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Abstract. Let \( H \subset \mathbb{N}^d \) be a normal simplicial affine semigroup, \( R = K[H] \) its semigroup ring over the field \( K \) and \( \omega_R \) its canonical module, which is identified with an ideal in \( R \). The Ulrich elements for \( H \) are those \( h \) in \( H \) such that for the multiplication map by \( x^h \) from \( R \) into \( \omega_R \), the cokernel is an Ulrich module. We say that the ring \( R \) is almost Gorenstein if Ulrich elements exist in \( H \).

We provide algebraic and combinatorial criteria to test the Ulrich property for arbitrary elements in \( H \). In particular, unless \( R \) is a regular ring, we show that Ulrich elements are located among the exponents of the minimal monomial generators of \( \omega_R \).

Assume \( d = 2 \) and \( a_1, a_2 \) are the vectors with coprime integer entries on the extremal rays of the cone \( C \) over \( H \). Then any \( b \) in the Hilbert basis \( B_H \), different from \( a_1, a_2 \), is an Ulrich element in \( H \) if and only if \( c_1 + c_2 \in (a_1 + H) \cup (a_2 + H) \cup (b + H) \) for all \( c_1, c_2 \in B_H \). For the bottom element of \( H \), which is defined as the smallest among the exponents of the monomials in \( \omega_R \) ordered componentwise, we have a more direct description of when it has the Ulrich property. Consequently, when \( H \) has all nonzero elements with both entries positive and \((1, 1)\) is in the relative interior of the cone \( C \) then we obtain a simple arithmetic criterion for the almost Gorenstein property of \( R \) in terms of the entries of \( a_1 \) and \( a_2 \) alone.

Introduction

Let \( H \) be an affine semigroup in \( \mathbb{N}^d \) and \( K[H] \) its semigroup ring over the field \( K \). In this paper we investigate the almost Gorenstein property for \( K[H] \) taking into account the natural multigraded structure of this ring, under the assumption that \( H \) is normal and simplicial.

The almost Gorenstein property appeared in the work of Barucci and Fröberg \cite{2} in the context of 1-dimensional analytical unramified rings. It was extended to 1-dimensional local rings by Goto, Matsuoka and Thi Phuong in \cite{13}, and later on to rings of higher dimension by Goto, Takahashi and Taniguchi in \cite{14}. Let \( R \) be a positively graded Cohen-Macaulay \( K \)-algebra with canonical module \( \omega_R \). We let \( a = -\min\{k \in \mathbb{Z} : (\omega_R)_k \neq 0\} \), which is also known as the \( a \)-invariant of \( R \). In \cite{14}, \( R \) is called (graded) almost Gorenstein (AG for short) if there exists an exact sequence of graded \( R \)-modules

\[
0 \to R \to \omega_R(-a) \to E \to 0,
\]

where \( E \) is an Ulrich module, i.e. \( E \) is a Cohen-Macaulay graded module which is minimally generated by \( e(E) \) elements. Here \( e(E) \) denotes the multiplicity of \( E \) with respect to the graded maximal ideal in \( R \).
Let $H \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$ be an affine semigroup with $\text{aff}(H) = \mathbb{R}^d$. We denote $C$ the cone over $H$. Assume $H$ is normal, i.e. $H = C \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$, equivalently, the ring $R$ is normal. Then $R$ is a Cohen-Macaulay ring ([20]) and a $K$-basis for the canonical module $\omega_R$ is given by the monomials with exponents in the relative interior of the cone $C$ ([7], [23]), i.e. in the set $\omega_H = \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \text{relint } C$. In the multigraded setting that we want to consider here, there does not seem to be any distinguished element in $\omega_H$ to replace the $a$-invariant in the short exact sequence (1). In this sense, we propose the following.

**Definition 3.1.** For $b \in \omega_H$ consider the following exact sequence

$$(2) \quad 0 \to R \to \omega_R(-b) \to E \to 0,$$

where $1 \in R$ is mapped to $u = x^b$ and $E = \omega_R/uR$. Then $b$ is called an Ulrich element in $H$, if $E$ is an Ulrich $R$-module.

If $H$ admits an Ulrich element $b$, then we call the ring $R = K[H]$ almost Gorenstein with respect to $b$, or simply AG if $H$ has an Ulrich element.

The Gorenstein property has attracted a lot of interest due to its multifaceted algebraic and homological descriptions. For rings with a combinatorial structure behind, there are often nice characterizations of the Gorenstein property. Scratching only at the surface, we mention that Gorenstein toric rings were characterized by Hibi in [18], and for special subclasses the results are more precise, see [8, 17, 19, 10].

The almost Gorenstein property was characterized for determinantal rings (Taniguchi, [21]), numerical semigroup rings (Nari, [22]) and Hibi rings (Miyazaki, [21]).

In this paper we prove several characterizations for Ulrich elements in $H$ under the assumption that the normal affine semigroup $H \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$ is also simplicial, i.e. the cone $C$ over $H$ has $d = \dim_R \text{aff}(H)$ extremal rays. That will be assumed for the rest of this introduction, too.

Next we outline the main results. We denote $a_1, \ldots, a_d$ the primitive integer vectors in $H$ situated on each extremal ray of the cone $C$, respectively, and we call them the extremal rays of $H$. They are part of the Hilbert basis of $H$, denoted $B_H$, which is the unique minimal generating set of $H$.

When $H$ is normal and simplicial it is known that the monomials $x^{a_1}, \ldots, x^{a_d}$ form a maximal regular sequence on $R$. A first result that we prove in Proposition 2.2 is that for any $b \neq 0$ in $H$ the sequence $x^b, x^{a_1} - x^{a_2}, \ldots, x^{a_1} - x^{a_d}$ is regular, as well. Let $J = (x^{a_i} - x^{a_j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq d)R$. In this notation, we prove the following statement.

**Theorem 3.2.** $b \in \omega_H$ is an Ulrich element in $H$ if and only if $m \omega_R \subseteq (x^b R, J \omega_R)$.

This allows to produce first examples of semigroups with Ulrich elements, see Examples 3.3, 3.4. The ideal $m \cdot \omega_R$ is generated by monomials in $R$, so in order to test the inclusion of ideals in Theorem 3.2, one should be able to verify whether any given monomial is in the ideal $(x^b R, J \omega_R)$. In order to achieve this goal, a key step is the following.
Lemma 5.1. Let \( b \in \omega_H \) and \( I = (x^b R, J_\omega R) \). For any \( c \in \omega_H \), the following are equivalent:

(a) \( x^c \in I \);
(b) there exist \( s \geq 0 \) and \( i_1, \ldots, i_s, j_1, \ldots, j_s \in \{1, \ldots, d\} \) such that \( \{i_1, \ldots, i_s\} \cap \{j_1, \ldots, j_s\} = \emptyset \) and \( c - a_i_1 - \cdots - a_i_s + a_j_1 + \cdots + a_j_s \in b + H. \)

For any \( z \in \mathbb{R}^d \) we denote \((z_1, \ldots, z_d)\) the vector of coordinates of \( z \) with respect to the basis \( a_1, \ldots, a_d \). Translates of the set

\[ P_H = \{ z \in \mathbb{R}^d : 0 \leq [z]_i < 1, i = 1, \ldots, d \} \]

by elements in \( \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{Z} a_i \) realize a tessellation of \( \mathbb{R}^d \). A first consequence of Lemma 5.1 is that unless \( R \) is a regular ring (i.e. \( B_H \supseteq \{a_1, \ldots, a_d\} \)), any Ulrich element lies in \( G(\omega_H) \), the minimal generating set of \( \omega_H \). In particular, \( b \in \overline{P_H}, \) the closure of \( P_H \) in \( \mathbb{R}^d \).

The philosophy behind Lemma 5.1 is as follows. The monomial \( x^c \) is in \( I \) if and only if there exists a way to move \( s \) boxes “down” from \( c \) in the tessellation and then \( s \) boxes “up” so that one ends up in the semigroup ideal \( b + H \). Such a condition can be expressed combinatorially in terms of the coordinates of \( c \) and \( b \) in the basis \( a_1, \ldots, a_d \). We denote

\[ [c - b]_{\leq 0} = \{ i : [c]_i < |b|_i \}, \quad [c - b]_{\geq 1} = \{ i : [c]_i \geq 1 + |b|_i \}. \]

Also, the order of \( c \) with respect to any subset \( S \subseteq \{1, \ldots, d\} \) is defined as \( \text{ord}_S(c) = \sum_{i \in S} [c]_i \). The set \([c - b]_{\leq 0}\) is also the set of (indices of) extremal rays that minimally need to be added to \( c \) in order to land in \( b + H \).

Let \( b \in \overline{P_H} \) and \( c \in \omega_H \). Lemma 5.4 shows that if \( c \) and \( b \) satisfy part (b) of Lemma 5.1 then

\[ \text{ord}_{c - b_{\geq 1}}(c) \geq |[c - b]_{\leq 0}|. \]

When the latter inequality holds we shall say that \( c \) is \( b \)-friendly in \( H \). Hence, when \( x^c \in I \), the extremal rays \( a_{j_1}, \ldots, a_{j_s} \) that are added to \( c \) come in exchange for extremal rays \( a_i \) with \([c - b]_i \geq 1 \).

Using this terminology we formulate the following combinatorial criterion, which is essentially easy to check once the Hilbert basis of \( H \) is available.

Theorem 5.8. Let \( b \in G(\omega_H) \). Then \( b \) is an Ulrich element in \( H \) if and only if for all \( c \in B_H \) and for all \( w \in G(\omega_H) \) the element \( c + w \) is \( b \)-friendly in \( H \).

With such a numerical criterion at hand we can construct AG rings with arbitrary dimension. We prove in Proposition 5.12 that \( K[H] \) is AG if and only if \( K[H \times \mathbb{N}] \) is AG.

The analysis of the AG property in case \( d = 2 \) deserves a special treatment. In order to get an idea about the difficulty of the problem of finding Ulrich elements, we treat the \( 2 \)-dimensional case first, in Section 4.

Let \( H \) be any normal affine semigroup \( H \subseteq \mathbb{N}^2 \). Note that it is automatically simplicial. We denote \( a_1, a_2 \) its extremal rays. In Theorem 4.3, we prove that any element \( b \in B_H \setminus \{a_1, a_2\} \) is an Ulrich element in \( H \) if and only if for all \( c_1, c_2 \in B_H \) one has \( c_1 + c_2 \in (a_1 + H) \cup (a_2 + H) \cup (b + H) \). Equivalently, if for all \( c_1, c_2 \in B_H \) so that \( c_1, c_2 \in P_H \) it follows that \( c_1 + c_2 \in b + H \).
Based on this result, in Section 4.26 we find examples with zero, one, or several Ulrich elements in $B_H$. In Remark 5.10 we discuss the connection between Theorem 4.3 and the specialization of Theorem 5.8 to dimension two.

We prove in Lemma 4.7 that for any $H \subseteq \mathbb{N}^2$ as above, the semigroup ideal $\omega_H$ has a unique minimal element with respect to the componentwise partial order on $\mathbb{N}^2$. We call it the bottom element of $H$. This definition naturally extends to higher embedding dimension, but not all normal semigroups in $\mathbb{N}^d$ where $d > 2$ have a bottom element.

However, bottom elements, when available, are good candidates to check against the Ulrich property. We prove that when $H \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$ is a normal simplicial affine semigroup such that

- (Proposition 3.6) the nonzero elements in $H$ have all the entries positive and $b = (1, 1, \ldots, 1) \in \omega_H$, or
- (Proposition 4.11) $d = 2$ and $b$ the bottom element in $H$ satisfies $2b \in P_H$,

then $b$ is the only possible Ulrich element in $H$.

These results motivate us to find more direct criteria for testing the Ulrich property of the bottom element. Our attempt is successful when $d = 2$.

In the following, $H$ is a normal affine semigroup in $\mathbb{N}^2$ with the extremal rays $a_1 = (x_1, y_1)$ and $a_2 = (x_2, y_2)$ with $a_1$ closer to the $x$-axis than $a_2$. Considering $b = (u, v)$ the bottom element of $H$, for $i = 1, 2$ we define $H_i$ to be the normal semigroup with the extremal rays $b$ and $a_i$. We denote $H^*_i = \text{relint} P_H \cap \mathbb{Z}^2$ for $i = 1, 2$. We show

**Lemma 4.18.** For $b$ the bottom element in $H$ the following are equivalent:

(a) $b$ is an Ulrich element in $H$;
(b) for $i = 1, 2$, if $p, q \in H^*_i$ then $p + q \notin H^*_i$.

We shall say that $H$ is AG1 if point (b) above is satisfied for $i = 1$ and we call it AG2 if it holds for $i = 2$.

Thus the bottom element is an Ulrich element in $H$ if and only if $H$ is AG1 and AG2. This calls for a better understanding of the points in $H^*_1$ and $H^*_2$. Lemma 4.22 shows that $H^*_i$ has $|vx_i - uy_i| - 1$ elements, for $i = 1, 2$. An immediate consequence of independent interest is the following Gorenstein criterion.

**Corollary 4.23.** With notation as above, the ring $K[H]$ is Gorenstein if and only if $vx_1 - uy_1 = uy_2 - vx_2 = 1$.

The $x$-coordinates of points in $H^*_1$ are distinct integers in the interval $(u, x_1)$. Moreover, if for any integer $i$ we consider the integers $q_i, r_i$ so that $iy_1 = q_i x_1 + r_i$ with $0 \leq r_i < x_1$ then any integer $k \in (u, x_1)$ is the $x$-coordinate of some $p \in H^*_1$ (i.e. $k \in \pi_1(H^*_1)$) if and only if $q_k = v + 1 + q_{k-1}$, or equivalently, if $r_k \geq x_1 - (vx_1 - uy_1)$. In that case, $p = (k, q_k + 1)$. These observations (detailed in Lemma 4.24) allow us to test the AG1 property as follows.

**Proposition 4.26.** The semigroup $H$ is AG1 if and only if $r_k + r_\ell < 2x_1 - (vx_1 - uy_1)$ for all integers $k, \ell \in \pi_1(H^*_1)$ with $k + \ell < x_1$. 

When the bottom element is $(1,1)$ (i.e. $y_1 < x_1$ and $x_2 < y_2$) we can describe recursively the points in $H^*_1$.

**Lemma 4.27** Assume $(1,1) \in \omega_H$ and $H^*_1 \neq \emptyset$. Let $n = |H^*_1| = x_1 - y_1 - 1$. Recursively, we define non-negative integers $\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_n$ and $s_1, \ldots, s_n$ by

$$x_1 = \ell_1(x_1 - y_1) + s_1, \quad \text{with} \quad s_1 < x_1 - y_1,$$

and

$$y_1 + s_{i-1} = \ell_i(x_1 - y_1) + s_i, \quad \text{with} \quad s_i < x_1 - y_1,$$

for $i = 2, \ldots, n$. Then

$$H^*_1 = \left\{ p_t = (c_t, d_t) : c_t = t + \sum_{i=1}^{t} \ell_i, \quad d_t = \sum_{i=1}^{t} \ell_i, \quad t = 1, \ldots, n \right\}.$$

A similar description is available for points in $H^*_2$. A little bit more effort is necessary to obtain the following arithmetic criterion for the Ulrich property of $(1,1)$. The effort is compensated with the simplicity of the statement.

