) $C_1 \wedge C^* = C_2 \wedge C^*$ if and only if there exists a route $R^* \in C^*$ such that $R^* <_v^{\text{cw}} \tilde{P}_2$ for some $v \in P$.

Proof. We prove only part (1) because (2) follows by symmetry, reversing the framing.

(\Leftarrow) Let $R^* \in C^*$ be a route satisfying $\tilde{P}_1 <_v^{\text{cw}} R^*$ at some $v \in P$. Since $C_1 \leq C_2$, we have that $C_1 \vee C^* \leq C_2 \vee C^*$. So, it suffices to show that $C_2 \vee C^* \leq C_1 \vee C^*$, or equivalently that $C_2 \leq C_1 \vee C^*$. By Theorem 1.2.15, this follows if every route $R' \in C_2$ is coherent with or clockwise from every route $R \in C_1 \vee C^*$. Since we know that this property holds for every route in C_1 , we only need to prove it for $R' = R_2$.

Assume toward a contradiction that there is a route $R \in C_1 \vee C^*$ such that $R <_w^{\text{cw}} R_2$ for some w . Since $\text{Top}(R_1, R_2)$ and $\text{Bot}(R_1, R_2)$ are in C_1 , they are also coherent with or clockwise from R . Thus, R must be a route weakly in between R_1 and R_2 at v . We distinguish two possible cases: (1) $R = R_1$ and (2) R is in between R_1 and R_2 at v .

Case (1). If $R = R_1$ then $R <_v^{\text{cw}} R^*$, which contradicts the fact that $C^* \leq C_1 \vee C^*$.

Case (2). If R is in between R_1 and R_2 at v then

- (i) $R_1 v <_{\mathcal{J}(v)} R v <_{\mathcal{J}(v)} R_2 v$ and $v R_2 \leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)} v R \leq_{\mathcal{O}(v)} v R_1$; or
- (ii) $R_1 v \leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)} R v \leq_{\mathcal{J}(v)} R_2 v$ and $v R_2 <_{\mathcal{O}(v)} v R <_{\mathcal{O}(v)} v R_1$.

We consider only case (i) here as (ii) is symmetric. Let P_R be the maximal path in $R \cap R_2$ that contains v . Let \tilde{P}_R be the path P_R with the additional edge of R incoming to P_R . Since $R \in C_1 \vee C^*$ and $C_1 \leq C_1 \vee C^*$, then any route in C_1 must be coherent with or clockwise from R , and hence also $\tilde{P}_R v$. However, a route of C_1 cannot be clockwise from $\tilde{P}_R v$ as it would then also be clockwise from $\text{Bot}(R_1, R_2)$. Thus $\tilde{P}_R v$ is coherent with C_1 , but by Lemma 1.1.8 it extends to a route in $R' \in C_1$. Moreover $v R' = v R_1$, otherwise R' would be incoherent with $\text{Bot}(R_1, R_2)$ or R_1 . Therefore, $R' \in C_1$ is in between R_1 and R_2 , which is a contradiction.

(\Rightarrow) Let $C_1 \vee C^* = C_2 \vee C^*$. Assume toward a contradiction that every route of C^* is coherent with or clockwise from \tilde{P}_1 . Since every route of C_1 is coherent with \tilde{P}_1 , any route counter-clockwise from \tilde{P}_1 is in $\text{Rem}_{\text{ccw}}(C_1, C^*)$ by construction. Therefore, every route in $C_1 \vee C^* = C_{\max}^{\text{Rem}}(C_1, C^*)$ is coherent with or clockwise from \tilde{P}_1 . Since $C_1 \vee C^* = C_2 \vee C^*$, every route in $C_2 \vee C^*$ is coherent with or clockwise from \tilde{P}_1 . However, since $R_2 \in C_2$ and \tilde{P}_1 is clockwise from R_2 , it follows from Lemma 1.2.1 that there exists a route $R' \in C_2 \vee C^*$ that is counter-clockwise from \tilde{P}_1 . This is a contradiction. \square

Theorem 1.3.11. *The framing lattice $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ is semidistributive.*

Proof. We provide only the proof of join-semidistributivity below using Lemma 1.3.9(i), as meet-semidistributivity is obtained symmetrically. We assume that x and y are covered by a common element with $z \vee x = z \vee y$ and show that $z \vee (x \wedge y) = z \wedge x$.

The interval $[x \wedge y, x \vee y]$ is a square, pentagon, or hexagon. We only write down the details of the hexagonal case here, as the other two cases are nearly identical. Let x' and y' be the elements in the hexagon covering $x \wedge y$, such that $x' \leq y$ and $y' \leq x$ (in the cases of the square and pentagon, we would have $x' = y$ and/or $y' = x$). It follows from our assumptions that $z \vee x = z \vee y = z \vee (x \vee y) = z \vee (x' \vee y')$. It may be helpful for the reader to refer to Figure 31 with $x := C'_1$, $y := C'_2$, $x' = C_2$, $y' = C_1$, and $x \wedge y := Q$. Let P_x be the path at which the two routes involved in the rotation from x to $x \vee y$ are incoherent. In Figure 31, these routes are R_1 and $R_2 b_1 R_1$, and P_x is the path from b_2 to c_2 . Extending the head and tail of P_x by an edge along the route of x involved in the rotation, we obtain the extended path \tilde{P}_x (in Figure 31 this extension is along R_1). Since $z \vee x = z \vee (x \vee y)$, Proposition 1.3.10 implies that there is a route $R_x \in z$ such that $\tilde{P}_x <_v^{\text{cw}} R_x$ for some $v \in P_x$. Now, $x \wedge y$ is covered by x' and they differ by routes that are also incoherent exactly at P_x with \tilde{P}_x contained in the route of $x \wedge y$ involved in the rotation to x' . Therefore, by Proposition 1.3.10, we have that $z \vee x' = z \vee (x \wedge y)$. Similarly, we obtain $z \vee y' = z \vee (x \wedge y)$. We can now simply compute:

$$z \vee x = z \vee (x' \vee y') = (z \vee x') \vee y' = z \vee (x \wedge y) \vee y' = z \vee y' = z \vee (x \wedge y).$$

This finishes our proof. \square

1.3.4. \mathcal{HH} -lattice property and congruence uniformity. Our next goal is to show that the framing lattice is congruence uniform. This is implied by the, perhaps less known, \mathcal{HH} -lattice property that we now recall.

Definition 1.3.12 ([10, Definition 10], Cf. [15]). Given a lattice \mathcal{L} , let $E(\mathcal{L})$ denote the set of covering relations of \mathcal{L} . We say that \mathcal{L} is an **\mathcal{HH} -lattice** if it is finite, semidistributive, polygonal, and there exist a labeling function

$$\ell : E(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$$

where \mathcal{L} is a set of labels, and a ranking function

$$r : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$$

satisfying the following condition on every polygon $[x, y]$ of \mathcal{L} .

Let x_1 and x_2 denote the two elements covering x , and let y_1 and y_2 denote the two elements covered by y , such that x_1 and y_1 (resp. x_2 and y_2) belong to the same maximal chain. The labeling ℓ and rank function r must satisfy:

- (1) $\ell(x, x_1) = \ell(y_2, y)$ and $\ell(x, x_2) = \ell(y_1, y)$;
- (2) if t_1, \dots, t_k is a maximal chain in a polygon, then

$$r(t_1), r(t_k) < r(t_2), r(t_{k-1}) < \dots < r(t_{\frac{k+1}{2}}) \text{ if } k \text{ is odd; and}$$

$$r(t_1), r(t_k) < r(t_2), r(t_{k-1}) < \dots < r(t_{\frac{k}{2}}), r(t_{\frac{k}{2}+1}) \text{ if } k \text{ is even.}$$

A lattice is **congruence uniform** if it can be obtained from the one element lattice by a sequence of *doublings* of intervals [18]. We refer to [36] for more details on congruence uniform lattices.

Theorem 1.3.13. [10, Corollary 1] *Every \mathcal{HH} -lattice is congruence uniform.*

Theorem 1.3.14. *The framing lattice is an \mathcal{HH} -lattice, and hence congruence uniform.*

Proof. We have shown that framing lattices are finite, polygonal, and semidistributive, so it remains to find a labeling ℓ and ranking function r satisfying the necessary conditions in Definition 1.3.12 for each polygon.

If (C, C') is an edge in $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ with $C \prec C'$, then $C' = C \setminus R \cup R'$ for some routes R and R' which are incoherent at a path P . Define ℓ by labeling each edge (C, C') by the associated path P , and define $r(P) = \max(P) - \min(P)$.

By inspection of the polygons in Figures 25, 30, and 31, condition (1) of Definition 1.3.12 holds for ℓ . As for the ranking r , observe that the maximal chains in the polygons can be of length 2 or 3. There is nothing to check when the length is 2. When the length is 3, if the chain is labeled by (t_1, t_2, t_3) , then we need to have $r(t_1) < r(t_2) > r(t_3)$. In all cases, we have $r(t_1) = \max(P_1) - \min(P_1)$ and $r(t_3) = \max(P_2) - \min(P_2)$ or the other way around. Furthermore, $r(t_2) = \max(P_1) - \min(P_2)$. As $\min(P_2) \leq \max(P_2) < \min(P_1) \leq \max(P_1)$, the desired inequalities $r(t_1) < r(t_2) > r(t_3)$ follow. \square

1.4. THE FRAMING CORE LABEL ORDER AND NONCROSSING PARTITIONS

The key ingredient in our proof of semistributivity and the \mathcal{HH} -lattice property (and consequently, congruence uniformity) was the labeling of the edges of the lattice by the path P at which the two routes involved in the rotation are incoherent, as well as the labeling by the extended paths \tilde{P}_1 and \tilde{P}_2 from Proposition 1.3.10.

In this section, we define these path and extended path labelings explicitly, and show that they can be used to describe the join- and the meet irreducibles of the framing lattice. We also describe the framing core label order which generalizes the poset of noncrossing partitions in this context.

1.4.1. The path- and extended path labeling. Let $C_1 \prec C_2$ be maximal cliques such that $C_2 = C_1 \setminus R_1 \cup R_2$. Let P be the path at which R_1 and R_2 are incoherent, and let \tilde{P}_1 (resp. \tilde{P}_2) be the path obtained from P by adding the edge of R_1 (resp R_2) incoming to P and the edge of R_1 (resp R_2) outgoing from P . An illustration of these paths is shown in Figure 35.

We define three different edge labelings of the Hasse diagram of the framing lattice:

- (1) the **path labeling** $\ell(C_1, C_2) := P$,




FIGURE 35. The path P , and the extended paths \tilde{P}_1 and \tilde{P}_2 .

- (2) the **cw-extended path labeling** $\tilde{\ell}_1(C_1, C_2) := \tilde{P}_1$, and
- (3) the **ccw-extended path labeling** $\tilde{\ell}_2(C_1, C_2) := \tilde{P}_2$.

Since we will be mainly using $\tilde{\ell}_1$ instead of $\tilde{\ell}_2$, we often call $\tilde{\ell}_1$ the **extended path labeling** for simplicity, and make a distinction adding cw or ccw when necessary.

As we observed already in the proofs of semidistributivity and of the \mathcal{HH} -lattice property, in every polygon of the framing lattice opposite edges containing the minimal or maximal element of the polygon have the same path and extended path labelings. This is stated formally in the following lemma, and is illustrated in Figure 36.

Lemma 1.4.1. *Given a polygon $[x, y]$ of the framing lattice $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$, let x_1 and x_2 denote the two elements covering x , and let y_1 and y_2 denote the two elements covered by y , such that x_1 and y_1 (resp. x_2 and y_2) belong to the same maximal chain. Then,*

- (1) $\ell(x, x_1) = \ell(y_2, y)$ and $\ell(x, x_2) = \ell(y_1, y)$,
- (2) $\tilde{\ell}_1(x, x_1) = \tilde{\ell}_1(y_2, y)$ and $\tilde{\ell}_1(x, x_2) = \tilde{\ell}_1(y_1, y)$,
- (3) $\tilde{\ell}_2(x, x_1) = \tilde{\ell}_2(y_2, y)$ and $\tilde{\ell}_2(x, x_2) = \tilde{\ell}_2(y_1, y)$.

That is, opposite edges containing the minimal or maximal element of any polygon have the same path and extended path labelings.

Proof. The proof follows by inspection of all the polygonal cases described in the proof of Proposition 1.3.3. The corresponding labels are shown in Figure 36 for the generic square, pentagon, and hexagonal cases from Figures 25, 30 and 31. \square

Explicit examples of the extended path labeling $\tilde{\ell}_1$ are shown in Figure 37, corresponding to the examples of framing lattices in Figures 16 to 18.

