

HODGE THEORY FOR POLYMATROIDS

ROBERTO PAGARIA AND GIAN MARCO PEZZOLI

ABSTRACT. We construct a Leray model for a discrete polymatroid with arbitrary building set and we prove a generalized Goresky-MacPherson formula. The first row of the model is the Chow ring of the polymatroid; we prove Poincaré duality, Hard Lefschetz, and Hodge-Riemann theorems for the Chow ring. Furthermore we provide a relative Lefschetz decomposition with respect to the deletion of an element.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. The Leray model	4
3. Generalized Goresky-MacPherson formula	10
4. Kähler package	18
5. The relative Lefschetz decomposition	28
6. Characteristic polynomial	32
7. An example	35
References	39

1. INTRODUCTION

Recently, long standing conjectures about log-concavity of graphs and matroids have been brilliantly solved by studying the Chow ring of matroids [Huh12, HK12, Len13, HW17, AHK18, BHM⁺20b]. A natural question is if the corresponding results hold for polymatroids [BEST21, Question 1.5].

Discrete polymatroids generalize arrangements of subspaces in the same way as matroids generalize hyperplane arrangements. Moreover polymatroids codify invariants of hypergraphs as matroids do with graphs. Polymatroids have application in linear programming [Edm70, Sch03], in code theory [GJLR20], and in commutative algebra [HH02]. The base polytope of a polymatroids is a *generalized permutahedra* with a vertex in the origin, this yields a criptomorphism between polymatroids and generalized permutahedra [Pos09, AA17].

The easiest definition of polymatroid is a pair $P = (E, \text{cd})$ where E is a finite ground set and $\text{cd}: 2^E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a *increasing submodular*

The first author is supported by PRIN 2017YRA3LK.

function. If P is realized by a subspace arrangement, then cd is the codimension of the corresponding flat.

In the case of arrangements of subspaces, De Concini and Procesi [DCP95] have constructed a *wonderful model*, i.e. a smooth projective variety that contains the complement of the arrangement as open subset. This wonderful model $Y_{\mathcal{G}}$ is obtained from \mathbb{P}^r by a sequence of blowups along some linear subspaces, the collection of those subspaces is called *building set* \mathcal{G} . The variety $Y_{\mathcal{G}}$ is used for studying the complement of the subspace arrangement, by considering the Leray spectral sequence for the inclusion of the complement in the wonderful model $Y_{\mathcal{G}}$. The spectral sequence collapses at the third page yielding a *Leray model* (also known as Morgan algebra [Mor78]) for the rational homotopy type.

Inspired by the realizable case, we give a combinatorial definition of *building set* for polymatroids and we introduce a *Leray model* $B(P, \mathcal{G})$ for a polymatroid with building set. In the case of matroids the Leray model was recently studied by Bibby, Denham, and Feichtner [BDF20]. The last combinatorial object that we need is the \mathcal{G} -*nested set complex* $n(P, \mathcal{G})$. In the realizable case this complex remembers whether the intersection of the corresponding divisors in $Y_{\mathcal{G}}$ is non-empty.

The problem of computing the cohomology of the complement of a subspace arrangement was solved by Goresky and MacPherson [GM88] and by De Concini and Procesi [DCP95] with different techniques. Goresky and MacPherson have used the stratified Morse theory to describe the additive cohomology with integer coefficients of the complement in terms of a poset. De Concini and Procesi have provided the aforementioned Morgan algebra (alias the Leray model) that describes the ring structure of the cohomology with rational coefficients. These two results were connected by Yuzvinsky [Yuz02, Yuz99] constructing a smaller rational model CM , however this connection was found only for the maximal building set.

We extend these results to the non-realizable setting and to arbitrary building set, see Theorems 3.14 and 3.15, by using the *critical monomial algebra* $\text{CM}(P, \mathcal{G})$.

Theorem. The inclusion $\text{CM}(P, \mathcal{G}) \hookrightarrow B(P, \mathcal{G})$ is a quasi-isomorphism. Moreover

$$H^{\bullet}(B(P, \mathcal{G})) \cong H^{\bullet}(\text{CM}(P, \mathcal{G})) \cong \bigoplus_{f \in L} \bigotimes_{g \in F} \tilde{H}_{2 \text{cd}(g) - 2 - \bullet} \left(n((\hat{0}, g), \mathcal{G}) \right).$$

In the realizable case with maximal building set, the above decomposition specializes to the Goresky-MacPherson formula.

The Leray model contains a subalgebra $\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})$ as the first row of the spectral sequence, we call this algebra the *Chow ring* of the polymatroid. For subspace arrangements, $\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})$ is the cohomology (indeed the Chow ring) of the wonderful model $Y_{\mathcal{G}}$. The combinatorial

Chow ring for matroids was studied by Feichtner and Yuzvinsky [FY04] and later by Huh, Katz, and Adiprasito [Huh12, HK12, AHK18] and others.

We prove that the Chow ring $\mathrm{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})$ of a polymatroid satisfies the Kähler package (see Theorems 4.7 and 4.21).

Theorem. The ring $\mathrm{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})$ has the Poincaré duality property. Moreover, there exists a simplicial cone $\Sigma_{P, \mathcal{G}}$ contained in $\mathrm{DP}^1(P, \mathcal{G})$ such that for each $\ell \in \Sigma_{P, \mathcal{G}}$ the Hard-Lefschetz theorem and the Hodge-Riemann relations hold.

A second and easier proof of the Kähler package for matroid was given in [BHM+20a] using a semismall decomposition; the decomposition is the first step through the singular Hodge theory [BHM+20b]. In the realizable setting the decomposition is induced by a map between wonderful models that is semismall (for semismall maps in algebraic geometry see [dCM02, dCM09]). In the case of polymatroids the corresponding map is not semismall, however we obtain a relative Lefschetz decomposition of the Chow ring (see Theorem 5.4). Unfortunately this decomposition cannot prove the Kähler package.

Theorem. Let $\mathrm{DP}_{(a)}$ be the Chow ring for the polymatroids $P \setminus a$ where an element $a \in E$ is removed from the ground set. The Chow ring $\mathrm{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})$ decomposes into irreducible $\mathrm{DP}_{(a)}$ -modules as

$$\mathrm{DP}(P, \mathcal{G}) = \mathrm{DP}_{(a)} \oplus \bigoplus_{f \in S_a} \bigoplus_{k=1}^{n_f} x_f^k \mathrm{DP}_{(a)},$$

where (almost) all summands are orthogonal with respect to Poincaré pairing. Moreover, the irreducibles are explicitly described by:

$$x_f^k \mathrm{DP}_{(a)} \cong \mathrm{DP}((P \setminus a)^{f \setminus a}, (\mathcal{G} \setminus a)^{f \setminus a}) \otimes \mathrm{DP}(P_f, \mathcal{G}_f)[k].$$

The *reduced characteristic polynomial* of a polymatroid is defined by

$$\bar{\chi}_P(\lambda) = \frac{\sum_{A \subseteq E} (-1)^{|A|} \lambda^{\mathrm{cd}(E) - \mathrm{cd}(A)}}{\lambda - 1}. \quad (1)$$

As final step we relate the coefficients of the reduced characteristic polynomial to the Hodge-Riemann bilinear form (see Theorem 6.4). In order to do that, we restrict to the case of maximal building set and we fix an isomorphism $\mathrm{deg}: \mathrm{DP}^r(P, \mathcal{G}_{\max}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$.

Theorem. There exists elements $\alpha, \beta \in \mathrm{DP}^1(P, \mathcal{G}_{\max})$ such that

$$\bar{\chi}_P(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^r (-1)^i \mathrm{deg}(\alpha^i \beta^{r-i}) \lambda^i.$$

Sadly, the coefficients of the reduced characteristic polynomial do not form a log-concave sequence (see Remark 6.6). Indeed every finite sequence of non-positive integers can appear as a substring of the coefficients.

Techniques. The techniques used for our proof are various and inspired by [FY04, BDF20, Yuz02, AHK18, BHM⁺20a].

In Section 2 we make use of Gröbner basis in order to give two explicit bases of the Leray model. In Section 3, by using algebraic discrete Morse theory, we compute the cohomology of the Leray model generalizing the Goresky-MacPherson formula. In Section 4, we use an inductive procedure to prove the Kähler package. The main difference with the previous methods is that we do not have partial building sets as in [BDF20] neither order filters as in [AHK18]. Our induction is based on the cardinality of the building set and the inductive step involved completely different polymatroids. Section 5 is devoted to the proof of the relative Lefschetz decomposition using some lemmas from the previous sections. The reduced characteristic polynomial is studied in Section 6. We prove the claimed equality by showing that both polynomials satisfy the same recursion. In this proof we used the properties of the Möbius function for posets.

Finally, Section 7 contains an explicit and exhaustive example that illustrate our definitions and properties.