**Theorem 4.29** Assume $(1,1) \in \omega_H$. Then $(1,1)$ is an Ulrich element in $H$ if and only if $x_i \equiv 1 \mod (x_i - y_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Consequently, by Corollary 4.30 if $x_1y_1x_2y_2 \neq 0$ the ring $K[H]$ is AG if and only if $x_i \equiv 1 \mod (x_i - y_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$.

In Section 6 we discuss another extension of the Gorenstein property for affine semigroup rings. According to the definition proposed in [15], any Cohen-Macaulay ring $K[H]$ is called nearly Gorenstein if the trace ideal $\text{tr}(\omega_K[H])$ contains the graded maximal ideal of $K[H]$. For one dimensional rings, the almost Gorenstein property implies the nearly Gorenstein property, but for rings of larger dimension there is no implication between these two properties. We prove in Theorem 6.1 that when $H$ is a normal semigroup in $\mathbb{N}^2$ the ring $K[H]$ is nearly Gorenstein. Example 6.2 shows that the statement is not valid in higher embedding dimensions.

1. **Background on affine semigroups and their toric rings**

A subset $H \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$ is called an affine semigroup if there exist $c_1, \ldots, c_r \in H$ such that $H = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \mathbb{N}c_i$. Moreover, $H$ is called a normal semigroup if for all $h \in \mathbb{N}^d$ and $n$ positive integer, $n h \in H$ implies that $h \in H$.

Let $K$ be any field and $H = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \mathbb{N}c_i \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$. The semigroup ring $K[H]$ is the subalgebra of the polynomial ring $K[x_1, \ldots, x_d]$ generated by the monomials with exponents in $H$. Then $H$ is normal if and only if the semigroup ring $K[H]$ is integrally closed in its field of fractions ([5]). The normality for $H$ is also equivalent to the fact that $H$ contains all the lattice points of the rational polyhedral cone $C$ that it generates, i.e. $H = C \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$, where

$$C = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{r} \lambda_i c_i : \lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, r \right\}.$$

The dimension (or rank) of $H$ is defined as the dimension of $\text{aff}(H)$, the affine subspace it generates. The latter is the same as $\text{aff}(C)$. In this paper all semigroups
considered are fully embedded, i.e. when writing $H \subset \mathbb{N}^d$ we shall implicitly assume that $\text{aff}(H) = \mathbb{R}^d$.

Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denote the usual scalar product in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Given $n \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$, the hyperplane $H_n = \{ z \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle z, n \rangle = 0 \}$ is called a support hyperplane for $C$ if $\langle z, n \rangle \geq 0$ for all $z \in C$ and $H_n \cap C \neq \emptyset$. In this case, the cone $H_n \cap C$ is called a face of $C$ and its dimension is $\text{dim}\text{aff}(H_n \cap C)$. Let $F$ be any face of the cone $C$. When $\text{dim} F = 1$, the face $F$ is called an extremal ray, and when $\text{dim} F = d-1$, it is called a facet of $C$. The normal vector to any hyperplane is determined up to multiplication by a nonzero factor, hence we may choose $n_1, \ldots, n_s \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ to be the normals to the support hyperplanes that determine the facets of $C$ and such that

$$C = \{ z \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle z, n_i \rangle \geq 0, \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, s \}.$$ 

The unique minimal set of generators for the semigroup $H$ is called the Hilbert basis of $H$ and we denote it as $B_H$.

It is known that the cone $C$ has at least $d$ facets and at least $d$ extremal rays. When $C$ has $d$ facets (equivalently, that it has $d$ extremal rays) the cone $C$ and the semigroup $H$ are called simplicial.

For any $d \geq 2$ we denote $\mathcal{H}_d$ the class of normal simplicial affine semigroups which are fully embedded in $\mathbb{N}^d$.

Let $H \in \mathcal{H}_d$ and $C$ the cone over $H$. On each extremal ray of $C$ there exists a unique primitive element from $H$, which we call an extremal ray for $H$. Denote $a_1, \ldots, a_d$ the extremal rays for $H$. These form an $\mathbb{R}$-basis in $\mathbb{R}^d$. For $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $z = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i a_i$ with $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \ldots, d$, we set $\lfloor z \rfloor_i = \lambda_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d$. In this notation, $z$ is in the cone $C$ if and only if $\lfloor z \rfloor_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d$. Also, when $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ one has that $z \in H$ if and only if $\lfloor z \rfloor_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d$.

The fundamental (semi-open) parallelotope of $H$ is the set

$$P_H = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R}^d : z = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i a_i \text{ with } 0 \leq \lambda_i < 1 \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, d \right\}.$$ 

Its closure in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is the set $\overline{P}_H = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R}^d : 0 \leq \lfloor z \rfloor_i \leq 1 \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, d \right\}$.

It is well known, and easy to see, that any $h$ in $H$ decomposes uniquely as $h = \sum_{i=1}^{d} n_i a_i + h'$ with $h' \in P_H \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $n_1, \ldots, n_d$ nonnegative integers. We denote $\lfloor h \rfloor = \sum_{i=1}^{d} n_i a_i$ and $\{ h \} = h - \lfloor h \rfloor$.

The extremal rays of $H$ are in $B_H \setminus P_H$, but the rest of the elements in $B_H$ belong to $P_H$.

Since $H$ is simplicial, $x^{a_1}, \ldots, x^{a_d}$ is a system of parameters in $R$, see [12, (1.11)]. As $H$ is a normal semigroup, by Hochster [20], the ring $R = K[H]$ is Cohen-Macaulay of dimension $d$, hence any system of parameters in $R$ is a regular sequence of maximal length. By Danilov [7] and Stanley [23], the canonical module $\omega_R$ of $R$ is the ideal in $R$ generated by the monomials $x^v$ whose exponent vector $v = \log(x^v)$ belongs to the relative interior of $C$, denoted by relint $C$. Note that

$$\text{relint} \, C = \left\{ c \in \mathbb{R}^d : c = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i a_i \text{ with } \lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \text{ for all } i = 1, \ldots, d \right\}.$$
We set
\[ \omega_H = \{ h \in H : x^h \in \omega_R \} = \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \text{relint } C, \]
which is a semigroup ideal of \( H \), i.e. \( \omega_H + H \subseteq \omega_H \). We note that \( h \in \mathbb{Z}^d \) is in \( \omega_H \) if and only if \([h]_i > 0 \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, d \).

The ideal \( \omega_R \) has a unique minimal system of monomial generators which we denote by \( G(\omega_R) \). We set \( G(\omega_H) = \{ \log(u) : u \in G(\omega_R) \} \). Clearly, \( G(\omega_H) \) is the unique minimal system of generators for \( \omega_H \). The situation when \( G(\omega_H) \) is a singleton corresponds to the situation when \( R \) is a Gorenstein ring. When \( B_H = \{ a_1, \ldots, a_d \} \) then \( R \) is a regular ring, there is no lattice point in the relative interior of \( P_H \), and \( G(\omega_H) = \{ \sum_{i=1}^d a_i \} \).

The following easy lemma shows where to search for the minimal generators of \( \omega_H \). Since we could not locate a reference to it in the literature, we prefer to include a proof here.

**Lemma 1.1.** Let \( H \) in \( \mathcal{H}_d \) with the extremal rays \( a_1, \ldots, a_d \). Then

\( (a) \) \( B_H \cap \omega_H \subseteq G(\omega_H); \)

\( (b) \) \( G(\omega_H) \subseteq \{ h \in H : h = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i a_i, 0 < \lambda_i \leq 1 \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, d \} \subseteq \overline{P_H}; \)

\( (c) \) If \( b \in G(\omega_H) \setminus P_H \), then \( b = \{ b \} + \sum_{i \in \text{supp } \{ b \}} a_i; \)

\( (d) \) If \( d = 2 \) then \( B_H \cap \omega_H = B_H \setminus \{ a_1, a_2 \} \). Moreover, if \( \{ a_1, a_2 \} \subsetneq B_H \), then \( G(\omega_H) = B_H \cap \omega_H \).

**Proof.** (a) is clear.

(b): Let \( h \in G(\omega_H) \) such that \( h = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i a_i \), with \( \lambda_i > 0 \) for all \( i \). If some \( \lambda_i > 1 \), then \( h = (h - a_i) + a_i \) and \( h - a_i \in \omega_H \), hence \( h \) is not a minimal generator for \( \omega_H \). Therefore \( \lambda_i \leq 1 \) for all \( i = 1, \ldots, d \).

(c): Assume \( b \in G(\omega_H) \setminus P_H \). Then in the decomposition \( b = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i a_i \) all \( \lambda_i \in [0, 1] \) and the set \( S = \{ 1 \leq i \leq d : \lambda_i = 1 \} \) is not empty. Let \( b' = b - \sum_{i \in S} a_i \). Then \( b' = \{ b \} + \sum_{i \in \overline{S}} a_i \).

(d): Clearly, \( B_H \cap \omega_H \subseteq B_H \setminus \{ a_1, a_2 \} \). If \( b \in B_H \setminus \{ a_1, a_2 \} \) then, since \( a_1 \) and \( a_2 \) are the extremal rays, it follows that \( b \in \text{relint } P_H \), hence \( b \in B_H \cap \omega_H \). Therefore, \( B_H \cap \omega_H = B_H \setminus \{ a_1, a_2 \} \).

Assume \( \{ a_1, a_2 \} \not\subseteq B_H \). Let \( b \in G(\omega_H) \). The only lattice points on the boundary of the parallelogram \( \overline{P_H} \) are \( 0, a_1, a_2, a_1 + a_2 \). None of them is in \( G(\omega_H) \), under our hypothesis. Thus \( b \in \text{relint } P_H \). If, on the contrary, \( b \notin B_H \), then \( b \) is the sum of at least two elements in \( B_H \), out of which at least one is not in \( \omega_H \), i.e. the latter is \( a_1 \) or \( a_2 \). This implies that \( b \notin P_H \), a contradiction. Consequently, \( G(\omega_H) \subseteq B_H \cap \omega_H \). The reverse inclusion is clear. \( \square \)

Lemma 1.1 indicates that a generator for \( \omega_H \) which is not already in \( B_H \), is obtained from a lattice point \( b \) lying on the facets of \( \overline{P_H} \) containing \( 0 \), by adding the extremal rays \( a_i \) which are not in the support of \( b \).

We refer to the monographs \([6], [5], [26], [27], [11]\) for more details about affine semigroups, their semigroup rings, rational cones and the connections with algebraic geometry.
2. A regular sequence in $K[H]$

Throughout this section $H \in \mathcal{H}_d$ having the extremal rays $a_1, \ldots, a_d$ and $R = K[H]$. The main result is Theorem 2.4 where we present a convenient reduction for the graded maximal ideal of $K[H]/(x^b)$, where $b$ is any nonzero element in $H$.

The following lemma plays a crucial role in the proof of Proposition 2.2 and in several other arguments in this paper.

**Lemma 2.1.** Let $b = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i a_i$, with $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_d \in \mathbb{R}$.

(a) Let $n_i = \lfloor \lambda_i \rfloor + 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d$. Then $(\sum_{i=1}^{d} n_i a_i) - b \in \omega_H$.

(b) If $b \in P_H$ then $(\sum_{i=1}^{d} a_i) - b \in H$, and in particular, if $b \in P_H$, then $(\sum_{i=1}^{d} a_i) - b \in \omega_H$.

**Proof.** For (a) we note that $(\sum_{i=1}^{d} n_i a_i) - b = \sum_{i=1}^{d} (1 - \lfloor \lambda_i \rfloor) a_i$ and $0 < 1 - \lfloor \lambda_i \rfloor \leq 1$ for all $i$, hence the sum of interest is in $\omega_H$. Here we denoted $\{\lambda_i\} = \lambda_i - \lfloor \lambda_i \rfloor$ for all $i$. Part (b) follows immediately. \hfill \Box

**Proposition 2.2.** For any $b \neq 0$ in $H$, the sequence $x^b, x^{a_1} - x^{a_2}, \ldots, x^{a_{i-1}} - x^{a_i}$ is a regular sequence on $R$.

**Proof.** In order to simplify notation we set $u = x^b$ and $v_i = x^{a_i}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d$. Let $I = (u, v_1 - v_2, \ldots, v_{i-1} - v_d)$. We may write $b = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i a_i$, with $\lambda_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d$. We denote $n_i = \lfloor \lambda_i \rfloor + 1$ for all $i$ and we set $N = \sum_{i=1}^{d} n_i$.

We will show that $v_i^N \in I$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d$. Since $v_i - v_j \in I$ for all $i$ and $j$, it follows by symmetry that it is enough to show that $v_1^N \in I$.

We write
\[
\begin{align*}
v_1^N &= (v_1^{n_2} - v_2^{n_2}) \cdot v_1^{N-n_2} + v_1^{N-n_2} \cdot v_2^{n_2} \\
&= (v_1^{n_2} - v_2^{n_2}) \cdot v_1^{N-n_2} + v_1^{N-n_2-n_3} v_2^{n_2} (v_3^{n_3} - v_3^{n_3}) + v_1^{N-n_2-n_3} v_2^{n_2} v_3^{n_3} \\
&= \sum_{i=2}^{d} v_1^{N-\sum_{j=2}^{i} n_j} v_2^{n_2} \cdots v_{i-1}^{n_{i-1}} (v_i^{n_i} - v_i^{n_i}) + v_1^{n_1} \cdots v_d^{n_d},
\end{align*}
\]

hence by Lemma 2.1 it follows that $v_1^N \in I$.

Since $H$ is a normal simplicial semigroup, $v_1, \ldots, v_d$ is a regular sequence in $R$, hence $v_1^N, \ldots, v_d^N$ is a regular sequence in $R$, as well. Since $R$ is a Cohen-Macaulay ring of dimension $d$ we get that $v_1^N, \ldots, v_d^N$ is also a system of parameters for $R$. Thus $0 < \lambda(R/I) \leq \lambda(R/(v_1^N, \ldots, v_d^N)) < \infty$, which implies that $u, v_1 - v_2, \ldots, v_1 - v_d$ is a system of parameters, and consequently a regular sequence for $R$. Here $\lambda(M)$ denotes the length of an $R$-module $M$. \hfill \Box

In the sequel, our aim is to find a reduction ideal for the graded maximal ideal $m$ of $R$, modulo the ideal $x^b R$, for any $b \in H \setminus \{0\}$. In this order, we need the following lemma which is interesting on its own.

**Lemma 2.3.** For any $b$ in $H$, there exists a positive integer $k$ such that for all $c_1, \ldots, c_k$ in $\omega_H$, one has $c_1 + \cdots + c_k \in b + H$. 8
Proof. Assume \( n_1, \ldots, n_r \in \mathbb{Z}^d \) are normal vectors to the support hyperplanes of the facets of the cone \( C \) such that

\[
C = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle x, n_i \rangle \geq 0, \text{ for all } i = 1, \ldots, r \}.
\]

The map \( \sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^r \) given by

\[
\sigma(h) = (\langle h, n_1 \rangle, \ldots, \langle h, n_r \rangle), \text{ for all } h \in \mathbb{R}^d.
\]

is clearly \( \mathbb{R} \)-linear and \( \sigma(H) \subseteq \mathbb{N}_r \).

