

A Discrete Proof of the General Jordan-Schoenflies Theorem

LI CHEN
STEVEN G. KRANTZ

In the early 1960s, Brown and Mazur proved the general Jordan-Schoenflies theorem. This fundamental theorem states: If we embed an $(n - 1)$ sphere $S^{(n-1)}$ locally flatly in an n sphere S^n , then it decomposes S^n into two components. In addition, the embedded $S^{(n-1)}$ is the common boundary of the two components and each component is homeomorphic to the n -ball.

This paper gives a constructive proof of the theorem using the discrete method. More specifically, we prove the equivalent statements: Let M be an n -manifold, which is homeomorphic to S^n . Then, every $(n - 1)$ -manifold S , a submanifold with local flatness in M , decomposes the space M into two components where each component is homeomorphic to an n -ball. The method was chosen in order to evaluate the computability and computational costs among operations between cells regarding homeomorphism. In addition, methods within the proof can be extended to applications in design algorithms under the assumption that homeomorphic mappings are constructible and computable. In this new revision, We add some new detailed discussions.

[MSC 57Q05](#);

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Concepts Review and New Concepts	4
2.1	Triangulation and Simplicial Complexes	5
2.2	Discrete Manifolds	8
2.3	Contraction and Simply Connected Spaces	9
2.4	Graph-Distances and Cell-Distances	11
2.5	Local Flatness	12
3	Local Flatness of Manifolds in Discrete Space	13
3.1	Some Observations on Local Flatness in Discrete Space	13
3.2	Formal Definitions of Local Flatness	15
3.3	Properties of Discrete Local Flatness	20
4	Properties of the Gradual Variation of Discrete Manifolds	23
4.1	Minimal Gradual Variation Between Curves	24
4.2	Gradually Varied Deformation in a Single Discrete k -cell	26
5	Discrete Proof of the General Jordan-Schoenflies Theorem	30
6	Conclusion	44
	Appendix	45
	Bibliography	49

1 Introduction

The classical Jordan curve theorem was believed to have been first proven by Veblen in 1905. The Jordan curve theorem states that a simple, closed curve C separates the plane into two components. After its first publication, there were many other proofs that followed, including Tutte’s proof based on planar graphs in 1978 [20]. Other discrete proofs have also been explored. In [1], Chen gave a discrete proof of the classical Jordan curve theorem based on discrete manifolds that are cell-complexes.

The Jordan-Schoenflies theorem is a further development of the Jordan curve theorem. The general Jordan-Schoenflies theorem is a fundamental theorem in geometric topology [16, 4, 6], which states that embedding an $(n - 1)$ -sphere $S^{(n-1)}$ locally flatly into an n -sphere S^n decomposes the space into two components. In addition, the embedded $S^{(n-1)}$ is the common boundary of the two components, where each component is homeomorphic to the n -ball.

To better understand this theorem, we can embed a 1-sphere (a circle) into a 2-sphere (a globe). This could result in two “bowls” where the circle is their common boundary. If the circle is a simple closed curve, then it would separate the two components (given that the curve is locally flat, a situation we later explain).

The Jordan-Schoenflies theorem confirmed that one component is homeomorphic to an open disk. However, this theorem is only valid in two dimensional space. In three-dimensional space, there is a counterexample given by Alexander’s horned sphere: It separates space into two regions, but the regions are so twisted that they are not homeomorphic to a normal 3-disk [11, 12].

Since the Alexander horned sphere embedding cannot be made differentiable nor polyhedral, Mazur [6, 7] used the concept of “nice embedding” to obtain the general Jordan-Schoenflies theorem. Brown [4] simplified Mazur’s concept to local flatness that can prevent the infinite twists of the Alexander horned sphere.

Compared to the original Jordan curve theorem, the classic description of the general Jordan-Schoenflies theorem only considers spheres as the ambient space. An equivalent, more inclusive statement to the theorem is as follows: For an n -manifold \mathbb{M} that is homeomorphic to an n -sphere and an $(n - 1)$ -submanifold $\mathbb{S} \subset \mathbb{M}$ that is homeomorphic to an $(n - 1)$ -sphere, \mathbb{S} decomposes \mathbb{M} into two components where their common boundary is \mathbb{S} if \mathbb{S} is locally flat in \mathbb{M} .

We give a discrete proof of the above description for the general Jordan-Schoenflies theorem in higher dimensions. We assume that M is a triangulation or a polygonal

decomposition of \mathbb{M} and S is an $(n - 1)$ dimensional discrete submanifold of M , where S is locally flat, closed, and orientable.

Our proof will reduce to proving the two following theorems: **(1)** (the general Jordan theorem) Every $(n - 1)$ -submanifold S that is homeomorphic to a sphere and is a submanifold with local flatness in an n -manifold M , which is homeomorphic to an n -sphere, decomposes the space M into two components. In other words, embedding an $(n - 1)$ -sphere $S^{(n-1)}$ in an n -sphere S^n decomposes the space into two components, and the embedded $S^{(n-1)}$ is their common boundary. **(2)** Each of the two components is homeomorphic to the n -ball.

The advantage of our proof is that we use a completely constructive method that can also be used to design algorithms for applications. For instance, we can use this method to actually deform a separated component into an n -ball. This kind of procedure has potential applications in the massive data processing of topological structures in persistent analysis.

2 Concepts Review and New Concepts

In this section, we review and clarify existing concepts and introduce some new concepts used in the proof of the discrete form of the Jordan-Schoenflies theorem in Section 5. To begin with definitions, a k -cell is basically a k -dimensional open manifold that is homeomorphic to a (an open) k -ball. For the purposes of this paper, we add certain constructive properties to the k -cell: 1) A k -cell and its boundary must be finite-time constructible, and 2) The k -cell and its boundary are finite-time computable (decidable) in computing science if k is a fixed number. In other words, even though we do not require that a k -manifold be constructible or computable, we at least require that a k -cell and its boundary be constructible and computable.

Constructible, decidable, and polynomial time computable functions are three main categories regarding computability in mathematics [13, 14]. The word “computable” means able to be calculated with a computer program, and “polynomial time computable” means able to be calculated with a computer program in polynomial time. Constructible functions may not necessarily be computable.

A cell should be simple enough that it can be constructed or determined effectively. For example, a simplex (triangle) is a cell that can be determined easily; it is linear-time (a special case of polynomial-time) computable if its vertices are not located at

non-rational number coordinates. ¹ A cubic cell with integer coordinates is also easy to determine and is polynomial time decidable.

Therefore, from a computing standpoint, it is not rational to make a cell as complicated as a manifold. If we allow the cell to be very complex, then we may encounter a difficult argument loop, which is why previous researchers primarily used simplices. However, in this paper, we use general cells since cubic cells are easy to deal with intuitively. Our definition already includes the simplex as a special case.

We want to add the polynomial-time computable property of cells to study the structure of manifolds. Therefore, we require a third property of a k -cell: 3) The k -cell and its boundary are polynomial-time computable.

This property allows us to use a computing algorithm to determine if a set is a k -cell. We can also find the boundary and other information regarding the k -cells in polynomial-time. In addition, we only consider a finite number of cells.

We can assume that each k -cell only contains a finite or constant number of i -cells with respect to k , $0 \leq i < k$. This means that if k is a fixed number, then the number of sub-cells of the k -cell will be bounded by a function with respect to k .

2.1 Triangulation and Simplicial Complexes

Triangulation is a type of decomposition of a continuous space. In other words, a 2D or 3D space is partitioned into triangles or tetrahedra, which are both examples of simplices.

Mathematically, an n -simplex Δ is a convex hull of $n + 1$ vertices $v_0, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that the vectors $\langle v_1 - v_0 \rangle, \dots, \langle v_n - v_0 \rangle$ are linearly independent (called an affine space). This simplex is the set determined by

$$\Delta = \left\{ \alpha_0 v_0 + \dots + \alpha_n v_n \mid \sum_{i=0}^n \alpha_i = 1 \text{ and } \alpha_i \geq 0 \right\}.$$

An $(n - 1)$ -face of Δ is a subset of Δ where $\alpha_k \equiv 0$ for a fixed k . The intuitive meaning is that if Δ is a 3D tetrahedron, then a 2-face of Δ is a boundary triangle of

¹Note that not every real number is computable. For readers who only want to deal with the concept of constructability, treat the concept of polynomial time decidable as having a sample equal to "easily constructible."

the tetrahedron. We can define an i -face of Δ as the $(n - i)$ numbers $\alpha_j \equiv 0$ in the above equation.

We define (in dimension theory) \emptyset to be a (-1) -face of Δ . A simplicial complex is defined as a set of simplices such that: **(1)** Any i -face of a simplex from \mathbb{K} is also in \mathbb{K} , and **(2)** the intersection of any two simplices $\Delta_1, \Delta_2 \in \mathbb{K}$ is a face of these two simplices in \mathbb{K} .

The dimension of a simplicial complex is defined as the highest dimension of any simplex in \mathbb{K} . We can see that a triangulation of a plane forms a 2-simplicial complex. [15]

In this subsection, we show that the discrete space used is a special case of the CW complex when embedding the discrete space into a Hausdorff space. In computer graphics or discrete geometry, a 2D complex is represented by three sets: (1) A set of 0-cells, (2) A set of 1-cells, and (3) A set of 2-cells. Each 1-cell is represented by two end points (0-cells), and each 2-cell is represented by the boundary polygon, which is a closed path formed by several 1-cells. Therefore, a 2-cell is completely determined by its boundary, which is a closed 1-cycle. Intuitively, when we think about a simple 1-cycle representing a 2-cell, we can fill substance into the cycle (such as a deformed 2-ball filling the inner part of the cycle). A famous example would be the minimal surface when given a boundary cycle. This process of obtaining this surface need to be computable here.

The following is the formal definition of discrete space:

Let us define a partial graph $P(S)$, $S \subset V$ to be a subgraph where each edge (a, b) of G is in $P(S)$ if $a, b \in S$. The concept of a minimal cycle C is a cycle that does not contain any proper subset that is also a cycle. Strictly speaking, we mean that the partial graph of any proper subset of vertices in the cycle C , with respect to the original graph $G = (V, E)$, does not contain any cycles.

A discrete space is a graph G that has an associated structure. We always assume that G is finite, meaning that G contains only a finite number of vertices. Specifically, \mathcal{C}_2 is the set of all minimal cycles representing all possible 2-cells; U_2 is a subset of \mathcal{C}_2 . Inductively, \mathcal{C}_3 is the set of all minimal 2-cycles made by U_2 . U_3 is a subset of \mathcal{C}_3 . Therefore, $\langle G, U_2, U_3, \dots, U_k \rangle$ is a discrete space, and we can see that a simplicial complex is a discrete space. For computational purposes, we require that each element in U_i can be embedded into a Hausdorff space or Euclidean space using a polynomial time algorithm or an efficient constructive method. Such a mapping will be a homeomorphism to an i -disk with the internal area of the cell corresponding to an

i -ball that can also be determined in polynomial time. Another thing we need to point out is that $u \cap v$ in $\langle G, U_2, U_3, \dots, U_k \rangle$ must be connected. In most cases, $u \cap v$ is either a single i -cell in U_i or is empty.

In general, $u \cap v$ is homeomorphic to an i -cell or empty. In [2, 3], we use connected and regular points to define this idea for algorithmic purposes because homeomorphism is difficult to compute. Now, we require that $u \cap v$ be homeomorphic to an i -cell in polynomial computable time. We also require that deciding whether an i -cycle is a minimal cycle or an $(i + 1)$ -cell be polynomial time computable as well. For example, a polyhedral partition can usually be completed in polynomial time in computational geometry.

The CW complex is a special type of cell-complex. Its definition was first introduced by Whitehead in [22]. A more abstract definition of CW complexes can be found in [11]. However, for simplicity, we use Whitehead's original definition.

A cell complex \mathbb{K} is: **(1)** A Hausdorff space, and **(2)** The union of disjoint (open) cells denoted by $e^{(0)}, \dots, e^{(n)}$ with the following characteristic mapping properties: Let $e^{(n)}$ be an n -cell, meaning that it is homeomorphic to an open n -ball B^n . Let D^n be the (closed) n -disk. We know that $S^{n-1} = D^n \setminus B^n$ is an $(n - 1)$ -sphere. The closure of $e^{(n)}$, $\bar{e}^{(n)}$, is the image of a mapping f from the n -disk D^n to $\bar{e}^{(n)}$ ($f : D^n \rightarrow \bar{e}^{(n)}$) such that: **(1)** f is a homeomorphism onto $e^{(n)}$ with restriction to $D^n \setminus S^{n-1}$, **(2)** $\bar{e}^{(n)} \setminus e^{(n)}$ (denoted by $\partial e^{(n)}$) is a subset of the $(n - 1)$ -skeleton (or section) of \mathbb{K} .