The following definitions will help us to characterize the labels that appear in the cw-extended path labeling and the ccw-extended path labeling.

Let (G, F) be a framed graph and \tilde{P} be a path containing at least two edges. Let e_1 and e_2 be the initial and final edges of \tilde{P} , respectively. Consider the vertices $w_1 = \max(e_1)$ and $w_2 = \min(e_2)$ in \tilde{P} . We say that \tilde{P} is a **cw-extended path** (resp. **ccw-extended path**) if the following two properties hold:

- (1) e_1 is not maximal (resp. minimal) with respect to the order $\text{In}(w_1)$, and
- (2) e_2 is not minimal (resp. maximal) with respect to the order $\text{Out}(w_2)$.

In other words, when the framing is induced by the drawing of the graph from top to bottom, we require that there is an edge entering w_1 below (resp. above) e_1 and an edge exiting w_2 above (resp. below) e_2 . We use the term clockwise cw (resp. counterclockwise ccw)




FIGURE 36. Opposite edges containing the minimal or maximal element of a polygon have the same path and extended path labelings.

for this reason. Examples are illustrated in Figure 38. The following lemma is straightforward by definition.

Lemma 1.4.2. *For two maximal cliques $C_1 \prec C_2$ we have*

- (1) $\tilde{\ell}_1(C_1, C_2)$ *is an cw-extended path.*
- (2) $\tilde{\ell}_2(C_1, C_2)$ *is an ccw-extended path.*

In fact, we will see in Corollary 1.4.10 that every cw-extended path (resp. ccw-path) is the label of an edge in the cw-extended path labeling ℓ_1 (resp. ccw-extended path labeling ℓ_2). Before doing that we provide a simple bijection between cw-extended paths and ccw-extended paths, which later on will translate into a bijection between meet irreducible and join irreducible elements of the framing lattice.

Let \tilde{P} be an cw-extended path (resp. ccw-extended path) and e_1, e_2 and w_1, w_2 as above. We define $\varphi^{\text{cw}}(\tilde{P})$ (resp. $\varphi^{\text{ccw}}(\tilde{P})$) as the path obtained from \tilde{P} by replacing the incoming edge e_1 at w_1 by its successor (resp. predecessor) in the order $\text{In}(w_1)$, and the outgoing edge e_2 at w_2 by its predecessor (resp. successor) in the order $\text{Out}(w_2)$; they exist by definition of extended cw-paths (resp. ccw-extended paths). The following lemma is also straight forward from the definitions.

Lemma 1.4.3. *The following hold:*

- (1) *The map φ^{cw} is a bijection from cw-extended paths to ccw-extended paths.*
- (2) *The map φ^{ccw} is a bijection from ccw-extended paths to cw-extended paths.*




FIGURE 37. The cw-extended path labeling $\tilde{\ell}_1$ for the running examples in Figures 16 to 18. The exceptional routes in each maximal clique have been suppressed for clarity.




FIGURE 38. Visual representations of cw-extended paths and ccw-extended paths obtained from a path from w_1 to w_2 .

Moreover, φ^{ccw} and φ^{cw} are inverses of each other.

We call φ^{cw} the **cw-map** and φ^{ccw} the **ccw-map**.

1.4.2. Join irreducibles and meet irreducibles. Now that we have introduced the preliminary concepts, we are ready to give a complete and very simple understanding of the join irreducible and meet irreducible elements of the framing lattice.

Theorem 1.4.4. *The framing lattice $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ has the following properties:*

- (1) *join irreducible elements of $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ are in bijection with ccw-extended paths of (G, F) .*
- (2) *meet irreducible elements of $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ are in bijection with cw-extended paths of (G, F) .*

1.4.2.1. From ccw-extended paths to join irreducible elements. We will prove Theorem 1.4.4 by providing explicit bijections. For a path P we consider the following two routes.

R_P^{cw} : clockwise-most route containing P

R_P^{ccw} : counterclockwise-most route containing P

Lemma 1.4.5 (Join irreducibles). *If \tilde{P}_2 is an ccw-extended path of (G, F) , then:*

- (1) $R_{\tilde{P}_2}^{\text{cw}} \in C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2)$.
- (2) $C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2) = C_{\min}(R_{\tilde{P}_2}^{\text{cw}})$.
- (3) $R_{\tilde{P}_2}^{\text{cw}}$ is the unique route that can be rotated down (i.e. in cw direction) in $C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2)$.
- (4) $C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2)$ is a join irreducible element of the framing lattice $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$.

Proof. (1) Let $R = R_{\tilde{P}_2}^{\text{cw}}$. We will show that R is coherent with all the routes in $C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2)$, which implies that $R \in C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2)$. Towards a contradiction, assume that there is a route $R' \in C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2)$ that is incoherent with R at some vertex v . By construction R is coherent with \tilde{P}_2 , and Lemma 1.2.18 implies that $R' <_{\text{cw}}^{\text{cw}} R$.

Let P_v be the maximal path containing v at which R and R' are incoherent. If P_v is contained in the interior of \tilde{P}_2 then R' would be incoherent with \tilde{P}_2 , which is a contradiction. Therefore, one of the two following cases holds: (i) $\min(P_v) \leq \min(\tilde{P}_2)$ or (ii) $\max(P_v) \geq$

$\max(\tilde{P}_2)$. In the first case we have that $\tilde{P}_2 \subseteq R'vR$, contradicting that R is the clockwise-most route containing \tilde{P}_2 . In the second case we have that $\tilde{P}_2 \subseteq RvR'$, also contradicting that R is the clockwise-most route containing \tilde{P}_2 .

(2) By Corollary 1.2.21, the set of maximal cliques whose routes are coherent with a set of coherent paths S is equal to the interval $I_S := [C_{\min}(S), C_{\max}(S)]$. Let $S_1 = \{\tilde{P}_2\}$ and $S_2 = \{R_{\tilde{P}_2}^{\text{cw}}\}$. If all the routes of a maximal clique C are coherent with S_2 then they are also coherent with S_1 , therefore $I_{S_2} \subseteq I_{S_1}$. In particular, $C_{\min}(S_2) \geq C_{\min}(S_1)$.

On the other hand, we proved in (1) that $S_2 \subseteq C_{\min}(S_1)$, which implies that the maximal clique $C_{\min}(S_1) \in I_{S_2}$. So, $C_{\min}(S_2) \leq C_{\min}(S_1)$. Combining both inequalities we get $C_{\min}(S_2) = C_{\min}(S_1)$ as desired.

(3) Let $R = R_{\tilde{P}_2}^{\text{cw}}$ as before and $C := C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2)$. By parts (1) and (2), we know that $R \in C$ and $C = C_{\min}(R)$. Furthermore, for $\tilde{P}_1 := \varphi^{\text{cw}}(\tilde{P}_2)$ and an interior vertex v of \tilde{P}_2 we have that $\tilde{P}_1 <_v^{\text{cw}} R$. Therefore, by the existence of a cw rotation Lemma 1.2.14 we know that there exist a route R_1 in C that can be rotated down in cw direction, producing a maximal clique $C_2 = (C \setminus R_1) \cup R_2$. If $R_1 \neq R$, then $R \in C_2$ contradicting that C is the smallest maximal clique containing R . Therefore $R_1 = R$, and R is the unique route of C that can be rotated in cw direction.

(4) Since $C = C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2)$ has exactly one route that can be rotated down (in cw direction), then C is a join irreducible element. \square

Lemma 1.4.6 (Injectivity). *Let \tilde{P}_2 and \tilde{P}'_2 be ccw-extended paths. If $C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2) = C_{\min}(\tilde{P}'_2)$ then $\tilde{P}_2 = \tilde{P}'_2$.*

Proof. Let $C = C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2)$ and $C' = C_{\min}(\tilde{P}'_2)$. By Lemma 1.4.5, $\tilde{P}_2^{\text{cw}} \in C$ (resp. $\tilde{P}'_2^{\text{cw}} \in C'$) is the unique route that can be rotated down in cw direction in C (resp. C'). Our assumption $C = C'$ then implies that

$$\tilde{P}_2^{\text{cw}} = \tilde{P}'_2^{\text{cw}}.$$

Moreover, we can recover \tilde{P}_2 from \tilde{P}_2^{cw} as follows: Let w_1 be the first vertex in \tilde{P}_2^{cw} whose incoming edge e_1 is not the first edge in the order $\text{In}(w_1)$, and let w_2 be the last vertex whose outgoing edge e_2 is not the last edge in the order $\text{Out}(w_2)$. Then $\tilde{P}_2 = e_1 w_1 \tilde{P}_2^{\text{cw}} w_2 e_2$. Furthermore, We can recover the path \tilde{P}'_2 from \tilde{P}'_2^{cw} in the same way. Since $\tilde{P}_2^{\text{cw}} = \tilde{P}'_2^{\text{cw}}$ then $\tilde{P}_2 = \tilde{P}'_2$ as desired. \square

1.4.2.2. *From cw-extended paths to meet irreducible elements.* The following two lemmas follow from Lemma 1.4.5 and Lemma 1.4.6 by symmetry.

Lemma 1.4.7 (Meet irreducibles). *If \tilde{P}_1 is an cw-extended path of (G, F) , then:*

- (1) $R_{\tilde{P}_1}^{\text{ccw}} \in C_{\max}(\tilde{P}_1)$.
- (2) $C_{\max}(\tilde{P}_1) = C_{\max}(R_{\tilde{P}_1}^{\text{ccw}})$.
- (3) $R_{\tilde{P}_1}^{\text{ccw}}$ is the unique route that can be rotated up (i.e. in ccw direction) in $C_{\max}(\tilde{P}_1)$.
- (4) $C_{\max}(\tilde{P}_1)$ is a meet irreducible element of the framing lattice $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$.

Lemma 1.4.8 (Injectivity). *Let \tilde{P}_1 and \tilde{P}'_1 be cw-extended paths. If $C_{\max}(\tilde{P}_1) = C_{\max}(\tilde{P}'_1)$ then $\tilde{P}_1 = \tilde{P}'_1$.*

1.4.2.3. *From irreducible elements to extended paths.* In the previous two sections we introduced injective maps

$$\tilde{P}_2 \rightarrow C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2)$$

from ccw-extended paths to join irreducible elements, and

$$\tilde{P}_1 \rightarrow C_{\max}(\tilde{P}_1)$$

from cw-extended paths to meet irreducible elements. Towards the proof of Theorem 1.4.4 it only remains to show that these two maps are surjective. We do this by describing their inverse maps.

Lemma 1.4.9 (Surjectivity). *Let $C_1 \prec C_2$ be two maximal cliques with $C_2 = (C_1 \setminus R_1) \cup R_2$ and $R_1 \prec_v^{\text{cw}} R_2$. Let \tilde{P}_1 and \tilde{P}_2 be the cw-extended path and ccw-extended path involved in the rotation. Then,*

- (1) *If C_2 is join irreducible then $C_2 = C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2)$ and $R_2 = R_{\tilde{P}_2}^{\text{cw}}$.*
- (2) *If C_1 is meet irreducible then $C_1 = C_{\max}(\tilde{P}_1)$ and $R_1 = R_{\tilde{P}_1}^{\text{ccw}}$.*

Proof. We prove only part (1) because (2) follows by symmetry. Assume that C_2 is join irreducible. Then C_1 is the only maximal clique that is covered by C_2 . Moreover, since all the routes in C_2 are coherent with \tilde{P}_2 then $C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2) \leq C_2$. If $C_2 \neq C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2)$ then by Lemma 1.2.19 there would be a maximal clique C'_2 whose routes are coherent with \tilde{P}_2 such that $C'_2 \prec_{\text{rot}}^{\text{ccw}} C_2$. Then $C'_2 = C_1$ and $R_1 \in C'_2$, which is a contradiction because R_1 is incoherent with \tilde{P}_2 . Thus $C_2 = C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2)$.

Moreover, Lemma 1.4.5 (3) implies that $R_{\tilde{P}_2}^{\text{cw}}$ is the unique route that can be rotated down (in the cw direction) in $C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2) = C_2$. Therefore, $R_2 = R_{\tilde{P}_2}^{\text{cw}}$. \square

In other words, the map $C_2 \rightarrow \tilde{P}_2$ (resp. $C_1 \rightarrow \tilde{P}_1$) sends join irreducible (resp. meet irreducible) elements of the framing lattice to ccw-extended paths (resp. cw-extended paths), such that $C_2 = C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2)$ (resp. $C_1 = C_{\max}(\tilde{P}_1)$).