Let \( k_0 = \max \{ \langle b, n_j \rangle : j = 1, \ldots, r \} \). For any integer \( k > k_0 \), any \( c_1, \ldots, c_k \in H \cap \text{relint} C \), and any \( 1 \leq j \leq r \), the \( j \)-th component of \( \sigma(c_1 + \cdots + c_k - b) \) equals

\[
(\sum_{i=1}^k \langle c_i, n_j \rangle) - \langle b, n_j \rangle \geq k - k_0 > 0, \text{ hence } c_1 + \cdots + c_k \in b + H. \quad \square
\]

**Theorem 2.4.** Let \( R = K[H], J = (x^{a_1} - x^{a_j} : i, j = 1, \ldots, d)R \) and \( 0 \neq b \in H \). Then there exists an integer \( k \) such that \( m^{k+1} = Jm^k \) modulo the ideal \( x^b R \).

Proof. Let \( u = x^b \) and \( v_i = x^{a_i} \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, d \). We decompose \( b = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i a_i \) with \( \lambda_i \geq 0 \) and we set \( n_i = \lfloor \lambda_i \rfloor + 1 \) for all \( i = 1, \ldots, d \) and \( N = \sum_{i=1}^d n_i \).

We claim that for any positive integer \( t \), any \( i_1, \ldots, i_t \in \{1, \ldots, d\} \) and any \( v \in \{v_1, \ldots, v_d\} \) one has

\[
(3) \quad v_{i_1} \cdots v_{i_t} \in Jm^{t-1} + v^t R.
\]

Indeed, this is a consequence of the following equations:

\[
v_{i_1} \cdots v_{i_t} = (v_{i_1} - v) \cdot v_{i_2} \cdots v_{i_t} + v \cdot v_{i_2} \cdots v_{i_t}
\]

\[
= (v_{i_1} - v) \cdot v_{i_2} \cdots v_{i_t} + v(v_{i_2} - v) \cdot v_{i_3} \cdots v_{i_t} + v^2 v_{i_3} \cdots v_{i_t}
\]

\[
= \sum_{j=1}^d v^{j-1} \cdot (v_{i_j} - v) \cdot v_{i_{j+1}} \cdots v_{i_t} + v^t.
\]

Now let \( i_1, \ldots, i_N \in \{1, \ldots, d\} \). In the product \( v_{i_1} \cdots v_{i_N} \) we apply (3) to the first \( n_1 \) terms, then to the next \( n_2 \) terms, etc. and we obtain that

\[
(4) \quad v_{i_1} \cdots v_{i_N} \in \prod_{i=1}^d (Jm^{n_i-1}, v^{n_i}) \subseteq (Jm^{N-1}, \prod_{i=1}^d v^{n_i}) \subseteq (Jm^{N-1}, uR),
\]

where for the last inclusion we used Lemma [2.1].

Let \( k_0 \) be a positive integer satisfying the conclusion of Lemma [2.3] for the element \( b \). We set \( k = k_0 + N - 2 \).

Let \( w \) be any product of \( k + 1 \) monomial generators of \( m \). If the exponents of at least \( k_0 \) of them are in \( \text{relint} C \), then by the choice of \( k_0 \) we get that \( w \in uR \).

Otherwise, \( w = v_{i_1} \cdots v_{i_N} \cdot w' \) for some \( i_1, \ldots, i_N \subseteq \{1, \ldots, d\} \) and \( w' \in m^{k+1-N} \). In the latter case, using (4) we derive that \( w \in Jm^k + uR \). This shows that \( m^{k+1} + uR = Jm^k + uR \), which completes the proof. \[ \square \]

### 3. Ulrich elements and the almost Gorenstein property

The theory of almost Gorenstein rings has its origin in the theory of the almost symmetric numerical semigroups in [2]. If \( R \) is the semigroup ring of a numerical
semigroup, then the semigroup is almost symmetric, if and only if there exists an exact sequence

\[ 0 \to R \to (\omega_R)(-a) \to E \to 0, \]

where \( E \) is annihilated by the graded maximal ideal of \( R \), see [16]. Here \( \omega_R \) denotes the canonical module of \( R \) and \(-a\) the smallest degree of a generator of \( \omega_R \), i.e. \(-a = \min\{k : (\omega_R)_k \neq 0\}\).

In [13] the 1-dimensional positively graded rings which admit such an exact sequence are called almost Gorenstein.

Goto et al. [14, Definition 8.1] extended the concept of the almost Gorenstein property to rings of higher dimension: let \( R \) be a positively graded Cohen–Macaulay \( K \)-algebra with \( a \)-invariant \( a \). Then \( R \) is called graded almost Gorenstein, if there exists an exact sequence like in (5), where \( E \) is an Ulrich module.

Ulrich modules are defined as follows: let \((R, m, K)\) be a local (or positively graded) ring with (graded) maximal ideal \( m \), and let \( M \) be a (graded) Cohen–Macaulay module over \( R \). Then the minimal number of generators \( \mu(M) \) of \( M \) is bounded by the multiplicity \( e(M) \) of \( M \). The module \( M \) is called an Ulrich module, if \( \mu(M) = e(M) \). In [25] Ulrich asked whether any Cohen–Macaulay ring admits an Ulrich module \( M \) with \( \dim M = \dim R \). At present this question is still open, and has an affirmative answer for example when \( R \) is a hypersurface ring [1].

In the case of almost symmetric numerical semigroup rings, the module \( E \) in the exact sequence (5) is of Krull dimension zero. A graded module \( M \) with \( \dim M = 0 \) is Ulrich if and only if \( mM = 0 \). Thus the above definition [14, Definition 8.1] is a natural extension of 1-dimensional almost Gorenstein rings to higher dimensions.

We propose the following multigraded version of the almost Gorenstein property for normal semigroup rings.

**Definition 3.1.** Let \( H \) be a normal affine semigroup and \( R = K[H] \). For \( b \in \omega_H \) consider the following exact sequence

\[ 0 \to R \to \omega_R(-b) \to E \to 0, \]

where \( 1 \in R \) is mapped to \( u = x^b \) and \( E = \omega_R/uR \). Then \( b \) is called an Ulrich element in \( H \), if \( E \) is an Ulrich \( R \)-module.

If \( H \) admits an Ulrich element \( b \), then we call \( R \) almost Gorenstein with respect to \( b \), or simply AG if \( H \) has an Ulrich element.

**Theorem 3.2.** Let \( H \in \mathcal{H}_d \) with extremal rays \( a_1, \ldots, a_d \), and let \( m \) be the graded maximal ideal of \( R = K[H] \). Let \( b \in \omega_H \), \( u = x^b \) and \( J = (x^{a_i} - x^{a_j} : i, j = 1, \ldots, d)R \).

Then \( b \) is an Ulrich element in \( H \) if and only if

\[ m\omega_R \subseteq (uR, J\omega_R). \]

**Proof.** Since \( uR \) and \( \omega_R \) are Cohen–Macaulay \( R \)-modules of dimension \( d \), we see (keeping the notation from [13]) that depth \( E \geq d - 1 \), and since \( uR \) and \( \omega_R \) are rank 1 modules, we deduce that \( \text{Ann}(E) \neq 0 \). Therefore, \( \dim E \leq d - 1 \), and this implies that \( E \) is a Cohen–Macaulay \( R \)-module of dimension \( d - 1 \).
Suppose that (7) holds. By [14, Proposition 2.2.2], it follows that $E$ is an Ulrich module since (7) implies that $mE = JE$ and since $J$ is generated by $d - 1(= \dim E)$ elements, namely by the elements $f_j = x^{a_j} - x^{b_j}$ with $j = 2, \ldots, d$. Thus $b$ is an Ulrich element in $H$.

Conversely, assume that $b$ is an Ulrich element. Then $E$ is an Ulrich module, and therefore $\lambda(E/mE) = e(E)$. It follows from Theorem $2.4$ that $J$ is a reduction ideal of $m$ with respect to $E$. Thus by [13, Lemma 4.6.5], $e(E) = e(J, E)$, where $e(J, E)$ denotes the Hilbert–Samuel multiplicity of $E$ with respect to $J$. Since $E$ is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension $d - 1$, and since $J$ is generated by the $d - 1$ elements $f_2, \ldots, f_d$ and $\lambda(E/JE) < \infty$, we see that $f_2, \ldots, f_d$ is a regular sequence on $E$. Thus [6, Theorem 4.7.6] implies that $e(J, E) = \lambda(E/JE)$. Hence, $\lambda(E/mE) = \lambda(E/JE)$.

Since $JE \subset mE$, it follows that $mE = JE$, and this implies (7). □

Remark 3.3. It follows from the proof of Theorem 3.2 that if (7) holds for some ideal $J \subset m$, generated by $d - 1$ elements, then $b$ is an Ulrich element in $H$.

Conversely, if $b$ is an Ulrich element in $H$, then (7) holds for any ideal $J$ which is a reduction ideal of $m$ with respect to $E$, and which is generated by $d - 1$ elements.

Example 3.4. (Ulrich elements in Gorenstein and regular rings)

(a) If $K[H]$ is a Gorenstein ring and $G(\omega_H) = \{b\}$, then $\omega_R = x^b R$, hence (7) holds and $b$ is an Ulrich element in $H$.

(b) Assume $K[H]$ is a regular ring with $a_1, \ldots, a_d$ the extremal rays of $H$. Set $c = \sum_{i=1}^a a_i$. Then $a_i + c$ is an Ulrich element in $H$ for any $i = 1, \ldots, d$.

Indeed, since $m = (x^{a_j} : 1 \leq j \leq d)$ and $x^{a_j + c} = x^c(x^{a_j} - x^{a_j}) + x^{c + a_i}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, d$, we have that (7) is verified for $b = c + a_i$.

Example 3.5. Let $H \in \mathcal{H}_2$ having the extremal rays $a_1 = (11, 2)$ and $a_2 = (31, 6)$. A computation with Normaliz [4] shows that the Hilbert basis of $H$ is

$$B_H = \{a_1, a_2, b = (16, 3), c_1 = (21, 4), c_2 = (26, 5)\}.$$ 

Moreover, $b, c_1, c_2$ are the only nonzero lattice points in $P_H$, and they all lie on the line $y = (x - 1)/5$ passing through $a_1$ and $a_2$. Comparing componentwise, we have $a_1 \preceq b \preceq c_1 \preceq c_2 \preceq a_2$.

We note that $a_1 + a_2 = b + c_2 = 2c_1$. It is also straightforward to check that in $K[H]$ we have

$$x^{a_1} x^{c_1} = (x^b)^2, x^{a_1} x^{c_2} = x^b x^{c_1}, x^{c_1} x^{c_1} = x^b x^{c_2}, x^{c_1} x^{c_2} = x^b x^{a_2},$$

$$x^{c_2} x^{c_2} = (x^{a_2} - x^{a_1})x^{c_1} + x^{a_1} x^{c_1} = (x^{a_2} - x^{a_1})x^{c_1} + (x^b)^2.$$ 

Using the criterion in Theorem 3.2 we conclude that $b$ is an Ulrich element in $H$, and hence $K[H]$ is AG.

In the following special case, the possible Ulrich elements can be identified.

Proposition 3.6. Let $H$ be a semigroup in $\mathcal{H}_d$ whose nonzero elements have all the entries positive, and assume that $(1, \ldots, 1) \in \omega_H$. If $H$ has an Ulrich element $b$, then $b = (1, \ldots, 1)$. 
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Proof. We set $b' = (1, \ldots, 1)$. Assume on the contrary that $b \neq b'$. Then by the criterion in Theorem 3.2 and using the same notation, we get that $x^b \cdot x^{b'} \in (x^b R, J_H R)$. This implies that $(2, \ldots, 2) = 2b' = b + c$ for some $c \in H$, or that $2b' = a_i + h$ for some $1 \leq i \leq d$ and $h \in \omega_H$, $h \neq b'$. Since $(1, \ldots, 1)$ is the smallest element of $\omega_H$ when comparing vectors componentwise at least one component of $b$ (respectively, of $h$) is at least two, hence at least one component of $c$ (respectively, of $a_i$) is less than or equal to zero, which is false by the assumption that all the entries of nonzero elements of $H$ are positive. □

4. THE AG PROPERTY FOR NORMAL SEMIGROPS IN DIMENSION 2

In Theorem 4.3 we will make more concrete for semigroups in $\mathcal{H}_2$ the algebraic criterion for Ulrich elements given in Theorem 3.2. For that we first prove a couple of lemmas.

Throughout this section, unless otherwise stated, $H$ is a semigroup in $\mathcal{H}_2$ with extremal rays $a_1$ and $a_2$. We denote by $m$, the graded maximal ideal of $R = K[H]$.

Lemma 4.1. Let $b$ be an element in $B_H \setminus \{a_1, a_2\}$. For any $c \in H$ such that $c \notin b + H$, there exists $t \in \{1, 2\}$ such that $c + a_t \in b + H$.

Proof. Let $C$ be the cone with the extremal rays $a_1$ and $a_2$. Let $n_1$ and $n_2$ be vectors normal to the facets of the cone $C$ such that $x \in C$ if and only if $\langle x, n_1 \rangle \geq 0$ and $\langle x, n_2 \rangle \geq 0$.

Since $c \notin b + H$ it follows that $c - b \notin C$. We may assume that $\langle c - b, n_1 \rangle < 0$, and claim then that $c + a_2 \in b + H$. Indeed,

$$\langle c + a_2 - b, n_1 \rangle = \langle c, n_1 \rangle + \langle a_1 + a_2 - b, n_1 \rangle > 0,$$

since $\langle a_1 + a_2 - b, n_1 \rangle > 0$, by Lemma 2.1 and

$$\langle c + a_2 - b, n_2 \rangle = \langle c - b, n_2 \rangle > 0,$$

since otherwise $c - b \in -C = \{-a : a \in C\}$, a contradiction to $b \in B_H$. □

Lemma 4.2. Let $b$ belong to $B_H \setminus \{a_1, a_2\}$. We set $I = (x^b R, (x^{a_1} - x^{a_2}) \omega_R) \subset R$. Let $c \in \omega_H$. The following conditions are equivalent:

(a) $x^c \in I$;
(b) $c \in (b + H) \cup (a_1 + \omega_H) \cup (a_2 + \omega_H)$;
(c) $c \in (b + H) \cup (a_1 + H) \cup (a_2 + H)$.

Proof. (a) ⇒ (b): Note that $x^c \in x^b R$ if and only if $c \in b + H$. If $x^c \notin x^b R$, then there exist $0 \neq f \in \omega_R$ and $g$ in $R$ such that

$$x^c = (x^{a_1} - x^{a_2}) \cdot f + x^b \cdot g.$$

Therefore, there exists a monomial $x^a$ in $\omega_R$ such that $x^c = x^{a_1} \cdot x^a$ or $x^c = x^{a_2} \cdot x^a$, equivalently $c \in (a_1 + \omega_H) \cup (a_2 + \omega_H)$.

(b) ⇒ (a): If $c \in b + H$ then clearly $x^c \in I$. Assume $c \notin b + H$. By symmetry, it is enough to consider the case $c \in a_1 + \omega_H$.

By Lemma 1.1 since $0 \neq c - a_1 \in \omega_H$, $c - a_1 \notin b + H$ and $(c - a_1) + a_1 = c \notin b + H$ it follows that $c - a_1 + a_2 \notin b + H$.
As we may write
\[ x^c = x^{c-a_1} \cdot (x^{a_1} - x^{a_2}) + x^{c-a_1+a_2}, \]
we conclude that \( x^c \in I. \)

(b) \( \Rightarrow \) (c) is trivial.