Acknowledgements. The authors thank Corrado De Concini for holding a mini-course on log-concavity results at winter school “Geometry, Algebra and Combinatorics of Moduli Spaces and Configurations IV”. The authors also thank the organizers of the conference for having created this opportunity.

2. THE LERAY MODEL

For general references about polymatroids we suggest [Wel76].

Definition 2.1. A *polymatroid* $P = (E, \text{cd})$ on the ground set E is a *codimension* function $\text{cd}: 2^E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ satisfying:

- (C1) $\text{cd}(\emptyset) = 0$,
- (C2) if $A \subseteq B$, then $\text{cd}(A) \leq \text{cd}(B)$, and
- (C3) if $A, B \subseteq E$, then $\text{cd}(A \cup B) + \text{cd}(A \cap B) \leq \text{cd}(A) + \text{cd}(B)$.

A polymatroid is a *matroid* if the codimension of singletons are either zero or one.

The closure of a subset $A \subseteq E$ is the subset

$$\{a \in E \mid \text{cd}(A \cup \{a\}) = \text{cd}(A)\}.$$

A *flat* is a closed set and the collection of flats forms a lattice L_P , that we call the *poset of flats*. We will use the notation $\max(X)$ for X a subset of a poset as the set of maximal elements of X .

Definition 2.2 (Combinatorial building set). Let $P = (E, \text{cd})$ be a polymatroid and let L be its lattice of flats. A subset \mathcal{G} in $L \setminus \{\hat{0}\}$ is

called a *combinatorial building set* if for any $x \in L$ the morphism of lattices:

$$\varphi_x: \prod_{y \in \max(\mathcal{G}_{\leq x})} [\hat{0}, y] \rightarrow [\hat{0}, x]$$

induced by the inclusions is an isomorphism and the equality

$$\text{cd}(x) = \sum_{y \in \max(\mathcal{G}_{\leq x})} \text{cd}(y)$$

holds.

We define $F(P, \mathcal{G}, x) = \max(\mathcal{G}_{\leq x})$ the set of \mathcal{G} -factors of x .

Definition 2.3 (\mathcal{G} -nested set complex). A subset S of \mathcal{G} is called \mathcal{G} -nested if, for any set of incomparable elements x_1, \dots, x_t in S of cardinality at least two, the join $x_1 \vee \dots \vee x_t$ is not contained in \mathcal{G} . The \mathcal{G} -nested sets form an abstract simplicial complex $n(P, \mathcal{G})$.

The following proposition summarizes the main properties of building and nested sets.

Proposition 2.4. Let P be a polymatroid with poset of flats L and \mathcal{G} be a building set. Then:

- (1) For each $g \in \mathcal{G}$, $x \in L$ with $x \geq g$, there exists a unique \mathcal{G} -factor p of x such that $p \geq g$.
- (2) If $g, h \in \mathcal{G}$ and $g \wedge h > \hat{0}$, then $g \vee h \in \mathcal{G}$.
- (3) If S is a \mathcal{G} -nested set, then the \mathcal{G} -factors of $\bigvee S$ are the maximal elements in S (i.e. $F(P, \mathcal{G}, \bigvee S) = \max(S)$).
- (4) Let S be a \mathcal{G} -nested set, the Hasse diagram of S (as subset of L) is a forest.

Proof. For (1) see [FK04] Proposition 2.5(1). For (2) see [BDF20] Proposition 2.5.3(b). For (3) see [FK04] Proposition 2.8. In order to prove (4) we suppose that the Hasse diagram Γ_S of S is not a forest. Thus there exist two incomparable elements $g, h \in S$ and $t \in S$ such that $g \wedge h \geq t \in S$; in particular $g \wedge h > \hat{0}$. By part (3) we get that $g \vee h \in \mathcal{G}$ but this contradicts the definition of nested set. Therefore Γ_S is a forest. \square

Let $P = (E, \text{cd})$ be a polymatroid, L be its poset of flats, and \mathcal{G} be a building set in L . Let $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{G}) = \mathbb{Q}[e_g, x_g \mid g \in \mathcal{G}]$ be the bigraded commutative algebra with generators e_g in bidegree $(0, 1)$ and x_g in bidegree $(2, 0)$.

The algebra is equipped with a differential d of bidegree $(2, -1)$ defined on generators by $d(e_g) = x_g$, $d(x_g) = 0$. Fix a linear extension \succ of the order on \mathcal{G} , this gives a reverse order among the e -variables and among the x -variables, i.e. $x_h \prec x_g$ and $e_h \prec e_g$ if and only if $h \succ g$. We also set $x_g \prec e_h$ for each g, h . The algebra $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{G})$ has a monomial basis given by:

$$e_T x_S^b := e_{g_1} \cdots e_{g_s} x_{h_1}^{b_1} \cdots x_{h_t}^{b_t}$$

where $T = \{g_1, \dots, g_s\}$ with $g_1 \prec g_2 \prec \dots \prec g_s$ and $S = \{h_1, \dots, h_t\}$. We define also:

$$c_g = \sum_{\substack{h \in \mathcal{G} \\ h \geq g}} x_h.$$

Definition 2.5 (The Leray model of a polymatroid). Let $I(\mathcal{G})$ be the ideal of $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{G})$ generated by

- (i) $e_T x_S$ whenever $S \cup T \notin n(P, \mathcal{G})$,
- (ii) $e_T x_S c_g^b$ whenever $S, T \subseteq \mathcal{G}$, $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $b \geq \text{cd}(g) - \text{cd}(\bigvee(S \cup T)_{<g})$.

The ideal $I(\mathcal{G})$ is preserved by the differential d , so the quotient

$$B(P, \mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{G})/I(\mathcal{G})$$

is a bigraded differential algebra, called the *Leray model* of the polymatroid.

Remark 2.6. Let $e_T x_S c_g^b$ be a monomial of type (ii) and let

$$S' = S \cap \max(S \cup T)_{<g} \quad \text{and} \quad T' = \max(S \cup T)_{<g} \setminus S.$$

The monomial $e_{T'} x_{S'} c_g^b$ divides the monomial $e_T x_S c_g^b$. Thus, when we consider a monomial of type (ii) we can always assume that $S \cap T = \emptyset$, $S \cup T$ is a antichain and $\bigvee(S \cup T) < g$.

Theorem 2.7. The generators of type (i) and (ii) of the ideal $I(\mathcal{G})$ of Definition 2.5 form a Gröbner basis with respect to the deg-lex order.

Proof. We adapt the method used in [FY04, Theorem 2] and in [BDF20, Theorem 5.3.1]. We are fixing a linear extension of the order on \mathcal{G} with $x_g \prec e_h$ for each g, h . With this we consider the deg-lex monomial order on $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{G})$. We explicitly compute S -polynomials.

Case (i)-(i): Since relations type (i) are monomials the S -polynomials will be zero.

Case (i)-(ii): Now we consider $f_1 = e_T x_S$ of type (i) and $f_2 = e_A x_B c_g^b$ of type (ii). We can assume that $\bigvee(A \cup B) < g$ (see Remark 2.6). Let $U = T \cup A$, $V = B \cup S \setminus \{g\}$, therefore the S -polynomial is

$$S(f_1, f_2) = e_U x_V x_g^b - e_U x_V c_g^b = e_U x_V (x_g^b - c_g^b).$$

If $g \notin S$, we have that $S \subseteq V$ and therefore

$$S(f_1, f_2) = \pm e_{A \setminus T} e_T x_S x_{V \setminus S} (x_g^b - c_g^b)$$

is divisible by $e_T x_S$.

Then assume $g \in S$, since $S \cup T$ is not nested we have that $U \cup V \cup \{g\}$ is not nested. If $U \cup V$ is not nested, then $S(f_1, f_2)$ would be divisible by $e_U x_V$.

So assume $U \cup V$ is nested, (thus we have that $g \notin U \cup V$) since $U \cup V \cup \{g\}$ is not nested the S -polynomial modulo $e_U x_V x_g$ became

$$S(f_1, f_2) \equiv e_U x_V \left(\sum_{f > g} x_f \right)^b.$$

The set $U \cup V \cup \{g\}$ contains a non trivial antichain Y whose join $\bigvee Y = y$ is in \mathcal{G} and Y must contain g since $U \cup V$ is nested; let $y' = \bigvee (Y \setminus \{g\})$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} b &= \text{cd}(g) - \text{cd} \left(\bigvee_{\substack{l \in A \cup B \\ l < g}} l \right) \\ &\geq \text{cd}(g \vee y') - \text{cd} \left(\bigvee_{\substack{l \in A \cup B \\ l < g}} l \vee y' \right) \\ &\geq \text{cd}(y) - \text{cd} \left(\bigvee_{\substack{l \in U \cup V \\ l < y}} l \right) = b' \end{aligned}$$

and so $e_U x_V c_y^b$ is a relation of type (ii). We claim that modulo relations of type (i)

$$S(f_1, f_2) \equiv e_U x_V c_y^b.$$

To obtain this, we will show that if $f \in \mathcal{G}$ with $f > g$ and $f \not\leq y$, then $U \cup V \cup \{f\}$ is not nested. Suppose that $U \cup V \cup \{f\}$ is nested and consider the following antichain $Y' = \max(Y \setminus \{g\} \cup \{f\}) \subseteq U \cup V \cup \{f\}$. The set Y' is nested and by Proposition 2.4 that the \mathcal{G} -factors of $\bigvee (Y \setminus \{g\} \cup \{f\})$ are exactly the elements of $Y' = \{y_1, \dots, y_k, f\}$. We have

$$\bigvee (Y \setminus \{g\} \cup \{f\}) = y' \vee f \geq y' \vee g = y.$$

By definition of \mathcal{G} -factor we have two cases:

- $y \leq y_i$ for a certain i . But this is impossible since $y_i < y$;
- $y \leq f$ contrary to the assumption $f \not\leq y$.