Corollary 1.4.10. *Let \tilde{P}_1 be an cw-extended path and \tilde{P}_2 be a ccw-extended path.*

- (1) *If $\mathbf{j} = C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2)$ is the join irreducible element corresponding to \tilde{P}_2 and \mathbf{j}_* is the unique element covered by \mathbf{j} then $\tilde{\ell}_2(\mathbf{j}_*, \mathbf{j}) = \tilde{P}_2$.*
- (2) *If $\mathbf{m} = C_{\max}(\tilde{P}_1)$ is the meet irreducible element corresponding to \tilde{P}_1 and \mathbf{m}^* is the unique element covering \mathbf{m} then $\tilde{\ell}_1(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}^*) = \tilde{P}_1$.*

Proof. We prove only (1) because (2) follows by symmetry. Let $\tilde{P}'_2 := \tilde{\ell}_2(\mathbf{j}_*, \mathbf{j})$. By Lemma 1.4.9, taking $C_1 = \mathbf{j}_*$ and $C_2 = \mathbf{j}$ we deduce that $\mathbf{j} = C_{\min}(\tilde{P}'_2)$. But by the injectivity Lemma 1.4.6 $\mathbf{j} = C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2) = C_{\min}(\tilde{P}'_2)$ implies that $\tilde{P}_2 = \tilde{P}'_2$ as desired. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.4.4. By Lemmas 1.4.5 and 1.4.6, the map

$$\tilde{P}_2 \rightarrow C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2)$$

is an injective map from ccw-extended paths to join irreducible elements. This map is surjective by Lemma 1.4.9 (1). Its inverse map is given by

$$j \rightarrow \tilde{\ell}_2(j_*, j).$$

This proves part (1) of the theorem.

For part (2), Lemmas 1.4.7 and 1.4.8 imply that

$$\tilde{P}_1 \rightarrow C_{\max}(\tilde{P}_1)$$

is an injective map from cw-extended paths to meet irreducible elements, and surjectivity follows from Lemma 1.4.9 (2). Its inverse map is given by

$$m \rightarrow \tilde{\ell}_1(m, m^*).$$

□

1.4.2.4. Bijection between join irreducibles and meet irreducibles. As seen in the proof of Theorem 1.4.4, join irreducible elements j of the framing lattice can be identified with ccw-extended paths, by taking the ccw-extended path labeling $\tilde{\ell}_2(j_*, j)$. Similarly, meet irreducible elements m correspond to cw-extended paths, by taking the cw-extended path labeling $\tilde{\ell}_1(m, m^*)$. On the other hand, ccw-extended paths and cw-extended paths are in correspondence via the inverse maps φ^{cw} and φ^{ccw} . So, we can think of these two maps as inverse maps between join irreducible and meet irreducible elements.

The following lemma implies that the join irreducible and meet irreducible elements corresponding to a cover relation are related by these two maps.

Lemma 1.4.11. *Let $C_1 \prec C_2$ be two maximal cliques with $C_2 = (C_1 \setminus R_1) \cup R_2$ and $R_1 <_v^{\text{cw}} R_2$. Let \tilde{P}_1 and \tilde{P}_2 be the cw-extended path and ccw-extended path involved in the rotation. Then,*

- (1) $\tilde{P}_1 = \varphi^{\text{cw}}(\tilde{P}_2)$.
- (2) $\tilde{P}_2 = \varphi^{\text{ccw}}(\tilde{P}_1)$.

Proof. We prove only (1) because (2) follows by symmetry. Let $P = \tilde{P}_1 \cap \tilde{P}_2$ be the path at which C_1 and C_2 are incoherent, and let $w_1 = \min(P)$ and $w_2 = \max(P)$. Assume towards a contradiction that $\tilde{P}_1 \neq \varphi^{\text{cw}}(\tilde{P}_2)$. Then, there is either (i) an edge e entering w_1 between \tilde{P}_1 and \tilde{P}_2 , or (ii) an edge e exiting w_2 between \tilde{P}_2 and \tilde{P}_1 . In case (i), we know that e belongs to some route $R \in C_1$ by Lemma 1.1.8. Furthermore, $w_1 R = w_1 R_1$ otherwise R would be incoherent with either R_1 or $\text{Bot}(R_1, R_2)$ in C_1 . But then $R \in C_1$ would be a route in between R_1 and R_2 which is a contradiction. Case (ii) is solved similarly. □

Theorem 1.4.12. *The framing lattice satisfies the following properties:*

- (1) *The map $j \rightarrow m := C_{\max}(\tilde{\ell}_1(j_*, j))$ is a bijection from join irreducible to meet irreducible elements.*
- (2) *The map $m \rightarrow j := C_{\min}(\tilde{\ell}_2(m, m^*))$ is a bijection from meet irreducible to join irreducible elements.*
- (3) *These two maps are inverse to each other.*

Proof. For (1), consider the composition of maps

$$j \rightarrow \tilde{P}_2 := \tilde{\ell}_2(j_*, j) \rightarrow \tilde{P}_1 := \varphi^{\text{cw}}(\tilde{P}_2) \rightarrow \mathbf{m} := C_{\max}(\tilde{P}_1).$$

Each map in this composition is a bijection:

- the first from join irreducible elements to ccw-extended paths
- the second from ccw-extended paths to cw-extended paths
- the third from cw-extended paths to meet irreducible elements

Therefore, this composition of maps is a bijection from join irreducible to meet irreducible elements. Moreover, Lemma 1.4.11 implies that $\tilde{P}_1 = \tilde{\ell}_1(j_*, j)$. So, we obtain $\mathbf{m} = C_{\max}(\tilde{\ell}_1(j_*, j))$ as desired.

For parts (2) and (3), we just need to consider the composition of the inverse maps in reverse direction:

$$\mathbf{m} \rightarrow \tilde{P}_1 := \tilde{\ell}_1(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}^*) \rightarrow \tilde{P}_2 := \varphi^{\text{ccw}}(\tilde{P}_1) \rightarrow j := C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2).$$

Again, Lemma 1.4.11 implies that $\tilde{P}_2 = \tilde{\ell}_2(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}^*)$. So, we obtain $j = C_{\min}(\tilde{\ell}_2(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}^*))$. \square

As another consequence of Lemma 1.4.11 we get the following corollary.

Corollary 1.4.13. *Let $C_1 \prec C_2$ be two maximal cliques with $C_2 = (C_1 \setminus R_1) \cup R_2$ and $R_1 <_v^{\text{cw}} R_2$. Let \tilde{P}_1 and \tilde{P}_2 be the cw-extended path and ccw-extended path involved in the rotation. Then,*

- (1) *If $j = C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2)$ then $\tilde{\ell}_1(j_*, j) = \tilde{P}_1$ and $\tilde{\ell}_2(j_*, j) = \tilde{P}_2$.*
- (2) *If $\mathbf{m} = C_{\max}(\tilde{P}_1)$ then $\tilde{\ell}_1(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}^*) = \tilde{P}_1$ and $\tilde{\ell}_2(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}^*) = \tilde{P}_2$.*

In other words, the cw-extended paths and ccw-extended paths involved in the rotations $C_1 \prec C_2$, $j_ \prec j$ and $\mathbf{m} \prec \mathbf{m}^*$ are the same.*

Proof. We only prove (1) because (2) follows by symmetry. Applying Lemma 1.4.11 to the two covering pairs $C_1 \prec C_2$ and $j_* \prec j$ we get $\tilde{P}_1 = \varphi^{\text{cw}}(\tilde{P}_2)$ and $\tilde{\ell}_1(j_*, j) = \varphi^{\text{cw}}(\tilde{\ell}_2(j_*, j))$, respectively. Furthermore, we already proved that $\tilde{\ell}_2(j_*, j) = \tilde{P}_2$ in Corollary 1.4.10. Therefore $\tilde{\ell}_1(j_*, j) = \varphi^{\text{cw}}(\tilde{P}_2) = \tilde{P}_1$. \square

1.4.3. The core label order of a congruence uniforme lattice. In [38], Reading introduced the shard intersection order of a finite Coxeter group W , a lattice which contains the noncrossing partition lattice $NC(W)$ associated to W as a sublattice. If W is the Coxeter group of type A_{n-1} , one recovers the classical noncrossing partition lattice of $[n]$.

One of Reading's main motivations for considering shards is the study of lattice congruences of the poset of regions of a hyperplane arrangement. Shards are certain closed polyhedral cones obtained by decomposing (or cutting) the hyperplanes of the arrangement. The shard intersection order is the poset of all possible intersections of shards ordered by reverse inclusion.

In his Chapter [37, Section 9-7.4], Reading proposed a generalization of the shard intersection order for any congruence uniform lattice $\mathcal{L} = (L, \leq)$. This is an alternate order structure on L which was coined the name *core label order* by Mühle in [28]. If \mathcal{L} is the

poset of regions of the Coxeter hyperplane arrangement of W one recovers the shard intersection order of W . If \mathcal{L} is the classical Tamari lattice $\text{Tam}(n)$ then its core label order is the classical lattice of noncrossing partition of $[n]$. In this section we recall the definition of the core label order, and propose the core label order of a framing lattice as the natural analog of the poset of noncrossing partitions for framing lattices.

Let $\mathcal{L} = (L, \leq)$ be a finite congruence uniform lattice. For a cover relation $u \prec v$ in L let $cg(u, v)$ be the finest lattice congruence of \mathcal{L} in which u and v are equivalent. These are precisely the *join irreducible lattice congruences* of \mathcal{L} . However, different covering pairs $u \prec v$ may lead to the same lattice congruence. In fact, if \mathcal{L} is congruence uniform then the map $j \rightarrow cg(j_*, j)$ is a bijection between join irreducible elements and join irreducible lattice congruences of \mathcal{L} , see [37, Section 9-7.4]. In other words, for every covering pair $u \prec v$ there is a unique join irreducible element j such that $cg(u, v) = cg(j_*, j)$. We denote this unique j as $j_{cg(u, v)}$. We label the edges $u \prec v$ of the Hasse diagram of \mathcal{L} by their corresponding join irreducible elements $j_{cg(u, v)}$.

The following lemma gives a characterization of $j_{cg(u, v)}$, cf. [20, Lemma 2.6].

Lemma 1.4.14 (Cf. [20, Lemma 2.6]). *Let $\mathcal{L} = (L, \leq)$ be a congruence uniform lattice, and $u \prec v$ be a covering pair. Then $j_{cg(u, v)}$ is the unique join irreducible element j satisfying:*

- (1) $j \vee u = v$
- (2) $j \wedge u = j_*$

The **core** of an element $x \in L$ is the interval $[x_\downarrow, x]$ where

$$x_\downarrow = \bigwedge_{y \in L: y \prec x} y$$

is the meet of all elements covered by x . The **core label set** of x is the set of labels of the edges in the core of x :

$$\psi_{\mathcal{L}}(x) := \{j_{cg(u, v)} : x^\downarrow \leq u \prec v \leq x\}.$$

When no confusion may arise, we omit the subscript \mathcal{L} and just write $\psi(x)$ for simplicity.

The **core label order** $CL(\mathcal{L}) = (L, \sqsubseteq)$ is the poset on L with the following relation. For $x, y \in L$ we say that $x \sqsubseteq y$ if and only if $\psi(x) \subseteq \psi(y)$.

1.4.4. The framing core label order. Our next goal is to give a precise description of the core label order of the framing lattice using ccw-extended paths. The first step is to characterize the join irreducible element associated to each covering pair $C_1 \prec C_2$.

Proposition 1.4.15. *Let $C_1 \prec C_2$ be two maximal cliques with $C_2 = (C_1 \setminus R_1) \cup R_2$ and $R_1 <_v^{\text{cw}} R_2$. Let \tilde{P}_1 and \tilde{P}_2 be the cw-extended path and ccw-extended path involved in the rotation. Then*

$$j_{cg(C_1, C_2)} = C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2),$$

the join irreducible element corresponding to the ccw-extended path \tilde{P}_2 .

Proof. Let $j = C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2)$ be the join irreducible element corresponding to the ccw-extended path \tilde{P}_2 , and let j_* be the unique element covered by j . By Lemma 1.4.14, we just need to show that (1) $j \vee C_1 = C_2$ and (2) $j \wedge C_1 = j_*$. We will see that both properties follow from Proposition 1.3.10. Let $P = \tilde{P}_1 \cap \tilde{P}_2$ be the path at which R_1 and R_2 are incoherent.