For (c) \( \Rightarrow \) (b) it is enough to consider the case when \( c \notin b + H. \) We may assume \( c \in a_1 + H. \) If \( c \notin a_1 + \omega_H, \) then there exists a positive integer \( n \) such that either \( c - a_1 = na_1, \) or \( c - a_1 = na_2. \) In the first case we get that \( c = (n + 1)a_1 \notin \omega_H, \) a contradiction. In the second case we get that \( c = a_1 + na_2 \in b + H, \) since \( a_1 + a_2 - b \in H \) by Lemma 2.1. This is again a contradiction. Thus \( c \in a_1 + \omega_H. \)

\[ \square \]

**Theorem 4.3.** An element \( b \in B_H \setminus \{a_1, a_2\} \) is an Ulrich element in \( H, \) if and only if
\[
\begin{align*}
&n_1 + n_2 \in (b + H) \cup (a_1 + H) \cup (a_2 + H), \text{ for all } n_1, n_2 \in B_H.
\end{align*}
\]

**Proof.** Let \( B_H = \{a_1, a_2, c_1, \ldots, c_m\}. \) Then \( \omega_R = (x^{a_1}, x^{a_2}, x^{c_1}, \ldots, x^{c_m}) \) and \( \omega_R = (x^{a_1}, \ldots, x^{a_m}). \)

If \( b \) is an Ulrich element, then \( \omega_R \subseteq (x^bR, (x^{a_1} - x^{a_2})\omega_R), \) and therefore \( x^c, x^c \in (x^bR, (x^{a_1} - x^{a_2})\omega_R) \) for all \( i, j. \) Thus the desired conclusion follows from Lemma 4.2.

Conversely, let \( x^c \in \omega_R. \) Then \( c = c_i + c_j + h, \) or \( c = a_i + a_j + h \) for some \( h \in H. \) In both cases our assumptions imply that \( c \in (b + H) \cup (a_1 + H) \cup (a_2 + H). \) Thus \( x^c \in (x^bR, (x^{a_1} - x^{a_2})\omega_R), \) by Lemma 4.2. This shows that \( b \) is an Ulrich element in \( H. \)

\[ \square \]

It will be showed in Proposition 5.2 that it is usually not a restriction to limit the search for Ulrich elements only to the Hilbert basis of \( H. \)

**Example 4.4.** Let \( H \) be the semigroup in \( \mathcal{H}_2 \) with the extremal rays \( a_1 = (5, 2) \) and \( a_2 = (2, 5). \) Then the Hilbert basis of \( H \) is
\[ B_H = \{a_1, a_2, c_1 = (1, 1), c_2 = (2, 1), c_3 = (1, 2)\}. \]

Using Theorem 4.3, we may check that none of \( c_1, c_2 \) or \( c_3 \) is an Ulrich element in \( H. \) The same conclusion could be reached by using Proposition 3.6 together with Theorem 4.2.

Here is one immediate application of Theorem 4.3.

**Proposition 4.5.** Let \( H \in \mathcal{H}_2 \) such that \( c + c' \notin P_H \) for all \( c, c' \in B_H \cap P_H. \) Then any \( b \in B_H \cap P_H \) is an Ulrich element in \( H. \)

**Proof.** By the hypothesis, if \( c, c' \in B_H \cap P_H \) then \( c + c' \in (a_1 + H) \cup (a_2 + H). \) Theorem 4.3 yields the conclusion.

\[ \square \]

One may check that the semigroup \( H \) in Example 3.5 satisfies the hypothesis of Proposition 4.5, hence \( H \) admits three Ulrich elements.

In the following example there is exactly one Ulrich element in the Hilbert basis of \( H. \)
Example 4.6. For the semigroup $H \in \mathcal{H}_2$ with $a_1 = (11, 13)$ and $a_2 = (3, 4)$, a Normaliz ([4]) computation shows that $B_H = \{a_1, a_2, c_1 = (4, 5), c_2 = (5, 6)\}$. We note that the points $2c_2 - c_1 = (6, 7)$ and $2c_2 - a_2 = (7, 8)$ are not in $\omega_H$ since the slope of the line through the origin and each of these respective points is not in the interval $(13/11, 4/3)$. Also, clearly, $2c_2 - a_1 = (-1, -1) \notin H$. Therefore, by Theorem 4.8, we get that $c_1$ is not an Ulrich element in $H$.

On the other hand, since $2c_1 = (8, 10) = c_2 + a_2$ and $B_H \setminus \{a_1, a_2\} = \{c_1, c_2\}$, by Theorem 4.8 we conclude that $c_2$ is an Ulrich element in $H$.

4.1. Bottom elements and the almost Gorenstein property. In the multigraded situation which we consider in Definition 3.1 there is in general no distinguished multidegree with $(\omega_{K[H]})_b \neq 0$. Inspired by Proposition 3.6 we are prompted to test the Ulrich property for elements in $\omega_H$ with smallest entries. First we present the following lemma.

Lemma 4.7. For any $H \in \mathcal{H}_2$, the set $\omega_H$ has a unique minimal element with respect to the componentwise partial ordering.

Proof. Let $C$ be the cone of $H$, and let $a = (a_1, a_2)$ and $b = (b_1, b_2)$ be points in the relative interior of $C$. We claim that $a \land b = (\min\{a_1, b_1\}, \min\{a_2, b_2\}) \in \text{relint } C$. This will imply the existence of the unique minimal element of $\omega_H$.

For the proof of the claim, it is enough to consider the case when $a_1 < b_1$ and $a_2 > b_2$. Since $a_2/a_1 > b_2/a_1 > b_2/b_1$, it follows that the point in the plane with coordinates $a \land b = (a_1, b_2)$ lies inside the cone with vertex the origin and passing through the points with coordinates $a$ and $b$. Since the latter cone is in relint $C$ it follows that $a \land b \in \text{relint } C$.

We call the unique minimal element of $\omega_H$ with respect to the componentwise partial ordering, the bottom element of $H$.

Remark 4.8. For $H \in \mathcal{H}_2$, since the elements in $\omega_H$ have only nonnegative entries, it follows that the bottom element of $H$ is also the smallest element in $G(\omega_H)$ with respect to the componentwise order. Moreover, if $K[H]$ is not a regular ring then the bottom element of $H$ is componentwise the smallest element in $B_H \setminus \{a_1, a_2\}$, see Lemma 4.1(d).

In arbitrary embedding dimension we give the following definition.

Definition 4.9. For $H \in \mathcal{H}_d$, an element $b \in \omega_H$ is called the bottom element of $H$ if $c - b \in \mathbb{N}^d$ for all $c \in \omega_H$.

Remark 4.10. In general, a semigroup $H \in \mathcal{H}_d$ with $d > 2$ may not have a unique minimal element in $\omega_H$ with respect to the componentwise partial ordering $\preceq$. For instance, let $d = 3$, $a_1 = (5, 3, 1), a_2 = (1, 5, 2), a_3 = (8, 3, 5)$. Then, a calculation with Normaliz ([4]) shows that $B_H = \{a_1, a_2, a_3, (1, 2, 1), (2, 1, 1), (2, 2, 1), (2, 5, 2), (3, 2, 1), (3, 2, 2), (3, 5, 2), (3, 5, 3), (4, 5, 2), (5, 2, 3), (5, 5, 2), (5, 5, 4), (7, 5, 5)\}$.

One can check that the vectors $n_1 = (19, 11, -37), n_2 = (-12, 17, 9), n_3 = (1, -9, 22)$ are normal to the planes generated by $a_2$ and $a_3$, by $a_1$ and $a_3$, by $a_1$ and $a_2$.
respectively. Also, that no element in $B_H \setminus \{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$ lies on any of the three planes just mentioned. Consequently, there are no inner lattice points on the faces of $P_H$. Now Lemma 1.1(d) and the discussion afterwards give that
\[ G(\omega_H) = B_H \setminus \{a_1, a_2, a_3\}. \]
It follows that $b_1 = (1, 2, 1)$ and $b_2 = (2, 1, 1)$ are both minimal elements in $\omega_H$ with respect to $\leq$.

Using Theorem 4.3 we show that sometimes the bottom element may be the only Ulrich element in $B_H$.  

**Proposition 4.11.** Let $b$ be the bottom element of $H \in \mathcal{H}_2$. If $2b \in P_H$, then $b$ is the only possible Ulrich element in $B_H$.

*Proof.* Assume $b' \in B_H$ is an Ulrich element in $H$. Then $2b \in (a_1 + H) \cup (a_2 + H) \cup (b' + H)$, by Theorem 4.3. Since $2b \in P_H$, we get that $2b \in b' + H$, hence $2b = b' + h$ for some $h \in P_H$. Moreover, comparing componentwise, $b \leq b'$ and $b \leq h$ since $b$ is the bottom element for $H$, thus $b' = b$. \hfill $\square$

**Remark 4.12.** In general, as Example 4.6 shows, even when the Hilbert basis of $H$ contains a unique Ulrich element, the latter need not be the bottom element.

In the following, we discuss when the bottom element $b$ of $H \in \mathcal{H}_2$ is Ulrich.

**Notation 4.13.** To avoid repetitions, in the rest of the section $H \in \mathcal{H}_2$ has the extremal rays $a_1 = (x_1, y_1)$ and $a_2 = (x_2, y_2)$ such that $(y_1/x_1 < y_2/x_2$ when $x_1, x_2 > 0)$ or $x_2 = 0$.

We define $H_1$ and $H_2$ to be the semigroups in $\mathcal{H}_2$ with the extremal rays $a_1$ and $b$, respectively $a_2$ and $b$. We denote $\mathbb{Z}^2 \cap \text{relint } P_{H_i}$ by $H_i^*$, for $i = 1, 2$.

By an easy argument, the following proposition presents a class of semigroups in $\mathcal{H}_2$ with Ulrich bottom element.

**Proposition 4.14.** Let $b$ be the bottom element of $H$. If $(x_2, y_1) \preceq b$, then $b$ is an Ulrich element in $H$.

*Proof.* If $K[H]$ is a regular ring, then $b$ is an Ulrich element in $H$, since $G(\omega_H) = \{b\}$.

Assume $K[H]$ is not a regular ring. Then $b \in G(\omega_H) = B_H \setminus \{a_1, a_2\}$, by Lemma 1.1(d). Let $c_1, c_2 \in B_H \setminus \{a_1, a_2\}$, and $c_1 + c_2 = (c, d), b = (u, v)$.

If $(c, d) \in H_1$, then $(c, d) = r_1(x_1, y_1) + r_2(u, v)$ for some $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Since $d \geq 2v \geq y_1 + v$, we have $r_1 \geq 1$ or $r_2 \geq 1$. Consequently, $(c, d) \in (b + H_1) \cup (a_1 + H_1) \subset (b + H) \cup (a_1 + H)$.

A similar argument shows that if $(c, d) \in H_2$, then $(c, d) \in (b + H) \cup (a_2 + H)$. \hfill $\square$

**Example 4.15.** Let $H$ be the semigroup with extremal rays $a_1 = (a, 1)$ and $a_2 = (1, b)$, where $a, b \geq 2$. Since $1/a < 1 < b$ we get that $b = (1, 1)$ is in $\omega_H$ and it is the bottom element in $H$. Then Proposition 4.14 implies that $b$ is an Ulrich element in $H$. 
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Clearly, $H = H_1 \cup H_2$ and $H_1 \cap H_2 = \emptyset$. The following lemma states some nice properties regarding $H_1$ and $H_2$.

**Lemma 4.16.** Let $b$ be the bottom element of $H$. Then

(a) $p + q \in b + H$ for all $p \in H_1 \setminus \{0\}$ and $q \in H_2 \setminus \{0\}$.
(b) $(b + H) \cup (a_1 + H) \cup (a_2 + H) = H \setminus (H_1^* \cup H_2^*)$.

**Proof.** (a). If $p - b \in H$ or $q - b \in H$, then clearly $p + q \in b + H$. Let us assume that $p - b \notin H$ and $q - b \notin H$. Let $C'$ be the cone generated by the extremal rays $p, q$. Since $b \in C'$, $b = r_1 p + r_2 q$ for some $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. If $r_1 > 1$, then $b - p = (r_1 - 1)p + r_2 q$, hence $b - p \in C' \cap \omega_H$, a contradiction with $b$ the bottom element in $H$. Therefore, $r_1 \leq 1$, and also $r_2 \leq 1$ by a similar argument. Now, $p + q - b = (1 - r_1)p + (1 - r_2)q \in C' \cap \mathbb{Z}^2 \subset H$.

(b). Note that for any $p \in H$ we have

$p \in H_1 \setminus H_1^* \Leftrightarrow p \in (b + H_1) \cup (a_1 + H_1)$,

$p \in H_2 \setminus H_2^* \Leftrightarrow p \in (b + H_2) \cup (a_2 + H_2)$.

Therefore, $H \setminus (H_1^* \cup H_2^*) = (H_1 \cup H_2) \setminus (H_1^* \cup H_2^*) \subseteq (b + H) \cup (a_1 + H) \cup (a_2 + H)$.

In order to check the reverse inclusion, let $p \in (b + H) \cup (a_1 + H) \cup (a_2 + H)$.

We first consider the case $p \in H_1$. Then clearly, $p \notin H_1^*$. If we assume, on the contrary, that $p \in H_1^*$, then $p = r_1a_1 + r_2b$ with $r_1, r_2 \in (0,1)$. We decompose $b = \alpha_1 a_1 + \alpha_2 a_2$ with $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (0,1]$. This gives $p = (r_1 + r_2 \alpha_1)a_1 + r_2 \alpha_2 a_2$. Since $r_2 \alpha_2 < 1$ and $r_2 \alpha_2 < \alpha_2$ we infer that $p \notin (a_2 + H) \cup (b + H)$. Thus $p \notin a_1 + H$ and $r_1 \geq 1$, a contradiction. Consequently, $p \notin H_1^* \cup H_2^*$. A similar argument works for the case $p \in H_2$. \hfill $\Box$

**Lemma 4.17.** Let $p = (k, r) \in H_1^*$ and $q = (\ell, s) \in H_2^*$. If $b = (u, v)$ is the bottom element of $H$, then

(a) $u < k < x_1$ and $v \leq r \leq y_1$.
(b) $u \leq \ell \leq x_2$ and $v < s < y_2$.

**Proof.** We only show (a), part (b) is proved similarly. Clearly, $b \notin p \in \omega_H$, thus $0 < u \leq k$ and $0 < v \leq r$. If $u = k$, then since $p \neq b$, we have $v < r$. Then $r/k > v/u > y_1/x_1$, which gives that $p \notin H_1$, which is false. Thus $u < k$.

On the other hand, by Lemma 2.1 applied in $H_1 \in H_2$ for $p$, the point

$(u, v) + (x_1, y_1) - (k, r) = (u + x_1 - k, v + y_1 - r) \in H_1^*$,

hence $u < u + x_1 - k$ and $v \leq v + y_1 - r$. That gives $k < x_1$ and $r \leq y_1$. \hfill $\Box$

The following result restricts the verification of the bottom element being Ulrich to verifying that the sum of any two points in $H_i^*$ is not in $H_i^*$, for $i = 1, 2$.

**Lemma 4.18.** Assume $b$ is the bottom element of $H$. The following conditions are equivalent:

(a) $b$ is an Ulrich element in $H$.
(b) For $i = 1, 2$, if $p, q \in H_i^*$ then $p + q \notin H_i^*$. 