Thus, $U \cup V \cup \{f\}$ is not nested and $S(f_1, f_2)$ reduces to zero.

Case (ii)-(ii): Let $f_1 = e_T x_S c_g^d$ and $f_2 = e_A x_B c_h^f$ be two relations of type (ii). We may assume $\bigvee (S \cup T) < g$ and $\bigvee (A \cup B) < h$ (see Remark 2.6). We have the following cases:

First $g = h$ and $d \leq f$, then the S -polynomial is

$$S(f_1, f_2) = e_{T \cup A} x_{S \cup B} c_g^d (x_g^{f-d} - c_g^{f-d});$$

which is divisible by $e_T x_S c_g^d$.

Second $g \neq h$, $g \notin B$, $h \notin S$, we also assume that $h \succ g$. The S -polynomial is

$$S(f_1, f_2) = e_{S \cup A} x_{T \cup B} (x_h^f c_g^d - x_g^d c_h^f).$$

Let $y = e_{T \cup A} x_{S \cup B} c_g^d (c_h^f - x_h^f)$, which is divisible by $e_T x_S c_g^d$ and has a leading term smaller or equal to that of $S(f_1, f_2)$. The remainder is

$$S(f_1, f_2) + y = e_{T \cup A} x_{S \cup B} (c_g^d - x_g^d) c_h^f,$$

it is divisible by $e_A x_B c_h^f$, and reduces to zero.

Finally, assume $g \neq h$ and $g \in B$, by Remark 2.6 we must have $g \prec h$ and $h \notin S$. Let $U = T \cup A$ and $V = S \cup B \setminus \{g\}$, the S -polynomial is

$$S(f_1, f_2) = e_U x_V (x_h^f c_g^d - x_g^d c_h^f).$$

Let $y = e_U x_V c_g^d (c_h^f - x_h^f)$, which is divisible by $e_T x_S c_g^d$ and has a leading term smaller or equal to that of S . It remains to verify that

$$S(f_1, f_2) + y = e_U x_V (c_g^d - x_g^d) c_h^f$$

reduces to zero. First, through division by $e_A x_B c_h^f$, since $g \in B$ we have

$$S(f_1, f_2) + y \equiv e_U x_V \left(\sum_{k>g} x_k \right)^d c_h^f. \quad (2)$$

We claim that for any $k > g$, $k \not\prec h$ we have

$$e_U x_V x_k c_h^f \equiv e_U x_V x_k c_{h \vee k}^f \equiv 0$$

modulo relations of type (i) and (ii). For the first claim, if $p \geq h$ but $p \not\prec h \vee k$ then $\{p, k\}$ is not nested by Proposition 2.4 and we can divide by the relations of type (i) $x_h x_p$. The last claim follows since $h \vee k \in \mathcal{G}$ by Proposition 2.4 and

$$\begin{aligned} f &\geq \text{cd}(h) - \text{cd}(\bigvee(A \cup B)) \\ &\geq \text{cd}(h \vee k) - \text{cd}(\bigvee(U \cup V \cup \{k\})). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the element in eq. (2) reduces to

$$S(f_1, f_2) + y \equiv e_U x_V c_h^{d+f}.$$

Then since $d + f \geq \text{cd}(h) - \text{cd}(\bigvee(U \cup V \cup \{k\}))$ we may divide by $e_U x_V c_h^{d+f}$ and reduce to zero.

This completes the proof. \square

Corollary 2.8. The algebra $B(P, \mathcal{G})$ has an additive basis given by the monomials $e_T x_S^b$ for which $S \cup T \in n(P, \mathcal{G})$ and for each $s \in S$ we have that $0 < b(s) < \text{cd}(s) - \text{cd}(\bigvee(S \cup T)_{<s})$.

Proof. An additive basis for the algebra $B(P, \mathcal{G})$ is given by all the monomials which are not divisible by the initial monomials of the Gröbner basis. The proof follows immediately. \square

Theorem 2.9. The morphism

$$\varphi: \Lambda[\tau_g \mid g \in \mathcal{G}] \otimes \mathbb{Q}[\sigma_g \mid g \in \mathcal{G}] \rightarrow B(P, \mathcal{G})$$

defined by $\varphi(\tau_g) = \sum_{h \geq g} e_h$ and by $\varphi(\sigma_g) = \sum_{h \geq g} x_h$, is surjective with kernel generated by:

- (i) $\prod_{t \in T} (\tau_t - \tau_g) \prod_{s \in S} (\sigma_s - \sigma_g)$ for $S \cup T$ a non-trivial antichain and $g = \bigvee (S \cup T) \in \mathcal{G}$,
- (ii) $\prod_{t \in T} (\tau_t - \tau_g) \prod_{s \in S} (\sigma_s - \sigma_g) \sigma_g^b$ for $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $b = \text{cd}(g) - \text{cd}(\bigvee (S \cup T)_{<g})$.

Lemma 2.10. Let $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\} \subset \mathcal{G}$ such that $\bigvee S \leq g$, set $b = \text{cd}(g) - \text{cd}(\bigvee S)$. Consider a set $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\} \subset \mathcal{G}$ such that $a_i \geq s_i$ and $a_i \not\geq g$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then

$$y_A c_g^b = 0,$$

where y_{a_i} is equal to e_{a_i} or x_{a_i} .

Proof. Define the element $h = \bigvee A \vee g$, we first prove the equality $y_A \sigma_g^b = y_A \sigma_h^b$ and then $y_A \sigma_h^b = 0$.

We want to show that $h \in \mathcal{G}$. Let $h' \in \mathcal{G}$ be the unique \mathcal{G} -factor of h such that $h' \geq g$. For each a_i we have $h' \wedge a_i \geq s_i$ and so $a_i \vee h' \in \mathcal{G}$. By maximality of h' we have $a_i \leq h'$ for all i . Therefore $h = h' \in \mathcal{G}$.

Firstly, let $g' \in \mathcal{G}$ be any element such that $g' \geq g$ and $g' \not\geq h$. Suppose that $A \cup \{g'\}$ is a \mathcal{G} -nested set. Then the \mathcal{G} -factors of $h \vee g'$ are the maximal elements of $A \cup \{g'\}$ by Proposition 2.4. So there exists an element in $A \cup \{g'\}$ bigger or equal to h , this is impossible since $g' \not\geq h$ and $a_i \not\geq g$. It follows that $A \cup \{g'\}$ is not \mathcal{G} -nested and $y_A x_{g'} = 0$.

Finally, we show that $y_A \sigma_h^b = 0$. Indeed, $b \geq \text{cd}(g) - \text{cd}(g \wedge \bigvee A)$ that is bigger than $\text{cd}(h) - \text{cd}(\bigvee A)$ by submodularity of cd . Applying the relation Theorem 2.7 we complete the proof. \square

Lemma 2.11. The elements $\prod_{t \in T} (\tau_t - \tau_g) \prod_{s \in S} (\sigma_s - \sigma_g) \sigma_g^b$ for $g \in \mathcal{G}$, and $b = \text{cd}(g) - \text{cd}(\bigvee (S \cup T)_{<g})$ belong to the kernel of φ .

Proof. From Remark 2.6 we may assume that $S \cap T = \emptyset$, $S \sqcup T$ being an antichain, and $\bigvee (S \cup T) \leq g$.

We have

$$\varphi\left(\prod_{t \in T} (\tau_t - \tau_g) \prod_{s \in S} (\sigma_s - \sigma_g) \sigma_g^b\right) = \sum_{A, B} e_A x_B \left(\sum_{l \geq g} x_l\right)^b,$$

where the sum is taken over the sets $A = (a_i)_i$ and $B = (b_j)_j$ such that $a_i \geq t_i$, $b_j \geq s_j$, $a_i \not\geq g$, and $b_j \not\geq g$. Each term $e_A x_B \left(\sum_{l \geq g} x_l\right)^b$ is zero by Lemma 2.10. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.9. Let \prec be a reverse linear extension of the order on \mathcal{G} with $x_g \prec e_h$ and $\sigma_g \prec \tau_h$ for each g, h . Now we consider the basis

formed respectively by the σ_g, τ_h and by the x_g, e_h ordered with \prec ; with respect of these two basis the matrix associated to the morphism φ is upper unitriangular and therefore invertible. It follows that the map φ is surjective.