For (1), let $C^* = j$ and consider the route $R^* = R_{\tilde{P}_2}^{\text{cw}}$. By Lemma 1.4.5 (1), $R^* \in C^*$. Moreover, $\tilde{P}_1 <_v^{\text{cw}} R^*$ for any $v \in P$. This implies, by Proposition 1.3.10 (1), that

$$C_1 \vee j = C_2 \vee j.$$

Now, every route of C_2 is coherent with \tilde{P}_2 . By the properties of the C_{\min} algorithm in Corollary 1.2.20, we deduce that $j = C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2) \leq C_2$. Therefore

$$C_1 \vee j = C_2 \vee j = C_2$$

as we wanted to prove.

For (2), we apply a similar argument for the covering pair $j_* \prec j$, which plays the role of $C_1 \prec C_2$ in Proposition 1.3.10. Note that the cw-extended path and ccw-extended path involved in the rotation from $j_* \prec j$ are also equal to \tilde{P}_1 and \tilde{P}_2 , respectively (by Corollary 1.4.13). Now, we consider $C^* = C_1$ and the route $R^* = R_1 \in C^*$. Since $R^* <_v^{\text{cw}} \tilde{P}_2$ for any $v \in P$, Proposition 1.3.10 (2) implies that

$$j_* \wedge C_1 = j \wedge C_1.$$

Now we want to apply Proposition 1.3.10 (2) again for the covering pair $C_1 \prec C_2$, $C^* = j_*$ and the route $R^* \in j_*$ obtained by a cw rotation of the route $R_{\tilde{P}_2}^{\text{cw}} \in j$. Since $\tilde{\ell}_1(j_*, j) = \tilde{P}_1$ (by Corollary 1.4.13), then \tilde{P}_1 is a subpath of R^* . Thus $R^* <_v^{\text{cw}} \tilde{P}_2$ for any $v \in P$, and applying Proposition 1.3.10 (2) we get

$$j_* \wedge C_1 = j_* \wedge C_2.$$

Combining the two previous equations we get

$$j \wedge C_1 = j_* \wedge C_1 = j_* \wedge C_2.$$

But $j_* \leq j \leq C_2$, and so $j \wedge C_1 = j_* \wedge C_2 = j_*$ as desired. \square

Instead of labeling the covering pairs (edges) by join irreducible elements (which can be very complicated in general), we can significantly simplify everything by labeling the covering pairs (edges) with the corresponding ccw-extended paths.

Define the **ccw-core label set** of a maximal clique x in the framing lattice $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ as

$$\psi_{\mathcal{L}}^{\text{ccw}}(x) := \left\{ \tilde{\ell}_2(u, v) : x^\perp \leq u \prec v \leq x \right\}.$$

That is, the set of ccw-extended path labels in the core $[x^\perp, x]$ of x . When no confusion may arise, we omit the subscript \mathcal{L} and simply write $\psi^{\text{ccw}}(x)$ for simplicity.

The following result is a powerful and very simple description of the core label order of a framing lattice.

Theorem 1.4.16. *The core label order of the framing lattice $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ is isomorphic to the poset of ccw-core label sets $\psi_{\mathcal{L}}^{\text{ccw}}(x)$ ordered by inclusion.*

Proof. This follows directly from the description of the join irreducible labels $j_{\text{cg}(C_1, C_2)} = C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2)$ in Proposition 1.4.15 and the bijective correspondence $C_{\min}(\tilde{P}_2) \leftrightarrow \tilde{P}_2 = \tilde{\ell}_2(C_1, C_2)$ between join irreducible elements and ccw-extended paths. \square

Figure 39 shows examples of the core label order for the framing lattices in Figure 37.




FIGURE 39. Examples of the core label order of the framing lattices in Figure 37

Remark 1.4.17. We remark that the framing lattice has a richer underlying geometric structure, consisting not only of vertices and edges but also 2-dimensional faces that are squares, pentagons and hexagons, as well as possibly higher dimensional faces. This geometric structure, which we call the *framingtope*, will be introduced and studied in forthcoming work [4]. It is a polytopal complex that is dual to the complex of interior faces of the framing triangulation of a flow polytope. As illustrated on the right of Figure 39, it can be topologically decomposed into a disjoint union of half open cells, one for each element of the lattice. If we identify faces with the same set of labels, then the core label order is just the containment poset of equivalence classes of faces (more explicitly their closures) in this cell decomposition.

1.5. LATTICE CONGRUENCES AND QUOTIENTS

The purpose of this section is to study certain lattice congruences and quotients of the framing lattice arising from certain operations called *M*-moves. In particular, we will show that the resulting quotients are the framing lattices of the modified framed graphs. Two examples for the oruga graph are illustrated in Figure 40, and further examples are shown in Figure 44.




FIGURE 40. Some lattice quotients obtained via *M*-moves.

1.5.1. An equivalence relation via *M*-moves. We say that an edge $e = (i, j)$ is an *inner edge* of G if i and j are inner vertices, i.e. when e is not incident to the source or sink of G . Given an inner edge $e = (i, j)$ of G , define the graph $M(G, e)$ as the graph obtained from G by replacing e with the edges (s, j) and (i, t) . In other words, $M(G, e)$ is obtained from G by cutting the edge e in half and identifying the two sources and identifying the two sinks. For a framing F of G , the graph $M(G, e)$ inherits a framing F_e in the natural way, replacing e with $e_s := (s, j)$ in the order $\leq_{\text{In}(j)}$ and replacing e with $e_t := (i, t)$ in the order $\leq_{\text{Out}(i)}$. In this case, we say that the framed graph $(M(G, e), F_e)$ is obtained from (G, F) by an *M-move*. Such *M*-moves are due to Martha Yip and first appear in [42], where they are used to connect permutree lattices with framing triangulations of flow polytopes.




FIGURE 41. An example of an M-move.

Given an inner edge $e = (i, j)$ in (G, F) , we define the map φ_e sending routes in G to sets of routes in $M(G, e)$ as follows. For a route R in G , if $e \notin R$ we define $\varphi_e(R) = R$, and if $e \in R$ we define $\varphi_e(R)$ as the pair of routes $e_s \cup jR$ and $Ri \cup e_t$. If A is a set of routes in G , we define the **split map** Φ_e to be the map $A \mapsto \bigcup_{R \in A} \varphi_e(R)$. Two examples of maximal cliques with the same image are illustrated in Figure 42.




FIGURE 42. The split map applied to two maximal cliques.

Lemma 1.5.1. *For an inner edge $e = (i, j)$ of G , the split map Φ_e is a surjection from the set of maximal cliques in (G, F) to the set of maximal cliques in $(M(G, e), F_e)$.*

Proof. Given a maximal clique C in (G, F) , it is clear from the construction that the routes in $\Phi_e(C)$ are pairwise coherent in $(M(G, e), F_e)$. Let R be a route in $M(G, e)$ that is coherent with all the routes in $\Phi_e(C)$. We show that R is necessarily in $\Phi_e(C)$. If R is in C , then R is also in $\Phi_e(C)$ by construction. If R is not in C , then R must be of the form $e_s \cup jR$ or $Ri \cup e_t$. However, in either case there is a path $((i, j) \cup jR$ or $Ri \cup (i, j))$ in G that is coherent with all routes in C . By Lemma 1.1.8, the path can be extended to a route R' that is coherent with all routes in C , and hence necessarily also contained in C . Now by construction $e \in R'$ and $\varphi_e(R')$ contains R . So, R is in $\Phi_e(C)$. \square

Lemma 1.5.2. *Given a maximal clique D in $(M(G, e), F_e)$, the fiber $\Phi_e^{-1}(D)$ is the set of maximal cliques in (G, F) that are coherent with the set S consisting of the following paths:*

- (1) the routes of D that are also routes in G ,
- (2) the paths of the form $(i, j) \cup jR$ where R is a route in D passing through e_s , and
- (3) the paths of the form $R'i \cup (i, j)$ where R' is a route in D passing through e_t .

In particular, $\Phi_e^{-1}(D) = [C_{\min}(S), C_{\max}(S)]$.

Proof. Let C be a maximal clique of (G, F) . We need to show that $\Phi_e(C) = D$ if and only if C is coherent with S .

For the forward direction, if $\Phi_e(C) = D$ then every path P in S is necessarily a subpath of a route in C . Thus, every route in C is coherent with P .

For the backward direction, if C is coherent with S then we need to show that the routes of D corresponding to the paths of types (1), (2) and (3) in S all belong to $\Phi_e(C)$, from which we can deduce that $\Phi_e(C) = D$. For type (1) paths, consider a route $R \in D$ that is also a route in G . Since R is coherent with C then $R \in C$ by maximality, and $\Phi_e(R) = R \in D$. For type (2) paths, consider a route R in D passing through e_s . Since the path $(i, j) \cup jR$ is coherent with C then it can be extended to a route $R'' \in C$ and $\Phi_e(R'') = R \in D$. Similarly for type (3) paths, consider a route R' in D passing through e_t . Since the path $R'i \cup (i, j)$ is coherent with C , it can be extended to a route $R'' \in C$, and then $\Phi_e(R'') = R' \in D$.

This finishes the proof that C is coherent with S if and only if $\Phi_e(C) = D$. Finally, S is a set of paths in (G, F) and $\Phi_e^{-1}(D)$ is the set of maximal cliques that are coherent with S . By Corollary 1.2.21, we deduce that $\Phi_e^{-1}(D) = [C_{\min}(S), C_{\max}(S)]$. \square

Let $\alpha(e)$ be the equivalence relation on $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ induced by $x \equiv y$ if and only if x and y belong to the same fiber of Φ_e .

Corollary 1.5.3. *Each equivalence class of $\alpha(e)$ is an interval in $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$.*

Proof. Each equivalence class is of the form $\Phi_e^{-1}(D)$ for some maximal clique D in $(M(G, e), F_e)$. As we have just proved $\Phi_e^{-1}(D) = [C_{\min}(S), C_{\max}(S)]$, which is an interval. \square

1.5.2. Lattice congruences. Our next goal is to show that the equivalence relation $\alpha(e)$ is a lattice congruence of the framing lattice $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ (Corollary 1.5.8). In order to do this we need to understand the projections mapping each element of $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ to the bottom element and to the top element in its equivalence class. The following lemma will be useful for that purpose.

Lemma 1.5.4. *Let C be a maximal clique in (G, F) , $D = \Phi_e(C)$ and S be the corresponding set of paths as in Lemma 1.5.2. A route in G is coherent with S if and only if it is:*

- (1) *a route of C that does not contain the edge $e = (i, j)$, or*
- (2) *a route of the form $RijR'$ where R and R' are routes in C containing e .*

Proof. We start by proving the forward direction. Let R'' be a route in G that is coherent with S . We will show that R'' is of type (1) or (2).

Type (1): Assume that R'' does not contain the edge $e = (i, j)$. If $R'' \notin C$ then there would be a route $R \in C$ that is not coherent with R'' . If the edge e is not in R then $R \in S$, which is a contradiction. If the edge e is in R then R'' and R are incoherent outside e , and so R'' is incoherent with either $(i, j) \cup jR$ or $Ri \cup (i, j)$; since both paths are in S , this is also a contradiction. As a consequence $R'' \in C$, which means that R'' is of type (1).

Type (2): Now assume that R'' contains the edge $e = (i, j)$. The subpath $R''j$ must be coherent with C , otherwise it would be incoherent with S . By Lemma 1.1.8, the path $R''j$ can be extended to a route coherent with C , and by maximality this extended route must be equal to a route R of C . Therefore, $R''j = Rj$ for some $R \in C$. Similarly, we can show that $iR'' = iR'$ for some route $R' \in C$. Thus $R'' = RijR'$, which is a route of type (2).

For the backward direction we will show that any route of type (1) or (2) is coherent with S .

Type (1): The paths in S are either routes in C not containing e or subpaths of routes of C containing e . Since every route of C is coherent with C then it is also coherent with S .

Type (2): Let R and R' be routes in C containing e . Towards a contradiction, assume there is $R'' \in S$ that is incoherent with $RijR'$. If R'' does not contain e then $R'' \in C$. Furthermore, R'' must be incoherent with $RijR'$ outside e . This implies that R'' is incoherent with either R or R' , which is a contradiction. If R'' contains e then R'' is a path that starts or ends with the edge e . In particular, the subpath where R'' and $RijR'$ are incoherent does not contain the edge e , and so R'' is incoherent with either R or R' . Since R'' is a subpath of a route of C we also have a contradiction. \square

We focus our attention on the routes of the form $RijR'$ where R and R' are routes in C containing e . We denote by $R_{C,e}^{\text{cw}} = RijR'$ the route obtained when Rj is minimal with respect to $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(j)}$ and iR' is maximal with respect to $\leq_{\mathcal{O}(i)}$; this is the clockwise most route through e that is coherent with S . Similarly, we denote by $R_{C,e}^{\text{ccw}} = RijR'$ the route obtained when Rj is maximal with respect to $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(j)}$ and iR' is minimal with respect to $\leq_{\mathcal{O}(i)}$; this is the counterclockwise most route through e that is coherent with S .