Proof. We know that \( b \in G(\omega_H) \) since it is the bottom element in \( H \). If \( K[H] \) is a regular ring, then \( b = a_1 + a_2 \). Hence statement (a) holds by Example 3.4 and (b) is true since \( H_1^* = H_2^* = \emptyset \).

Assume that \( K[H] \) is not a regular ring, hence \( b \in B_H \setminus \{a_1, a_2\} \). According to Theorem 4.3, \( b \) is true since \( H \) is an Ulrich element in \( H \) if and only if for all \( p, q \in B_H \) one has

\[
p + q \in (b + H) \cup (a_1 + H) \cup (a_2 + H).
\]

It is of course equivalent to check (8) for all \( p \) and \( q \) nonzero in \( H \).

If \( (p \in H_1 \text{ and } q \in H_2) \) or \( (p \in H_2 \text{ and } q \in H_1) \) then \( p + q \in b + H \), by Lemma 4.16. Thus, for (a) it suffices to check (8) for nonzero \( p, q \) both in \( H_1 \) or both in \( H_2 \). For \( i = 1, 2 \), the semigroup \( H_i \) is normal and simplicial, hence any \( p \in H_i \) is of the form \( p = n_1b + n_2a_i + p' \) with \( n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( p' \in H_i^* \cup \{0\} \). Consequently, \( b \) is an Ulrich element in \( H \) if and only if property (b) holds. \( \square \)

Definition 4.19. We say that \( H \) is AG1 if condition (b) in Lemma 4.18 is satisfied for \( i = 1 \), and we call it AG2 if the said condition is satisfied for \( i = 2 \).

Thus the bottom element is an Ulrich element in \( H \) if and only if \( H \) is AG1 and AG2.

Remark 4.20. Using Lemma 4.17 property AG1 means that for any \( p = (k, r) \) and \( q = (\ell, s) \in H_1^* \) such that \( k + \ell < x_1 \) and \( r + s \leq y_1 \) one has that \( p + q \notin H_1^* \).

Similarly, the AG2 condition means that when \( p = (k, r) \) and \( q = (\ell, s) \in H_2^* \) such that \( k + \ell \leq x_2 \) and \( r + s < y_2 \), then \( p + q \notin H_2^* \).

Remark 4.21. Assume \( b = (u, v) \) is the bottom element in \( H \). If \( y_1 = 0 \) then \( v = 1 \), since otherwise the inequalities \( v/u > (v-1)/u > y_1/x_1 = 0 \) would give that \( (u, v-1) \in \omega_H \), a contradiction to the fact that \( (u, v) \) is the bottom element in \( H \). Then, by Lemma 4.17 we get that \( H_1^* = \emptyset \), hence \( H \) satisfies condition AG1.

Similarly, if \( x_2 = 0 \) then \( u = 1 \) and \( H_2^* = \emptyset \); hence \( H \) is AG2.

In order to check the AG1 and AG2 conditions we need to have a better understanding of the points in \( H_1^* \) and \( H_2^* \). We can count their elements.

Lemma 4.22. Let \( b = (u, v) \) be the bottom element for \( H \). Then

\( a \) \(|H_1^*| = vx_1 - uy_1 - 1\) and \(|H_2^*| = uy_2 - vx_2 - 1\).

\( b \) \( 1 \leq vx_1 - uy_1 \leq x_1 \) and \( 1 \leq uy_2 - vx_2 - 1 \leq y_2 \).

\( c \) if \( H_1^* \neq \emptyset \) then \( vx_1 - uy_1 \leq x_1 - u \).

\( d \) if \( H_2^* \neq \emptyset \) then \( uy_2 - vx_2 \leq y_2 - v \).

Proof. We only show the first part of (a) and (b), since the second part is proved similarly:

(a): The area of the parallelogram spanned by \( b \) and \( a_1 \) equals \( \det \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & u \\ y_1 & v \end{pmatrix} = vx_1 - uy_1 \). Since the boundary of that parallelogram contains precisely four lattice points, the vertices, (here we use the fact that gcd(\( u, v \)) = gcd(\( x_1, y_1 \)) = 1), Pick’s theorem ([3, Theorem 2.8]) implies that \( P_{H_1} \) has \( vx_1 - uy_1 - 1 \) inner lattice points, which proves the claim.
(b): The inequality $1 \leq vx_1 - uy_1$ follows from (a). Since $(u, v)$ is the bottom element of $H_i$, it follows that $(u, v - 1)$ is not in $\omega H_i$ and in relint $P_{H_1}$. As $(v - 1)/u < v/u$, and $y_1/x_1 < v/u$ by our assumption, we get that $(v - 1)/u \leq y_1/x_1$, i.e. $vx_1 - uy_1 \leq x_1$.

Parts (c) and (d) will be proved after Remark 4.25.

One nice consequence of Lemma 4.22 is a Gorenstein criterion for $K[H]$ in terms of the coordinates of the bottom element in $H$.

**Corollary 4.23.** If $b = (u, v)$ is the bottom element in $H$, then the $K$-algebra $K[H]$ is Gorenstein if and only if $vx_1 - uy_1 = uy_2 - vx_2 = 1$.

**Proof.** The ring $K[H]$ is Gorenstein if and only if $\omega H$ is a principal ideal, hence generated by $b$, which is equivalent to saying that $P_{H_1}$ and $P_{H_2}$ have no inner points. By Lemma 4.22 this is the case if and only if $vx_1 - uy_1 = uy_2 - vx_2 = 1$. □

**Lemma 4.24.** Let $b = (u, v)$ be the bottom element of $H$. We assume that $H^*_1$ is not the empty set. For any integer $i$ we consider the integers $q_i, r_i$ such that $iy_1 = q_i x_1 + r_i$ with $0 \leq r_i < x_1$.

Assume the integer $k$ satisfies $u < k < x_1$. The following statements are equivalent:

1. $k$ is the $x$-coordinate of some $p \in H^*_1$;
2. $[ky_1/x_1] \leq v + [(k - u)y_1/x_1]$;
3. $[ky_1/x_1] = v + [(k - u)y_1/x_1]$;
4. $q_k \leq v - 1 + q_{k-u}$;
5. $q_k = v - 1 + q_{k-u}$;
6. $r_k \geq r_{k-u} + x_1 - (vx_1 - uy_1)$;
7. $r_k = r_{k-u} + x_1 - (vx_1 - uy_1)$;
8. $r_k \geq x_1 - (vx_1 - uy_1)$.

If any of these conditions holds, then $p = (k, [ky_1/x_1]) = (k, q_k + 1)$.

**Proof.** Since $H^*_1 \neq \emptyset$ we have that $y_1 > 0$ and $u < x_1$ by Remark 4.21 and Lemma 4.17 respectively. We note that for any integer $u < k < x_1$, the fractions $ky_1/x_1$ and $v + (k - u)y_1/x_1$ are not integers. Thus $[ky_1/x_1] = q_k + 1$ and $[v + (k - u)y_1/x_1] = v + q_{k-u}$. This shows that (ii) $\iff$ (iv) and (iii) $\iff$ (v). Since $q_k = (ky_1 - r_k)/x_1$, simple manipulations give that (iv) $\iff$ (vi) and (v) $\iff$ (vii).

We also infer that the number of points in $H^*_1$ whose $x$-coordinate is $k$ equals the number of lattice points on the line $x = k$ located strictly between the lines $y = \frac{y_1}{x_1}x$ and $y = \frac{y_1}{x_1}(x - u) + v$, which is

\begin{equation}
(9) \quad \left\lfloor \frac{y_1}{x_1}(k - u) + v \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{y_1}{x_1}k \right\rfloor + 1 = v + q_k + \left\lfloor \frac{r_k - uy_1}{x_1} \right\rfloor - (q_k + 1) + 1
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
(10) \quad = \left\lfloor \frac{vx_1 - uy_1 + r_k}{x_1} \right\rfloor \in \{0, 1\}.
\end{equation}

The latter statement is due to the fact that $r_k < x_1$ and $vx_1 - uy_1 \leq x_1$, by Lemma 4.22.
Consequently, \( k \in (u, x_1) \) is the \( x \)-coordinate of some point in \( H_1^* \) if and only if the value in equation (2) is at least (and actually equal to) 1, which is equivalent to property (ii), respectively to (iii). That is, moreover, equivalent (using (10)) to

\[
1 \leq \frac{vx_1 - uy_1 + r_k}{x_1},
\]

which can be rewritten as \( r_k \geq x_1 - (vx_1 - uy_1) \), namely statement (viii).

From (9) and (10) we obtain that if \( k \) is the \( x \)-coordinate of some point \( p \in H_1^* \), then \( p = (k, \lceil \frac{y_1}{x_1} k \rceil) = (k, q_k + 1) \). \( \square \)

Remark 4.25. A similar result holds for the points in \( H_2^* \) in terms of the integers \( q'_i, r'_i \) such that \( ix_2 = q'_i y_2 + r'_i \) with \( 0 \leq r'_i < y_2 \).

Now we can finish the proof of Lemma 4.22

Proof. (of Lemma 4.22 continued).

(c): By Lemma 4.24 for each \( u < k < x_1 \) there is at most one point in \( H_1^* \) whose \( x \)-coordinate is \( k \), therefore \( |H_1^*| \leq x_1 - u - 1 \). Using point (a) we obtain the inequality at (c). Part (d) is proved similarly. \( \square \)

It will be convenient to denote \( \pi_1(H_1^*) = \{ k : \) there exists \( (k, \ell) \in H_1^* \} \). The next result is a criterion to verify the AG1 property in terms of the remainders \( r_i \) introduced in Lemma 4.24, with \( i \in \pi_1(H_1^*) \). A similar statement characterizes the AG2 property in terms of the \( r'_i \)'s from Remark 4.25 with \( j \in \pi_2(H_2^*) \).

Proposition 4.26. For any integer \( i \) let \( r_i \equiv iy_1 \text{mod} x_1 \) with \( 0 \leq r_i < x_1 \). Then \( H \) is AG1 if and only if \( r_k + r_\ell < 2x_1 - (vx_1 - uy_1) \) for all integers \( k, \ell \in \pi_1(H_1^*) \) with \( k + \ell < x_1 \).

Proof. If \( H_1^* = \emptyset \) then there is nothing to prove. Assume \( H_1^* \) is not empty. If \( k, \ell \in \pi_1(H_1^*) \) then by Lemma 4.23 \( p_1 = (k, \lceil ky_1/x_1 \rceil) \) and \( p_2 = (\ell, \lceil y_1/x_1 \rceil) \) are the corresponding points in \( H_1^* \). By definition, \( H \) is AG1 if and only if \( p_1 + p_2 \notin H_1^* \) for all \( p_1 \) and \( p_2 \) as above. When \( k + \ell \geq x_1 \), Lemma 4.17 implies already that \( p_1 + p_2 \notin H_1^* \). If \( k + \ell < x_1 \), then \( p_1 + p_2 \notin H_1^* \) if and only if

\[
\begin{align*}
\left\lceil \frac{ky_1}{x_1} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{\ell y_1}{x_1} \right\rceil & \geq (k + \ell - u) \frac{y_1}{x_1} + v, \quad \text{equivalently} \\
\frac{ky_1 - r_k}{x_1} + 1 + \frac{\ell y_1 - r_\ell}{x_1} + 1 & \geq (k + \ell - u) \frac{y_1}{x_1} + v, \\
k y_1 - r_k + \ell y_1 - r_\ell + 2x_1 & \geq (k + \ell)y_1 - uy_1 + ux_1, \\
2x_1 - (vx_1 - uy_1) & \geq r_k + r_\ell.
\end{align*}
\]

Since \( u < k + \ell < x_1 \), the term of the right hand side of (11) is not an integer, hence the inequality at (11) (and equivalently, at (12)) can not become an equality. \( \square \)

4.2. A criterion for \((1,1)\) to be an Ulrich element. Our aim in the rest of the section is to obtain a complete classification of when \( b = (1,1) \) is an Ulrich element. The setup in Notation 4.13 is in use. The element \((1,1)\) is in \( \omega_H \) if and only if
\(y_1/x_1 < 1 < y_2/x_2\). If that is the case, it is clear that \((1, 1)\) is the bottom element in \(H\). It suffices to verify the AG1 and AG2 conditions, by Lemma 4.18.

Set \(n = x_1 - y_1 - 1\), which equals \(|H_1^*|\), by Lemma 4.22. If \(n = 0\), then \(H\) is clearly AG1.

We consider the case \(n > 0\). The next result presents an explicit way to determine \(H_1^*\). Recursively, we define non-negative integers \(\ell, \ldots, \ell_n\) and \(s_1, \ldots, s_n\) by

\[
x_1 = \ell_1(x_1 - y_1) + s_1, \quad \text{with} \quad s_1 < x_1 - y_1,
\]

and

\[
y_1 + s_{i-1} = \ell_i(x_1 - y_1) + s_i, \quad \text{with} \quad s_i < x_1 - y_1,
\]

for \(i = 2, \ldots, n\).

**Lemma 4.27.** Assume that \((1, 1)\) belongs to \(\omega_H\) and \(H_1^* \neq \emptyset\). Then

\[
H_1^* = \left\{ p_t = (c_t, d_t) : c_t = t + \sum_{i=1}^{t} \ell_i, \quad d_t = \sum_{i=1}^{t} \ell_i, \quad t = 1, \ldots, n \right\},
\]

**Proof.** For \(k = 1, \ldots, x_1 - 1\), let \(ky_1 = q_kx_1 + r_k\) with integers \(q_k \geq 0\) and \(x_1 > r_k \geq 0\).

By Lemma 4.23, the integer \(k > 1\) is the \(x\)-coordinate of an element of \(H_1^*\) if and only if \(q_k = q_{k-1}\). In this case, \((k, 1 + q_k) \in H_1^*\).

Now, let \(t \geq 1\). Summing up the equations \(x_1 = \ell_1(x_1 - y_1) + s_1\) and \(y_1 + s_{i-1} = \ell_i(x_1 - y_1) + s_i\), for \(i = 2, \ldots, t\), we get

\[
x_1 + (t - 1)y_1 + s_1 + s_2 + \cdots + s_{t-1} = \sum_{i=1}^{t} \ell_i(x_1 - y_1) + s_1 + s_2 + \cdots + s_t,
\]

consequently,

\[
\left( t - 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{t} \ell_i \right) y_1 = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{t} \ell_i - 1 \right) x_1 + s_t.
\]

Then

\[
\left( t + \sum_{i=1}^{t} \ell_i \right) y_1 = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{t} \ell_i - 1 \right) x_1 + s_t + y_1,
\]

with \(s_t + y_1 < x_1\). Therefore, \(q_k = q_{k-1} = (\sum_{i=1}^{t} \ell_i - 1)\), for \(k = t + \sum_{i=1}^{t} \ell_i\).

Note that

\[
n + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \ell_i = n + \frac{x_1 - s_1}{x_1 - y_1} + \sum_{i=2}^{t} \frac{y_1 - s_{i-1} + s_i}{x_1 - y_1}
\]

\[
= n + \frac{x_1 + (n - 1)y_1 - s_n}{x_1 - y_1} = n + 1 + \frac{ny_1 - s_n}{x_1 - y_1}
\]

\[
< n + 1 + y_1 = x_1,
\]

hence \(p_t = (t + \sum_{i=1}^{t} \ell_i, \sum_{i=1}^{t} \ell_i) \in H_1^*\) for \(t = 1, \ldots, n\).