We want to prove that $\ker \varphi$ is generated by relation of type (i) and (ii) of Theorem 2.9. From Lemma 2.11 we know that elements of the form (ii) belong to $\ker \varphi$. The relations (i) are a particular case of relations (ii) with $b = 0$. Let J be the ideal generated by relation of type (i) and (ii), we denote also by $\text{in}(J)$ the initial ideal of J . It suffices to prove that

$$\dim \mathcal{C}/\text{in}(J) \leq \dim \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{G})/\text{in}(I(\mathcal{G}))$$

where $\mathcal{C} = \Lambda[\tau_g \mid g \in \mathcal{G}] \otimes \mathbb{Q}[\sigma_g \mid g \in \mathcal{G}]$. Let $K \subseteq \text{in}(I)$ be the ideal generated by the leading monomial of relation of type (i) and (ii), since

$$\dim \mathcal{C}/K \geq \dim \mathcal{C}/\text{in}(J)$$

it suffices to check that

$$\dim \mathcal{C}/K = \dim \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{G})/\text{in}(I(\mathcal{G})). \quad (3)$$

The leading monomials of relation type (i) are of the form $\tau_T \sigma_S$ where $S \cup T$ is not \mathcal{G} -nested; the leading monomials of relation type (ii) are of the form $\tau_T \sigma_S \sigma_g^b$ whenever $S, T \subseteq \mathcal{G}$, $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $b = \text{cd}(g) - \text{cd}(\bigvee(S \cup T)_{<g})$. The monomials in \mathcal{C} , which are not divisible by the these two type of leading monomials, are of the form $\tau_T \sigma_S^m$ with $S \cup T \in n(P, \mathcal{G})$ and for each $s \in S$ we have that $0 < m(s) < \text{cd}(s) - \text{cd}(\bigvee(S \cup T)_{<s})$. Hence eq. (3) follows. Since the map φ is surjective it is also injective; and the initial ideal $\text{in}(J)$ is equal to K . Therefore, relation type (i) and (ii) form a Gröbner basis for $\ker \varphi$. \square

From the proof of Theorem 2.9 we obtain also the following corollary:

Corollary 2.12. The set of monomials $\tau_T \sigma_S^m$ with $S \cup T \in n(P, \mathcal{G})$ and $0 < m(s) < \text{cd}(s) - \text{cd}(\bigvee(S \cup T)_{<s})$ is an additive basis of $B(P, \mathcal{G})$. \square

3. GENERALIZED GORESKEY-MACPHERSON FORMULA

In this section we generalize the Goresky-MacPherson formula to the non-realizable case and to arbitrary building set. The choice of the minimal building set yield a significantly smaller nested set complex and it can be useful in practical computations. Other generalization of this formula can be found in [BLZ15, Des18, MP20].

3.1. Critical monomials.

Definition 3.1. A *standard monomial* $e_T x_S$ (resp. $\tau_T \sigma_S$) is a monomial that appears in the basis given by Corollary 2.8 (resp. by Corollary 2.12).

For the sake of notation for any standard monomial $\tau_T \sigma_S^b$ we extend the function b by setting $b(g) = 0$ for $g \notin S$.

Definition 3.2. Let $\tau_T \sigma_S^b$ be a standard monomial, an element $g \in \mathcal{G}$ is called *critical* with respect to the monomial $\tau_T \sigma_S^b$ if $g \in T$ and $b(g) = \text{cd}(g) - \text{cd}(\bigvee(S \cup T)_{<g}) - 1$. If every element of $S \cup T$ is critical with respect to $\tau_T \sigma_S^b$ then the monomial $\tau_T \sigma_S^b$ is called *critical*.

Notice that if the monomial $\tau_T \sigma_S^b$ is critical we have that $S \subseteq T$ and so the critical monomial is uniquely determine by T .

Definition 3.3. The *critical monomial* associated with $T \in n(P, \mathcal{G})$ is

$$c\mu(T) = \tau_T \sigma_S^b,$$

where $S = \{t \in T \mid \text{cd}(t) - \text{cd}(\bigvee(S_{<t})) > 1\}$ and $b(s) = \text{cd}(s) - \text{cd}(\bigvee(T_{<s})) - 1$ for all $s \in S$.

Lemma 3.4. For every critical monomial $c\mu(T)$ we have

$$d(c\mu(T)) = \sum_{t \in T \setminus \max(T)} (-1)^{|T \setminus t|} c\mu(T \setminus \{t\}).$$

Proof. Let $c\mu(T) = \tau_T \sigma_S^b$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(c\mu(T)) &= \sum_{t \in T} (-1)^{|T \setminus t|} \tau_{T \setminus \{t\}} \sigma_S^b \sigma_t \\ &= \sum_{t \in T \setminus \min(T)} (-1)^{|T \setminus t|} \tau_{T \setminus \{t\}} \sigma_S^b \sigma_t, \end{aligned}$$

because if $t \in \min(T)$ then $b(t) = \text{cd}(t) - 1$ and so $\sigma_t^{\text{cd}(t)} = 0$.

Fix $t \in T \setminus \min(T)$, the set $R = \max(T_{<t})$ is nonempty. By using relation (ii) of Theorem 2.9 and the fact that $\tau_t^2 = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_R \sigma_R^b \sigma_t^{b(t)+1} &= \sum_{r \in R} (-1)^{|R \setminus r|} \tau_{R \setminus \{r\}} \tau_t \sigma_R^b \sigma_t^{b(t)+1} \\ &= \sum_{r \in R} (-1)^{|R \setminus r|} \tau_{R \setminus \{r\}} \tau_t \sigma_{R \setminus \{r\}}^b \sigma_t^{b(t)+b(r)+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we used

$$0 = \tau_t(\sigma_r - \sigma_t) \sigma_t^{b(t)+1} \prod_{l \neq r} (\tau_l - \tau_t) = \tau_t \tau_{R \setminus \{r\}} (\sigma_r - \sigma_t) \sigma_t^{b(t)+1}.$$

Notice that $T \in n(P, \mathcal{G})$ implies $\text{cd}(\bigvee R) = \text{cd}(\bigvee(R \setminus \{r\})) + \text{cd}(r)$ and $\text{cd}(\bigvee(R \setminus \{r\}) \vee \bigvee(T_{<r})) = \text{cd}(\bigvee(R \setminus \{r\})) + \text{cd}(\bigvee(T_{<r}))$; so $b_{T \setminus \{r\}}(t) = b_T(t) + b_T(r) + 1$. Therefore

$$\tau_R \sigma_R^b \sigma_t^{b(t)+1} = \sum_{r \in R} (-1)^{|R \setminus r|} c\mu((R \setminus \{r\}) \cup \{t\})$$

and finally:

$$\begin{aligned} d(c\mu(T)) &= \sum_{t \in T \setminus \min(T)} \sum_{r \in \max(T_{<t})} (-1)^{|T_{<r}|} \mu(T \setminus \{r\}) \\ &= \sum_{r \in T \setminus \max(T)} (-1)^{|T_{<r}|} \mu(T \setminus \{r\}), \end{aligned}$$

because T is a forest by Proposition 2.4. This concludes the proof. \square

We want to apply algebraic Morse theory to the complex $B(P, \mathcal{G})$. We refer to [JW09] for basic definitions and properties of algebraic Morse theory.

We define the following *matching* \mathcal{M} : for each non-critical monomial $\tau_T \sigma_S^b$ let $g \in S \cup T$ be the smaller (with respect to $<$) non-critical element. If g belongs to T , then the pair $(\tau_T \sigma_S^b, \tau_{T \setminus \{g\}} \sigma_S^b \sigma_g)$ is in \mathcal{M} .

Lemma 3.5. The set \mathcal{M} is a matching. Moreover a monomial is critical if and only if it is critical for the matching \mathcal{M} .

Proof. We need to check that each non-critical monomial appears exactly once in \mathcal{M} and that all monomials in \mathcal{M} are non-critical.

By definition if the monomial $\tau_T \sigma_S^b$ appears in the first position in \mathcal{M} is non-critical. Moreover $\tau_{T \setminus \{g\}} \sigma_S^b \sigma_g$ is non-critical because $S \cup \{g\} \not\subseteq T \setminus \{g\}$. So every monomial in the matching is non-critical.