The $(n - 1)$ -skeleton (or section) of \mathbb{K} is usually denoted by K^{n-1} , meaning that all cells whose dimension does not exceed $(n - 1)$ are in \mathbb{K} . A CW complex is a special cell complex with properties called closure-finite and weak topology: **(1)** For any $e \in \mathbb{K}$, \bar{e} only intersects a finite number of cells in \mathbb{K} . (This means that the boundary of e only contains a finite number of cells in \mathbb{K}). This is called *closure-finite*.) **(2)** A subset X of \mathbb{K} is closed if and only if $X \cap \bar{e}$ is closed in X for each cell e in \mathbb{K} . (This is called *weak topology*.)

We know that if \mathbb{K} is finite, then this cell complex is a CW complex [22]. We would only need to show that a discrete space, which is always finite as defined above, is a cell complex. It is easy to show that, in $G = (V, E)$, V contains all 0-cells, and E is the 1-cell set. A simple 1-cycle, which is finite, can be embedded into Euclidean space (or a Hausdorff space) as the boundary of a 1-ball. If this 1-cycle is in U_2 (which must be a minimum cycle), then it represents a 2-cell with boundaries. The inner part of this 2-cell is an abstract entity of the cell. It is represented as an element existing in U_2 , and it becomes concrete (or real) when it is embedded into an actual space such as Euclidean space. In addition, the boundary is made up of 1-cells and 0-cells (in

K^1 , 1-Skeleton). Such an embedded mapping is a characteristic map required for cell complexes.

Inductively, for any $e \in U_n$, we know that e is a minimum $(n - 1)$ -cycle and can be algorithmically embedded into a Hausdorff space (as we assume). The inner part of e is homeomorphic to B^n (again we assume this to be algorithmically doable in the construction of $\langle G, U_2, U_3, \dots, U_k \rangle$). This $(n - 1)$ -cycle is a subset of $K^{n-1} = U_0 \cup \dots \cup U_{n-1}$, where $U_0 = V$ and $U_1 = E$.

Triangulations and the piecewise linear decomposition of a space in Euclidean space are two examples.

The only restriction of the discrete space is that we require that the intersection of the closures of two cells must be homeomorphic to an i -cell. For a triangulation, this is true. For a piecewise linear decomposition, we can usually use an algorithm to refine the original decomposition to satisfy such a property. This property is somewhat similar to the closure finite property. The reason we want finiteness in a CW complex is that it is not possible to constructively determine whether a boundary has an infinite number of cells.

The original meaning of an n -sphere in the Jordan-Schoenflies theorem is slightly different from the algorithmic homeomorphic mapping from a simple discrete n -cycle. This is because perfect discrete spheres are hard to describe. Some similar ideas and historical reviews related to the proofs of this theorem can be found in [18].

2.2 Discrete Manifolds

The concept of discrete manifolds was created for computational purposes. In other words, we re-define a simplicial complex (or a cell complex) as a discrete manifold; We can view a discrete manifold as a simplicial complex that is made from the decomposition of a manifold. This simplicial complex only contains a finite number of simplices.

Our definition of discrete space is a special case of piecewise linear space, and the definition of discrete manifolds is more strict. Here, we present a brief description (the formal definition of discrete space and discrete manifolds can be found in the Appendix in this paper). We can see that a triangle is determined by three edges that form a closed cycle. We can say that a 2-simplex is formed by a closed 1-cell path (cycle). This cycle does not contain any other cycles and is called a minimal cycle. Intuitively, we can fill some materials inside the cycle to make a solid triangle. However, computationally,

there is no need to do this (filling) since we are not going to split a triangle by adding a point or doing any other surgeries on a triangle in this paper. In any case, we can say that a 2-cell is determined by a minimal (closed path) cycle of 1-cells.

In general, the boundary of a k -cell is a minimal closed $(k - 1)$ -cycle, and the k -cell is fully determined by its boundary, a minimal closed $(k - 1)$ -cycle. However, a minimal closed $(k - 1)$ -cycle might not be the boundary of a k -cell in general discrete space since it is dependent on whether the inner part of the cell is defined (included) in the complex. For instance, the inner cycle of a torus is a minimal cycle, but it is not the boundary of a 2-cell. (Note that we sometimes simplify by saying that a k -cell is a minimal $(k - 1)$ -cycle because their computational representations are the same.)

To repeat the above idea, we assume that a 1-cycle is a closed simple path that is homeomorphic to a 1-sphere. Further, a $(k - 1)$ -cycle is homeomorphic to a $(k - 1)$ -sphere. The boundary of a k -cell is a $(k - 1)$ -cycle. Note that the boundary of a k -cell requires homeomorphism to be decided in polynomial time.

We also have further requirements on *regular manifolds*. A regular k -manifold M must have the following properties: **(1)** Any two k -cells must be $(k - 1)$ -connected, **(2)** Any $(k - 1)$ -cell must be contained in one or two k -cells, **(3)** M does not contain any $(k + 1)$ -cells, and **(4)** For any point p in M , the neighborhood of p in M , denoted by $S(p)$, must be $(k - 1)$ -connected in $S(M)$.

In the theory of intersection homology or piecewise linear topology [9] (or as proven in [1]), the neighborhood $S(x)$ of x (which consists of all cells that contain x) is called the *star* of x . Note that $S(x) \setminus \{x\}$ is called the *link*. Now we have: If K is a piecewise linear (PL) k -manifold, then the link $S(x) \setminus \{x\}$ is a piecewise linear $(k - 1)$ -sphere. We can write $\text{Star}(x)$ as $S(x)$ and $\text{Link}(x) = S(x) \setminus \{x\}$. In general, we can define $\text{Star}(\text{arc}) = \cup_{x \in \text{arc}} \text{Star}(x)$. Therefore, $\text{Link}(\text{arc}) = \text{Star}(\text{arc}) \setminus \{\text{arc}\}$. $\text{Star}(\text{arc})$ is the envelope (or a type of closure) of arc.

We also know that if any $(k - 1)$ -cell is contained by two k -cells in a k -manifold M , then M is closed.

2.3 Contraction and Simply Connected Spaces

A simple path (in a graph) is called a pseudo-curve, or semi-curve in [3]. If a pseudo-curve does not contain all points of a 2-cell, or k -cell if $k \geq 2$, then this pseudo-curve

is called a discrete curve. We can see that a discrete curve is similar to the locally flat curve in continuous cases. Detailed definitions can be found in the Appendix. ²

Two (pseudo-)curves C and C' are called *gradually varied* if we can deform C to match C' using only one step. A detailed definition is given in the Appendix.

For the concepts of discrete contraction, we also need the following definition:

Definition 2.1 We say that a collection of simple paths (a pseudo-curve) is *side-gradually varied* if there are no transversal intersections, i.e. no crossovers.

The transversal intersection (see Appendix) is also called the cross-over in discrete space meaning that two curves intersect each other, not only touch (each other).

For further calculations, we want to define a special operator XORSum, which stands for Exclusive-Or-Sum. XORSum is *sum(modulo2)* in Newman's book [17]. XORSum is a computer science term that is relatively easy to understand. Let $E(C)$ be all of the edges in path C . Then, $\text{XorSum}(C, C') = (E(C) \setminus E(C')) \cup (E(C') \setminus E(C))$. The purpose of this operation is to cut out the shared portion between C and C' . The remaining edges will be the collection of cycles when the two end points of C and C' are the same. If these cycles are boundaries of 2-cells, we can move C to C' in one unit time. In other words, C and C' are gradually varied (a discretely continuous move without a jump).

A space is said to be simply connected if any closed simple path can be deformed to a point on the original curve through a collection of side-gradually-varied simple paths (pseudo-curves). See the Appendix for details.

²A pseudo-curve is equivalent to a PL curve in geometry or topology. It is called a pseudo-curve in digital geometry since we can usually collect or sample discrete points in real world applications. Therefore, for applications, a k -manifold is represented by 0-cells. If we want a unique interpretation of these 0-cells, then we must have some restrictions. In such a case, for example, we want to eliminate all instances of 2-cells in the representation of the curve, so we use the concept of the pseudo-curve as the arbitrary curve. We refer to *the discrete curve* as a set of 0-cells not containing all 0-cells of a 2-cell. Otherwise, it is hard to distinguish a curve or a 2-cell computationally. However, in this paper, without indicating specifically, the pseudo-curve (or discrete curve) is the PL curve so that there is no confusion when a curve is represented using edges (1-cells) or a k -manifold is represented using k -cells. In addition, if all k -cells in a complex form the boundary of a $(k + 1)$ -cell, then we can view this complex as a closed k -manifold if the $(k + 1)$ -cell is not included in the complex. We could also view this complex as a $(k + 1)$ -cell if the $(k + 1)$ -cell is included in the complex. We call the former the discrete k -manifold and the latter boundary of a $(k + 1)$ -cell the discrete pseudo- k -manifold. The reason is that in real world problems, filling a closed k -manifold is an abstract matter for computers. This does not affect the concepts or proofs in this paper.

(Note that pseudo-curves can be embedded in Euclidean space as simple curves. For our purposes, we use both pseudo-curves and (pure) discrete curves depending on which stage we are at during the process. The difference between them is that pseudo-curves may contain ambiguities when view a curve as a set of points (0-cells). Generally, in discrete space, a pseudo-curve contains all vertices of a 2-cell (or k -cell) but not necessarily the 2-cell, but for the pure discrete curve, if it contains all vertices of a 2-cell, it contains everything within these vertices including the 2-cell.

However, when we involve higher dimensional cells in a cell complex, we can use appropriate involvements of 2-cells or 3-cells to limit the number of possible outcomes we encounter for pseudo-curves. Therefore, using pseudo-curves for our purposes would not be a problem since we treat pseudo-curves the same as pure curves, so this does not affect our results or proofs. However, we will need to add a task to select cells in a cell complex. Pure curves will be simpler. To be more specific, when we select a curve in the beginning or produce a final curve, we require that the curves be pure discrete curves. However, during the middle of the process, for example during a contraction, we can use pseudo-curves—this is because we can easily determine which 2-cell to be excluded.

As long as we embed a curve in Euclidean space or use higher dimensional cells in a cell complex, the distinction between pseudo and pure curves are nonexistent. Only in discrete space, we want to choose a pure, locally flat curve (not a pseudo-curve) at the beginning to minimize preprocessing, such as memory use. Making a pseudo-curve locally flat would require even more preprocessing time, so we might as well start with the ideal curve at the beginning. However, during the process, allowing pseudo-curves would simplify the method, especially in contractions.)

2.4 Graph-Distances and Cell-Distances

In a graph, we refer to the distance as the length of the shortest path between two vertices. The concept of *graph-distance*, in this paper, is the edge distance, meaning how many edges are needed to get from one vertex to another. We usually use the length of the shortest path between two vertices to represent the distance in graphs. In order to distinguish from distance in Euclidean space, we use graph-distance to represent lengths in graphs for this paper.

Therefore, graph-distance is the same as edge-distance or 1-cell-distance, which is the number of 1-cells that are needed to travel from one point (vertex) x to point y . We can generalize this idea to define 2-cell-distance by counting how many 2-cells are needed

to go from x to y . In other words, 2-cell-distance is the length of the shortest path of 2-cells that contains x and y . In this path, each adjacent pair of 2-cells shares one 1-cell, which means that the path is 1-connected (meaning that two adjacent elements in the path share a 1-cell).

We define $d^{(k)}(x, y)$, the k -cell-distance from x to y , as the length of the shortest path (or the minimum number of k -cells in such a sequence), where each adjacent pair of two k -cells shares a $(k - 1)$ -cell. This path is $(k - 1)$ -connected; in other words, two adjacent elements in the path share a $(k - 1)$ -cell.

We can see that $d^{(1)}(x, y)$ is the edge-distance or graph-distance, and we have $d(x, y) = d^{(1)}(x, y)$.

(We can also define $d_i^{(k)}(x, y)$ to be a k -cell path that is i -connected. However, we do not need to use such a concept in this paper.)

2.5 Local Flatness

The concept of local flatness for embedded submanifolds is similar to the smoothness of manifolds, but it is a stronger definition in some sense. The concept is as follows:

Suppose a k -manifold M_k is embedded into an n -manifold M_n , $k < n$. The manifold M_k is said to be *locally flat* at $x \in M_k$ if there is a neighborhood $U_x \subset M_n$ of x such that the topological pair $(U_x, U_x \cap M_k)$ is homeomorphic to the pair $(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^k)$, with a standard inclusion of \mathbb{R}^k as a subspace of \mathbb{R}^n . That is, there exists a homeomorphic mapping $f : U_x \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $f(U_x \cap M_k) = \mathbb{R}^k$. Here, \mathbb{R}^n is the standard n -dimensional real vector space.

Let us assume that M_n is closed (since x should not be selected as a boundary point of M_n). If every point $x \in M_k$ is locally flat in M_n , then M_k is called locally flat in M_n .