We know from Lemma 4.22 that \(H_1^*\) has exactly \(n = x_1 - y_1 - 1\) elements, so \(p_1, \ldots, p_n\) are the only elements of \(H_1^*\). \(\square\)
Examples 4.28. Let $x_1 = \ell_1(x_1 - y_1) + s_1$ and $y_1 + s_{i-1} = \ell_i(x_1 - y_1) + s_i$, for $i = 2, \ldots, n = x_1 - y_1 - 1$ as before.

(a) If $y_1 = 1$, then $H_1^* = \{(m, 1) : m = 2, \ldots, x_1 - 1\}$. In this case, $H$ is AG1 by Lemma 4.18.

(b) If $x_1 - y_1 \in \{1, 2\}$ then by Lemma 4.22 $H_1^*$ is either empty, or it consists of one element, which is different from $(0, 0)$. Hence $H$ is AG1.

(c) If $2 < 2y_1 < x_1 < 3y_1$, then $\ell_1 = \ell_2 = 1$. Therefore, $p_1 = (2, 1)$ and $p_2 = (4, 2) = 2p_1$ belong to $H_1^*$. Then, by definition, $H$ is not AG1.

The next theorem gives a simple arithmetic criterion to check the AG1 or AG2 property.

Theorem 4.29. Assume that $(1,1)$ belongs to $\omega_H$. Assuming Notation 4.13 then

(a) $H$ is AG1 if and only if $x_1 \equiv 1 \mod(x_1 - y_1)$;
(b) $H$ is AG2 if and only if $y_2 \equiv 1 \mod(y_2 - x_2)$;
(c) $(1, 1)$ is an Ulrich element in $H$ if and only if $x_i \equiv 1 \mod(x_i - y_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Proof. (a): Let $n = x_1 - y_1 - 1 = |H_1^*|$. If $n \in \{0, 1\}$, then $H$ is AG1 by Example 4.28(b). On the other hand, if $n = 0$ then $x_1 - y_1 = 1$ and clearly, $x_1 \equiv 1 \mod(x_1 - y_1)$. When $n = 1$ we have $x_1 - y_1 = 2$. Since $\gcd(x_1, y_1) = 1$ we get that $\ell_1$ is odd, hence $x_1 \equiv 1 \mod(x_1 - y_1)$, too.

We further prove the stated equivalence when $n \geq 2$. Let $\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_n \geq 0$ and $x_1 - y_1 > s_1, \ldots, s_n \geq 0$ such that

$$x_1 = \ell_1(x_1 - y_1) + s_1, \quad y_1 + s_{i-1} = \ell_i(x_1 - y_1) + s_i,$$

for $i = 2, \ldots, n$. Then

$$H_1^* = \{ (c_t, d_t) : c_t = t + \sum_{i=1}^{t} \ell_i, \quad d_t = \sum_{i=1}^{t} \ell_i, \quad t = 1, \ldots, n \},$$

by Lemma 4.27. We note that since $y_1 > 0$ (see Remark 4.21) we have $x_1 > x_1 - y_1$, hence $\ell_1 \geq 1$.

Assume that $x_1 \equiv 1 \mod(x_1 - y_1)$. Then it is easy to check that $s_i = i$ and $\ell_i = \ell_1 - 1$ for $i = 2, \ldots, n$. Consequently,

$$H_1^* = \{ (t\ell_1 + 1, t(\ell_1 - 1) + 1) : t = 1, \ldots, n \},$$

and therefore, the sum of any two elements of $H_1^*$ is not in $H_1^*$, i.e. $H$ is AG1.

Conversely, assume that $H$ is AG1. As $n > 0$ we get that $x_1 - y_1 > 1$ and $y_1 > 0$. In case $y_1 = 1$, then clearly, $x_1 \equiv 1 \mod(x_1 - y_1)$.

We consider the case $y_1 \geq 2$. As $1 = \gcd(x_1, y_1) = \gcd(x_1, x_1 - y_1) = \gcd(s_1, x_1 - y_1)$ and $x_1 - y_1 > 1$ we have that $s_1 > 0$. We need to prove that $s_1 = 1$.

Assume, on the contrary, that $s_1 \neq 1$. Then $s_1 \geq 2$. Since

$$\ell_1(x_1 - y_1) + s_1 = y_1 + s_{i-1} = \ell_i(x_1 - y_1) + s_i$$

and

$$y_1 + s_{i-1} < y_1 + (x_1 - y_1) = x_1 = \ell_1(x_1 - y_1) + s_1,$$

we have $\ell_1 - 1 \leq \ell_i \leq \ell_1$, for $i = 2, \ldots, n$. 
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If $\ell_2 = \ell_1$, then $p_2 = (2 + 2\ell_1, 2\ell_1) = 2p_1$ which contradicts the AG1 property. Now, we consider the case $\ell_2 = \ell_1 - 1$. By subtracting the equations

$$x_1 = \ell_1(x_1 - y_1) + s_1 \quad \text{and} \quad y_1 + s_1 = \ell_2(x_1 - y_1) + s_2,$$

we get that $s_2 = 2s_1$, hence $s_2 > s_1$.

If $\ell_2 = \cdots = \ell_n$ then $s_1 < s_2 < \cdots < s_n$ is an increasing sequence of $n$ positive integers less than $n + 1$, hence $s_1 = 1$, which is false. Thus $\ell_i = \ell_1$ for some $i \geq 3$. Let $i$ be the smallest index with this property, i.e. $\ell_2 = \cdots = \ell_{i-1} = \ell_1 - 1$ and $\ell_i = \ell_1$. Then

$$p_i = (i + (i - 2)(\ell_1 - 1) + 2\ell_1, (i - 2)(\ell_1 - 1) + 2\ell_1)) = (1 + \ell_1, \ell_1) + (i - 1 + (i - 2)(\ell_1 - 1) + \ell_1, (i - 2)(\ell_1 - 1) + \ell_1) = p_1 + p_{i-1},$$

a contradiction. This shows that when $H$ is AG1, then $x_1 \equiv 1 \mod(x_1 - y_1)$.

For part (b) we let $H'$ be the semigroup in $\mathcal{H}_2$ with the extremal rays $a_1' = (y_2, x_2)$ and $a_2' = (y_1, x_1)$. We remark that $H$ is AG2 if and only if $H'$ is AG1, and we use (a). Part (c) is a consequence of (a) and (b).

**Corollary 4.30.** Let $H$ be a semigroup in $\mathcal{H}_2$ with extremal rays $a_i = (x_i, y_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Assume $(1, 1) \in \omega_H$ and $x_1x_2y_1y_2 \neq 0$. Then $K[H]$ is AG if and only if $x_i \equiv 1 \mod(x_i - y_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$.

**Proof.** By Proposition 3.6, the only possible Ulrich element in $H$ is $(1, 1)$. Conclusion follows by Theorem 4.29. ∎

**Remark 4.31.** In the statement of Corollary 4.30, the assumption $x_1x_2y_1y_2 \neq 0$ can not be dropped. For instance, let $H \in \mathcal{H}_2$ with the extremal rays $a_1 = (1, 0)$ and $a_2 = (2, 5)$. Its Hilbert basis is $B_H = \{a_1, a_2, c_1 = (1, 1), c_2 = (2, 3), c_3 = (1, 2)\}$. The bottom element in $H$ is $c_1$, and by Theorem 4.29 it follows that $H$ is not AG2.

Still, $H$ is AG. Since $2c_1 = (2, 2) = c_3 + a_1$, $2c_2 = (4, 6) = a_1 + a_2 + c_1$ and $c_1 + c_2 = (3, 4) = a_1 + 2c_3$, by Theorem 4.3 we get that $c_3$ is an Ulrich element in $H$.

5. A test criterion for Ulrich elements in higher dimensions

Throughout this section, unless otherwise stated, $d \geq 2$ is any integer and $H$ is an affine semigroup in $\mathcal{H}_d$ with the extremal rays $a_1, \ldots, a_d$. We recall that for $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $z = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i a_i$ and $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$ we denote $[z]_i = \lambda_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d$. For any $S \subset \{1, \ldots, d\}$, the order of $z$ relative to $S$ is defined as

$$\text{ord}_S(z) = \sum_{i \in S} [[z]_i].$$

In particular, we set $\text{ord}_0(z) = 0$.

Our goal now is to transform Theorem 3.2 into a combinatorial criterion for checking when $b \in \omega_H$ is an Ulrich element. A key ingredient is the following lemma which detects the monomials in the ideal on the right hand side of (7).
Lemma 5.1. Let $b \in \omega_H$ and $I = (x^b) R + (x^{a_i} - x^{a_j}) : 1 \leq i < j \leq d) R$. For any $c \in \omega_H$, the following conditions are equivalent:

(a) $x^c \in I$;
(b) there exist $s \geq 0$ and $i_1, \ldots, i_s, j_1, \ldots, j_s \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ such that $\{i_1, \ldots, i_s\} \cap \{j_1, \ldots, j_s\} = \emptyset$ and $c - a_{i_1} - \cdots - a_{i_s} + a_{j_1} + \cdots + a_{j_s} \in b + H$.

For $s, i_1, \ldots, i_s, j_1, \ldots, j_s$ as above, one has that $c - a_{i_1} - \cdots - a_{i_s} \in \omega_H$.

Proof. (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b): If $c \in b + H$, then we take $s = 0$ and there is nothing to prove.

Assume $c \notin b + H$. Since $x^c \in I$, we may write

\begin{equation}
(13) \quad x^c = x^b \cdot g + \sum_{t=1}^r \lambda_t(x^{a_{b_t}} - x^{a_{r_t}})x^{u_t}
\end{equation}

with $g$ in $K[H]$, $0 \neq \lambda_t \in K$, $k_t \neq \ell_t$ and $u_t \in \omega_H$ for $t = 1, \ldots, r$.

As a first step, we prove that in equation (13) we may pick $g = 1$ and $\lambda_t = 1$ for all $t = 1, \ldots, r$. We introduce the graph $G$ having as vertices the set of monomials

\begin{equation}
M = \{x^{a_{b_t} + u_t}, x^{a_{r_t} + u_t} : 1 \leq t \leq r\},
\end{equation}

and where there is an edge between the monomials $m_1$ and $m_2$ if there exists a $t \in 1, \ldots, r$ such that $m_1 - m_2 = \pm (x^{a_{b_t} + u_t} - x^{a_{r_t} + u_t})$.

Since $c \notin b + H$ it follows that $x^c \in M$. Let $G_0$ be the connected component of $G$ containing $c$. We denote $T_1$ the sum of those binomials $\lambda_t(x^{a_{b_t} + u_t} - x^{a_{r_t} + u_t})$ in the right hand side of (13) such that one (hence both) of its monomials are in $G_0$, and we let $T_2$ be the sum of the rest of the binomials from (13).

We claim that there is a vertex $x^u$ in $G_0$ with $u \in b + H$. Assume this that is the case. Therefore, there is no overlap between $G_0$ and the monomials in the support of $x^b \cdot g$ or the support of $T_2$. Since $x^c - T_1 = T_2 + x^b \cdot g$, we get that $x^c = T_1$. In this identity, after we let $x_i = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d$ we obtain that $1 = 0$, a contradiction.

Let $h \in b + H$ such that there exists a path $m_1 = x^c, m_2, \ldots, m_n, x^h = m_{n+1}$ in $G_0$. This means that

\begin{equation}
(14) \quad x^c = (m_1 - m_2) + (m_2 - m_3) + \cdots + (m_n - x^h) + x^h,
\end{equation}

and there exist $e_t \neq f_t \in 1, \ldots, n$ and $c_t \in \omega_H$ for all $t = 1, \ldots, n$ such that

\begin{equation}
m_t - m_{t+1} = (x^{a_{e_t}} - x^{a_{f_t}}) \cdot x^{c_t}.
\end{equation}

It follows that $c_1 = c - a_{e_1}$, and moreover, by induction that

\begin{equation}
c_t = c - (a_{e_1} - a_{f_1}) - \cdots - (a_{e_{t-1}} - a_{f_{t-1}}) - a_{e_t}, \quad \text{for } t = 2, \ldots, n,
\end{equation}

hence

\begin{equation}
h = c_n + a_{f_n} = c - \sum_{t=1}^n (a_{e_t} - a_{f_t}) = c - \sum_{t=1}^n a_{e_t} + \sum_{t=1}^n a_{f_t}.
\end{equation}

We denote by $E$ the sequence $e_1, \ldots, e_n$ and by $F$ the sequence $f_1, \ldots, f_n$. If there is any, we remove the common entries from $E$ and $F$, one from $E$ and one from $F$ at a time, until the remaining sequences (that we still name $E$ and $F$) have no common
entry. Say, \( \mathcal{E} : i_1, \ldots, i_s \) and \( \mathcal{F} : j_1, \ldots, j_s \) with \( \{i_1, \ldots, i_s\} \cap \{j_1, \ldots, j_s\} = \emptyset \). We note that

\[
\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{c} - \sum_{t=1}^{s} a_{i_t} + \sum_{t=1}^{s} a_{j_t} \in \mathbf{b} + H,
\]

which proves that \( (a) \Rightarrow (b) \). Since \( \mathbf{h} \in \omega_H \),

\[
[c - a_{i_1} - \cdots - a_{i_r}] = \begin{cases} [c]_i & \text{if } i \notin \{i_1, \ldots, i_r\} \\ [c - \sum_{t=1}^{r} a_{i_t} + \sum_{t=1}^{s} a_{j_t}]_i & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}
\]

hence \([c - a_{i_1} - \cdots - a_{i_r}] > 0\) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq d \), and we get that \( \mathbf{c} - \sum_{t=1}^{s} a_{i_t} \in \omega_H \).

\( (b) \Rightarrow (a) \): If \( s = 0 \) then \( \mathbf{x}^\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{x}^\mathbf{b}R \subset I \). When \( s > 0 \), since \( \mathbf{c} - \sum_{t=1}^{s} a_{i_t} \in \omega_H \) we may write

\[
\mathbf{x}^\mathbf{c} = (\mathbf{x}^{a_{i_1}} - \mathbf{x}^{a_{j_1}}) + \mathbf{x}^{(a_{i_2} - a_{j_2})} + \cdots + \mathbf{x}^{(a_{i_s} - a_{j_s})}.
\]

and we conclude that \( \mathbf{x}^\mathbf{c} \in I \). \( \square \)

As a first consequence of the above result, we obtain that whenever \( K[H] \) is not a regular ring, any Ulrich element must be a minimal generator for \( \omega_H \).

**Proposition 5.2.** Assume \( K[H] \) is not a regular ring. If \( \mathbf{b} \) is an Ulrich element in \( H \), then \( \mathbf{b} \in G(\omega_H) \).