For the equivalence relation $\alpha(e)$ on $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$, the **down projection** $\pi_{\downarrow}^{\alpha(e)}$ (resp. **up projection** $\pi_{\uparrow}^{\alpha(e)}$) is defined as the map sending each element to the bottom (resp. top) element in its equivalence class.

Lemma 1.5.5 (Down projection). *The projection $\pi_{\downarrow}^{\alpha(e)}(C)$ of a maximal clique C in (G, F) can be described equivalently as either:*

- (1) *the unique maximal clique containing the routes of C without e and the route $R_{C,e}^{\text{cw}}$,*
or
- (2) *the maximal clique containing the routes of C without e , and the routes of the form $R_{C,e}^{\text{cw}}iR$ and $RjR_{C,e}^{\text{cw}}$, where R is a route in C containing e .*

Proof. Let $D = \Phi_e(C)$ and S be the corresponding set of paths as in Lemma 1.5.2. We know that the fiber containing C is the set $\Phi_e^{-1}(D) = [C_{\min}(S), C_{\max}(S)]$ of maximal cliques that are coherent with S , and so $\pi_{\downarrow}^{\alpha(e)}(C) = C_{\min}(S)$.

Let $C' \in \Phi_e^{-1}(D)$ be a maximal clique in the fiber containing C . We will show first that if $R_{C,e}^{\text{cw}} \in C'$ then C' is the maximal clique containing the routes of C without e , and the routes of the form $R_{C,e}^{\text{cw}}iR$ and $RjR_{C,e}^{\text{cw}}$, where R is a route in C containing e . Our second step in the proof will be to show that this C' is equal to $\pi_{\downarrow}^{\alpha(e)}(C)$.

For the first step, assume that $R_{C,e}^{\text{cw}} \in C'$. By Lemma 1.5.4, the routes of C' are the routes of C without $e = (i, j)$, together with some routes of the form $RijR'$ where R and R' are routes of C containing e . But if neither R nor R' is equal to $R_{C,e}^{\text{cw}}$, then $RijR'$ is incoherent with $R_{C,e}^{\text{cw}}$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, every route of C' containing e is of the form $R_{C,e}^{\text{cw}}iR$ or $RjR_{C,e}^{\text{cw}}$, where R is a route in C containing e . Since all of these routes are pairwise coherent, it follows that C' must contain all of them by maximality.

For the second step, consider a maximal clique $C'' \neq C'$ in the fiber $\Phi_e^{-1}(D)$. There must be a route $RijR'$ in $C'' \setminus C'$ for some $R, R' \in C$ containing e . But then $R \neq R_{C,e}^{\text{cw}}$ and $R' \neq R_{C,e}^{\text{cw}}$, which implies that the route $R_{C,e}^{\text{cw}} \in C'$ is clockwise incoherent from the route

$RijR' \in C''$ at e . So, C'' cannot be smaller than C' . Since the fiber has a unique minimum element, this minimum must be equal to C' . Thus, $\pi_{\downarrow}^{\alpha(e)}(C) = C'$. \square

By symmetry we get an analogous result for the up projection.

Lemma 1.5.6 (Up projection). *The projection $\pi_{\uparrow}^{\alpha(e)}(C)$ of a maximal clique C in (G, F) can be described equivalently as either:*

- (1) *the unique maximal clique containing the routes of C without e and the route $R_{C,e}^{\text{ccw}}$, or*
- (2) *the maximal clique containing the routes of C without e , and the routes of the form $R_{C,e}^{\text{ccw}}iR$ and $RjR_{C,e}^{\text{ccw}}$, where R is a route in C containing e .*

Corollary 1.5.7. *The following hold:*

- (1) *The map $\pi_{\downarrow}^{\alpha(e)}$ is order preserving.*
- (2) *The map $\pi_{\uparrow}^{\alpha(e)}$ is order preserving.*

Proof. To prove (1), let C and C' be maximal cliques in $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ satisfying $C \leq C'$. We need to show that $\pi_{\downarrow}^{\alpha(e)}(C) \leq \pi_{\downarrow}^{\alpha(e)}(C')$. Let R be a route in $\pi_{\downarrow}^{\alpha(e)}(C)$ and R' be a route in $\pi_{\downarrow}^{\alpha(e)}(C')$. By Lemma 1.5.5, the route R (resp. R') behaves purely as a route of C (resp. C') outside the edge $e = (i, j)$. So, if R and R' are incoherent outside e then R would be clockwise incoherent from R' (because $C \leq C'$), which is what we want to prove. So, it is enough to consider the case where R and R' are incoherent at a path containing e (in particular, $e \in R$ and $e \in R'$). In this case, it suffices to check that $R_{C,e}^{\text{cw}}j \leq_{\mathcal{J}(j)} R_{C',e}^{\text{cw}}j$ and $iR_{C',e}^{\text{cw}} \leq_{\mathcal{O}(i)} iR_{C,e}^{\text{cw}}$.

Suppose toward a contradiction that $R_{C',e}^{\text{cw}}j <_{\mathcal{J}(j)} R_{C,e}^{\text{cw}}j$. Let P be the maximal path in $R_{C,e}^{\text{cw}}j \cap R_{C',e}^{\text{cw}}j$ containing j , and let k be the minimal vertex in P . Consider the path P' formed from P by appending the edge of $R_{C',e}^{\text{cw}}j$ incoming to k . Now since $R_{C',e}^{\text{cw}}j$ is minimal with respect to $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(j)}$, the path P' must be incoherent with some route R^* in C at k (otherwise it can be extended to a route in C that is smaller in the order $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(j)}$). However, such a route R^* is counter clockwise from the routes in C' containing $R_{C',e}^{\text{cw}}j$, which contradicts the fact that $C \leq C'$. This shows that $R_{C,e}^{\text{cw}}j \leq_{\mathcal{J}(j)} R_{C',e}^{\text{cw}}j$. The proof that $iR_{C',e}^{\text{cw}} \leq_{\mathcal{O}(i)} iR_{C,e}^{\text{cw}}$ uses similar arguments.

The proof of (2), i.e. that $\pi_{\uparrow}^{\alpha(e)}$ is order preserving, is similar to the proof of (1). \square

Corollary 1.5.8. *The equivalence relation $\alpha(e)$ is a lattice congruence on $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$.*

Proof. The equivalence relation $\alpha(e)$ is a lattice congruence if and only if each equivalence class is an interval and the maps $\pi_{\downarrow}^{\alpha(e)}$ and $\pi_{\uparrow}^{\alpha(e)}$ are order preserving (see e.g. [37, Proposition 9-5.2]). These properties were proven in Corollary 1.5.3 and Corollary 1.5.7. \square

1.5.3. Lattice quotients. Our next goal is to show that the lattice quotient induced by the equivalence relation $\alpha(e)$ on $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ is isomorphic to the framing lattice $\mathcal{L}_{M(G,e),F_e}$ (Corollary 1.5.10).

Proposition 1.5.9. *Let C and C' be two minimal elements of the $\alpha(e)$ equivalence classes on $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$, and let $D = \Phi_e(C)$ and $D' = \Phi_e(C')$ be their images on $\mathcal{L}_{M(G,e),F_e}$. Then $C \leq C'$ if and only $D \leq D'$.*

Proof. For the forward direction we do not need to assume that C and C' are minimal elements in their equivalence classes. If C and C' are maximal cliques of $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ satisfying $C \leq C'$ then it follows directly that $\Phi_e(C) \leq \Phi_e(C')$.

For the backward direction, assume $D \leq D'$ in $\mathcal{L}_{M(G,e),F_e}$. We will show that $C \leq C'$. Since C is the minimal element of its class, we have that $C = \pi_{\downarrow}^{\alpha(e)}(C)$. By Lemma 1.5.5, the route $R_{C,e}^{\text{cw}} \in C$ and every route of C containing e is of the form $R_{C,e}^{\text{cw}} i R$ or $R j R_{C,e}^{\text{cw}}$, where R is a route containing e . The similar statement holds for C' .

Let R_{D,e_s}^{cw} (resp. R_{D,e_t}^{cw}) be the clockwise most route of D passing through the edge e_s (resp. e_t), and define these routes similarly for D' . Since $D = \Phi_e(C)$ and $D' = \Phi_e(C')$ then

$$\begin{aligned} R_{C,e}^{\text{cw}} i &= R_{D,e_t}^{\text{cw}} i, & R_{C',e}^{\text{cw}} i &= R_{D',e_t}^{\text{cw}} i \\ j R_{C,e}^{\text{cw}} &= j R_{D,e_s}^{\text{cw}}, & j R_{C',e}^{\text{cw}} &= j R_{D',e_s}^{\text{cw}} \end{aligned}$$

Since the routes of C (resp. C') behave as routes of D (resp. D') outside of e , if a route of C is incoherent with a route of C' outside e then they are incoherent in the right order because $D \leq D'$. Therefore, it is enough to consider the case where they are incoherent at a path containing the edge e . In this case, it suffices to check that $R_{C,e}^{\text{cw}} j \leq_{\mathcal{J}(j)} R_{C',e}^{\text{cw}} j$ and $i R_{C',e}^{\text{cw}} \leq_{\mathcal{O}(i)} i R_{C,e}^{\text{cw}}$ (as in the proof of Corollary 1.5.7). By the equations above, these two conditions are equivalent to $R_{D,e_t}^{\text{cw}} \leq_{\mathcal{J}(t)} R_{D',e_t}^{\text{cw}}$ and $R_{D',e_s}^{\text{cw}} \leq_{\mathcal{O}(s)} R_{D,e_s}^{\text{cw}}$.

Following the same lines as in the proof of Corollary 1.5.7, suppose toward a contradiction that $R_{D',e_t}^{\text{cw}} <_{\mathcal{J}(t)} R_{D,e_t}^{\text{cw}}$. Let P be the maximal path in $R_{D,e_t}^{\text{cw}} \cap R_{D',e_t}^{\text{cw}}$ containing t , and let k be the minimal vertex in P . Consider the path P' formed from P by appending the edge of R_{D',e_t}^{cw} incoming to k . Now since R_{D',e_t}^{cw} is the minimal route in D' containing e_t with respect to $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(t)}$, the path P' must be incoherent with some route R^* in D at k (otherwise it can be extended to a route in D that is smaller in the order $\leq_{\mathcal{J}(t)}$). However, such a route R^* is counter clockwise from the route R_{D',e_t}^{cw} in D' at k , which contradicts the fact that $D \leq D'$. This shows that $R_{D,e_t}^{\text{cw}} \leq_{\mathcal{J}(t)} R_{D',e_t}^{\text{cw}}$. The proof that $R_{D',e_s}^{\text{cw}} \leq_{\mathcal{O}(s)} R_{D,e_s}^{\text{cw}}$ uses similar arguments. \square

Corollary 1.5.10. *For any inner edge e of G we have $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}/\alpha(e) \cong \mathcal{L}_{M(G,e),F_e}$.*

Proof. The lattice quotient $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}/\alpha(e)$ is isomorphic to the restriction of $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ to the set of minimal elements of the equivalence classes (see e.g. [37, Proposition 9-5.5]). This restricted poset is isomorphic to $\mathcal{L}_{M(G,e),F_e}$ by Proposition 1.5.9. \square

Remark 1.5.11. It would be interesting to study all lattice quotients of the framing lattice, not just the ones arising from M -moves. In particular, we do not know if every quotient is itself a framing lattice of some modified graph. We leave this as an open question for the interested reader.

1.5.4. A distributive quotient. An M -move decreases the number of inner edges in a framed graph (G, F) by one, and it can be repeated until the resulting graph has no more inner edges. We use $M(G)$ to denote the graph obtained from G by repeating M -moves until there are no more inner edges. Note that the induced framing of the graph $M(G)$, which we denote by $M(F)$, is independent of the order of the performed M -moves. Moreover, since all edges in $M(G)$ are incident to the source or sink, it follows from Lemma 1.2.12 (parts (3))

and (4)) that the framing lattice $\mathcal{L}_{M(G),M(F)}$ is independent of the initial framing F . Thus we abbreviate it by simply writing $\mathcal{L}_{M(G)}$.