Proposition 2.2 [Brown (1962)] *If $k = n - 1$, then a locally flat M_k is collared, meaning that it has a neighborhood, which is homeomorphic to $M_k \times [0, 1]$ where M_k is (homeomorphically) corresponding to $M_k \times \{\frac{1}{2}\}$.*

This result by Brown provided an intuitive interpretation of local flatness. The meaning of collared is shown in Fig. 1. The boundary of a collar cannot intersect itself, a property that will be used in the discrete case.

In the next section, we discuss the concepts of local flatness and collars for the discrete case.




Figure 1: An example of a collar of a curve in continuous space. The boundary of the collar will not intersect itself.

3 Local Flatness of Manifolds in Discrete Space

We have explained the intuitive meaning of a collar of a continuous curve: there is a neighborhood (of the curve) that does not intersect itself. The boundary of the collar has a unique distance to the curve, called graph distance or cell distance. In this section, we define the local flatness of a curve or a manifold in the discrete case.

A discrete curve or a curve in discrete space is usually represented as a path of vertices where each adjacent pair forms an edge. See Section 2. The collar of a discrete curve is a 2-dimensional manifold. In Fig. 2 (a), we present a collar of a discrete curve, but in Fig. 2 (b), the boundary of the collar intersects at a vertex, which means that the latter is not a valid collar.

3.1 Some Observations on Local Flatness in Discrete Space

Before we give the formal definition of local flatness in discrete space, we first give an example to illustrate properties that local flatness should inherently hold. In Fig. 3, points A and B are linked by an edge so that any neighborhood of A will contain B . That is to say that curve $\cdots ACB \cdots$ is not a locally flat curve if we do not allow a vertex to be added on the edge (A, B) .

Mathematically, this is related to the definition of local flatness in Section 2.6. We require U_x to be topologically equivalent (or homeomorphic) to \mathbb{R}^n . We also require

$U_x \cap M_k$ to be topologically equivalent to \mathbb{R}^k .

In the discrete case, $U_A \cap M_k$ is a 2-cell not topologically equivalent to \mathbb{R}^1 in Fig. 3 (a) and (b). (Based on the definition of discrete manifolds in Section 2, we can further extrapolate that when a set contains all points of a cell, then this set will also contain




Figure 2: (a) An example of a collar of a curve in discrete space. (b) The boundary intersects itself, which makes it not locally flat and not a collar.

the cell. The exception will be in the cases of contraction motions or process. That is also the main difference between a pure discrete manifold and the pseudo discrete manifold.)

On the other hand, in Fig. 3 (c), $U_A \cap M_k$ is two 1-cells plus a single point (0-cell) B that is not homeomorphic to R^1 . Here, M_k is a curve.

Therefore, $U_A \cap M_k$ should contain the edge (A, B) . That is to say that $U_A \cap M_k$ is a tree where point A connects to three points, including B .

Thus, separating two points on a curve with a vertex not on the curve is one way to maintain the local flatness property. Topologically, we can see that for some discrete cases, only having one vertex between the two points on the curve is not sufficient. See Fig. 4. $U_A \cap M_k$ will intersect $U_A \cap M_k$ at point C .




Figure 3: Examples of not locally flat curves: (a) The curve contains points AC and B , (b) The curve contains points ACB , and (c) The curve is of the form $\dots A \dots C \dots B$.

This is because topologies in discrete space are finite topologies. There is no clear distinction between the open set and the closed set. When a point (vertex) is contained within two or more collars of a curve, it may create a more difficult case. This case would not occur in continuous space since we could use open sets that would not contain such a midpoint C (or a midline). However, we would not be able to store all the points of an open set in finite space (this is not constructive). The open set is a type of imaginary interpretation for continuous space from the discrete space point of view.

3.2 Formal Definitions of Local Flatness

In this subsection, we give the formal definition of local flatness in discrete space. We use a curve (1D-manifold) as an example for discussion. Then, we extend the definition to more general cases.

According to the discussion above, an intuitive definition of local flatness is that each pair of points, if they are not adjacent, in curve C will have a graph-distance of 3. However, the following example shows that the corner of a curve can be locally flat. See Fig. 5. Therefore, the challenge is that sometimes one point separation is enough.

This example shows us that the graph-distance of 3 does not apply to some corner points for local flatness. In other words, we could have a collar.

However, for similar cases (see Fig. 6 (a)) we would not have a collar since the collar must intersect at a point. Our intention is to explain why in the following discussion.

We know that Fig. 6 (a) does not have a collar since the collar intersects at a point p . When we insert a point p' in Fig. 6 (b), we have met the previous observation of having




Figure 4: A case that satisfies the original definition of local flatness in continuous space but may cause conflicts in discrete space.

a graph-distance of 3 for the edges. However, we still could not get a collar. In Fig. 6 (c), we make a triangulation that might not work as well unless there is a link between two certain points q and r .

Fig. 6(d) shows that the 2-cell distance is still 2 in this figure for two points a and c that are not adjacent on the curve. This means that, even if the edge-distance (or graph-distance) is 3, the two points can still be linked by two 2-cells.

Now, we can conclude that the shape of the 2-cells (in "holding" space) are not the problem. The key is that a distance of 3 is required for both 1-cell distance (graph-distance) and 2-cell distance.

It is interesting to note that in a triangulated decomposition of a plane, this problem would not exist. We prove later that in triangulated manifolds, the problem related to 2-cell distance disappears.

To summarize mathematically: (1) For each pair of two points p and q in C , if p and q are adjacent in M , i.e. $d_M(p, q) = 1$, then p and q must be adjacent in C . (2) If $d_M(p, q) = 2$, then there must be a point a in M such that $\text{Link}(a) \cap C$ is an arc that contains p and q . (Point a is called a focal point of C , and focal points are always at the collar boundary.) (3) If $d_M(p, q) = 3$, then for triangulated manifolds, there is a collar. For general shape 2-cells, we require a distance of 3 in 1D and 2D distance.




Figure 5: Example of a curve that can be locally flat with one point in between.

In general, for the local flatness of a curve $C \in M$, we require that the 1-cell distance is 3, 2-cell distance is 3, and k -cell distance is also 3 for all cases where M is a k -manifold.

The following is a formal definition for local flatness. As we know, a triangulated discrete manifold M is a discrete manifold where each face is a simplex.

Definition 3.1 (*Triangulated discrete manifolds*) A curve C is locally flat in a 2D triangulated discrete manifold M (or C can be a $(k - 1)$ -manifold in a k -triangulated manifold M .) if every pair of points p and q on the curve satisfies one of the following conditions: (1) $d_M(p, q) \geq 3$, (2) $d_M(p, q) = 2$, if every point a in $M \setminus C$ on any path with length 2 (from p to q) satisfies $\text{Link}(a) \cap C$ is an arc containing p and q , or (3) $d_M(p, q) = 1$ where p and q are adjacent points in C , i.e. $d_M(p, q) = d_C(p, q) = 1$.

In Definition 3.1, condition (2) describes a point a that is close to a corner of this curve. If $\text{path}_C(p, q)$ in C denotes the path from p to q and if $\text{path}(p, q)$ surrounds a (meaning that $\text{Link}(a) \cap C = \text{path}(p, q)$), then $d_M(p, q) = 2$ is allowed. We can call a a *near-corner point with respect to C* or a “focal point” of the corner of the curve. Any point with such a property must also be near the corner of the curve. In Fig. 7 (a), point a satisfies condition (2), but point b does not. Therefore, it is not a locally flat curve.

Intuitively, if a shortest path passes a point b in $M \setminus C$ that is not a *near-corner point with respect to C* , then this path is referred to as the “waist” of the curve. We demand that any waist have at least a length of 3.




Figure 6: Example of a curve that does not have a collar. (a) The collar intersects at a point p . (b) A point is inserted, but it still does not have a collar. (c) Triangulation that might not work as well unless there is a link between two certain points q and r . (d) The reason behind is that the 2-cell-distance between these two points is still 2.

Definition 3.2 (General discrete manifolds) A curve or submanifold C is locally flat in a discrete k -manifold M if every pair of points p and q on the curve satisfies one of the following conditions: (1) $d_M^{(i)}(p, q) \geq 3$ for all $i \leq k$, (2) $d_M^{(i)}(p, q) = 2$ for some $i \leq k$ if every point a in $M \setminus C$ on such a path satisfies that $\text{Link}(a) \cap C$ is an arc containing p and q , or (3) $d_M(p, q) = 1$ where p and q are adjacent points in C , i.e. $d_M(p, q) = d_C(p, q) = 1$.

Note that the dimension of C in Definition 3.2 above is smaller than k .

Lemma 3.3 For a triangulated manifold M , graph-distance (1-cell distance) is the same as k -cell distance in M , which is a k -discrete manifold.




Figure 7: Collar and gradually varied properties: (a) Point p does not satisfy Definition 3.1 and a cannot be a collar point, (b) Point a as a collar point, and (c) A collar line based on (b).

Proof Proving this is not hard using mathematical induction. We know that every pair of vertices in a simplex is adjacent.

If $d_M(x, y) = d_M(1)(x, y) = 1$, then this means that there is an edge linking x and y . It is obvious that x and y are in a simplex in M . Therefore, $d_M(i)(x, y) = 1$ for all i , $1 \leq i \leq k$.

Let us assume that $d_M(x, y) = d_M(i)(x, y)$ is valid for distance t . We want to prove that when $d_M(x, y) = t + 1$, then $d_M(k)(x, y) = t + 1$. Since $d_M(x, y) = t + 1$, there must be a shortest path $x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_t, x_{t+1} = y$ in M , so x_t, x_{t+1} must be in a simplex K . Therefore, $d_M(k)(x, y) \leq t + 1$. If $d_M(k)(x, y) = t$, then x_{t+1} must be contained in t k -simplices that also contain $x(= x_0), x_1, \dots, x_t$.

According to the assumption, $d_M(x, x_t) = d_M(k)(x, x_t)$ and every pair of points in a simplex must have an edge linking this pair. The point $x_{t+1} = y$ must be contained in a simplex that also contains three vertices in the path $x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_t, x_{t+1} = y$. Then, $d_M(x, y) = t$ and is not equal to $t + 1$. This gives a contradiction.

It is not difficult to see that $d_M(i - 1)(x, y) \geq d_M(i)(x, y)$. Therefore, for all i , we have $d_M(x, y) = d_M(i)(x, y) = t + 1$.

□

Now, we repeat the formal definition of collar in discrete space:

Definition 3.4 *The meaning of collar in discrete space is that each point on the collar boundary is 1-cell distance from a point on the curve C . The boundary of the collar does not intersect itself.*

The following lemma is a natural consequence of the above definition.

Lemma 3.5 *For an open curve C , if it has a collar, the boundary of the collar must consist of two curves, each of which is gradually varied to C . However, no point on the collar is in C .*

In the next subsection, we prove the following theorem: If C_{k-1} is a discrete local flat $(k - 1)$ -submanifold in a k -discrete manifold M , then there is a collar for C_{k-1} .

3.3 Properties of Discrete Local Flatness

Intuitively, if a discrete curve has a collar, then it is locally flat. However, this observation might not be true for continuous space. In this section, we prove that if a curve is locally flat, then there is a discrete collar.

According to the definition of the discrete collar, we consider the boundary of the union of $\text{Link}(p)$, $p \in C$. We can see that the boundary of the collar of C is the subset of $\cup_{p \in C} \text{Link}(p)$.

Theorem 3.6 *(Discrete version of the collar theorem) If a curve C is discrete locally flat in a discrete 2-manifold M , then there is a collar for C .*

Proof We examine two adjacent points x, x' in $C = C(a, b)$, where a and b are two end points. Here, C is a locally flat arc, meaning that $d_M(a, b) \geq 3$ if a and b in C are not adjacent. The exception is when a and b are in $Star(p)$, $p \in M \setminus C$, as stated in Definition 3.2.

Let (x, x') in C be a 1-cell. Then, $Link((x, x'))$ is a simple cycle, which is the union of $Link(x)$ and $Link(x')$. If x' is not an end point of C , then we have another $y \in C$ that is adjacent to x' . (We assume that C is a closed curve, which is closer to the original requirements in Brown's theorem on collars.)

We only want to prove that there are two local curves B_1 and B_2 that do not intersect C and that the maximum distance (cell-distance) of each point in B_1 or B_2 to C is 1. Therefore, x and y have a distance of 2 in C because, if $d_M(x, y) = 1$, then C would not be locally flat by definition.

There are two cases: (1) If there is a point $p \in M \setminus C$ such that $Link(p)$ contains x and y , then $Link(p)$ would contain x' and p would be on one side of a "collar" (B_1 or B_2) locally. We can always find a new p such that $Link(p)$ contains x, y and x' .

This is because if $Link(p)$ does not contain x' and since $Link(p)$ is a simple cycle, then we will have another path from x to y in $Link(p)$ due to the following: (a) If (x, y) is an edge in $Link(p)$, then C is not locally flat. (b) This path, denoted by ρ , and x, x', y will form a cycle, and now $Link(x')$ will contain a point in the path. Using this point as p , we can use $link(x')$ to select a point not in C to be the new p . If we continue doing this, we can always get a p such that $Link(p)$ contains x, y and x' .