**Proof.** Assume, on the contrary, that \( \mathbf{b} \) is not a minimal generator for \( \omega_H \). Therefore, there exist \( \mathbf{c}_1 \in G(\omega_H) \) and \( 0 \neq \mathbf{h} \in H \) such that \( \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{c}_1 + \mathbf{h} \). Since \( \mathbf{h} \neq 0 \), there exist \( \mathbf{a} \in B_H \) and \( \mathbf{h}' \in H \) such that

\[
\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{c}_1 + \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{h}'.
\]

Let \( J = (\mathbf{x}^{a_i} - \mathbf{x}^{a_j} : 1 \leq i < j \leq d)R \). Since \( \mathbf{b} \) is an Ulrich element, \( \mathbf{x}^{a_1 + a_1} \in (\mathbf{x}^b, J\omega_R) \). By Lemma 5.1 there exist \( s \geq 0 \) and \( i_1, \ldots, i_s, j_1, \ldots, j_s \in [d] \) such that \( \{i_1, \ldots, i_s\} \cap \{j_1, \ldots, j_s\} = \emptyset \) and

\[
\mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{c}_1 - \mathbf{a}_{i_1} - \cdots - \mathbf{a}_{i_s} + \mathbf{a}_{j_1} + \cdots + \mathbf{a}_{j_s} = \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{h}'
\]

for some \( \mathbf{h}' \in H \). After we substitute \( \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{c}_1 + \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{h}' \) in the previous equation, we get that

\[
\mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{a}_{j_1} + \cdots + \mathbf{a}_{j_s} = \mathbf{a}_{i_1} + \cdots + \mathbf{a}_{i_s} + \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{h}' + \mathbf{h}''.
\]

If \( s = 0 \) then \( \mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}_1 \) and \( \mathbf{h}' = \mathbf{h}'' = 0 \), hence \( \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{c}_1 + \mathbf{a}_1 \).

If \( s > 0 \), since \( i_k \) is not any of \( j_1, \ldots, j_s \) for any \( k = 1, \ldots, s \), it follows that \( s = 1 \) and \( i_1 = 1 \). Hence \( \mathbf{a}_{j_1} = \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{h}' + \mathbf{h}'' \). As \( \mathbf{a}_{j_1} \) and \( \mathbf{a} \) are in the Hilbert basis, we get that \( \mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}_{j_1} \) and \( \mathbf{h}' = \mathbf{h}'' = 0 \).

In either case, there exists \( i_0 \in \{1, \ldots, d\} \) such that

\[
\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{c}_1 + \mathbf{a}_{i_0}.
\]

We claim that there exist \( \mathbf{c}_2 \in B_H \setminus \{\mathbf{a}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{a}_d\} \) and \( \mathbf{h} \in H \) such that

\[
\mathbf{c}_1 = \mathbf{c}_2 + \mathbf{h}_0.
\]
Indeed, if \( c_1 \in P_H \) then we may take \( c_2 = c_1 \) and \( \bar{h} = 0 \). Otherwise, if \( c_1 \in G(\omega_H) \setminus P_H \), by Lemma 1.1.c it follows that

\[
(18) \quad c_1 = \{c_1\} + \sum_{i \in \text{supp}((c_1))} a_i.
\]

If \( \{c_1\} = 0 \) then \( c_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{d} a_i \) which implies that \( K[H] \) is a regular ring, which is not the case. Thus \( 0 \neq \{c_1\} \in P_H \) and there exist \( c_2 \in B_H \setminus \{a_1, \ldots, a_d\} \) and \( \bar{h}' \in H \) such that \( \{c_1\} = c_2 + \bar{h}' \). Using (18) we get that there exists \( \bar{h} \in H \) such that \( c_1 = c_2 + \bar{h} \), as desired.

Since \( b \) is an Ulrich element, \( x^{c_1+c_2} \in (x^b, J_{\omega_R}) \). Then, by Lemma 5.1 there exist \( s \geq 0, i_1, \ldots, i_s, j_1, \ldots, j_s \in [d] \) and \( \bar{h} \in H \) such that \( \{i_1, \ldots, i_s\} \cap \{j_1, \ldots, j_s\} = \emptyset \) and

\[
c_1 + c_2 - a_{i_1} - \cdots - a_{i_s} + a_{j_1} + \cdots + a_{j_s} = b + \bar{h}.
\]

After we substitute the formula for \( b \) from (17) in the previous equation, we have

\[
c_2 + a_{j_1} + \cdots + a_{j_s} = a_{i_1} + \cdots + a_{i_s} + a_{i_0} + \bar{h}.
\]

In the previous equation, the element on the left has order \( s \), while the order of the element on the right is at least \( s+1 \), which is not possible.

This finishes the proof by contradiction that \( b \in G(\omega_H) \). \( \square \)

**Corollary 5.3.** Assume \( K[H] \) is a Gorenstein ring and \( G(\omega_H) = \{b\} \).

(a) If \( K[H] \) is not a regular ring, then \( b \) is the only Ulrich element in \( H \).
(b) If we further assume that \( K[H] \) is a regular ring, then \( b, b + a_1, \ldots, b + a_d \) are the Ulrich elements in \( H \). Here, \( b = \sum_{i=1}^{d} a_i \) where \( a_1, \ldots, a_d \) are the extremal rays in \( H \).

**Proof.** Part (a) follows from Proposition 5.2 and Example 3.4(a). For (b) let us assume that \( K[H] \) is a regular ring. Then \( b = \sum_{i=1}^{d} a_i \) generates \( \omega_H \), and \( b, b + a_i \) are Ulrich elements in \( H \) for all \( i = 1, \ldots, d \), by Example 3.3. For the converse, we consider \( b' \) any Ulrich element in \( H \) which is not in \( G(\omega_H) \), i.e. \( b \neq b' \). Arguing as in the first part of the proof of Proposition 5.2 we get that \( b' = b + a_{i_0} \), with \( 1 \leq i_0 \leq d \).

In order to test the containment of ideals in Eq. (7) from Theorem 3.2, according to Lemma 5.1 one needs to detect when \( c \in \omega_H \) can be brought into \( b + H \) by a sequence of subtractions and additions of the same number of extremal rays. That can be decided by inspecting the coordinates of \( c \) and \( b \) with respect to the basis \( a_1, \ldots, a_d \). For \( z \in \mathbb{R}^d \) and \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \) we consider the following subsets of \( \{1, \ldots, d\} \)

\[
[z]_{<\lambda} = \{i : [z]_i < \lambda\},
\]

\[
[z]_{\geq\lambda} = \{i : [z]_i \geq \lambda\}.
\]

**Lemma 5.4.** Let \( b \in P_H \) and \( c \in \omega_H \). Assume that there exist \( s \geq 0 \) and \( i_1, \ldots, i_s, j_1, \ldots, j_s \in [d] \) such that \( \{i_1, \ldots, i_s\} \cap \{j_1, \ldots, j_s\} = \emptyset \) and \( c - a_{i_1} - \cdots - a_{i_s} + a_{j_1} + \cdots + a_{j_s} \in b + H \). Then \( \text{ord}_{[c-b]_{\geq 1}}(c) \geq \|c-b\|_{<0} \).
Proof. By the hypothesis, \( c - \sum_{t=1}^{s} a_{it} + \sum_{t=1}^{s} a_{jt} = b + \sum_{t=1}^{d} \lambda_{i}a_{t} \), where \( \lambda_{i} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, d \). This gives \( c - b = \sum_{t=1}^{d} \lambda_{i}a_{t} + \sum_{t=1}^{s} a_{it} - \sum_{t=1}^{s} a_{jt} \). Therefore, \( \{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{s}\} \subseteq \{c - b\}_{\geq 1} \) and \( \{c - b\}_{< 0} \subseteq \{j_{1}, \ldots, j_{s}\} \). Lemma 5.1 implies that \( c - \sum_{t=1}^{s} a_{it} \in \omega_{H}, \) thus
\[
\text{ord}_{\{c - b\}_{\geq 1}}(c) \geq \text{ord}_{\{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{s}\}}(c) \geq s \geq |\{j_{1}, \ldots, j_{s}\}| \geq |\{c - b\}_{< 0}|.
\]
\[\Box\]

**Lemma 5.5.** Let \( b \in \overline{F_{H}} \) and \( c \in \omega_{H} \). The following statements are equivalent.

(a) There exist \( s \geq 0 \), the integers \( 1 \leq i_{1} < \cdots < i_{s} \leq d \) and \( j_{1}, \ldots, j_{s} \in [d] \setminus \{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{s}\} \) such that \( c - a_{i_{1}} - \cdots - a_{i_{s}} + a_{j_{1}} + \cdots + a_{j_{s}} \in b + H \).

(b) \( |\{c - b\}_{\geq 1}| \geq |\{c - b\}_{< 0}| \).

**Proof.** (a) \( \Rightarrow \) (b): We may write \( c - \sum_{t=1}^{s} a_{it} + \sum_{t=1}^{s} a_{jt} = b + \sum_{t=1}^{d} \lambda_{i}a_{t} \), where \( \lambda_{i} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \). Then, arguing as in the proof of Lemma 5.1, we get that \( \{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{s}\} \subseteq |c - b|_{\geq 1} \) and \( |c - b|_{< 0} \subseteq \{j_{1}, \ldots, j_{s}\} \). As \( i_{1}, \ldots, i_{s} \) are distinct, we obtain that \( |c - b|_{\geq 1} \geq s \geq |c - b|_{< 0} \).

(b) \( \Rightarrow \) (a): Let \( s = |c - b|_{< 0} \) and \( |c - b|_{< 0} = \{j_{1}, \ldots, j_{s}\} \). Since, by the hypothesis, \( s \leq |c - b|_{\geq 1} \) we may pick \( i_{1} < \cdots < i_{s} \) in \( |c - b|_{\geq 1} \).

We denote \( z = c - b + \sum_{t=1}^{s} a_{jt} - \sum_{t=1}^{s} a_{it} \in b + H \).

Since \( z \in \mathbb{Z}^{d} \) and \( |z|_{t} \geq 0 \) for all \( t \), we infer that \( z \in H \). Consequently, \( c + \sum_{t=1}^{s} a_{jt} - \sum_{t=1}^{s} a_{it} \in b + H \).
\[\Box\]

**Lemma 5.6.** Let \( b \in \overline{F_{H}} \) and \( c \in \omega_{H} \). If \( |c|_{i} < 2 \) for all \( i = 1, \ldots, d \), then \( |c - b|_{\geq 1} = \text{ord}_{\{c - b\}_{\geq 1}}(c) \).

**Proof.** For \( \ell \in |c - b|_{\geq 1} \) we have \( |c|_{\ell} - |b|_{\ell} \geq 1 \), hence \( |c|_{\ell} \geq 1 \). On the other hand, \( |c|_{\ell} < 2 \) implies that \( |c|_{\ell} = 1 \). This gives \( \text{ord}_{\{c - b\}_{\geq 1}}(c) = \sum_{\ell \in |c - b|_{\geq 1}} |c|_{\ell} = |c - b|_{\geq 1} \).
\[\Box\]

It is convenient to give a name to the numerical condition appearing in Lemma 5.4.

**Definition 5.7.** Let \( b \in H \). We say that an element \( c \in \omega_{H} \) is \( b \)-friendly in \( H \) if \( \text{ord}_{\{c - b\}_{\geq 1}}(c) \geq |c - b|_{< 0} \).

We can now formulate the announced combinatorial criterion for Ulrich elements.

**Theorem 5.8.** Let \( b \in G(\omega_{H}) \). Then \( b \) is an Ulrich element in \( H \) if and only if for all \( c \in B_{H} \) and for all \( w \in G(\omega_{H}) \) the element \( c + w \) is \( b \)-friendly in \( H \).

**Proof.** We denote \( R = K[H] \), \( J = (x^{a_{i}} - x^{a_{j}}) : 1 \leq i < j \leq d)R \), and \( I = (x^{b}R, J\omega_{R}) \).

If \( R \) is a Gorenstein ring, then \( b \) is an Ulrich element by Corollary 5.3. Also, for all \( c \in B_{H} \) one has \( [(c + b) - b]_{< 0} = [c]_{< 0} = \emptyset \), which implies by the definition that \( c + b \) is \( b \)-friendly. We further assume that \( R \) is not a Gorenstein ring.
Theorem 5.8 gives that $b$ is an Ulrich element if and only if $x^{c+w} \in I$ for all $c \in B_H$ and $w \in G(\omega_H)$. Therefore, if $b$ is an Ulrich element, Lemma 5.1 together with Lemma 5.4 imply that $c + w$ is $b$-friendly in $H$ for all $c \in B_H$ and $w \in G(\omega_H)$.

For the converse implication, we first consider the case when $c \in B_H$ is not an extremal ray of $H$, and $w$ is arbitrary in $G(\omega_H)$. Then $0 \leq |c|_i < 1$ and $0 < |w|_i \leq 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$. From Lemmas 5.6, 5.5 and 5.1 combined we obtain that $x^{c+w} \in I$. Given $w \in G(\omega_H)$ there exists $1 \leq i_0 \leq d$ so that $|w|_{i_0} < 1$, otherwise, by Lemma 1.1 we get that $w = \sum_{i=1}^d a_i$, hence $K[H]$ is a Gorenstein ring, which is not the case. Then $0 < |a_{i_0} + w|_i < 2$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, d$. Arguing as before, Lemmas 5.6, 5.5 and 5.1 combined give that $x^{a_{i_0}+w} \in I$. Note that for any $i \in [d]$, since the binomial $x^{a_i+w} - x^{a_{i_0}+w} = x^w(x^{a_i} - x^{a_{i_0}})$ is in $I$, it also follows that $x^{a_{i_0}+w} \in I$. We conclude that $b$ is an Ulrich element in $H$.

Remark 5.9. The proof of Theorem 5.8 indicates that in order to confirm that $b$ is an Ulrich element in $H$ we do not need to check that $a_i + w$ is $b$-friendly for all $i \in [d]$ and $w \in G(\omega_H)$.

Indeed, for a given $w \in G(\omega_H)$ it is enough to test that $x^{a_{i_0}+w} \in I$ for some $i_0 \in [d]$ and one can extend the conclusion to all $i$ in $[d]$. If $|w|_j < 1$ for all $j$ (i.e. $w \in B_H$) then one can pick $i_0 \in [d]$ arbitrarily. If $w \notin B_H$ and $K[H]$ is not already Gorenstein (i.e. $|G(\omega_H)| > 1$), we pick $i_0 \in [d]$ so that $|w|_{i_0} < 1$.

Then one verifies that $a_{i_0} + w$ is $b$-friendly to decide if $x^{a_{i_0}+w} \in I$.

Remark 5.10. When we specialize Theorem 5.8 to $d = 2$ we get to test a seemingly stronger condition than the one appearing in Theorem 4.3.

Indeed, let us assume that the ring $K[H]$ is not Gorenstein (for simplicity, by Corollary 5.3) and let $b \in G(\omega_H) = B_H \setminus \{a_1, a_2\}$. It is easy to see that $a_1 + w$ and $a_2 + w$ are $b$-friendly for all $w \in G(\omega_H)$. Then, according to Theorem 5.8 $b$ is an Ulrich element in $H$ if and only if for all $c, w \in G(\omega_H)$ such that $c + w \not\in H$ one has that $\text{ord}_{c+w-b} | c + w | \geq 1$. The latter inequality is equivalent to $|c + w|_i \geq 1 + |b|_i$ for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

On the other hand, by reformulating Theorem 4.3 and using the fact that $H$ is a normal semigroup, we have that $b$ is an Ulrich element in $H$ if and only if for all $c, w \in G(\omega_H)$ such that $c + w \not\in H$ it follows that $|c + w|_i \geq 1$ for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

Example 5.11. Let $H \in H_3$ with the extremal rays $a_1 = (1, 2, 2), a_2 = (2, 2, 1), a_3 = (2, 1, 3)$. A computation with Normalize (H) shows that $B_H = \{a_1, a_2, a_3, c_1 = (1, 1, 1), c_2 = (2, 2, 3)\}$. Note that $2c_2 = c_1 + a_1 + a_3$, and $a_2 + c_2 = 4c_1$. Thus $2c_2 \in c_1 + H$ and $a_2 + c_2 \in c_1 + H$, hence $[2c_2 - c_1]_{<0} = [a_2 + c_2 - c_1]_{<0} = 0$. By Theorem 5.8 and Remark 5.9 it follows that $c_1$ is an Ulrich element in $H$. Moreover, Proposition 5.6 says it is the only one.