In this section, we present a simple combinatorial description of the lattice quotient $\mathcal{L}_{M(G)}$ as a product of certain distributive lattices described in terms of lattice paths. In particular, this will imply that $\mathcal{L}_{M(G)}$ is a distributive lattice quotient of the framing lattice.

1.5.4.1. *A distributive lattice on lattice paths.* For each inner vertex v of $M(G)$, let G_v denote the subgraph of $M(G)$ induced by $\{s, v, t\}$. The framing lattice of G_v is independent of its framing, so we can denote it by \mathcal{L}_{G_v} . Furthermore, we have that

$$(1) \quad \mathcal{L}_{M(G)} = \prod_{v \in G \setminus \{s, t\}} \mathcal{L}_{G_v}.$$

Hence, it is enough to concentrate on the lattices \mathcal{L}_{G_v} .

Let $a+1$ be the in-degree of v in G_v , and $b+1$ be its out-degree. The flow polytope \mathcal{F}_{G_v} is the product $\Delta_a \times \Delta_b$ of two simplices, where $\Delta_a := \text{conv}\{e_1, \dots, e_{a+1}\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{a+1}$. The framing triangulation of \mathcal{F}_{G_v} is a well known triangulation of the product of two simplices, called the staircase triangulation [19]. As we will see in a more general setting in Section 2.3, the framing lattice \mathcal{L}_{G_v} is a lattice on the set of multipermutations of $1^a 2^b$, with cover relations given by replacing a consecutive pair 12 by 21. Two examples are illustrated in Figure 43.




FIGURE 43. Two examples of the distributive lattice \mathcal{L}_{G_v}

Alternatively, the elements of \mathcal{L}_{G_v} can be described as lattice paths in the plane from $(0,0)$ to (a,b) using unit East steps and unit North steps. Each multipermutation of $1^a 2^b$ can be transformed in such a lattice path by replacing each 1 by an E step and each 2 by a N step. The covering relation can be then described as adding a box to the path. This resulting poset is known to be a distributive lattice.

As a side remark, note that the number of elements of \mathcal{L}_{G_v} is then equal to $\binom{a+b}{a}$, which in turn is the volume of the product of two simplices $\Delta_a \times \Delta_b$.

Theorem 1.5.12. *For a framed graph (G, F) , the lattice $\mathcal{L}_{M(G)}$ is a distributive lattice quotient of $\mathcal{L}_{G, F}$ independent of the choice of F .*

Proof. As discussed above, $\mathcal{L}_{M(G)}$ is independent of the initial framing F of G . So, it remains to show that it is a distributive lattice. Since the product of distributive lattices is distributive, this follows from Equation (1) and the fact that \mathcal{L}_{G_v} is distributive. \square

1.5.4.2. *A Boolean lattice on lattice quotients via M -moves.* One may also be interested in the lattice quotients of $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ obtained by applying M -moves to a subset A of internal edges of G . We denote by $(M(G, A), F_A)$ be the resulting framed graph; note that the framing F_A is independent of the order in which we apply the M -moves for edges in A . We can order such lattice quotients by declaring $\mathcal{L}_{M(G,A),F_A} \leq \mathcal{L}_{M(G,B),F_B}$ whenever $B \subseteq A$. The resulting poset is a Boolean lattice, with the original framing lattice $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ on the top and the distributive quotient $\mathcal{L}_{M(G)}$ on the bottom. An example is illustrated in Figure 44.

Example 1.5.13. Let G be the graph shown on the top of Figure 44. It is a special case of the multioruga graphs discussed in Section 2.3. The framing lattice $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ is the lattice of multipermutations of 11223, with cover relations given by swapping consecutive elements $i < j$, see Figure 47. There are three internal edges e, e', e'' (corresponding to label 2) colored yellow, red and purple from bottom to top in the figure, respectively. Making an M -move on e corresponds to contracting the edges swapping 1 and 3 before the first appearance of 2; these are the four yellow edges $11322-13122$, $13122-31122$, $13212-31212$, $13221-31221$. For e' we contract the edges swapping 1 and 3 in between the first and the second appearance of 2 (edges colored red), while for e'' we contract edges swapping 1 and 3 after the second appearance of 2 (edges colored purple).

Remark 1.5.14 (The multisylvester congruence). In general, doing an M -move on an internal edge of a multioruga graph corresponds to contracting some edges of the lattice. If the internal edge corresponds to label j and is the $(\ell + 1)$ th edge from bottom to top, then the edges that are contracted are precisely those swapping any two labels i and k between the ℓ th and the $(\ell + 1)$ th appearance of j , satisfying $i < j < k$.

Remark 1.5.15 (The sylvester congruence and the Tamari lattice). As we have seen in Example 1.2.4, the weak order on permutations of $[n]$ is the framing lattice $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ for the oruga graph $G = \text{oru}(n)$ with the natural framing F . Performing M -moves to all the lower internal edges gives rise to the lattice congruence identifying permutations $UacVbW \equiv UcaVbW$ where $a < b < c$. This is a known lattice congruence of the weak order called the Sylvester congruence, whose corresponding lattice quotient is isomorphic to the Tamari lattice, see e.g. [32, Section 2.1]. Cambrian lattices of type A can also be obtained as lattice quotients of the weak order via M -moves on the oruga graph. Cambrian lattices are indexed by a sequence $\varepsilon \in \{\pm\}^n$ consisting of plus and minuses. We apply one M -move for each sign, except the first and the last, in the graph $\text{oru}(n)$. If the k th sign is $+$ (resp. $-$) then we apply an M -move on the k th upper edge (resp. down edge). The resulting framing lattice after these M -moves is isomorphic the ε -Cambrian lattice.

1.6. OPEN QUESTIONS AND CONJECTURES

Note that there are many more lattice quotients of a framing lattice as there are lattice quotients of it obtained via M -moves. For instance, the graph $G = \text{oru}(4)$ has four internal edges and the framing lattice $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ has $2^4 = 16$ lattice quotients obtained via M -moves. However, $\mathcal{L}_{G,F}$ is the weak order on permutations of $[4]$, which has 47 lattice congruences




FIGURE 44. The Boolean lattice of M-moves.

(but only 20 up to horizontal and vertical symmetry) [31]. As we have shown, every lattice quotient obtained from M -moves is itself a framing lattice. But we do not know if every lattice quotient is a framing lattice as well. We leave this as an open question, which is interesting even in the simple case of the oruga graph.

Question 1.6.1. Is every lattice quotient of a framing lattice isomorphic to a framing lattice?

We also propose the following purely enumerative conjecture, which is based on extensive computational evidence.

Conjecture 1.6.2. If F_1 and F_2 are framings of the same graph G , then \mathcal{L}_{G,F_1} and \mathcal{L}_{G,F_2} have the same number of linear intervals of length k for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

For instance, Figure 18 shows two different framing lattices of the same caracol graph with two different framings. In both cases, the number of linear intervals of length zero, one and two are 5, 5, and 2 respectively. There are no further intervals of larger length. Conjecture 1.6.2 is known to hold in the case of alt ν -Tamari lattices. This was shown by [11], but their methods do not seem to be easily extended even to cross-Tamari lattices.

Our next question is related to the complexity of framing lattices.

Question 1.6.3. What is the complexity of finding a shortest path between two maximal cliques in the rotation graph of framing lattices? Is it NP-hard? The complexity problem in the case of the classical Tamari lattice is a widely open renowned problem.

Part 2. The zoo of framing lattices

In this second part, we present the zoo of framing lattices. It contains a wide range of examples of lattices previously studied in the literature, see Figure 2. We expect other interesting species to come.

2.1. THE BOOLEAN LATTICE

The Boolean lattice \mathcal{B}_n is the lattice on the subsets of $[n]$ ordered by inclusion. In this section, we describe how to obtain \mathcal{B}_n as a framing lattice. Let G_n be the flow graph with vertex set $\{s, t\} \cup [n]$ and edge set constructed as follows. For each vertex $i \in [n]$ we add a pair of edges (s, i) and $(s, i)'$ and a pair of edges (i, t) and $(i, t)'$. In light of Lemma 1.2.12, all framings of G_n give isomorphic framing lattices. For convenience, we choose F to be a framing induced by ordering $(s, i) <_{\mathcal{J}(i)} (s, i)'$ and $(i, t) <_{\mathcal{O}(i)} (i, t)'$ at each $i \in [n]$. See Figure 45 for an example.




FIGURE 45. The graph G_3 and the Boolean lattice \mathcal{B}_3 .

Proposition 2.1.1. *The framing lattice $\mathcal{L}_{G_n, F}$ is the Boolean lattice \mathcal{B}_n .*

Proof. A maximal clique of (G_n, F) contains either the route $R_i := \{(s, i), (i, t)'\}$ or the route $R'_i := \{(s, i)', (i, t)\}$ for each $i \in [n]$. For a set $S \subseteq [n]$, define the maximal clique C_S to be the unique maximal clique with routes R'_i with $i \in S$. The map $S \mapsto C_S$ is an order preserving bijection between \mathcal{B}_n and $\mathcal{L}_{G_n, F}$. \square

2.2. CAMBRIAN LATTICES OF TYPE A

Reading's type A ε -Cambrian lattices [35] are lattices on triangulations of a polygon. The parameter ε is a map $\varepsilon : [n] \rightarrow \{\pm\}$ that assigns a positive or negative sign to each element of $[n]$. We define the polygon $P_\varepsilon(n)$ as a convex $(n+2)$ -gon with vertices $0, 1, \dots, n+1$ ordered from left to right, such that 0 and $n+1$ are on a horizontal line and i is above this line if $\varepsilon(i) = +$, or below if $\varepsilon(i) = -$. The ε -Cambrian lattice is the poset on triangulations of $P_\varepsilon(n)$ whose cover relations are increasing slope diagonal flips. The classical Tamari lattice is recovered when $\varepsilon(i) = -$ for all i .

Let the **Cambrian caracol graph** G_ε be the graph with vertex set $\{s, 0, 1, \dots, n, t\}$ and the following three kinds of edges:




FIGURE 46. The polygon $P_\varepsilon(3)$ and the Cambrian caracol graph G_ε for the parameter $\varepsilon = (-, +, -)$.

- horizontal edges $(s, 0), (0, 1), (1, 2), \dots, (n-1, n), (n, t)$,
- positive edges $(s, a)^+, (a-1, t)^+$ when $\varepsilon(a) = +$ (above the horizontal line), and
- negative edges $(s, a)^-, (a-1, t)^-$ when $\varepsilon(a) = -$ (below the horizontal line).

The graph G_ε is independent of ε , and coincides with the caracol graph $\text{car}(n+3)$ from Example 1.2.6. The framing F_ε is the one induced by the drawing, which depends on ε .

Theorem 2.2.1. *The framing lattice $\mathcal{L}_{G_\varepsilon, F_\varepsilon}$ is the ε -Cambrian lattice.*

Proof. The routes of G_ε are in bijection with the diagonals of the polygon $P_\varepsilon(n)$. More precisely, a route is completely determined by its first edge (s, i) entering at i and its last edge $(j-1, t)$ exiting at $j-1$. This route corresponds to the diagonal ij of the polygon. Under this bijection, two routes are coherent if and only if the corresponding diagonals do not cross; see Figure 46. Therefore, maximal cliques of the framing lattice correspond to triangulations of the polygon. One can also observe that a ccw rotation corresponds to an increasing slope diagonal flip. As a consequence, the framing lattice $\mathcal{L}_{G_\varepsilon, F_\varepsilon}$ is isomorphic to the ε -Cambrian lattice. \square

An example for $\varepsilon = (-, -, +, -)$ is shown in Figure 1.

Remark 2.2.2. The Tamari lattice was generalized to ν -Tamari lattices by Préville-Ratelle and Viennot [34], which coincide with the (I, J) -Tamari lattices described in [13] for certain subsets $I, J \subseteq \{0\} \sqcup [n]$. Using similar ideas, the ε -Cambrian lattice was generalized to (ε, I, J) -Cambrian lattices by Pilaud in [29]¹. These more general lattices can also be obtained as framing lattices. The (ε, I, J) graph to be used is obtained from G_ε by removing the edges (s, i) for $i \notin I$ and the edges $(j-1, t)$ for $j \notin J$. The framing is the one induced by the drawing.

2.3. THE LATTICE OF MULTIPERMUTATIONS

The weak order on S_n can be extended to a weak order on multipermutations. To our knowledge, the resulting lattice of multipermutations was first considered by Bennett and Birkhoff in [8]. For a composition $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n)$ of a positive integer k , let M be the set of mutlipermutations of the multiset with s_i copies of i for $1 \leq i \leq n$. The lattice of \mathbf{s} -multipermutations $\mathcal{M}_\mathbf{s}$ is the poset induced by the cover relation: $\mu_1 \prec \mu_2$ if and only if the multipermutation μ_2 is obtainable from the multipermutation μ_1 by an increasing

¹Note that while we use $J \subseteq \{0\} \sqcup [n]$, the convention in [29] is to use $J \subseteq \{1, \dots, n+1\}$. Our convention matches that of [13].