This also follows the definition of local flatness that x and y must be connected in $Link(p)$, which means that $Link(p)$ must also contain x' . Therefore, $xx'y$ is a corner point.

(2) If there is no such point p such that $Link(p)$ contains x and y , then the path from x to y without passing x' will be at least a distance of 3 based on Definition 3.2. There is a nonempty intersection of $Link((x, x')) \cap Link((x', y))$, which is a subset of $Link(x')$. This subset is a connected curve that does not contain any point in C . This set is the collar on both sides of $xx'y$, B_1 , and B_2 .

Now, we use mathematical induction for the rest of proof. (It is similar to the proof in paper [1].) If there are x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} satisfying the condition of having a collar on both sides, then we add an x_k adjacent to x_{k-1} . If there is a point p , $p \in M \setminus C$, such that x_{k-2} , x_{k-1} , and x_k are neighbors of p , then this p is a corner point. Therefore, if p is a collar boundary point for x_k , then the other boundary points are in $Link(x_k)$. In particular, starting at p , all points with a common 2-cell x_k will be in the new collar.

If there is no such p , then every cell-distance to points (other than x_{k-1}) will be 3 or larger. There must be two points on each side of C that are intersection points of $\text{Link}(a = x_0, \dots, x_{k-2})$. Otherwise, $\text{Link}(a = x_0, \dots, x_{k-2})$ will not reach $\text{Link}(x_k)$, and the distance of x_k to some x_i will be 2. Therefore, $\text{Link}(x_{k-1}) \cup \text{Link}(x_k) = \text{Link}((x_{k-1}, x_k))$ (the link of each n -cell is a cycle in the cell complex) must have two points q_1 and q_2 in $\text{Link}(x_{k-1}) \cap \text{Link}(x_k)$ such that $q_1, y_0, \dots, y_t, q_2$ is an arc (connected) in $\text{Link}(x_k)$ but y_0, \dots, y_t are not in $\text{Link}(x_{k-1})$.

We have proven that local flatness implies a discrete collar for a closed curve.

□

In general,

Corollary 3.7 *Local flatness implies the existence of a discrete collar for each dimension.*

Proof This proof is a continuation of Theorem 3.6. We want to prove the following: If C_{k-1} is a discrete local flat $(k-1)$ -submanifold in k -discrete manifold M , then there exists a collar for C_{k-1} .

Using the same principle as in the above proof of Theorem 3.6, we can prove this corollary. Let C_{k-1} be a discrete local flat $(k-1)$ -submanifold. (Precisely, C_{k-1} is assumed to be a discrete pseudo-submanifold meaning that C_{k-1} might contain all 0-cells of a k -cell. See the Appendix for details, which will not affect our proof.) We can assume that C_{k-1} is closed, i.e. C_{k-1} is a $(k-1)$ -cycle. We consider two sets: (a) For each $(k-1)$ -cell $Ce \in C_{k-1}$, we have $\text{Link}(Ce)$, and (b) For each point a in $M - C_{k-1}$, we consider such an a so that there is a k -cell $\mathcal{K} \in M$ containing both a and some point $p \in Ce$ where Ce is a $(k-1)$ -cell in C_{k-1} . The intuitive meaning of the set containing all a 's is the neighboring set C_{k-1} . In other words, a is a neighbor of the $(k-1)$ -cycle C_{k-1} . For convenience, we use C to represent C_{k-1} in the rest of the proof.

We can prove that all points a 's (0-cells), denoted by set B where each element of B has a k -cell distance of 1 to C (C_{k-1}), form two $(k-1)$ -submanifolds. (i) Assume that $a \in B$. Then, $\text{Link}(a) - C$ must contain at least two points. Otherwise, if there is only one element $b \in \text{Link}(a) - C$, there must be a path from one point p in C to another point q in C that passes b on $\text{Link}(a)$. Since $\text{Link}(a)$ is a $(k-1)$ -cycle, pbq has a cell-distance of 2. Based on Definition 3.3, C is not locally flat. On the other hand, there are at least two points in $\text{Link}(a) - C$ that have a cell-distance of 1 to C .

Therefore, a part of B is a k -cell-connected set on the same side as a . (ii) Since C includes a $(k - 1)$ -cell containing p , this cell is contained in two k -cells in M , one that also contains a and another that contains a point e . Therefore, B contains a part that is a k -cell-connected set on the same side as e . (iii) We want to prove that it is impossible for a point $b \in B$ to be cell-connected to a or e . This is because $Link(x)$ and $x \in B$ must intersect with another $Link(y)$ for some $y \in B$. It is obvious that x and y are cell-connected by passing C . For instance, we have a $(k - 1)$ -cell-sequence Ce_1, \dots, Ce_t fully contained in C where x is in $Link(Ce_1)$ and y is in $Link(Ce_t)$. $Link(Ce_i) \cup Link(Ce_{i+1}) - Link(Ce_i) \cap Link(Ce_{i+1})$ is similar to the connected-sum of two $(k - 1)$ -cycles. Therefore, x can reach y by passing the points on $Link(Ce_j)$, $j = 1, \dots, t$, without containing any points in C . The rest of the details of the proof are similar to the steps in the proof for Theorem 3.6.

□

We can easily see that B_1 and B_2 in the proof of Theorem 3.6 are two gradually varied curves of C . When C is an open curve, B_1 and B_2 are connected. (We do not have to use the property of collars to prove the main theorem of this paper in Section 5. The concept of local flatness is enough.)

Since it is not difficult to know whether there is a collar (and whether it is locally flat) in (finite) discrete space, we have the following:

Lemma 3.8 *The necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a discrete collar of a curve C is that it is locally flat.*

Therefore, the collar condition in the discrete case is the same as local flatness, which is stronger than the definition of the collar condition in the continuous case.

4 Properties of the Gradual Variation of Discrete Manifolds

Deformation is the continuous motion from one object to another. In mathematics, we can view an object as a manifold. A special type of deformation, called a contraction, is a cycle on a surface that shrinks continuously to a point.

Gradual variation is a discrete term for continuity[?], which we define in the Appendix. Two discrete curves are gradually varied if we can obtain the second curve by moving each point on the first curve by a distance of at most one unit. In other words, if C and




Figure 8: Gradually varied moves of curves: (a) C and C' are gradually varied, (b) C and C' are not gradually varied, (c) $\text{XorSum}(C, C')$ contains all points in three 2-cells, and (d) $\text{XorSum}(C, C')$ is a cycle that does not contain any 2-cells.

C' are two discrete curves, we can change C into C' by moving each point of C by at most a distance of 1. See more in the Appendix of this paper.

The following is an example to explain this concept.

The gradual variation between two (discrete) curves can also be described as the modulo-2 sum of two curves (see Appendix). The modulo-2 sum has another name called the exclusive-OR operation, represented by $\text{XorSum}(C, C')$. $\text{XorSum}(C, C')$ contains all edges of $C \setminus C'$ and $C' \setminus C$. In Fig. 8 (c), $\text{XorSum}(C, C')$ contains all points in three 2-cells. As we discussed in Section 2 and in [2, 3], we say that $\text{XorSum}(C, C')$ also contains these 2-cells. Fig. 8 (d) only contains some edges. Therefore, two curves are gradually varied if and only if the XorSum of them is the union of several 2-cells (see Appendix).

Discrete deformation can be done by a sequence of gradually varied moves. In this section, we give some useful properties of the gradual variation of discrete manifolds.

4.1 Minimal Gradual Variation Between Curves

Let us continue the example shown in Fig. 8 (a). A new observation can be made in Fig. 9.




Figure 9: More details of gradually-varied moves: (a) C and C' are gradually varied, (b) C and $C1$ are gradually varied with a difference of A in a 2-cell, (c) $C1$ and $C2$ differ by only two edges in a 2-cell, and (d) $C2$ and C' differ only by some edges in a 2-cell.

Therefore, the gradually-varied move from C to C' can be replaced by three simple moves: C to $C1$, $C1$ to $C2$, and $C2$ to C' . That is to say that a gradually-varied move from C to C' can be made by a sequence of simple gradually-varied moves where each adjacent pair only differs by a 2-cell (meaning that only some edges are different in this 2-cell). This simple gradually-varied move is called *minimal gradual variation* between two curves.

(Both gradually varied moves and minimal gradually-varied moves can naturally be extended to k -manifolds. Now we can say that two k -manifolds M and M' are gradually varied if and only if $\text{XorSum}(M, M')$ is the union of several $(k + 1)$ -cells. This means that $\text{XorSum}(M, M')$ contains all 0-cells of these $(k + 1)$ -cells. We also assume that M and M' are simply connected.)

In fact, for any two curves C_0 and C_1 that are gradually varied, there must be a sequence of curves where each adjacent pair of curves has the property of minimal gradual variation. This means that we only change one 2-cell between two curves at a time. We can reach C_1 from C_0 using a sequence of curves.

Lemma 4.1 *A gradually-varied move between two discrete curves is equivalent to a sequence of discrete curves where two adjacent curves only change one 2-cell between them (in terms of XorSum). This property is true for k -manifolds.*

Proof Using mathematical induction to prove the necessary condition, the sufficient condition is satisfied naturally. First, if $\text{XorSum}(C_0, C_1)$ only contains one 2-cell, the condition is valid. Second, we assume that there are i 2-cells in $\text{XorSum}(C_0, C_1)$, which is equivalent to a sequence of gradually-varied moves where each move only changes one 2-cell. Then, we want to prove that if there are $(i + 1)$ 2-cells in $\text{XorSum}(C_0, C_1)$, then we can still split the moves into a sequence of gradually varied moves where each move only changes one 2-cell.

Let there be $(i+1)$ 2-cells in $\text{XorSum}(C_0, C_1)$. Since there are a finite number of 2-cells in $\text{XorSum}(C_0, C_1)$, we can select the last 2-cell, denoted by A , in $\text{XorSum}(C_0, C_1)$. We can then construct C'_1 such that the boundary of A is $\text{XorSum}(C'_1, C_1)$. The rest of C'_1 is the same as C_1 . We can do this because there are a finite number of cases, and each cell has a finite number of points and edges in discrete space. Therefore, $\text{XorSum}(C_0, C'_1)$ contains i 2-cells and, according to the assumption of mathematical induction, we have proven this lemma. \square

Again, the lemma states that we can move one curve to another curve gradually by changing one 2-cell at a time. If we are dealing with a k -manifold, then a $(k + 1)$ -cell is considered. The XorSum of the two adjacent k -manifolds (for such a sequence in the proof of the lemma) contains only the boundary of one $(k + 1)$ -cell. We provide related examples in the next subsection.

4.2 Gradually Varied Deformation in a Single Discrete k -cell

In this subsection, we discuss gradually varied deformation of curves and manifolds in a single discrete k -cell. We also show specific examples and methods that can move a discrete curve (or a submanifold) in a k -cell. We are especially interested in moving a $(k - 2)$ -manifold on the boundary of a discrete k -cell, called a $(k - 1)$ -cycle. This move is a minimal gradually-varied move. We also note that, as we discussed in Section 2, the boundary of a k -cell is always a $(k - 1)$ -cycle that is homeomorphic to a $(k - 1)$ -sphere. Such homeomorphism is also constructive.

We first look at two examples. In these two examples, we move a curve along the partial boundary of a 3-cell (passing one 2-cell at a time). This partial boundary of a 3-cell was created by removing a 2-cell from the boundary of the 3-cell. We need to use this special construction in the following section.

Example 1: Simplices and Gradually Varied Deformation

The following example shows how we generate a sequence of curves surrounding the boundary surface of a 3-cell. This sequence shows the gradual variation of curves. The two ends (curves) of the sequence were originally two closer curves that only differed by one 2-cell (having the property of minimal gradual variation).

Gradual variation does not pass a 2-cell

The deformation from "...ABC..." to "...AC..." can be replaced by




Figure 10: Deform one curve to another with gradual variation on the boundary of a 3-simplex. This deformation does not pass the shaded 2-cell.

See the shaded area in Fig. 10. We request that the sequence not pass the shaded area. The question is as follows: can we always find such a sequence that starts at curve $\dots ABC \dots$ and ends at $\dots AC \dots$? In this example, we can first select $\dots ADBC \dots$ and then select $\dots ADC \dots$ to arrive at $\dots AC \dots$. In other words, without passing the shaded cell, we can use the sequence of $\dots ABC \dots$, $\dots ADBC \dots$, and $\dots ADC \dots$ to finally get $\dots AC \dots$.

This is because if we remove a 2-cell from the boundary surface of a 3-cell, the rest of the boundary surface still consists of 1-connected 2-manifolds. The boundary of the new surface is a 1-cycle.