We can use Theorem 5.8 to construct higher dimensional AG rings.

Proposition 5.12. Let $H \in H_3$. Then $b$ is an Ulrich element in $H$ if and only if $(b, 1)$ is an Ulrich element in the semigroup $H \times \mathbb{N}$.

In particular, the ring $K[H]$ is AG if and only if $K[H \times \mathbb{N}]$ is AG.
Proof.} We describe the relevant sets in order to apply Theorem \[5.8\]. We denote \( L = H \times \mathbb{N} \) and \( b' = (b, 1) \). As \( a_1, \ldots, a_d \) are the extremal rays for \( H \) it follows that \( a'_1 = (a_1, 0), \ldots, a'_d = (a_d, 0) \) and \( a'_{d+1} = (0, \ldots, 0, 1) \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1} \) are the extremal rays for \( L \).

The last coordinate of a lattice point in \( \overline{P_L} \) is 0 or 1, hence
\[
\overline{P_L} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{d+1} = ((\overline{P_H} \cap \mathbb{Z}^d) \times \{0\}) \cup ((\overline{P_H} \cap \mathbb{Z}^d) \times \{1\}).
\]

If \((z, 1) \in \overline{P_H} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{d+1} \) then \( (z, 1) = (z, 0) + a'_{d+1} \), hence \((z, 1) \notin B_L \) unless \( z = 0 \). This implies that \( B_L = (B_H \times \{0\}) \cup \{a'_{d+1}\} \).

We claim that \( G(\omega_L) = G(\omega_H) \times \{1\} \). Indeed, \( \overline{P_L} \) has no inner lattice points, and if \((w, 1) \in G(\omega_L) \) then, by Lemma \[3.1\] \( w \in \omega_H \cap \overline{P_H} \). If \( w = w_1 + h \) with \( w_1 \in G(\omega_H) \) and \( h \in H \), then from the decomposition \((w, 1) = (w_1, 1) + (h, 0) \) we infer that \( h = 0 \) and, consequently, \( w \in G(\omega_H) \).

In particular, \( b \) generates \( \omega_H \) if and only if \( b' \) generates \( \omega_L \). In this situation, the desired equivalence follows from Corollary \[5.3\].

We further assume that \( K[H] \) and \( K[L] \) are not Gorenstein rings. Before proving the stated equivalence we isolate an important part of the argument. Let \( c \in B_H \) and \( w \in G(\omega_H) \). We set \( c' = (c, 0) \) and \( w' = (w, 1) \), which are in \( B_L \) and \( G(\omega_L) \), respectively. Then
\[
[c' + w' - b']_\ell = [(c + w - b, 0)]_\ell = \begin{cases} [c + w - b]_\ell, & 1 \leq \ell \leq d, \\ 0, & \ell = d + 1. \end{cases}
\]

This implies that \([c' + w' - b']_{<0} = [c + w - b]_{<0} \) and \([c' + w' - b']_{\geq1} = [c + w - b]_{\geq1} \). We also deduce that
\[
\text{ord}_{[c' + w' - b']_{\geq1}}(c' + w') = \text{ord}_{[c + w - b']_{\geq1}}((c + w, 1)) = \text{ord}_{[c + w - b']_{\geq1}}(c + w).
\]

Therefore, \( c + w \) is \( b \)-friendly in \( H \) if and only if \( c' + w' \) is \( b' \)-friendly in \( L \).

We assume that \( b' \) is an Ulrich element in \( L \). If \( c \in B_H \) and \( w \in G(\omega_H) \) then \( c' = (c, 0) \in B_L \), \( w' = (w, 1) \in G(\omega_L) \) and by Theorem \[5.8\] and the above discussion we infer that \( c + w \) is \( b \)-friendly in \( H \). Hence, by Theorem \[5.8\] \( b \) is an Ulrich element in \( H \).

For the converse, we assume that \( b \) is an Ulrich element in \( H \). Let \( w' = (w, 1) \in G(\omega_H) \) with \( w \in G(\omega_H) \). If \( c' \in B_L \) is of the form \((c, 0) \) with \( c \in B_H \), then since \( c + w \) is \( b \)-friendly in \( H \), by the above discussion we obtain that \( c' + w' \) is \( b' \)-friendly in \( L \).

Since \( K[H] \) is not a regular ring (as it is not even Gorenstein), we may pick \( i_0 \in [d] \) such that \([w]_{i_0} < 1 \). Then \([w']_{i_0} < 1 \). Our hypothesis implies that \( a'_{i_0} + w \) is \( b \)-friendly in \( H \), hence also \( a'_{i_0} + w' \) is \( b' \)-friendly in \( L \). Now Remark \[5.9\] implies that \( b' \) is an Ulrich element in \( L \).

The statement about the AG property follows from the description of the generators for \( \omega_H \) and \( \omega_L \) combined with Proposition \[5.2\]. \( \square \)

For comparison, we present below a more algebraic approach to prove Proposition \[5.12\] by using Remark \[3.3\].
A second proof of Proposition 5.12. We denote \( L = H \times \mathbb{N} \), \( R = K[H] \), \( R' = K[L] = R[x_{d+1}] \), \( \mathbf{u} = x^\mathbf{b} \in R \) and \( \mathbf{u}' = x^\mathbf{b} \cdot x_{d+1} \in R' \). Then \( \mathbf{m}' = (\mathbf{m}, x_{d+1})R' \) is the maximal graded ideal of \( R' \) and \( \omega_{R'} = x_{d+1} \cdot \omega_{R} R' \).

We let \( J = (x^\mathbf{a} - x^{\mathbf{a1}} : 2 \leq i \leq d)R \) and \( J'' = (x_{d+1}, J)R' \). We claim that \( J'' \) is a reduction ideal of \( \mathbf{m}' \) with respect to \( E' = \omega_{R'}/\mathbf{u}' R' \). Indeed, by Theorem 2.4 there exists a positive integer \( k \) such that \( \mathbf{m}^{k+1} + \mathbf{u} R = J \mathbf{m}^k + \mathbf{u} R \), equivalently, such that \( \mathbf{m}^{k+1} \subseteq J \mathbf{m}^k + \mathbf{u} R \). Then

\[
\mathbf{m}^{k+1} \omega_{R'} R' \subseteq J \mathbf{m}^k \omega_{R'} R' + \mathbf{u} \cdot \omega_{R'} R' \subseteq (x_{d+1}, J) \cdot (\mathbf{m}, x_{d+1})^k \omega_{R} R' + \mathbf{u} R'.
\]

Clearly, for \( 0 \leq i \leq k \) one has \( x_{d+1} \cdot \mathbf{m}^{k-i} \cdot x_{d+1}^i \cdot \omega_{R'} R' \subseteq (x_{d+1}, J) \cdot (\mathbf{m}, x_{d+1})^k \cdot \omega_{R'} R' \).

Hence

\[
(\mathbf{m}, x_{d+1})^{k+1} \cdot \omega_{R'} R' \subseteq (x_{d+1}, J) \cdot (\mathbf{m}, x_{d+1})^k \cdot \omega_{R'} R' + \mathbf{u} R'.
\]

After we multiply by \( x_{d+1} \) both ideals in the line above, we obtain

\[
(\mathbf{m}^{k+1} \cdot \omega_{R'}) \subseteq (x_{d+1}, J) \cdot (\mathbf{m}, x_{d+1})^k \cdot \omega_{R'} + \mathbf{u} R', \quad \text{equivalently}
\]

\[
(\mathbf{m}')^{k+1} \omega_{R'} R' + \mathbf{u} R' = (x_{d+1}, J) \cdot (\mathbf{m}')^k \cdot \omega_{R'} + \mathbf{u} R', \quad \text{which means that}
\]

\[
(\mathbf{m}')^{k+1} E' = J'' (\mathbf{m}')^k E',
\]

and this proves the claim.

Assume \( \mathbf{b} \) is an Ulrich element in \( H \). Theorem 3.2 yields \( \mathbf{m} \omega_{R} \subseteq (\mathbf{u}, J \omega_{R})R \). Then \( (\mathbf{m}, x_{d+1}) \omega_{R} R' \subseteq (\mathbf{u}, J \omega_{R}, x_{d+1} \omega_{R}) R' \), which after multiplying both sides by \( x_{d+1} \) gives

\[
\mathbf{m}' \omega_{R'} \subseteq (\mathbf{u}', J'' \omega_{R'}) R' .
\]

As \( J'' \) is generated by \( d (= \dim R' - 1) \) elements, by Remark 3.3 we obtain that \((\mathbf{b}, 1)\) is an Ulrich element in \( L \).

We now assume \((\mathbf{b}, 1)\) is an Ulrich element in \( L \). Since \( J'' \) is a reduction ideal of \( \mathbf{m}' \) with respect to \( E' \), \( J'' \) is generated by \( d = \dim E' - 1 \) elements, and \((\mathbf{b}, 1)\) is an Ulrich element in \( L \), it follows by Remark 3.3 that \( \mathbf{m}' \omega_{R'} \subseteq (\mathbf{u}', (x_{d+1}, J) \omega_{R'}) R' \). As \( x_{d+1} \) is a regular element in \( R' \), we obtain that \( (\mathbf{m}, x_{d+1}) \omega_{R} R' \subseteq (\mathbf{u}, (x_{d+1}, J) \omega_{R}) R' \). Hence

\[
(\mathbf{m} \omega_{R}) R' \subseteq (\mathbf{u}, (x_{d+1}, J) \omega_{R}) R'.
\]

Let \( \varphi : R' \rightarrow R \) be the \( K \)-algebra map letting \( \varphi(x_i) = x_i \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, d \) and \( \varphi(x_{d+1}) = 0 \). After we apply \( \varphi \) to \( (19) \) we get that \( \mathbf{m} \omega_{R} \subseteq (\mathbf{u}, J \omega_{R})R \), hence \( \mathbf{b} \) is an Ulrich element in \( H \). □

Remark 5.13. The semigroup ring \( K[H \times \mathbb{N}] = K[H][x_{d+1}] \) is a polynomial extension of \( K[H] \). Thus, Proposition 5.12 is the multigraded analogue of [14] Theorem 8.5 of Goto et al. Namely, they show that if \((R, \mathbf{m})\) is a Noetherian local ring with infinite residue field and \( S = R[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \) is a standard graded polynomial ring, then \( R \) is an almost Gorenstein local ring if and only if \( S \) is an almost Gorenstein graded ring.
6. Nearly Gorenstein semigroup rings

In this section we prove the nearly Gorenstein property for semigroup rings $K[H]$ when $H \in \mathcal{H}_2$.

Nearly Gorenstein rings approximate Gorenstein rings in a different way as almost Gorenstein rings. In \cite{15}, a local (or graded) Cohen–Macaulay ring which admits a canonical module $\omega_R$ is called nearly Gorenstein if the trace of $\omega_R$ contains the (graded) maximal ideal of $R$. In the case that $R$ is a domain, the canonical module can be realized as an ideal of $R$ and its trace in $R$, which we denote by $\text{tr}(\omega_R)$, is the ideal $\sum_f f\omega_R$, where the sum is taken over all $f$ in the quotient field of $R$ for which $f\omega_R \subseteq R$, see \cite{15} Lemma 1.1.

A one-dimensional almost Gorenstein ring is nearly Gorenstein, but the converse does not hold in general. In higher dimension there is in general no implication valid between these two concepts, see \cite{15}.

**Theorem 6.1.** Let $H$ be a simplicial affine semigroup in $\mathcal{H}_2$. Then $R = K[H]$ is a nearly Gorenstein ring.

*Proof.* Let $a_1 = (c, d)$ and $a_2 = (e, f)$ be the extremal rays of $H$. We may assume that $d/c < f/e$ and that $R$ is not already a Gorenstein ring.

The vector $n_1 = (-d, c)$ is orthogonal to $a_1$ and $n_2 = (f, -e)$ is orthogonal to $a_2$. Moreover, $c$ is in $C$, the cone over $H$, if and only if $\langle n_1, c \rangle \geq 0$ and $\langle n_2, c \rangle \geq 0$.

Let $c_1, \ldots, c_t, c_{t+1}, c_{t+2}$ be the Hilbert basis of $H$, where $c_{t+i} = a_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then $\omega_R$ is generated by $v_i = x^{c_i}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, t$, see Lemma 1.1.

In order to prove that $R$ is nearly Gorenstein, it suffices to show that for each element $c_i$ of the Hilbert basis there exist $c \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and an integer $k \in \{1, \ldots, t\}$ such that

(i) $c + c_j \in C$ for $j = 1, \ldots, t$, and

(ii) $c + c_k = c_i$.

If $i \in \{1, \ldots, t\}$, we may choose $c = 0$ and $k = i$. It suffices to consider the cases $i = t + 1$ and $i = t + 2$. By symmetry we may assume that $i = t + 1$, and have to find $c \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $k \in \{1, \ldots, t\}$ such that (i) is satisfied and such that $c + c_k = a_1$.

Let $k \in \{1, \ldots, t\}$ be chosen such that $\langle n_1, c_k \rangle = \min\{\langle n_1, c_j \rangle : j = 1, \ldots, t\}$. Set $c = a_1 - c_k$. Then $c + c_k = a_1$. Moreover, by the choice of $k$ for $j = 1, \ldots, t$ we have

$$\langle n_1, c + c_j \rangle = \langle n_1, a_1 \rangle - \langle n_1, c_k \rangle + \langle n_1, c_j \rangle = 0 - \langle n_1, c_k \rangle + \langle n_1, c_j \rangle \geq 0,$$

and

$$\langle n_2, c + c_j \rangle = \langle n_2, a_1 \rangle - \langle n_2, c_k \rangle + \langle n_2, c_j \rangle.$$ 

Since $c_j \in H$, we have $\langle n_2, c_j \rangle \geq 0$. Let $L$ be the line passing through $c_k$ which is parallel to $L_2 = \mathbb{R}a_2$, and $L'$ be the line passing through $a_1$ parallel to $L_2$. Since $c_k \in P_H$, the line $L$ has smaller distance to $L_2$ than the line $L'$. This implies that $\langle n_2, a_1 \rangle > \langle n_2, c_k \rangle$, hence $\langle n_2, c + c_j \rangle > 0$. Thus we conclude that $c + c_j \in C$, as desired. \hfill $\square$

Theorem 6.1 is no longer valid when $\dim K[H] > 2$, as the following example shows.
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Example 6.2. We consider again the semigroup $H \in \mathcal{H}_3$ from Remark 4.10. It turns out that $K[H]$ is not nearly Gorenstein for this semigroup $H$. One can see that $a_i$ does not satisfy the two conditions (i) and (ii) in the proof of Theorem 6.1.

In fact, if we consider the set $A$ of all $a_i - c_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, 13$, then the third component of elements in $A$, belongs to $\{0, -1, -2, -3, -4\}$. Adding the elements with negative third component to $(1, 2, 1)$, we get a vector with third component less than 1, which does not belong to $C$, the cone over $H$. Adding those elements in $A$ with zero third component to either $(2, 1, 1)$ or $(1, 2, 1)$, we again get a vector which does not belong to $C$.
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