Viceversa, if $\tau_T \sigma_S^b$ is a non-critical monomial let g be the minimal non-critical element in $S \cup T$. If $g \in T$ then $\tau_T \sigma_S^b$ appears in the matching (in the first position). Otherwise, $g \in S \setminus T$ so the monomial $\tau_T \tau_g \frac{\sigma_S^b}{\sigma_g}$ is basic and non-critical. Notice that an element $f \in \mathcal{G}$ is critical for $\tau_T \sigma_S^b$ if and only if it is critical for $\tau_T \tau_g \frac{\sigma_S^b}{\sigma_g}$. Therefore the pair $(\tau_T \tau_g \frac{\sigma_S^b}{\sigma_g}, \tau_T \sigma_S^b)$ is in \mathcal{M} . \square

Definition 3.6. Given a standard monomial $\tau_T \sigma_S^b$ we define $m(T, S, b)$ as the multiset $\{g^{a(g)} \mid g \in \mathcal{G}\}$ where $a(g)$ is the sum of the exponents of τ_g and σ_g in the monomial $\tau_T \sigma_S^b$. Moreover, we order these multisets lexicographically using the reverse order on \mathcal{G} .

As an example, if $h < g$ then $h < g$ and $\{h^2\} \succ \{h, g\}$.

Definition 3.7. Let G be the directed graph whose vertices are the standard monomials with a directed edge from $\tau_T \sigma_S^b$ to $\tau_{T'} \sigma_{S'}^{b'}$ if the monomial $\tau_{T'} \sigma_{S'}^{b'}$ appears with non zero coefficients in $d(\tau_T \sigma_S^b)$.

Let $G_{\mathcal{M}}$ be the directed graph G with all directed edges in \mathcal{M} reversed.

Proposition 3.8. The matching \mathcal{M} is a Morse matching.

Proof. We need to show that the graph $G_{\mathcal{M}}$ is acyclic.

Although m is not a term order (because $m(\tau_g) = m(\sigma_g)$) it has the property that for any relation of Theorem 2.9

$$\prod_{t \in T} (\tau_t - \tau_g) \prod_{s \in S} (\sigma_s - \sigma_g) \sigma_g^b \quad (4)$$

with $\bigvee(S \cup T) \leq g$ the monomial $\tau_T \sigma_S \sigma_g^b$ has $m(T, S, b)$ strictly bigger than any other monomial in the expansion of eq. (4). Moreover m is multiplicative.

First notice that:

$$\begin{aligned} d(\tau_T \sigma_S^b) &= \sum_{g \in T} (-1)^{|T \prec g|} \tau_{T \setminus g} \sigma_S^b \sigma_g \\ &= \sum_{\substack{g \in T \\ g \text{ non-critical}}} (-1)^{|T \prec g|} \tau_{T \setminus g} \sigma_S^b \sigma_g + \sum_{\substack{g \in T \\ g \text{ critical}}} (-1)^{|T \prec g|} \tau_{T \setminus g} \sigma_S^b \sigma_g \\ &= \sum_{\substack{g \in T \\ g \text{ non-critical}}} (-1)^{|T \prec g|} \tau_{T \setminus g} \sigma_S^b \sigma_g + \sum_{\substack{\text{some } T', S', b' \\ m(T', S', b') \prec m(T, S, b)}} \alpha_{T', S', b'} \tau_{T'} \sigma_{S'}^{b'}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha_{T', S', b'}$ are some coefficients. In the last equality we used the relations of Theorem 2.9 in order to write the non-standard monomials $\tau_{T \setminus g} \sigma_S^b \sigma_g$ as linear combination of standard ones. Notice also that if the pair $(\tau_T \sigma_S^b, \tau_{T \setminus g} \sigma_{S \cup g}^{b'})$ is in \mathcal{M} then $m(T, S, b) = m(T \setminus g, S \cup \{g\}, b')$. This implies that the function m is weakly decreasing on every direct path in $G_{\mathcal{M}}$, so it is constant on every directed cycle.

It is a classical fact that it is enough to prove that there are no alternating directed cycles, i.e. cycles such that for every pair of consecutive edges exactly one is in \mathcal{M} . Suppose that there exists a directed cycle and consider two consecutive edges. We can assume that the first one is in \mathcal{M} and the second one is not. The first edge is $(\tau_T \sigma_S^b, \tau_T \tau_g \frac{\sigma_S^b}{\sigma_g})$ for some non-critical monomial $\tau_T \sigma_S^b$ with g the smaller non-critical element and $g \in S \setminus T$. The second edge is $(\tau_T \tau_g \frac{\sigma_S^b}{\sigma_g}, \tau_{T'} \sigma_{S'}^{b'})$ for some standard monomial $\tau_{T'} \sigma_{S'}^{b'}$. Since the value of m is constant on the cycle we have that $\tau_{T'} \sigma_{S'}^{b'} = \tau_{T \setminus \{f\}} \tau_g \frac{\sigma_S^b}{\sigma_g} \sigma_f$ for some $f \in T$ non-critical for the monomial $\tau_T \tau_g \frac{\sigma_S^b}{\sigma_g}$. This two edges are shown below.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \tau_T \tau_g \frac{\sigma_S^b}{\sigma_g} & \\ & \nearrow \quad \searrow & \\ \tau_T \sigma_S^b & & \tau_{T \setminus \{f\}} \tau_g \frac{\sigma_S^b}{\sigma_g} \sigma_f \end{array}$$

The sets of critical elements for $\tau_T \sigma_S^b$ and for $\tau_T \tau_g \frac{\sigma_S^b}{\sigma_g}$ coincide, so both g and f are non-critical for $\tau_T \tau_g \frac{\sigma_S^b}{\sigma_g}$. By minimality of g we have $g \prec f$, so $T \prec (T \setminus \{f\}) \cup \{g\} = T'$.

We have proved that in every alternating path after two steps the set indexing the variable τ strictly increases. Therefore there are no alternating cycles. \square

3.2. Multiplicative structure. Let (g_1, g_2, \dots, g_k) be a list of elements in \mathcal{G} and recall that \prec is a linear extension of the order on \mathcal{G} . Define

$$\tilde{\lambda}(g_1, g_2, \dots, g_k) = (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k)$$

where f_i is the unique \mathcal{G} -factor of $g_1 \vee g_2 \vee \dots \vee g_i$ bigger than g_i guaranteed by Proposition 2.4. Define $\lambda(g_1, g_2, \dots, g_k) = \tilde{\lambda}(g_1, g_2, \dots, g_k)$ if (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k) form a \mathcal{G} -nested set and $f_i \prec f_{i+1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, k-1$. Set $\lambda(g_1, g_2, \dots, g_k) = 0$ otherwise. We will use the convention that $c\mu(0) = 0$.

Remark 3.9. Let $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_k$ be a permutation, T_1 and T_2 be two \mathcal{G} -nested sets. The set $\lambda(\pi(T_1 \cup T_2))$ is zero if there exist $t, t' \in T_1 \cup T_2$ such that $t < t'$ and $\pi(t')$ precedes $\pi(t)$. In particular if $\lambda(\pi(T_1 \cup T_2)) \neq 0$ then the last element of $\pi(T_1 \cup T_2)$ belongs to $\max(T_1 \cup T_2)$.

In the particular case of \mathcal{G} maximal building set, T_i are flags and $\lambda(\pi(T \cup S))$ is zero if π is not a $(|T_1|, |T_2|)$ -shuffles.

Proposition 3.10. Let T_1 and T_2 be nested sets. If $\text{cd}(\vee(T_1 \cup T_2)) < \text{cd}(\vee T_1) + \text{cd}(\vee T_2)$, then $c\mu(T_1)c\mu(T_2) = 0$. Otherwise

$$c\mu(T_1)c\mu(T_2) = \sum_{\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{|T_1 \cup T_2|}} \text{sgn}(\pi) c\mu(\lambda\pi(T_1 \cup T_2)).$$

Before the proof of Proposition 3.10 we need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.11. Let T_1 and T_2 be nested sets such that $\text{cd}(\vee T_1) + \text{cd}(\vee T_2) = \text{cd}(\vee(T_1 \cup T_2))$ and $\vee(T_1 \cup T_2) \notin \mathcal{G}$. Then $T_1 \cup T_2$ is \mathcal{G} -nested and

$$c\mu(T_1)c\mu(T_2) = (-1)^s c\mu(T_1 \cup T_2),$$

where s is the length of the permutation that reorder T_1 and T_2 . Moreover:

$$c\mu(T_1)c\mu(T_2) = \sum_{\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{|T_1 \cup T_2|}} \text{sgn}(\pi) c\mu(\lambda\pi(T_1 \cup T_2)).$$

Proof. Notice that $[\hat{0}, \vee(T_1 \cup T_2)] = [\hat{0}, \vee T_1] \times [\hat{0}, \vee T_2]$ with the same codimension. Therefore $T_1 \cup T_2$ is \mathcal{G} -nested and

$$c\mu(T_1)c\mu(T_2) = (-1)^s c\mu(T_1 \cup T_2).$$

Since each subset of $T_1 \cup T_2$ is \mathcal{G} -nested, for each $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{|T_1 \cup T_2|}$ we have $\tilde{\lambda}\pi(T_1 \cup T_2) = \pi(T_1 \cup T_2)$ by (3) of Proposition 2.4. Hence $\lambda\pi(T_1 \cup T_2)$

is zero for all permutation π except for the unique permutation that reorder T_1 and T_2 . \square

Lemma 3.12. Suppose that T is a \mathcal{G} -nested set and $g \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\text{cd}(g \vee \vee T) - \text{cd}(\vee T) = \text{cd}(g) - \text{cd}(\vee T_{<g})$. Set $b = \text{cd}(g) - \text{cd}(\vee T_{<g}) - 1$, then

$$c\mu(T)\tau_g\sigma_g^b = \sum_{\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{|T|+1}} \text{sgn}(\pi)c\mu(\lambda\pi(T \cup \{g\})), \quad (5)$$

where the sum is taken over all permutations of $T \cup \{g\}$.