Example 2: Cubical Cells and Gradually Varied Deformation

We now present another example. For a 3-cube, we can still find a sequence that is gradually varied without passing the bottom 2-cell $ABCD$. (See Fig. 11.)

In Fig. 11, we have two curves $C_{i-1} = \dots ABC \dots$ and $C_i = \dots ADC \dots$. C_{i-1} and C_i are gradually varied with $\text{XorSum}(C_{i-1}, C_i) = 2\text{-cell } ABCD$. If the 2-cell is not in

consideration, meaning that we cannot pass this cell for gradual variation, then what we can do is go around the boundary surface of the 3-cell.

The thin-dashed curve in Fig. 11 (a) is the first one leaving C_{i-1} , which is gradually varied, to go to C_{i-1} . Then, the thin-dashed curve of Fig. 11 (b) is the next curve to do the same. If we continue, we will eventually reach C_i .

Another property of the sequence is that any two adjacent curves differ by a 2-cell (i.e., the only difference between any two adjacent curves is that they share a 2-cell). There are five steps to get to C_i by passing all five 2-cells.

In higher dimensional cases, we can always make such sequences for simplices or cubic cells.

The easiest case is the k -simplex. Let the $(k-2)$ -cell be a simple path, where C_i and C_{i-1} share a $k-1$ -cell D (XorSum). There are $(k+1)(k-1)$ -cells in the simplex. Removing D , we have a $(k-2)$ dimensional boundary set. There is a 0-cell that will be combined with each of the cells to form a $(k-1)$ -cell. Then, we have a total of k cells and a connected $(k-1)$ -manifold.

Generally, we can always make such an arrangement. The boundary of the k -cell is a $(k-1)$ -cycle, which is (constructively) homeomorphic to the $(k-1)$ -sphere. Removing a $(k-1)$ -cell from this boundary will result in creating half a sphere. This half sphere has a $(k-2)$ -cycle as its boundary that is homeomorphic to the $(k-2)$ -sphere. In Section 2, we defined i -cells for any integer i to be constructive: A cell is defined in the simplest way in terms of being homeomorphic to a ball. The simplest method is constructive or algorithmic, meaning that we can use an algorithm to determine the path (as well as its boundary, which is homeomorphic to a sphere).

Therefore, we have a generalized conclusion as follows:

Proposition 4.2 *Let C_0 and C_1 be two discrete i -manifolds (curves) with boundaries that are two $(i-1)$ -cycles. Let the following three conditions hold: (1) C_0 and C_1 are joined only by their two end points or at $(i-1)$ -cycles, (2) The union of C_0 and C_1 is an i -cycle that is homeomorphic to an i -sphere, and (3) This i -cycle is the boundary of an $(i+1)$ -cell, E_{i+1} , and there is an $(i+2)$ -cell F_{i+2} containing E_{i+1} with the boundary that is an $(i+1)$ -cycle homeomorphic to an $(i+1)$ -sphere. Then, we can always find a minimal gradually varied sequence from C_0 to C_1 without passing E_{i+1} .*

Proof We can assume $k = i+2$. Now, $\partial(F_{i+2}) - E_{i+1}$ means to remove a $(k-1)$ -cell, and $\partial(F_{i+2}) - E_{i+1}$ has a boundary that is a $(k-2)$ -cycle. This $(k-2)$ -cycle is the




Figure 11: Deform one curve to another gradually on the boundary of a 3-cube without passing the bottom 2-cell.

union of C_0 and C_1 . We can get a minimal gradually varied sequence from C_0 to C_1 on $\partial(F_{i+2}) - E_{i+1}$.

We can use the following method to get such a minimal gradually varied sequence from C_0 to C_1 on $\partial(F_{i+2}) - E_{i+1}$. Let $H = \partial(F_{i+2}) - E_{i+1}$. Cut one $(i + 1)$ -cell from H at a time (from the boundary of H). (This is the inverse process to the connected-sum of adding one $(i + 1)$ -cell to an $(i + 1)$ -manifold with common (i) -cell(s).) In other words, find an i -cell e in C_0 that is contained in an $(i + 1)$ -cell A in H . $\partial(A) = (\partial(A) - C_0) \cup ((C_0 - \partial(A)) \cap \partial(A))$ is an i -cycle. Using $(\partial(A) - C_0)$ to replace $(C_0 - \partial(A)) \cap \partial(A)$ in C_0 will create another i -manifold $C_0^{(1)}$. Here, $C_0^{(1)} = (\partial(A) - C_0) \cup ((C_0 - \partial(A)))$. We mark the cell as A . C_0 , and $C_0^{(1)}$ are

gradually varied with the only difference of passing A . Starting at the new $C_0^{(1)}$, we can find another $(i+1)$ -cell $A^{(1)}$. Then, we would get $C_0^{(2)}$ and mark a new $A^{(1)}$. When all $(i+1)$ -cells in H are marked, we would have a sequence of gradual variation from C_0 to C_1 . The marking process is to eliminate one cell from H at a time. Since we only have a finite number of cells in H , this process will eventually stop. \square

5 Discrete Proof of the General Jordan-Schoenflies Theorem

In order to construct a discrete proof of the Jordan-Schoenflies theorem, we recall some concepts from the theory of discrete manifolds presented in Section 2. A discrete manifold is a piecewise linear manifold. The difference is that we cannot arbitrarily decompose a discrete cell into pieces. For instance, a discrete 2-cell is predefined. It is a simple and minimal cycle of discrete 1-cells. Inductively, the boundary of a discrete k -cell is a simple and minimal cycle of discrete $(k-1)$ -cells. Therefore, in our discrete geometry, a discrete manifold is defined on a graph with topological structures. In addition, it is finite.

Essentially, in this paper, we do not allow a cell to be decomposed into smaller cells unless it is expressed explicitly. In such a discrete case, a cell is already the minimal entity in its dimension. A k -cell is a k -polyhedron but cannot be decomposed into smaller pieces.

The general Jordan-Schoenflies theorem states that, in discrete space, every closed and simply connected $(n-1)$ -submanifold S with local flatness in a closed and simply connected n -manifold decomposes the space into two components, and S is their common boundary. Each of the two components is homeomorphic to the discrete n -ball. In other words, an $(n-1)$ -sphere can be locally flatly embedded into an n -sphere as its equator.

In [1], we used these discrete techniques to prove the classical Jordan curve theorem: A closed, discrete curve C separates the plane into two components.

If M is a closed, two-dimensional surface, then $M \setminus C$ consists of two connected components. We also proved that: If we select a point not on C , then there is a component that contains a finite number of 2-cells, and this component (when embedded in Euclidean space) is homeomorphic to a disk. For a closed M in discrete form (or a piecewise linear 2-complex), both of the components contain finite numbers of 2-cells

(determined by minimal cycles). Then each of them is homeomorphic to a disk using the same proof.

Our proof in this paper is based on the original, classical Jordan-Schoenflies theorem. In other words, we admit the Jordan-Schoenflies theorem for simply connected closed discrete 2-manifolds (or piecewise linear 2-manifold) M : A 1-cycle that is a discrete curve (which is not a minimal cycle) divides M into two components. Each component is homeomorphic to a 2-cell.

We would also like to restate that if a 1-cycle is a minimal cycle, then this cycle might be the boundary for a 2-cell in discrete space. A 2-cell in discrete space cannot be divided into other 2-cells based on our definition (in discrete space). We reject such a case in order to preserve the properties of the original Jordan curve theorem. In addition, the union of two 2-cells in this paper is not considered a 2-cell in this paper. All 2-cells are pre-defined in the discrete case, but the union of two 2-cells with a common edge will be homeomorphic to a 2-cell in Euclidean space. We also assume that M is orientable.

Our proof is divided into two parts: (1) We prove the Jordan theorem for a closed surface on the 3D manifold, and then (2) we prove the Jordan-Schoenflies Theorem on the 3D manifold.

Theorem 5.1 (Jordan Theorem for a closed surface on the 3D manifold) *Let M be a simply connected 3D manifold (discrete or piecewise linear); a closed discrete surface S (with local flatness) will separate M into two components. Here, M can be closed.*

Proof: For the beginning part of the proof, we use the idea of the proof of the classical Jordan Curve Theorem in [1]. However, the proof given here is independent.

Select a 2-cell in S . This 2-cell is contained in two 3-cells in M , called A and B . Let a and b be two points in A and B , respectively. Both a and b are adjacent to the intersection of A and B . This intersection is the original 2-cell we chose in S .

We know that $a, b \in M \setminus S$. We also know there is a path $P(b, a)$ from b to a ($P(b, a)$) passing through a point in $A \cap B$. We denote this by $P^{-1}(b, a)$, the reverse order of $P(b, a)$.


Now, we want to prove that every path $P(a, b)$ from a to b includes a point in S .

On the contrary, we assume there is a $P(a, b)$ that does not include any point in S . Since M is simply connected, there will be a sequence of simple paths (pseudo-curves), $P(a, b) = P(0), P(1), \dots, P(n) = P^{-1}(b, a)$, that are side-gradually varied to $P(b, a)$.

Note that $P(b, a)$ contains a point in S . There must be a first i such that $P(i - 1)$ does not contain any point in S , but $P(i)$ contains $x \in S$. Note that $P(i - 1)$ and $P(i)$ are side-gradually varied, meaning that $\text{XORSum}(P(i - 1), P(i))$ are a collection of 2-cells in M . $\text{XORSum}(P(i - 1), P(i))$ is the exclusive sum that contains 2-cells where all corner points in each 2-cell are contained in the edges in $P(i - 1)$ or $P(i)$ but not in both. (See the Appendix.)

We illustrate this in Fig. 12 below for the current proof, $k = 3$:

Space M is simply connected



A,B are two k-cells; share a (k-1)-cell in S.

Figure 12: A closed $(k - 1)$ -manifold in a k -manifold. Assume that x is the first intersection point in S where $x \in P(i)$, the collection of paths $P(i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

For a vertex x , we use $S_M(x)$ to denote a set that contains all 3-cells in M containing x , and $S_S(x)$ is a set that contains all 2-cells in S containing x . We know that $S_S(x) = S \cap S_M(x)$.

$S_M(x) \setminus \{x\}$ is a 2-sphere, a special 2-cycle where each point is included in a 3-cell that contains x . It is similar to the set where each element links to the center x by one edge or is in the same 3-cell containing x .

Note that for higher-dimensional cases, we defined the k -cell-distance as the length of the shortest path of k -cells (see Section 2). Now, k -cell-distance 1 means that each element x' in the $(k - 1)$ -cycle, $S_M(x) \setminus \{x\}$, is in a k -cell that also contains the center x (x' is not the center x).

In this proof, $S_S(x) \setminus \{x\}$ is a 1-sphere. Also, $S_S(x) \setminus \{x\}$ is a subset of $S_M(x) \setminus \{x\}$. In other words, $C = S_S(x) \setminus \{x\}$ is a closed discrete curve of $Q = S_M(x) \setminus \{x\}$.

In the path $P(i)$, there must be a node u that moves to x and also a node v that comes after x . See Fig. 12. We have two major cases: **(a)** v is not on S , and **(b)** v is on S . We can see that if v is on S , then we need to apply the property of local flatness (discussed in Section 3).

Proof of Case (a):

According to the Jordan curve theorem, $S_S(x) \setminus \{x\}$ divides $S_M(x) \setminus \{x\}$ into two components. In Fig. 12, $\cdots u \rightarrow x \rightarrow v \cdots$ is a substring (path) of $P(i)$. Note that u and v are in $Q = S_M(x) \setminus \{x\}$ with all vertices surrounding x in M . Also, u and v are not in C because $C \subset S$. (This means that the path $\cdots u \rightarrow x \rightarrow v \cdots$ is transversal to S . We later discuss the case where v is in S so we can find $v' \in Q$.)

Our purpose is to show that from u to v , there is a path that shares a part of $P(i - 1)$. And this part must contain a point in $C \subset S$. This generates a contradiction that $P(i - 1)$ does not contain any point in S .

Since $P(i - 1)$ and $P(i)$ are gradually varied, u will be included in a 2-cell containing a point in $P(i - 1)$, and v will be included in a 2-cell containing a point in $P(i - 1)$. Particularly, x will be included in a 2-cell that contains a point in $P(i - 1)$. There will be a cycle $u, \cdots, y_1, \cdots, y_t, \cdots, v, x, u$ that contains part of the path $P(i - 1)$, denoted by y_1, \cdots, y_t . This cycle is in $S_M(x)$ (Also see an example in [1]). All points $u, \cdots, u_0, y_1, \cdots, y_t, v_0 \cdots, v$ are in Q . In fact, this path must contain a point in C based on the Jordan curve theorem. Otherwise, $P(i)$ is not cross-over (or transversal to) S .

This path has three parts: u, \cdots, u_0 are in $P(i)$; y_1, \cdots, y_t are in $P(i - 1)$; and $v_0 \cdots, v$ are in $P(i)$. We want to prove that only the second part y_1, \cdots, y_t can intersect C .