FIGURE 47. The lattice of multipermutations.

transposition of two adjacent numbers. Note that when choosing $\mathbf{s} = (1, \dots, 1)$ with length n , the lattice of multipermutations $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}}$ is the classical weak order on S_n .

For $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n)$, let $\text{oru}(\mathbf{s})$ be the graph on vertex set $[n+1]$ with $s_i + 1$ edges between i and $i+1$ for each $i \in [n]$. Its flow polytope is a product of n simplices, $\Delta_{s_1} \times \dots \times \Delta_{s_n}$. Let F be the framing induced by a planar drawing (i.e. without edges intersecting) of $\text{oru}(\mathbf{s})$. For an example see Figure 47.

Theorem 2.3.1. *The framing lattice $\mathcal{L}_{\text{oru}(\mathbf{s}), F}$ is the lattice of multipermutations $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}}$.*

Proof. The argument in the case of the weak order (see Example 1.1.7) generalizes naturally to the setting of multipermutations. More precisely, multipermutations are in bijection with maximal cliques as follows. The maximal clique associated to a multipermutation is the set of routes obtained by starting with the bottom-most route and proceeding to bump up the edges corresponding to numbers in the multipermutation (read left to right) until arriving to the top-most route. An example of this generalized bijection is shown in Figure 47. Under this bijection, applying an increasing transposition corresponds to a ccw-rotation. Thus, the lattice of multipermutations $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}}$ is isomorphic to the framing lattice $\mathcal{L}_{\text{oru}(\mathbf{s}), F}$. \square

2.4. THE CROSS-TAMARI LATTICE

In this section we introduce a new family of lattices which we call cross-Tamari lattices. This family includes several well studied lattices in the literature:

- (1) the ν -Tamari lattices of Préville–Ratelle and Viennot [34] (Cf. [14]),
- (2) the principal order ideal induced by ν in Young's lattice [5] (also known as the ν -Dyck lattice [11] or Stanley's distributive lattice),
- (3) the alt- ν -Tamari lattices [11], and
- (4) the ε -Cambrian lattices of type A [35].
- (5) the (ε, I, J) -Cambrian lattices [29].

Our starting point is a beautiful connection between the first two examples and triangulations of flow polytopes presented in [5].² The authors showed that both the Hasse diagram of the ν -Tamari lattice and the principal order ideal induced by ν in Young's lattice appear as dual graphs of framing triangulations of a single flow polytope $\mathcal{F}_{\text{car}(\nu)}$, obtained using different framings. We will introduce the concept of cross-Tamari lattices and show that they are framing lattices of a framed graph induced by a cross-shaped grid (Theorem 2.4.2). This immediately implies strong non-trivial consequences that we summarize in Corollaries 2.4.3 and 2.4.4. We will also see that cross-shaped grids that can be obtained from each other by permutations of rows and columns give rise to the same flow polytope but (possibly) different framing triangulations and lattices (Proposition 2.4.5), recovering the results in [5] as a particular case.

2.4.1. Cross-shaped grids. Let D be a set of lattice points in \mathbb{Z}^2 . We say that D is *horizontally connected* if for any pair of points (x, y) and (x', y) in D we have $(z, y) \in D$ for all $x < z < x'$. Let $\text{row}_D(z)$ denote the set of points in D with y -coordinate z . We say that D is *horizontally nested* if the x -coordinates of the points in $\text{row}_D(v)$ are a subset of the x -coordinates of the points in $\text{row}_D(w)$ whenever $|\text{row}_D(v)| \leq |\text{row}_D(w)|$. Similarly, we define *vertically connected* and *vertically nested*. A set of lattice points $D \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^2$ is a *cross-shaped grid* if it is both horizontally and vertically connected, and horizontally and vertically nested. Two examples are illustrated in Figure 48.



FIGURE 48. Two cross-shaped grids with proper labelings. Note that they are related by a sequence of row and column commutations that preserve the cross-shaped property.

Remark 2.4.1. Replacing lattice points by unit boxes, cross-shaped grids coincide with the moon polyominoes already used in the literature, see i.e. [39, 41]. We keep the terms “cross-shaped grid” and “cross-Tamari” for simplicity.

2.4.2. The cross-Tamari lattice. Let D be a cross-shaped grid. Two distinct points $p, p' \in D$ are *incompatible* if one of them is strictly north-east of the other and every lattice point in the smallest rectangle containing p and p' belongs to D . Two points are *compatible* if they are not incompatible. A *maximal filling* T in D is a maximal set of pairwise compatible points. If two maximal fillings $T \neq T'$ differ by one single element $T \setminus \{p\} = T' \setminus \{p'\}$ where p' is located strictly north-east of p , then we say the T' is obtainable from T by an *increasing rotation*. The *cross-Tamari order* $\text{Tam}(D)$ is the poset of maximal fillings in D where $T \preceq_D T'$ if T' can be obtained from T by a sequence of increasing rotations.

²These triangulations appear to be highly special, as they repeatedly arise in the literature under various guises and across a range of different contexts. In particular, they occur as triangulations of integrally equivalent polytopes associated with root polytopes, order polytopes, and products of two simplices. See [13, Section 1.4] for more detailed references, as well as [12].




FIGURE 49. An example of an increasing rotation in a cross-shaped grid (left), and a cross-Tamari lattice (right).

The case where D is the set of lattice points weakly above a staircase shape recovers the classical Tamari lattice. If D is the set of lattice points \mathcal{L}_ν weakly above a given lattice path ν then we recover of ν -Tamari lattice of Préville-Ratelle and Viennot [34] (using the approach of [14]). Commuting the columns of \mathcal{L}_ν while preserving the cross-shaped property, gives rise to the alt ν -Tamari lattices studied in [11]. See Figure 50 for some examples.




FIGURE 50. Some examples of cross-Tamari lattices: (1) a Tamari lattice, (2) a ν -Tamari lattice, (3) an alt ν -Tamari lattice, (4) the cross-Tamari lattice of the “minimal cross-shaped grid”.

2.4.3. The cross-Tamari lattice as a framing lattice. Our next objective is to find a framed graph whose framing lattice is isomorphic to the cross-Tamari order $\text{Tam}(D)$ associated to a cross-shaped grid D . If D has a columns and b rows, it is convenient to assign positions to the points in D according to a relabeling of the columns with the numbers $1, \dots, a$ and the rows with $\bar{1}, \dots, \bar{b}$, in some order. We identify a point $p \in D$ with its **position** $p = (v, \bar{w})$ where v is the label of column and \bar{w} is the label of the row of the point. We denote by $\ell(v)$ (resp. $\ell(\bar{w})$) the number of elements of D in column v (resp. row \bar{w}). A **proper labeling** of the rows and columns of D is a labeling satisfying the following conditions:

- the column labels form a unimodular sequence³ and $\ell(v) > \ell(v')$ implies $v < v'$
- the row labels form a unimodular sequence and $\ell(\bar{w}) > \ell(\bar{w}')$ implies $w < w'$

Intuitively, this means that we label the columns (resp. rows) with the integers $1, 2, \dots$ in order, from longest to shortest, starting with one of the longest columns (resp. rows) and then adding one column (resp. row) at a time directly to the left or right (resp. above or below) of those previously added. Such a labeling is not unique if D has rows or columns of the same length, but any proper labeling will suffice for our purposes. See Figure 48 for two examples of cross-shaped grids with proper labelings of their rows and columns. In this figure, the bottom-left corners (colored blue and red) of the two example have positions $(1, \bar{5})$ and $(3, \bar{4})$, respectively.

Let D be a cross-shaped grid and L be a proper labeling of its columns and rows with the numbers $[a]$ and $[\bar{b}]$. We define the **(D, L) -caracol graph** $G_{D,L}$ as the graph on the vertex set $\{s, t\} \sqcup [a] \sqcup [\bar{b}]$, whose edges are given as follows.

First we define a linear order \prec on the vertices, whose minimal element is s , maximal element is t , and the following three relations hold:

- $i_1 \prec i_2$ when $i_1 < i_2$
- $\bar{j}_2 \prec \bar{j}_1$ when $j_1 < j_2$
- $x \prec \bar{y}$ when $(x, \bar{y}) \in D$

The fact that \prec is a linear order follows from the conditions on D and L . We place the vertices $\{s, t\} \sqcup [a] \sqcup [\bar{b}]$ in a horizontal line following the linear order \prec and draw an edge between each pair of consecutive elements. This looks like $s - 1 - \dots - \bar{1} - t$. We add additional edges (s, i) and (\bar{j}, t) as follows:

- For $\bar{1} \neq \bar{j} \in [\bar{b}]$, we draw an edge (\bar{j}, t) below the horizontal line if row label \bar{j} is below row label $\bar{1}$, and above if it is above.
- For $1 \neq i \in [a]$, we draw an edge (s, i) below the horizontal line if column label i is on the right of column label 1 , and above if it is on the left.

The resulting graph is $G_{D,L}$, and the framing $F_{D,L}$ is the framing induced by our drawing; see Figure 51 for an example.

Theorem 2.4.2. *For any proper labeling L of the rows and columns of D , the framing lattice $\mathcal{L}_{G_{D,L}, F_{D,L}}$ is isomorphic to the cross-Tamari order $\text{Tam}(D)$.*

³increases and then decreases




FIGURE 51. A cross-shaped grid D with a proper labeling L of its rows and columns (left). The (D, L) -caracol graph $G_{D,L}$ with the routes corresponding to the marked points in D highlighted (right).

Proof. An important feature of $G_{D,L}$ is that its routes can be characterized by two edges, namely the edges of the route incident to the source and sink. We can then express the unique route that uses edges (s, i) and (\bar{j}, t) by $R_{i, \bar{j}}$. The map $(i, \bar{j}) \rightarrow R_{i, \bar{j}}$ is a bijection between the lattice points in D and the routes in $G_{D,L}$. One can check by inspection that, under this bijection, two lattice points are compatible in D if and only if their corresponding routes are coherent (see examples of incompatible/coherent pairs of lattice points and their corresponding incoherent/coherent routes in Figure 51). Therefore, maximal cliques of the framing lattice correspond to maximal fillings. One can also observe that increasing tree rotations correspond to ccw-rotations. As a consequence, the framing lattice $\mathcal{L}_{G_{D,L}, F_{D,L}}$ is isomorphic to the cross-Tamari order $\text{Tam}(D)$. \square

The following is a direct non-trivial consequence of Theorem A.

Corollary 2.4.3. *The cross-Tamari order $\text{Tam}(D)$ is an \mathcal{HH} -lattice. Hence it is semidistributive, congruence uniform, and polygonal. Furthermore, its polygons consist only of squares, pentagons or hexagons.*

The following is another immediate but nontrivial consequence that illustrates the power of the framing lattice approach.

Corollary 2.4.4. *For a cross-shaped grid D with a columns and b rows the following hold:*

- (1) *All maximal fillings have the same number of elements, equal to $a + b - 1$.*
- (2) *The rotation graph of maximal fillings is connected.*
- (3) *$\text{Tam}(D)$ has a unique maximal and a unique minimal element.*

Proof. For simplicity, let $G = G_{D,L}$. maximal fillings determine the maximal simplices of the framing triangulation of the flow polytope \mathcal{F}_G . Thus, the number of elements of any maximal filling T is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \mathcal{F}_G + 1 &= |E(G)| - |V(G)| + 2 \\ &= (2a + 2b - 1) - (a + b + 2) + 2 \\ &= a + b - 1 \end{aligned}$$

This proves item (1). Item (2) follows from the fact that the dual graph of a triangulation of a polytope is connected. Item (3) about $\text{Tam}(D)$ having a unique maximal and a unique minimal element follows from the fact of being a lattice. \square

The following result shows different cross-Tamari lattices obtainable through framing triangulations of the same flow polytope.