Proof. We prove the statement by induction on $|T|$.

If $T \cup \{g\}$ is nested then both side of eq. (5) agree with $c\mu(T \cup \{g\})$. Let $f = g \vee \vee T$, if $f \notin \mathcal{G}$ then there exist T' and T'' nonempty \mathcal{G} -nested sets such that $T \cup \{g\} = T' \sqcup T''$ and $[\hat{0}, f] = [\hat{0}, \vee T'] \text{ times } [\hat{0}, \vee T'']$. Assume that $g \in T'$ and set $t' = |T'|$ and $t'' = |T''|$. By using the inductive hypothesis and Lemma 3.11, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c\mu(T)\tau_g\sigma_g^b &= (-1)^s c\mu(T'')c\mu(T' \setminus \{g\})\tau_g\sigma_g^b \\ &= (-1)^s c\mu(T'') \sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{S}_{t''}} \text{sgn}(\alpha)c\mu(\lambda\alpha(T'')) \\ &= \sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{S}_{t''}} (-1)^{s+s_\alpha} \text{sgn}(\alpha)c\mu(T'' \sqcup \lambda\alpha(T')) \\ &= \sum_{\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{t'+t''}} \text{sgn}(\pi)c\mu(\lambda\pi(T \cup \{g\})), \end{aligned}$$

where s corresponds to the permutation that reorder T'' and $T' \setminus \{g\}$, s_α to the permutation that reorder T'' and $\alpha(T')$.

Now suppose that $f \in \mathcal{G}$ and let $Y = \{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_k\} = \max(g \vee \vee T)$ numbered such that $g = g_k$. For the sake of notation set $m(g_k) = m$. We assume $g \succ t$ for all $t \in T$, the general case differs only by a sign. We have $\prod_{i=1}^k (\tau_{g_i} - \tau_f) = 0$ and so

$$\tau_Y = \sum_{i=1}^k (-1)^{k-i} \tau_{Y \setminus \{g_i\} \cup \{f\}}.$$

Set $b(g_i) = \text{cd}(g_i) - \text{cd}(\vee T_{<g_i}) - 1$, for all $i \leq k$ we have

$$(\sigma_{g_i}^{b(g_i)} - \sigma_f^{b(g_i)})\tau_f \prod_{j \neq i} (\tau_{g_j} - \tau_f) = 0,$$

so $\tau_{Y \setminus \{g_i\} \cup \{f\}} \sigma_{g_i}^{b(g_i)} = \tau_{Y \setminus \{g_i\} \cup \{f\}} \sigma_f^{b(g_i)}$. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} c\mu(T)\tau_g\sigma_g^b &= (-1)^s c\mu(T \setminus Y) \prod_{i=1}^k \tau_{g_i} \sigma_{g_i}^{b(g_i)} \\ &= (-1)^s c\mu(T \setminus Y) \sum_{i=1}^k (-1)^{k-i} \prod_{j \neq i} \tau_{g_j} \sigma_{g_j}^{b(g_j)} \tau_f \sigma_f^{b(g_i)} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (-1)^{t_i+1} c\mu(T \setminus \{g_i\}) \tau_g \sigma_g^b \tau_f \sigma_f^{b(g_i)} + c\mu(T \cup \{f\}),$$

where s (and t_i) is the length of the permutation that reorder $T \setminus Y$ and $Y \setminus \{g\}$ (respectively $T \setminus \{g_i\}$ and $\{g_i\}$). The last addendum corresponds to the identity permutation. Apply the inductive hypothesis on the terms $c\mu(T \setminus \{g_i\}) \tau_g \sigma_g^b$ so that

$$(-1)^{t_i+1} c\mu(T \setminus \{g_i\}) \tau_g \sigma_g^b \tau_f \sigma_f^{b(g_i)} = \sum_{\pi} \operatorname{sgn}(\pi) c\mu(\lambda\pi(T \cup \{g\}))$$

where the sum is taken over all permutations π in $\mathfrak{S}_{|T|+1}$ that sends the element g_i in the last position. Since every π such that $\lambda\pi(T \cup \{g\}) \neq 0$ have in the last position an element in $\max(T \cup \{g\})$, the result follows. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.10. For the first part notice that $c\mu(T_i)$ is in bidegree $(2(\operatorname{cd}(\bigvee T_i) - |T_i|), |T_i|)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Let $f = \bigvee(T_1 \cup T_2)$, the product $c\mu(T_1)c\mu(T_2)$ can be rewritten as sum of standard monomials using only relations of type

$$\prod_{s \in S} (\tau_s - \tau_g) \prod_{t \in T} (\sigma_t - \sigma_g) \sigma_g^b$$

for $\bigvee(S \cup T) \leq g \leq f$. The standard monomials $\tau_S \sigma_T^b$ with $\bigvee(S \cup T) \leq f$ as bidegree at most $(2(\operatorname{cd}(f) - |S|), |S|)$. Therefore, if $\operatorname{cd}(f) < \operatorname{cd}(\bigvee T_1) + \operatorname{cd}(\bigvee T_2)$ we have $c\mu(T_1)c\mu(T_2) = 0$ by degree argument.

We prove the second statement by induction on $|T_2|$. The base case $T_2 = \emptyset$ is trivial. If $\bigvee T_2 \notin \mathcal{G}$ then there exist T_3 and T_4 nonempty \mathcal{G} -nested sets such that $T_2 = T_3 \sqcup T_4$ and $[\hat{0}, \bigvee T_2] = [\hat{0}, \bigvee T_3] \times [\hat{0}, \bigvee T_4]$. Applying Lemma 3.11 and the inductive step we have

$$\begin{aligned} c\mu(T_1)c\mu(T_2) &= (-1)^s c\mu(T_1)c\mu(T_3)c\mu(T_4) \\ &= (-1)^s \sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{S}_{t_1+t_3}} \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha) c\mu(\lambda\alpha(T_1 \cup T_3)) c\mu(T_4) \\ &= (-1)^s \sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{S}_{t_1+t_3}} \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha) \sum_{\beta \in \mathfrak{S}_{t_1+t_2}} \operatorname{sgn}(\beta) c\mu(\lambda\beta(\alpha(T_1 \cup T_3), T_4)) \\ &= \sum_{\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{t_1+t_2}} \operatorname{sgn}(\pi) c\mu(\lambda\pi(T_1 \cup T_2)), \end{aligned}$$

where $t_i = |T_i|$.

Now we deal with the case $\bigvee T_2 \in \mathcal{G}$. Let $g = \max T_2 \in \mathcal{G}$, $T'_2 = T_2 \setminus \{g\}$, and $m = \operatorname{cd}(g) - \operatorname{cd}(T'_2) - 1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} c\mu(T_1)c\mu(T_2) &= c\mu(T_1)c\mu(T'_2) \tau_g \sigma_g^m \\ &= \sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{S}_{t_1+t_2-1}} \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha) c\mu(\lambda\alpha(T_1 \cup T'_2)) \tau_g \sigma_g^m \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{S}_{t_1+t_2-1}} \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha) \sum_{\beta \in \mathfrak{S}_{t_1+t_2}} \operatorname{sgn}(\beta) c\mu(\lambda\beta(\alpha(T_1 \cup T'_2) \cup \{g\})) \\
&= \sum_{\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{t_1+t_2}} \operatorname{sgn}(\pi) c\mu(\lambda\pi(T_1 \cup T_2)),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the inductive hypothesis on T_1 and T'_2 and Lemma 3.12 on $\alpha(T_1 \cup T'_2)$ and $\{g\}$. \square

Definition 3.13. Let $\operatorname{CM}(P, \mathcal{G})$ be the \mathbb{Q} -vector space generated by all the nested sets $T \in n(P, \mathcal{G})$ with bidegree $(2(\operatorname{cd}(\bigvee T) - |T|), |T|)$. The differential is defined on the base by

$$d(T) = \sum_{t \in T \setminus \max(T)} (-1)^{|T-t|} (T \setminus \{t\})$$

and the product by $T \cdot S = 0$ if $\operatorname{cd}(\bigvee(T \cup S)) < \operatorname{cd}(\bigvee T) + \operatorname{cd}(\bigvee S)$ and

$$T \cdot S = \sum_{\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{|T|+|S|}} \operatorname{sgn}(\pi) \lambda(\pi(T \cup S))$$

otherwise. This structure make $\operatorname{CM}(P, \mathcal{G})$ a differential bigraded algebra.