We now just need to check whether u, \cdots, u_0 could contain any point in C . Since u_0, \cdots, u is on $P(i)$ and u_0, \cdots, u are in a 2-cell, we see that x is the first element of $P(i)$ on S . This is impossible since C is a subset of S .

Next, we check whether v_0, \dots, v could contain a point in C . Note that v_0, \dots, v are also in $P(i)$ and they are in a 2-cell including x . If v_0, \dots, v has one point in C , then this 2-cell contains two or more points in S . This is impossible for the following reason: Let us say that v_i is in C , the path joining with C is $x \in S, v, \dots, v_i \in C, \dots, v_0$. We know that (x, v, \dots, v_0) is contained in a 2-cell denoted by $A1$. Since v_i is also in C , there must be a cell $B1$ in $S_S(x)$ that contains both x and v_i . ($C = S_S(x) \setminus \{x\}$ is the link of x .) The set $A1 \cap B1$ contains x and v_i but not v . In the Appendix, we have strictly specified that any intersection must be a connected path.

(In our definition of discrete manifolds, any two cells must be well-attached or not attached. In other words, the intersection must be a simply connected i -manifold composed of i -cells and be homeomorphic to an i -ball when embedding to \mathbb{R}^n . In terms of cell-complexes, the intersection is an i -cell that is homeomorphic to an i -ball. However, it is hard to determine this fact in continuous space, and we only mention it because it is not computable. It is obvious that we do not want to allow a complex case of the intersection of two cells. For us, any two cells A and B can be in any dimension. The intersection of A and B is a simply connected i -manifold and the intersection is homeomorphic to the i -ball. It is important that these facts can be determined in polynomial time of $O(|A| + |B|)$. Here, $|A|$ refers to the number of vertices in A .)

In other words, the intersection of two 2-cells or any two cells must be connected by its vertices. However, v, \dots, v_{i-1} are not in the intersection. So, v_i must be v . We already assumed that v is not on S . Therefore, there must be a y_i in y_1, \dots, y_t that is in C . Thus, we have a contradiction. We have proven the case of $S \cap P(i) = \{x\}$ where x is a simple point.

Proof of Case (b):

If S contains two points of $P(i)$, then $C = S_S(e = (x, x_1))$ and G are still cycles. (Any link of a k -face or k -cell is a cycle or sphere by a standard theorem in intersection homology theory[9]). We can still prove the same result as in Case (a).

(Note: We require that S be a discrete 2-manifold or $(k - 1)$ -manifold in M . There will not be a case where $\dots xv \dots$ in $P(i)$ if x and v are in S , but the edge (x, v) is not in S when edge $(x, v) \in M$. We only allow pseudo-manifolds while we are doing a contraction or other actions; we do not allow a pseudo-manifold when we first select it. Please see the Appendix for more details. This restriction is related to the so

called partial graph properties, meaning that if the vertex set is determined, then the subgraph will contain all edges (1-cells and i -cells) if these vertices are in the set. So, the definition of discrete manifolds here will give a unique interpretation. We know that this situation could also be prevented by the local flatness of S in M . We now return to our proof.)

Here is a complex example of this case: S contains a consecutive part of $P(i)$, $X = \{x, x_k, \dots, x_0\}$, i.e., there are more than two points in $P(i)$ that are in S . Please note that $P(i)$ is a simple path, so X is not restricted to be a flat path. The key of the proof is to modify $P(i)$ to be a flat path.

Let us have more detailed explanations. In $2D$, S is a curve. So, x, x_k, \dots, x_0 is a subset of S that is a pure discrete curve. In this paper, S is a surface. $P(i)$ can be zigzagged on S . we may have some cases where $S_S(X) \setminus X$ is not a simple (discrete) closed curve. Here, x, x_k, \dots, x_0 is only a subset of a simple path in higher-dimensional space.

In order to treat this case, we want x, x_k, \dots, x_0 to have a collar, meaning that the neighborhood of x, x_k, \dots, x_0 does not intersect itself, which is the concept of local flatness. (See Proposition 1.) In other words, $S_S(X) \setminus X$ and $S_M(X) \setminus X = S(X) \setminus X$ must be a (simple) 1-cycle and 2-cycle, respectively.

We know that S is locally flat in M by the condition of the generalized Jordan-Schoenflies theorem. This means that S is not folding together in M (see examples in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4.). If it does, then we can never make a locally flat $P(i)$ in M . Therefore, this is our pre-condition.

The key to the proof of Case (b) is to design an algorithm that uses a technique to modify $P(i)$ into a local flat path: If X contains two points a, b (these two points are not adjacent in $P(i)$) in S such that a and b are adjacent in S or $d(a, b) = 2$ (see Fig. 13), then we can have a $P'(i)$ that is gradually varied to $P(i)$. $P'(i)$ still contains x as the entering point.

Before we describe this modification algorithm, we recall a little more about local flatness. To observe that $P'(i)$ is “locally flat” in S means that there are at least a distance of 3 between any two points that are not adjacent in the path X or consecutive such as a, b, c (see Definition 3.1 and Definition 3.2).

Now we describe the algorithm for modification as follows:

The idea is to insert a sequence of side-gradually varied paths between $P(i - 1)$ and $P(i)$. This sequence does not contain a . In more detail, we want to find a locally flat $P'(i)$ containing the original x just before reaching $P(i)$ (from $P(i - 1)$).




Figure 13: $X \in P(i)$ is not locally flat. We can modify X to make a new locally flat $P'(i)$ in S .

Here, the path $P'(i)$ is gradually varied (by a sequence of paths) to $P(i-1)$. In other words, we have a sequence of side-gradually varied paths from P_{i-1} to $P'(i)$. Except for $P'(i)$, any path in the sequence will not contain a point in S . In addition, this sequence does not contain point a . Let us prove this statement: First we draw Fig. 14, which is a continuation of the case of Fig. 13.

The actual procedure to find such a sequence of side-gradually varied paths is the following:

We want a locally flat $P'(i)$ to replace $P(i)$ (this process may take more than one iteration). The point $P'(i)$ is obtained by moving the point a by a 2-cell to point a' in S to build distance from point b in Fig. 13. (If S is $(k-1)$ -dimensional, we will move a along with a $(k-1)$ -cell.)

In Fig. 14, we exhibit the relationship between P_i and P'_i . The 2-cell e is between these two paths, and we want to find another path from P_{i-1} to P'_i without passing through e . In other words, we want to find a sequence of side-gradually varied paths from P_{i-1} to P'_i that do not pass the 2-cell e (in Fig. 14). This is definitely possible since e is contained in a 3-cell, and the inserted paths can go by way of other edges (or faces) to reach P'_i from P_{i-1} .

(Note that in the current 3D manifold M , this distance is the edge-distance. If M is a k -manifold, then S will be a $(k-1)$ -manifold. The point a will move to be the point a' in the next $(k-1)$ -cell, at least to be shared with the next $(k-1)$ -cell. We can define $d^i(x, y)$ as the i -cell distance for x and y and $x \neq y$, as the smallest number of i -cells




Figure 14: Some facts about $P(i)$ and $P'(i)$: The 2-cell e is between $P(i)$ and $P'(i)$. When a moves to a' , path $P(i)$ changes to path $P'(i)$, and arc rap changes to arc $ra'p$. Cell e containing $rapa'$ is in S , but d and f are not; d and f are in $Star(a)$. There are two cases: (i) A 3-cell (or k -cell) contains e and arc df , and (ii) A 3-cell contains e and is 2-connected to the cell containing arc df . Our purpose is to make a gradually varied path-sequence on $Link(a)$ from $P(i-1)$ to $P'(i)$ where every path in the sequence (except $P'(i)$) does not intersect S . (Without pass e , see Proposition 4.2).

in the $(i-1)$ -connected path where x and y are at the end of path. The graph-distance means the distance of edges in the path. In this paper, the edge-distance, or 1-cell distance, is the graph-distance.)

Here are the facts: (1) $P(i-1)$ is side-gradually varied to $P(i)$. There must be points r and p on $P(i)$ that have adjacent points d and f in $P(i-1)$ in M , respectively. Or they are in the same 2-cell in M . (2) $P'(i)$ is almost the same as $P(i)$ except at point r . The path changes from r to a' and from a' to p . (3) We want to build a sequence of paths from $P(i-1)$ to $P'(i)$ without passing a . (That is, do not use the cell e . For instance, this is always possible on the boundary of a 3-cell. By cutting e out, we can still have a bounded surface.) See Section 4.2 and Proposition 4.2.

We also know the following facts: (1) $Star_M(a)$ contains all points of r, d, f, p, a' . (2) Since S is locally flat, then $Link_M(a)$ is a 2-sphere that contains all of r, d, f, p, a' . In fact, S has a collar in M .

Now we want to prove that $arc(d \rightarrow f)$ is a deformation of $arc(d \rightarrow r \rightarrow a' \rightarrow p \rightarrow f)$.

This must be true since we already proved in [1]: A discrete 2-cycle (or 2-sphere)³ is simply connected using graph-distance for contraction. The problem here is finding a path that is side-gradually varied to P'_i on $\text{Link}_M(a)$ that does not contain any point in $S \cap \text{Link}_M(a)$. (This is because there may be other points between r and a' .)

Here is the process that can make such a path be the “collar-edge” of the arc($r \rightarrow a' \rightarrow p$). We know that there is a side-gradually varied sequence $\text{arc}(d \rightarrow f) = B_1, B_2, \dots, B_i = \text{arc}(d \rightarrow r \rightarrow a' \rightarrow p \rightarrow f)$. Let B_i be the first containing point q (which is neither r nor p) that is in a 2-cell or $(k-1)$ -cell containing a point in $\text{arc}(r \rightarrow a' \rightarrow p)$. We want to fix q in W , a queue that was originally empty, so we split B_i into two sub-arcs: A_1 from r to q , and A_2 from q to p . (We will have two smaller 1-cycles based on the two sub-arcs A_1 and A_2 .) Therefore we can repeat this process to make a q' that lies between r and q so that q' shares a 2-cell with a point in P'_i , and put q' into W . Since we have a finite number of points, we can perform the same process for A_2 .

So, dWf will be a path that is side-gradually varied to $P'(i)$ in $\text{Link}_M(a)$, where Link is $\text{Star}(x) \setminus \{x\}$. Note that d and f in Fig. 14 are points on $P(i-1)$, which has an edge-distance of 1 to $P(i)$. In addition, dWf does not contain any points in S . Replacing dWf in $P(i-1)$, we get $P'(i-1)$. In other words, we use the arc $rdWfp$ to replace the arc $rd \cdots fp$ in $P(i-1)$ to get the new path $P'(i-1)$. $P'(i-1)$ has a gradually varied path sequence to $P(i-1)$ (see Section 4.2 and Proposition 4.2.).

Thus, $P'(i)$ is locally flat at the point we modified. If $P'(i)$ contains cases that are not locally flat, we will need to repeat the above process by changing another a to a' until the entire $P'(i)$ is locally flat. This procedure is finite since our space is finite, meaning that there are only a finite number of cells in our discrete spaces.

There must be a path in the deformation sequence to locally flat $P'(i)$ (in S). (See Section 3 and Section 4.) The set $X' = \{x, \dots\} \in P'(i)$ is a subset of S . Because X' is locally flat, we have two cycles $C^{(1)} = S_S(X') \setminus X'$ and $C^{(2)} = S_M(X') \setminus X'$, where $S_S(X') \setminus X'$ is a 1-cycle and $S_M(X') \setminus X'$ is a 2-cycle when M is a 3-manifold. $C^{(1)}$ is the closed curve in $C^{(2)}$. According to the Jordan curve theorem, every path that is gradually varied to $P'(i)$ must contain a point in $C^{(1)}$. Assume that $P'(i-1)$ is such a path toward $P(i-1)$ from $P'(i)$ (we can denote the gradually-varied paths as $P'(i), P'(i-1), P^{(2)}(i-1), \dots, P^{(t)}(i-1) = P(i-1)$), then $P'(i-1)$ must contain a point in $C^{(1)}$. So, $P'(i-1)$ has a point x' in S . Based on $P'(i-1)$ and x' , we can continue the above process until we reach $P(i-1)$ (this is because we only have a finite number of paths). By continuously doing this analysis, $P(i-1)$ must have a point in

³We can just view the k -sphere as $\text{Star}(x) \setminus \{x\}$

S . Therefore, we have a contradiction. Thus, we have proven the statement we wanted for Case **(b)**, which is a key construction.

(For a k -manifold M , we will have a similar construction. If M is a k -manifold, then $S_S(X) \setminus X$ is a $(k - 2)$ -cycle and $S_M(X) \setminus X$ is a $(k - 1)$ -cycle. See Corollary 3.7.)