Proposition 2.4.5. *Let D and D' be two cross-shaped grids that are obtainable from each other by a permutation of rows and columns. Then,*

- (1) *The graph $G_{D,L}$ is independent of a proper labeling L of the rows and columns of D (but the framing depends on L). In particular, the flow polytope $\mathcal{F}_{G_D} := \mathcal{F}_{G_{D,L}}$ is independent of L .*
- (2) *The two graphs of D and D' are equal: $G_{D,L} = G_{D',L'}$.*
- (3) *The Hasse diagrams of the cross-Tamari lattices $\text{Tam}(D)$ and $\text{Tam}(D')$ are the dual graphs of two framing triangulations of the same flow polytope $\mathcal{F}_{G_D} = \mathcal{F}_{G_{D'}}$.*

Proof. For item (1), it suffices to check that the horizontal line of $G_{D,L}$ is fixed independent of the proper labeling L . Or equivalently, that the linear order \prec on the vertices $\{s, t\} \sqcup [a] \sqcup [\bar{b}]$ is independent of L . This follows from the fact that $(i, \bar{j}) \in D$ for L if and only if $(i, \bar{j}) \in D$ for L' , for any two proper labelings L and L' .

For item (2), fix two proper labelings L and L' of D and D' respectively. Since D and D' are obtainable from each other by a permutation of rows and columns, one can observe that $(i, \bar{j}) \in D$ if and only if $(i, \bar{j}) \in D'$. This implies that $G_{D,L} = G_{D',L'}$.

For item (3), since $G_{D,L} = G_{D',L'}$ then their flow polytopes are equal. \square

Proposition 2.4.6. *Any framing of $G_{D,L}$ produces a framing lattice that is isomorphic to a cross-Tamari lattice.*

Proof. Consider $G_{D,L}$ with framing $F_{D,L}$. Changing the framing by flipping an edge (s, i) with $i \neq 1$ drawn above (resp. below) the horizontal line to being drawn below (resp. above) corresponds with moving the column labeled i in D to the right (resp. left) of the column labeled 1, while preserving the cross-shaped property. Similarly, changing the framing by flipping an edge (\bar{j}, t) with $\bar{j} \neq \bar{1}$ drawn above (resp. below) the horizontal line to being drawn below (resp. above) corresponds with moving the column labeled \bar{j} in D below (resp. above) the row labeled $\bar{1}$. Any of these operations gives a new cross-shaped grid D' with proper labeling L' , with $G_{D,L} = G_{D',L'}$, while $F_{D,L}$ and $F_{D',L'}$ differ by the drawing of a single edge. Since every framing of $G_{D,L}$ can be obtained by iterating these moves, we obtain a corresponding cross-shaped grid and proper labeling for each framing. \square

Remark 2.4.7. The ε -Cambrian lattices (and the (ε, I, J) -Cambrian lattices of Remark 2.2.2) are special cases of the cross-Tamari lattices. This follows from the observation that for any Cambrian caracol graph G_ε , one can easily construct a (D, L) -caracol graph $G_{D,L}$ that differs from G_ε only by contracting idle edges (thus having isomorphic framing lattices). More precisely, an internal node i of G_ε is duplicated to a horizontal edge $i - \bar{i}$, and the pair of edges $(s, i), (i, t)$ are transformed to $(s, i), (\bar{i}, t)$; Note that in contrast to the cross-Tamari case, the bar labels now appear in increasing order from left to right, so when we translate to the cross-shaped grid the row labels are reversed (labels of rows now *decrease* from longer to shorter, while the labels of columns increase from longer to shorter). A lattice point (i, \bar{j}) in the grid corresponds to the diagonal $(i, j + 1)$ in the polygon P_ε . See Figure 52 for an example.




FIGURE 52. ε -Cambrian lattices are cross-Tamari lattices (Remark 2.4.7): example of a Cambrian caracol graph G_ε and its corresponding (D, L) -caracol graph $G_{D,L}$ (with the order of labels in $[\bar{b}]$ reversed).

In order to get the (ε, I, J) -Cambrian lattices from [29], one just needs to restrict the cross-shaped grid corresponding to G_ε to a subset of columns and a subset of rows. The restricted cross-shaped grid gives a cross-Tamari lattice isomorphic to a (ε, I, J) -Cambrian lattice.

2.5. FURTHER SPECIES

Further species in the framing lattice zoo include:

- the s -weak order of Ceballos and Pons, which is a direct consequence of [21];
- the permutree lattices of Pilaud and Pons [30], which unify the weak order and the Boolean, Tamari, and Cambrian lattices. This is a direct consequence of the connection to flow polytopes given by Tamayo in [42].
- τ -tilting posets for certain gentle algebras, which follows directly from [6];
- the Grassmann–Tamari order of Santos–Stump–Welker [40].
- the Grid-Tamari lattices of McConville [24], which generalize the Grassman-Tamari order;

REFERENCES

- [1] Welleda Baldoni and Michèle Vergne. “Kostant partitions functions and flow polytopes”. In: *Transform. Groups* 13.3-4 (2008), pp. 447–469.
- [2] Matias von Bell. “On flow polytopes, nu-associahedra, and the subdivision algebra”. In: *Theses and Dissertations–Mathematics. 90* (2022). URL: https://uknowledge.uky.edu/math_etds/90.
- [3] Matias von Bell and Cesar Ceballos. “Framing lattices and flow polytopes”. In: *Sém. Lothar. Combin.* 91 (2024), p. 9812.
- [4] Matias von Bell, Cesar Ceballos, and Sergio Fernandez de soto Guerrero. *Framingtopes*. Unpublished work in progress. In preparation. 2025.

- [5] Matias von Bell et al. “A Unifying Framework for the nu -Tamari Lattice and Principal Order Ideals in Young’s Lattice”. In: *Combinatorica* (2023), pp. 1–26.
- [6] Matias von Bell et al. “Triangulations of flow polytopes, ample framings, and gentle algebras”. In: *Selecta Mathematica* 30.3 (2024), p. 55.
- [7] Carolina Benedetti et al. “A combinatorial model for computing volumes of flow polytopes”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 372.5 (2019), pp. 3369–3404.
- [8] Mary K Bennett and Garrett Birkhoff. “Two families of Newman lattices”. In: *Algebra Universalis* 32 (1994), pp. 115–144.
- [9] Jonah Berggren and Khrystyna Serhiyenko. “Wilting theory of flow polytopes”. In: *Sém. Lothar. Combin.* 91 (2024).
- [10] Nathalie Caspard, Claude Le Conte de Poly-Barbut, and Michel Morvan. “Cayley lattices of finite Coxeter groups are bounded”. In: *Advances in Applied Mathematics* 33.1 (2004), pp. 71–94.
- [11] Cesar Ceballos and Clément Chenevière. “On linear intervals in the alt ν -Tamari lattices”. In: *Combinatorial Theory* 4.2 (2024).
- [12] Cesar Ceballos, Arnau Padrol, and Camilo Sarmiento. “Dyck path triangulations and extendability”. In: *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 131 (2015), pp. 187–208. ISSN: 0097-3165,1096-0899.
- [13] Cesar Ceballos, Arnau Padrol, and Camilo Sarmiento. “Geometry of ν -Tamari lattices in types A and B ”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 371.4 (2019), pp. 2575–2622.
- [14] Cesar Ceballos, Arnau Padrol, and Camilo Sarmiento. “The ν -Tamari lattice via ν -trees, ν -bracket vectors, and subword complexes”. In: *Electron. J. Comb* 27 (2020).
- [15] Cesar Ceballos and Viviane Pons. “The s -weak order and s -permutahedra I: combinatorics and lattice structure”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.11556* (2022).
- [16] Clara S Chan, David P Robbins, and David S Yuen. “On the volume of a certain polytope”. In: *Experimental Mathematics* 9.1 (2000), pp. 91–99.
- [17] Vladimir I. Danilov, Alexander V. Karzanov, and Gleb A. Koshevoy. “Coherent fans in the space of flows in framed graphs”. In: *24th International Conference on Formal Power Series and Algebraic Combinatorics (FPSAC 2012)*. Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci. Proc., AR. 2012, pp. 481–490.
- [18] Alan Day. “Splitting lattices generate all lattices”. In: *Algebra Universalis* 7 (1977), pp. 163–169.
- [19] Jesús A. De Loera, Jörg Rambau, and Francisco Santos. *Triangulations*. Vol. 25. Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics. Structures for algorithms and applications. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010, pp. xiv+535. ISBN: 978-3-642-12970-4.
- [20] Alexander Garver and Thomas McConville. “Oriented flip graphs of polygonal subdivisions and noncrossing tree partitions”. In: *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 158 (), pp. 126–175. ISSN: 0097-3165,1096-0899.
- [21] Rafael González D’León et al. “Realizing the s -permutahedron via flow polytopes”. In: *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 378.11 (2025), pp. 7625–7666.
- [22] Lutz Hille. “Quivers, cones and polytopes”. In: *Linear algebra and its applications* 365 (2003), pp. 215–237.
- [23] Ricky I Liu, Karola Mészáros, and Avery St Dizier. “Gelfand–Tsetlin Polytopes: A Story of Flow and Order Polytopes”. In: *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* 33.4 (2019), pp. 2394–2415.

- [24] Thomas McConville. “Lattice structure of Grid–Tamari orders”. In: *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A* 148 (2017), pp. 27–56.
- [25] Karola Mészáros and Alejandro H. Morales. “Volumes and Ehrhart polynomials of flow polytopes”. In: *Math. Z.* 293.3-4 (2019), pp. 1369–1401.
- [26] Karola Mészáros, Alejandro H. Morales, and Brendon Rhoades. “The polytope of Tesler matrices”. In: *Selecta Mathematica* 23.1 (2017), pp. 425–454.
- [27] Karola Mészáros and Avery St. Dizier. “From generalized permutahedra to Grothendieck polynomials via flow polytopes”. In: *Algebraic Combinatorics* 3.5 (2020), pp. 1197–1229.
- [28] Henri Mühle. “The core label order of a congruence-uniform lattice”. In: *Algebra Universalis* 80.1 (2019), Paper No. 10, 22. ISSN: 0002-5240,1420-8911.
- [29] Vincent Pilaud. “Cambrian triangulations and their tropical realizations”. In: *European Journal of Combinatorics* 83 (2020), p. 102997.
- [30] Vincent Pilaud and Viviane Pons. “Permutrees”. In: *Algebraic Combinatorics* 1.2 (2018), pp. 173–224.
- [31] Vincent Pilaud and Francisco Santos. “Quotientopes”. In: *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society* 51.3 (2019), pp. 406–420.
- [32] Vincent Pilaud, Francisco Santos, and Günter M. Ziegler. “Celebrating Loday’s associahedron”. In: *Archiv der Mathematik* 121.5 (2023), pp. 559–601.
- [33] Jim Pitman and Richard P. Stanley. “A polytope related to empirical distributions, plane trees, parking functions, and the associahedron”. In: *Discrete Comput. Geom.* 27.4 (2002), pp. 603–634.
- [34] Louis-François Prévaille-Ratelle and Xavier Viennot. “The enumeration of generalized Tamari intervals”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 369.7 (2017), pp. 5219–5239.
- [35] Nathan Reading. “Cambrian lattices”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 205.2 (2006), pp. 313–353.
- [36] Nathan Reading. “Lattice and order properties of the poset of regions in a hyperplane arrangement”. In: *Algebra Universalis* 50 (2003), pp. 179–205.
- [37] Nathan Reading. “Lattice theory of the poset of regions”. In: *Lattice Theory: Special Topics and Applications: Volume 2*. Ed. by George Grätzer and Wehrung Friedrich. Springer, 2016, pp. 399–487.
- [38] Nathan Reading. “Noncrossing partitions and the shard intersection order”. In: *J. Algebraic Combin.* 33.4 (2011), pp. 483–530. ISSN: 0925-9899,1572-9192.
- [39] Martin Rubey. “Maximal 0-1-fillings of moon polyominoes with restricted chain lengths and rc-graphs”. In: *Adv. in Appl. Math.* 48.2 (2012), pp. 290–305. ISSN: 0196-8858,1090-2074.
- [40] Francisco Santos, Christian Stump, and Volkmar Welker. “Noncrossing sets and a Grassmann associahedron”. In: *Forum of Mathematics, Sigma*. Vol. 5. Cambridge University Press, 2017, e5.
- [41] Luis Serrano and Christian Stump. “Maximal fillings of moon polyominoes, simplicial complexes, and Schubert polynomials”. In: *Electron. J. Combin.* 19.1 (2012), Paper 16, 18. ISSN: 1077-8926.
- [42] Daniel Tamayo Jiménez. “Combinatorics of Permutreehedra and Geometry of s -Permutahedra”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.19732* (2023).

(von Bell) INSTITUTE OF GEOMETRY, GRAZ UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY,
Email address: `matias.vonbell@gmail.com`

(Ceballos) INSTITUTE OF GEOMETRY, GRAZ UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY,
Email address: `cesar.ceballos@tugraz.at`