Theorem 3.14. The morphism $\xi: \operatorname{CM}(P, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow B(P, \mathcal{G})$ defined by $\xi(T) = c\mu(T)$ is an inclusion of differential algebras and a quasi-isomorphism.

Proof. The map ξ is well defined as morphism of \mathbb{Q} -vector spaces. It is an inclusion since the monomials $c\mu(T)$ for $T \in n(P, \mathcal{G})$ are standard monomials and linearly independent by Corollary 2.12. The equality $d\xi = \xi d$ follows from Lemma 3.4 and the equality $\xi(S \cdot T) = \xi(S)\xi(T)$ from Proposition 3.10. This also proves that $\operatorname{CM}(P, \mathcal{G})$ is a differential bigraded algebra.

Finally, the algebraic Morse theory applied to $B(P, \mathcal{G})$ and the matching \mathcal{M} ensure that there exists a subcomplex $N_{\mathcal{M}}$ such that the projection

$$B(P, \mathcal{G}) \twoheadrightarrow B(P, \mathcal{G})/N_{\mathcal{M}}$$

is a quasi-isomorphism and the quotient is freely generated by critical monomials. The composition of ξ with the projection gives an isomorphism of chain complexes. Therefore ξ is a quasi-isomorphism. \square

Let $n((\hat{0}, g), \mathcal{G})$ be the full subcomplex of $n(P, \mathcal{G})$ on the set of vertices $\{h \in \mathcal{G} \mid h < g\}$.

All the homology groups are taken with rational coefficients. We use the standard convention for the reduced homology that $\tilde{H}_{-1}(\emptyset) = \mathbb{Q}$.

Theorem 3.15. Let P be a polymatroid and \mathcal{G} be a building set. Then

$$H^*(B(P, \mathcal{G}), d) \cong H^*(\operatorname{CM}(P, \mathcal{G}), d) \cong \bigoplus_{f \in L} \bigotimes_{g \in F} \tilde{H}_{2\operatorname{cd}(g)-2-\bullet} \left(n((\hat{0}, g), \mathcal{G}) \right),$$

where $F = F(P, \mathcal{G}, f)$ is the set of \mathcal{G} -factors of f .

In particular the addendum $\tilde{H}_i(n((\hat{0}, g), \mathcal{G}))$ contributes in bidegree $(2(\text{cd}(g) - 2 - i), 2 + i)$.

Proof. We use Theorem 3.14 to obtain

$$H(B(P, \mathcal{G}), d) \cong H(\text{CM}(P, \mathcal{G}), d).$$

For each flat f let CM_f be the subcomplex of $\text{CM}(P, \mathcal{G})$ generated by all nested set T such that $\max(T) = F(P, \mathcal{G}, f)$. Moreover for each $g \in \mathcal{G}$ set $\text{CM}(g)$ be the subcomplex of $\text{CM}(P, \mathcal{G})$ generated by all nested set T such that $\{g\} = \max(T)$. We have

$$\text{CM}(P, \mathcal{G}) = \bigoplus_{f \in L} \text{CM}_f$$

and

$$\text{CM}_f = \bigotimes_{g \in F(P, \mathcal{G}, f)} \text{CM}(g)$$

as complexes. It is enough to prove that

$$H^\bullet(\text{CM}(g), d) = \tilde{H}_{2\text{cd}(g)-2-\bullet}(n((\hat{0}, g), \mathcal{G})).$$

Indeed $\text{CM}(g)$ coincides with the reduced simplicial chain complex for $n((\hat{0}, g), \mathcal{G})$, under the correspondence $T \mapsto T \setminus \{g\}$. Notice that the bidegree of $T \in \text{CM}(g)$ is $(2(\text{cd}(g) - |T|), |T|)$ and the degree of $T \setminus \{g\}$ in the reduced chain complex is $|T \setminus \{g\}| - 1 = |T| - 2$. \square

Definition 3.13 has a straightforward generalization to integer coefficients, we left open the following question.

Conjecture 3.16. Does Theorem 3.15 generalizes to integer coefficients?

The analogous statement in the realizable case with maximal building set was proven in [DGM00, dLS01].

4. KÄHLER PACKAGE

Let $\text{DP}^\bullet(P, \mathcal{G})$ be the graded algebra $B^{2\bullet, 0}(P, \mathcal{G})$. This algebra, in the realizable case, is the Chow ring of the De Concini Procesi wonderful model for the subspace arrangement. A presentation of $\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})$ is given by the generators x_g for $g \in \mathcal{G}$ with relations

$$x_S c_g^b$$

where $S \subseteq \mathcal{G}$, $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $b \geq \text{cd}(g) - \text{cd}(\bigvee S_{<g})$. From Corollary 2.8 the algebra $\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})$ has an additive basis given by

$$x_S^b$$

where $S \in n(P, \mathcal{G})$ and for each $s \in S$ we have that $0 < b(s) < \text{cd}(s) - \text{cd}(\bigvee(S)_{<s})$.

A second presentation is given by the generators σ_g for $g \in \mathcal{G}$ with relations

$$\sigma_g^b \prod_{s \in S} (\sigma_s - \sigma_g)$$

where $\bigvee S \leq g$ and $b = \text{cd}(g) - \text{cd}(\bigvee S)$, see Theorem 2.9. From Corollary 2.12 the algebra $\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})$ has an additive basis given by

$$\sigma_S^b$$

where $S \in n(P, \mathcal{G})$ and for each $s \in S$ we have that $0 < b(s) < \text{cd}(s) - \text{cd}(\bigvee S_{<s})$.

Remark 4.1. If $\hat{1} \notin \mathcal{G}$ then the polymatroid P is direct sum of other polymatroids. Indeed, let a_1, \dots, a_k be the \mathcal{G} -factors of $\hat{1}$, the poset L is a product $\prod_{i=1}^k [\hat{0}, a_i]$. There exist polymatroids P^{a_i} (defined in the following, see Lemma 4.12) such that $P = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k P^{a_i}$ and building sets $\mathcal{G}^{a_i} = \mathcal{G} \cap [\hat{0}, a_i]$. Moreover, $\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G}) = \bigotimes_{i=1}^k \text{DP}(P^{a_i}, \mathcal{G}^{a_i})$ and the dimension of $\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})$ is $\text{cd}(\hat{1}) - |F(P, \mathcal{G}, \hat{1})|$ (where $k = |F(P, \mathcal{G}, \hat{1})|$).

For the clarity of exposition we assume $\hat{1} \in \mathcal{G}$ in this section. Define $\text{deg}: \text{DP}^{\text{cd}(\hat{1})-1}(P, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ the isomorphism defined by

$$\text{deg}(x_{\hat{1}}^{\text{cd}(\hat{1})-1}) = (-1)^{\text{cd}(\hat{1})-1}.$$

Definition 4.2. Let A be a graded algebra with top degree n and $\text{deg}: A^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ an isomorphism. We say that

- the algebra A satisfies *Poincaré duality* if the bilinear pairing

$$A^k \times A^{n-k} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$$

defined by $(a, b) \mapsto \text{deg}(ab)$ is non-degenerate.

- the element $\ell \in A^1$ satisfies the *Hard Lefschetz property* if the multiplication map

$$\cdot \ell^{n-2k}: A^k \rightarrow A^{n-k}$$

is an isomorphism for all $k \leq \frac{n}{2}$.

- the element $\ell \in A^1$ satisfies the *Hodge Riemann relations* if the bilinear form

$$Q_\ell^k: A^k \times A^k \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$$

defined by $Q_\ell^k(a, b) = (-1)^k \text{deg}(a \ell^{n-2k} b)$ (for $k \leq \frac{n}{2}$) is positive defined on the subspace

$$P_k = \ker(\cdot \ell^{n-2k+1}: A^k \rightarrow A^{n-k+1}).$$

We will abbreviate these properties with PD_A , $\text{HL}_A(\ell)$, and $\text{HR}_A(\ell)$ respectively.

4.1. Poincaré duality. In this subsection we give a direct proof of the Poincaré duality property for $\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})$.

Definition 4.3. Suppose that $\hat{1} \in \mathcal{G}$ and let x_S^b be a standard monomial, the element $\epsilon(x_S^b)$ is

$$\epsilon(x_S^b) = (-1)^{|S \setminus \{\hat{1}\}|} x_{S^+}^c,$$

where $S^+ = S \cup \{\hat{1}\}$, $c(\hat{1}) = \text{cd}(\hat{1}) - \text{cd}(\bigvee S_{<\hat{1}}) - b(\hat{1}) - 1$, and $c(g) = \text{cd}(g) - \text{cd}(\bigvee S_{<g}) - b(g)$ for $g \in S \setminus \{\hat{1}\}$.