Thus, we have proven the generalized Jordan-Schoenflies theorem for the discrete closed surface in 3D space. \square

We would like to discuss a little more about local flatness even though Section 3 is dedicated to this topic. We can view local flatness in the discrete case as follows: A discrete curve C is said to be *locally flat* if for any proper subset (arc) X of C , $S(X) \setminus X$ is a simple cycle. See the proof of Theorem 3.6 where the existence of the collar preserves this property. In addition, the manifold M_n must be locally flat. Otherwise, M_k cannot be locally flatly embedded in M_n . (We usually view M_n as an n -sphere, n -cycle, or a manifold that is homeomorphic to an n -sphere as predefined and computationally decidable in polynomial time.)

On the other hand, a locally flat path $P(t)$ means that $S(x)$ (x with a collar) does not intersect with $S(x')$ if $x, x' \in P(t)$ are apart from each other. Intuitively, the collar of $P(t)$ is just the union of $S(x)$ for all points $x \in P(t)$. This means that x to x' s in M or S must be apart from each other with a distance of 3.

Therefore, the graph-distance (or cell-distance) of 3 is the key for most pairs of points or cells. See Section 3.2 and Definition 3.2. Distance 3 is the minimum distance in the discrete case for local flatness where the collar will not intersect, except in some cases found in Fig. 5 in Section 3. With flatness, $\text{Link}(\text{subpath} = \text{arc}) = \text{Star}(\text{arc}) \setminus \{\text{arc}\}$ is a cycle in either S or M .⁴

Now, we prove the Schoenflies theorem: A closed 2-cycle separates M (M is homeomorphic to 3-sphere) into two components, each of which will be homeomorphic to a 3-ball. (We use a technique similar to the one used in [1].)

The following lemma completes the proof of the Jordan-Schoenflies theorem for a closed surface in the 3D sphere M .

⁴Graph-distance (or edge-distance) 3 in our previous version posted on Arxiv.org was not very accurate since we did not consider certain “corner” cases. In Section 3 of this paper, we expanded further investigations on discrete local flatness. We prove the following statement in the proof of Theorem 3.6 in Section 3: With local flatness, $\text{Link}(\text{subpath} = \text{arc}) = \text{Star}(\text{arc}) \setminus \{\text{arc}\}$ is a cycle in either S or M . This is also the real meaning of the collar of a curve.

Lemma 5.2 *Let M be a simply connected 3-manifold (discrete or piecewise linear) that is homeomorphic to a 3-sphere. A closed discrete (2)-manifold S on M will separate M into two components where each component is homeomorphic to a 3-cell.*

Proof: Since S separates M into two, we can find a connected component and mark every 3-cell in this component; we denote this component as \mathcal{D} . Choosing one 3-cell D_p that has a 2-face (2-cell in this case) in S , we design a procedure to contract S toward to this 3-cell D_p .

The algorithm is similar to the algorithm described in [1]. We first measure (compute) the distance from each k -cell ($k = 3$) X in the component \mathcal{D} to D_p . This distance counts how many k -cells are between X and D_p (in other words, the distance is the number of k -cells involved). More specifically, note that if p is a point (0-cell) in D_p , then, each point $q \neq p$ in D_p has a distance of 1. Each point r , not equal to q , in another k -cell (not D_p) that contains both r and q will have a distance of 2 to p if r is not in D_p .

In other words, use the 3-cell distance to measure how far each 3-cell is to D_p in the component. (See Section 2.4.) This distance is called the k -distance and indicates the length of the shortest path.

As a result, we can find the longest 2-cell F from S in D , meaning that there is a point $x \in F$ that has the longest k -distance to p . This must exist since we only have a finite number of k -cells in the component. Note that S and M are orientable, and so there must also be a longest distance on S . We also assume F is a 2-face in a 3-cell X in \mathcal{D} .

Now, we delete a 2-cell F in S containing x .

After we delete this face (2-cell) in S , we use other faces in X that are not in S to replace the deleted one. Thinking about the intersection of S and X (X is a 3-cell containing F , $X \cap S$ is not empty.), this intersection can be empty, 0-cells, 1-cells, or $(k - 1)$ -cells (2-cells in our case). We are only interested in the intersection that is a 2-cell or a set of 2-cells (this set must be homeomorphic to a 2-disk). If the intersection is the 2-cell F , then all 2-cells in $X \setminus F$ will be like a coffee cup without a lid F .

Let $U_2(X)$ be the set of 2-cells in X . (We also define $U_k(X)$ to be the set of k -cells in X .) $U_2(X) \setminus \{F\}$ will contain all 2-cells in X except F , so $(U_2(X) \setminus F) \cap F$ is the boundary cycle of F and $U_2(X) \setminus \{F\}$.

Thus, $(U_2(X) \setminus F) \cap F$ is a simple closed path (or a closed $(k - 2)$ -pseudo-curve or manifold). If $S \cap X$ is a set of 2-cells, then these 2-cells are connected (S is a

pseudo-manifold), and the boundary is also a simple closed path (or a closed $(k - 2)$ -pseudo-curve or manifold). Let $B(X)$ be the boundary faces of X . Using $B(X) \setminus (S \cap X)$ to replace $(S \cap X)$ in S , we will have an S' .

(We do not consider the case where $S \cap X$ does not contain 2-cells or $(k - 1)$ -cells in this proof.)

We have a new S' that is also a closed pseudo-surface. (S is a surface.) The new $\text{XorSum}(S', S)$ is the boundary of X . Changing S to S' , we will reduce the internal part of X , i.e. we determined a 3-cell from the original component D . We can mark it.

In the above process, we removed a 3-cell X . We can repeat this process to remove all 3-cells except D_p . This is because the number of (both unmarked and marked) 3-cells is finite, and the process will stop eventually. This is the general philosophy of the algorithm. When some extreme cases occur, we also need to process it. For instance, when the 2-cell F found is contained in X where X has a point that is on S but this point is not connected to F in $S \cap X$. In other words, $S \cap X$ is not a connected or it is not homeomorphic to a 2-disk. This X could not be deleted by removing F to keep $\mathcal{D} \setminus X$ to be simply connected. In such a case, we just need to remove any F so that X can be removed from \mathcal{D} to maintain it to be simply connected. This means that $S \cap X$ is homeomorphic to a 2-disk and $S \cap X$ is not the boundary of a 3-cell. In fact, theoretically we only need to remove those X to keep the new \mathcal{D} to be simply connected in contracting process. Such X always exist for \mathcal{D} ⁵. We can see that S can be contracted to the boundary of a 3-cell; then, we can contract the 3-cell to a point. The inverse of this process will provide a homeomorphic mapping from the component bounded by S to a 3-cell, D_p .

When we deal with a k -manifold, the principle of the proof is the same. □

Theorem 5.3 (The general Jordan-Schoenflies Theorem) *If M is a simply connected k -manifold (discrete or piecewise linear) that is homeomorphic to a k -sphere, then a closed discrete $(k - 1)$ -manifold with local flatness in M will separate M into two components. In addition, each component is homeomorphic to a k -cell.*

Proof: We use mathematical induction to prove the case for a (discrete or piecewise linear) simply connected k -manifold M that is homeomorphic to a k -sphere; a closed

⁵An extreme case was found when the first author revising his paper in dealing with 3D triangulation of a 3D compact manifold. The statement is still true. See Appendix A in *L. Chen, Algorithms for Deforming and Contracting Simply Connected Discrete Closed Manifolds (III), 2017. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1710.09819.pdf>*. (The revision v5 was posted in Feb. 2020).

$(k-1)$ -manifold S will divide M into two components. The assumption is that a $(k-1)$ -manifold that is homeomorphic to a $(k-1)$ -sphere satisfies the Jordan-Schoenflies theorem. Just like we did in the proof of Theorem 5.1, if there is a path from a to b without passing any point in S , then we can denote the path as $P = P(0)$. If x is the first point that is on S in the sequence of side-gradually varied paths $P(0), \dots, P(n)$, we can assume that this point is in $P(i-1)$. We can use the same strategy we used before to prove this theorem: **(a)** If x is the only point in $P(i) \cap S$, then $Q = S_M(x) \setminus \{x\}$ is a $(k-1)$ -sphere and $C = S \cap Q$ is a $(k-2)$ -sphere. According to the inductive hypothesis, C separates Q into two components. Every path from u to v in Q must contain a point in C , so $P(i-1)$ must contain a point in C . There is a contradiction if we assume $P(i-1)$ does not contain any point in S . **(b)** If $X = P(i) \cap S$ contains more than one point, then we can use local flatness to find a locally flat $P'(i)$ that is gradually varied to $P(i)$. In addition, if $X' = P'(i) \cap S$, then $Q = S_M(X') \setminus \{x\}$ is a $(k-1)$ -sphere and $C = S \cap Q$ is a $(k-2)$ -sphere. We can still use the Jordan theorem for general closed manifolds in $(k-1)$ -dimensions to prove the current theorem.

We can use the same technique to prove that the connected component is homeomorphic to a k -disk in the above lemma. Therefore, we have proven the general Jordan-Schoenflies theorem.

□

The above Theorem 5.3 can be split into two pieces just like Theorem 5.1 and Lemma 5.2. The treatment was presented in *2018 Lehigh University Geometry and Topology Conference*. (L. Chen jointly with S. G. Krantz, *The Discrete Method for Decomposition of n -Spheres and n -Manifolds*, Lehigh University Geometry and Topology Conference, May 24-27, 2018.) We just repeat the proof above as follows:

Theorem 5.4 (*The general Jordan separation Theorem*) *If M is a simply connected k -manifold (discrete or piecewise linear), then a $(k-1)$ -closed discrete manifold, orientable and simply connected with local flatness in M will separate M into two components.*

Proof: Using mathematical induction, we can prove that for a (discrete or piecewise linear) simply connected k -manifold M , a $(k-1)$ -closed discrete manifold, orientable and simply connected with local flatness in M will separate M into two components. The inductive hypothesis here is: For a (discrete or piecewise linear) simply connected $(k-1)$ -manifold M' , a $(k-2)$ -closed discrete manifold, orientable and simply connected with local flatness in M' will separate M' into two components.

Just like we did in the proof of Theorem 5.1, if there is a path from a to b without passing any point in S , then we can denote the path as $P = P(0)$. If x is the first point that is on S in the sequence of side-gradually varied paths $P(0), \dots, P(n)$, we can assume that this point is in $P(i-1)$. We can use the same strategy we used before to prove this theorem: **(a)** If x is the only point in $P(i) \cap S$, then $Q = S_M(x) \setminus \{x\}$ is a $(k-1)$ -sphere and $C = S \cap Q$ is a $(k-2)$ -sphere. According to the inductive hypothesis, C separates Q into two components. Every path from u to v in Q must contain a point in C , so $P(i-1)$ must contain a point in C . There is a contradiction if we assume $P(i-1)$ does not contain any point in S . **(b)** If $X = P(i) \cap S$ contains more than one point, then we can use local flatness to find a locally flat $P'(i)$ that is gradually varied to $P(i)$. In addition, if $X' = P'(i) \cap S$, then $Q = S_M(X') \setminus \{x\}$ is a $(k-1)$ -sphere and $C = S \cap Q$ is a $(k-2)$ -sphere. We can still use the Jordan theorem for general closed manifolds in $(k-1)$ -dimensions to prove the current theorem.

□

Theorem 5.5 (*The general Jordan-Schoenflies Theorem*) *If M is a simply connected k -manifold (discrete or piecewise linear) that is homeomorphic to a k -sphere, then a $(k-1)$ -cycle with local flatness in M will separate M into two components. In addition, each component is homeomorphic to a k -cell. (we can assume this k -sphere is in Euclidean space.)*

Proof: For a (discrete or piecewise linear) simply connected k -manifold M that is homeomorphic to a k -sphere, we can get that there is a partition or decomposition of M and each k -cell of the partition is homeomorphic to a Euclidean k -cell. So we can get the discretization of the cell to be a discrete k -cell. Again, the process for homeomorphism can be done in finite time or even in polynomial time regarding numbers of cells in the final decomposed k -complex.

The first part of this theorem is the same as Theorem 5.4. We only need to face the second part. We can use the same technique to prove that the connected component is homeomorphic to a k -disk in Lemma 5.3. Therefore, we have proven the general Jordan-Schoenflies theorem.

□

The advantage of using the discrete method for proving the general Jordan-Schoenflies theorem is rendering the proof as an algorithmic procedure. We can actually program this algorithm for contraction. This method may also have applications in other geometric problems.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we give a complete proof of the general Jordan-Schoenflies theorem. When we say that M is a simply connected k -manifold (discrete or piecewise linear) that is also homeomorphic to the k -sphere, we mean that there is an efficient constructive method (a polynomial time algorithm in computational geometry) to decide whether M is homeomorphic to a k -sphere. We prove the main result at the end of Section 5.

The general Jordan Schoenflies theorem states: Embedding an $(n - 1)$ -sphere $S^{(n-1)}$ local flatly in an n -sphere S^n decomposes S^n into two components. In addition, the embedded $S^{(n-1)}$ is the common boundary of the two components and each component is homeomorphic to the n -ball. According to the theorem in Section 2 that states that local flatness implies the existence of a collar, the general Jordan-Schoenflies theorem can also be stated as: Embed $S^{n-1} \times [-1, 1]$ in the n -sphere, then each of the closed components bounded by $S^{n-1} \times 0$ in this n -sphere is homeomorphic to the n -ball.

Appendix: Basic Concepts of Discrete Manifolds

In topology, the formal description of the Jordan curve theorem is: A simple closed curve J in a plane Π decomposes $\Pi \setminus J$ into two components. In fact, this theorem holds for any simply connected surface. A plane is a simply connected surface in Euclidean space, but this theorem is not true for a general continuous surface. For example, a torus fails this result.

What is a simply connected continuous surface? A connected topological space T is simply connected if, for any point p in T , any simple closed curve containing p can be contracted to p . The contraction is a continuous mapping among a series of closed continuous curves [17].

In order to keep the concepts simple to understand, we first define the gradual variation between graphs. Then, we define discrete deformation among discrete pseudo-curves. And finally, we define the contraction of curves as a type of discrete deformation.

In this section, we assume the discrete surface is both regular and orientable. A discrete surface is regular if every neighborhood of each point is homomorphic to a 2D discrete disk (a umbrella shape) [3].

Definition .1 Let G and G' be two connected graphs. A mapping $f : G \rightarrow G'$ is gradually varied if, for two vertices $a, b \in G$ that are adjacent in G , $f(a)$ and $f(b)$ are adjacent in G' or $f(a) = f(b)$.

Intuitively, “continuous” change from a simple path C to another path C' means that there is no “jump” between these two paths. If $x, y \in S$, then $d(x, y)$ denotes the distance between x and y . For instance, $d(x, y) = 1$ means that x and y are adjacent in S . It is important to point out that, in a 2-cell (or any other k -cell), from a point p to another point q in the cell, $p \neq q$, the distance $d(p, q)$ can be viewed as 1. In other words, a cell can be viewed as a complete subgraph on its vertices.

Definition .2 Two simple paths $C = p_0, \dots, p_n$ and $C' = q_0, \dots, q_m$ are gradually varied in S if $d(p_0, q_0) \leq 1$ and $d(p_n, q_m) \leq 1$, and for any non-end point p in C :

- (1) p is in C' , or p is contained by a 2-cell A (in $G(C \cup C')$) such that A has a point in C' .
- (2) Each non-end-edge in C is contained by a 2-cell A (in $G(C \cup C')$), which has an edge contained by C' but not C if C' is not a single point.

And vice versa for C' .

For example, C and C' in Fig. 15 (a) are gradually varied, but C and C' in Fig. 15 (b) are not gradually varied. We can see that a 2-cell, which is a simple path, and any two connected parts in the 2-cell are gradually varied, so we can say that a 2-cell can be contracted to a point gradually.

Assume $E(C)$ denotes all edges in path C . Let $\text{XorSum}(C, C') = (E(C) \setminus E(C')) \cup (E(C') \setminus E(C))$. XorSum is called sum(modulo 2) in Newman's book [17].




Figure 15: Gradually varied curves: (a) C and C' are gradually varied; (b) C and C' are not gradually varied.

Attaching a 2-cell to a simple path C , if the intersection is an arc (connected path) and not a vertex, then we can cut the intersection (keeping the first and last vertices of the intersection, which is an arc); the simple path will go another half of the arc of the cell. The new path is also a simple path, and it is gradually varied to C . Therefore,

Lemma .3 *Let C be a pseudo-curve and A be a 2-cell. If $A \cap C$ is an arc containing at least one edge, then $\text{XorSum}(C, A)$ is a gradual variation of C .*

It is not difficult to see that $\text{XorSum}(\text{XorSum}(C, A), A) = C$ and $\text{XorSum}(\text{XorSum}(C, A), C) = A$ under the condition of the above lemma.

Definition .4 Two simple paths (or pseudo-curves) C and C' are said to be homotopic if there is a series of simple paths C_0, \dots, C_n such that $C = C_0$, $C' = C_n$, and C_i, C_{i+1} are gradually varied.

We say that C can be discretely deformed to C' if C and C' are homotopic. The following lemma states that we can deform a curve by making changes one cell at a time.

Lemma .5 *If two (open, not closed) simple paths C and C' are homotopic, then there is a series of simple paths C_0, \dots, C_m such that $C = C_0$, $C' = C_m$, and $\text{XorSum}(C_i, C_{i+1})$ is a 2-cell excepting end-edges of C and C' .*

To prove the Jordan curve theorem, we need to describe what the disconnected components are by distinguishing them from a simple curve C . It means that any path from one component to another must include at least one point in C . It also means that this linking path must cross-over the curve C . In this subsection, we want to define this idea.

Because a surface-cell A is a closed path, we can define two orientations (normals) to A : clockwise and counter-clockwise. Usually the orientation of a 2-cell is not a critical issue. However, it is necessary for the proof of the Jordan curve theorem.

In other words, a pseudo-curve, which is a set of points with no “direction,” as a path has its own “travel direction” from p_0 to p_n . For two paths C and C' , which are gradually varied, if a 2-cell A is in $G(C \cup C')$, the orientation of A with respect to C is determined by the first pair of points $(p, q) \in C \cap A$ and $C = \dots pq \dots$. Moreover, if a 1-cell of A is in C , then the orientation of A is fixed with respect to C .

According to Lemma 7.6 in [3], $S(p)$ contains all adjacent points of p and $S(p) \setminus \{p\}$ is a simple cycle, and there is a cycle containing all points in $S(p) \setminus \{p\}$.

We assume that the cycle $S(p) \setminus \{p\}$ is always oriented clockwise. For two points $a, b \in S(p) \setminus \{p\}$, there are two simple cycles containing the path $a \rightarrow p \rightarrow b$: (1) A cycle from a to p to b then moving clockwise to a , and (2) A cycle from a to p to b then moving counter-clockwise to a . See Fig. 16(a).

It is easy to see that the simple cycle $S(p) \setminus \{p\}$ separates $S \setminus \{S(p) \setminus \{p\}\}$ into at least two connected components because from p to any other points in S , the path must contain a point in $S(p) \setminus \{p\}$. $S(p) \setminus \{p\}$ is an example of a Jordan curve.




Figure 16: $S(p)$ and cross-over at p : (a) Two adjacent points a and b of p in $S(p)$, and (b) Two cross-over paths.

Definition .6 Two simple paths C and C' are said to “cross-over” each other if there are points p and q (p may be the same as q) such that $C = \dots apb \dots sqt \dots$ and

$C' = \dots a'pb \dots sqt' \dots$ where $a \neq a'$ and $t \neq t'$. The cycle $apa' \dots a$ without b in $S(p)$ and the cycle $qt \dots t'q$ without s in $S(q)$ have different orientations with respect to C .

For example, in Fig. 16 (b), C and C' do “cross-over” each other. When C and C' do not “cross-over” each other, we will say that C is on the side of C' .

Lemma .7 *If two simple paths C and C' do not cross-over each other, and they are gradually varied, then every surface-cell in $G(C \cup C')$ has the same orientation with respect to the “travel direction” of C and opposite to the “travel direction” of C' .*

We also say that C and C' in the above lemma are side-gradually varied.

Intuitively, a simply connected set is a set where, for any point, every simple cycle containing this point can contract to the point.

Definition .8 A simple cycle C can contract to a point $p \in C$ if there exists a sequence of simple cycles, $C = C_0, \dots, p = C_n$ such that: **(1)** C_i contains p for all i ; **(2)** If q is not in C_i then q is not in all $C_j, j > i$; **(3)** C_i and C_{i+1} are side-gradually varied.

We now exhibit three reasonable definitions of simply connected spaces below. We will provide a proof for the Jordan curve theorem under the third definition of simply connected spaces. The Jordan theorem shows the relationship among an object, its boundary, and its outside area.

A general definition of a simply connected space should be:

Definition .9 Simply Connected Surface Definition (a) $\langle G, U_2 \rangle$ is simply connected if any two closed simple paths are homotopic.

If we use this definition, then we may need an extremely long proof for the Jordan curve theorem. The next one is the standard definition, which is a special case of the above definition.

Definition .10 (Simply Connected Surface Definition (b)) A connected discrete space $\langle G, U_2 \rangle$ is simply connected if, for any point $p \in S$, every simple cycle containing p can contract to p .

This definition for the simply connected set is based on the original meaning of simple contraction. In order to make the task of proving the Jordan theorem simpler, we give the third strict definition of simply connected surfaces as follows.

We know that a simple closed path (simple cycle) has at least three vertices in a simple graph. This is true for a discrete curve in a simply connected surface S . For simplicity, we call an unclosed path an arc. Assume that C is a simple cycle with clockwise orientation. Let two distinct points $p, q \in C$. Let $C(p, q)$ be an arc of C from p to q in a clockwise direction, and $C(q, p)$ be the arc from q to p also in a clockwise direction. Then, we know that $C = C(p, q) \cup C(q, p)$. We use $C^a(p, q)$ to represent the counter-clockwise arc from p to q . Indeed, $C(p, q) = C^a(q, p)$. We always assume that C is in clockwise orientation.

Definition .11 (Simply Connected Surface Definition (c)) A connected discrete space $\langle G, U_2 \rangle$ is simply connected if, for any simple cycle C and two points $p, q \in C$, there exists a sequence of simple cycle paths Q_0, \dots, Q_n where $C(p, q) = Q_0$ and $C^a(p, q) = Q_n$ such that Q_i and Q_{i+1} are side-gradually varied for all $i = 0, \dots, n-1$.

In fact, it is easy to see that the Definitions (b) and (c) are special cases of Definition (a). $C(p, q) = Q_0$ and $C^a(p, q) = Q_n$ are two arcs of C .

In continuous mathematics, the concept of the cross-over of two paths is called *transversal intersection*. It means that one curve or path goes through (or penetrates) another curve.

References

- [1] L. Chen, Note on the discrete Jordan curve theorem (revised version), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1312.0316>. The simple and revised version of this paper is at L. Chen, A Concise Proof of Discrete Jordan Curve Theorem, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1411.4621>.
- [2] L. Chen, *Discrete Surfaces and Manifolds*, SP Computing, Rockville, 2004.
- [3] L. Chen, *Digital and Discrete Geometry*, Spinger, New York, 2014.
- [4] M. Brown, A proof of the generalized Schoenflies theorem, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 66(1960), pp. 74–76.
- [5] M. Brown, Locally flat imbeddings of topological manifolds, *Annals of Mathematics*, Second series, 75(1962), pp. 331–341.
- [6] B. Mazur, On embeddings of spheres, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 65(1959), no. 2, pp. 59–65. <http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.bams/1183523034>.

- [7] B. Mazur, On embeddings of spheres, *Acta Math.* 105(1961), pp. 1–17. MR 0125570 Zbl 0096.37904.
- [8] R. J. Daverman and G. A. Venema, *Embeddings in Manifolds* (Graduate Studies in Mathematics) Hardcover, October 14, 2009 , American Mathematical Society (October 14, 2009)
- [9] M. Goresky and R. MacPherson, Intersection homology theory, *Topology* 19(1980), no. 2, 135-162. or
- [10] T.C.Hales, The Jordan curve theorem formally and informally, *Amer. Math. Monthly* 114(2007), 882–894.
- [11] A. Hatcher. *Algebraic Topology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
- [12] R.C. Kirby and L.C. Siebenmann, *Foundational Essays on Topological Manifolds, Smoothings, and Triangulations*, Annals of Math. Studies, No. 88, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1977.
- [13] E. Bishop and D. Bridges, *Constructive Analysis*, (Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, 279), Heidelberg: Springer Verlag, 1985.
- [14] M. Sipser, Introduction to the Theory of Computation, PWS Publishing Company, Boston, MA, 1997.
- [15] S. Lefschetz, *Introduction to Topology*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1949.
- [16] E.E. Moise, *Geometric Topology in Dimensions 2 and 3*, Springer, New York, 1977.
- [17] M. Newman, *Elements of the Topology of Plane Sets of Points*, Cambridge, London, 1954.
- [18] L Siebenmann, The Osgood-Schoenflies theorem revisited, *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk* 60 (2005) 67-96.
- [19] C. Thomassen, The Jordan-Schoenflies theorem and the classification of surfaces, *Amer. Math. Month.* 99(1992), 116-131.
- [20] W.T. Tutte, *Graph Theory*, Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- [21] O. Veblen, Theory on Plane Curves in Non-Metrical Analysis Situs, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 6(1905), 83-98.
- [22] J. H. C. Whitehead. Combinatorial homotopy. II, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 55(1949), 453–496.

Department of Computer Science and IT, University of the District of Columbia, Washington, DC 20008, USA

Department of Mathematics, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MI 63130, USA,

lchen@udc.edu, sk@math.wustl.edu

www.udc.edu/prof/chen, <http://www.math.wustl.edu/~sk/>