We will write c_S instead of c when we want to stress the dependency on S and b .

Lemma 4.4. If $\hat{1} \in \mathcal{G}$ then for all standard monomials we have

$$x_S^b \epsilon(x_S^b) = x_{\hat{1}}^{\text{cd}(\hat{1})-1}.$$

Proof. We prove the statement by induction on $|S \setminus \{\hat{1}\}|$. The base case $S = \{\hat{1}\}$ is trivial. For the inductive step we choose $g \in \max(S_{<\hat{1}})$ and set $T = S \setminus \{g, \hat{1}\}$. For the sake of notation let $n(h) = b(h) + c_S(h)$ for all $h \in S^+$ (where $c_S(h)$ is introduced in Definition 4.3). Notice that $x_T x_f x_{\hat{1}}^{n(\hat{1})} = 0$ for all $f \in (g, \hat{1}) \cap \mathcal{G}$ because $f \vee \bigvee T > g \vee \bigvee T$. Since $x_T^n \sigma_g^{n(g)} = 0$ by relation (ii), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= x_T^n \sigma_g^{n(g)} x_{\hat{1}}^{n(\hat{1})} \\ &= x_T^n (x_g + x_{\hat{1}})^{n(g)} x_{\hat{1}}^{n(\hat{1})} \\ &= x_T^n (x_g^{n(g)} + x_{\hat{1}}^{n(g)}) x_{\hat{1}}^{n(\hat{1})}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we used $x_T x_g x_{\hat{1}}^{n(\hat{1})+1} = 0$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} x_S^b \epsilon(x_S^b) &= (-1)^{|S \setminus \{\hat{1}\}|} x_T^n x_g^{n(g)} x_{\hat{1}}^{n(\hat{1})} \\ &= (-1)^{|S \setminus \{\hat{1}\}|-1} x_T^n x_{\hat{1}}^{n(g)} x_{\hat{1}}^{n(\hat{1})} \\ &= (-1)^{|T \setminus \{\hat{1}\}|} x_T^n x_{\hat{1}}^{n(g)+n(\hat{1})} \\ &= x_T^b \epsilon(x_T^b) = x_{\hat{1}}^{\text{cd}(\hat{1})-1}, \end{aligned}$$

by inductive hypotheses on T . \square

We set d_S be the function defined by $d_S(\hat{1}) = \text{cd}(\hat{1}) - \text{cd}(\bigvee S_{<\hat{1}}) - 1$ and by $d_S(g) = \text{cd}(g) - \text{cd}(\bigvee S_{<g})$ for $g \neq \hat{1}$.

Lemma 4.5. Let S be a nested set, $g \in S$ and x_S^b be a monomial such that for all $h > g$ we have $b(h) \geq d_S(h)$ and $b(g) > d_S(h)$. Then $x_S^b = 0$. \square

The proof of the lemma is the same of [BDF20, Lemma 5.4.1 (b)]. Recall the chosen monomial order with the property that if $h > g$ then $h \succ g$ and $x_h \prec x_g$. We need the following statement.

Lemma 4.6. Let x_S^b and x_T^c be two standard monomials in $\text{DP}^k(P, \mathcal{G})$ such that $x_S^b \prec_{\text{revlex}} x_T^c$. Then $x_S^b \epsilon(x_T^c) = 0$.

Proof. Consider T' and c' such that $x_{T'}^{c'} = \epsilon(x_T^c)$ and notice that $T' \setminus \{\hat{1}\} = T \setminus \{\hat{1}\}$. Define $g = \max_{\prec} \{h \mid b(h) \neq c(h)\}$ and, by hypothesis, $b(g) > c(g)$. If $S \cup T'$ is not \mathcal{G} -nested then we have $x_S^b \epsilon(x_T^c) = 0$. Otherwise set $A = (S \cup T')_{\geq g}$, by (4) of Proposition 2.4 we have that A is a chain $(a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_l)$ with $a_1 = g$. For $a_i \neq g, \hat{1}$ we have

$$b(a_i) + c'(a_i) = b(a_i) + \text{cd}(a_i) - \text{cd}(\bigvee T_{< a_i}) - c(a_i) \quad (6)$$

$$= \text{cd}(a_i) - \text{cd}(\bigvee T'_{< a_i}) \quad (7)$$

$$\geq \text{cd}(a_i) - \text{cd}(\bigvee (S \cup T')_{< a_i}) = d_{S \cup T'}(a_i). \quad (8)$$

The same holds for $\hat{1}$ (the proof has a minus one in the mid steps). For a_1 we have $b(g) + c'(g) > d_{S \cup T'}(g)$ because $b(g) > c(g)$. Therefore the monomial $x_S^b \epsilon(x_T^c) = x_{S \cup T'}^{b+c'}$ satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 4.5 and we obtain the claimed result $x_S^b \epsilon(x_T^c) = 0$. \square

Finally we can prove the Poincaré duality property:

Theorem 4.7 (Poincaré duality). If $\hat{1} \in \mathcal{G}$ then the algebra $\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})$ is a Poincaré duality algebra of dimension $\text{cd}(\hat{1}) - 1$.

More generally, $\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})$ is a Poincaré duality algebra of dimension $\text{cd}(\hat{1}) - |F(P, \mathcal{G}, \hat{1})|$.

Proof. The function ϵ has the property $\epsilon^2 = \text{Id}$ and gives a bijection between standard monomials in degree k and in degree $r - k$. This, together with Corollary 2.8, ensure that $\dim \text{DP}^k(P, \mathcal{G}) = \dim \text{DP}^{r-k}(P, \mathcal{G})$. We consider on standard monomials the reverse lexicographical order. Lemma 4.6 ensures that the matrix of the Poincaré pairing (in the chosen basis) is upper triangular. From Lemma 4.4 we obtain that the entries on the diagonal are ± 1 and so the Poincaré pairing is non degenerate. The last statement follows from the first one together with Remark 4.1. \square

We remark that the bases of standard monomials $\{x_S^b\}$ and $\{(-1)^r \epsilon(x_S^b)\}$ are not dual basis.

4.2. Tensor decomposition. The following proposition is needed for the proof of the main result of this section.

Proposition 4.8. Let A and B be Poincaré duality algebra of the same dimension n , then:

- for each $x \in A^k$, $x \neq 0$, the ring $A / \text{Ann}(x)$ is a Poincaré duality algebra of dimension $n - k$,
- each surjective homomorphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ is an isomorphism.

The proof of the above proposition can be found, for example, in [AHK18, Proposition 7.2, Proposition 7.13].

Let $P = (E, \text{cd})$ be a polymatroid with building set \mathcal{G} . Consider $g \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\text{cd}(g) > 1$. Let $\text{tr}_g \text{cd}: 2^E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be the function defined by:

$$\text{tr}_g \text{cd}(h) = \begin{cases} \text{cd}(h) - 1 & \text{if } \text{cd}(h) = \text{cd}(h \cup g), \\ \text{cd}(h) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We denote by $\text{tr}_g L$ the poset of flats of $\text{tr}_g \text{cd}$. Finally, define

$$\text{tr}_g \mathcal{G} = \{\bar{h} \in \text{tr}_g L \mid h \in \mathcal{G}\},$$

where \bar{h} is the closure with respect to $\text{tr}_g \text{cd}$ of the flat h . Notice that $\text{tr}_g L$ is a subposet of L but with a different codimension function.

Lemma 4.9. For all $g \in \mathcal{G}$ with $\text{cd}(g) > 1$, the pair $\text{tr}_g P = (E, \text{tr}_g \text{cd})$ is a polymatroid and $\text{tr}_g \mathcal{G}$ is a building set for the poset of flats $\text{tr}_g L$.

Proof. It is easy to see that $(E, \text{tr}_g \text{cd})$ is a polymatroid. Let $x \in \text{tr}_g L$ and notice that for all $h \in \mathcal{G}$ we have $h \leq x$ in L if and only if $\bar{h} \leq x$ in $\text{tr}_g L$. Thus, we have that $\max \text{tr}_g \mathcal{G}_{\leq x} = \max \mathcal{G}_{\leq x}$ and it follows that

$$[\hat{0}, x] \simeq \prod_{y \in \max(\mathcal{G}_{\leq x})} [\hat{0}, y] \simeq \prod_{y \in \max(\text{tr}_g \mathcal{G}_{\leq x})} [\hat{0}, y].$$

For the second part of the definition of a building set we have two cases. Let $\{y_1, \dots, y_n\} = \max \mathcal{G}_{\leq x}$ and assume $g \not\leq x$ which implies $g \not\leq y_i$ for every i :

$$\text{tr}_g \text{cd}(x) = \text{cd}(x) = \sum_{y \in \max \mathcal{G}_{\leq x}} \text{cd}(y) = \sum_{y \in \max \text{tr}_g \mathcal{G}_{\leq x}} \text{tr}_g \text{cd}(y).$$

Finally, let $g \leq x$ then by Proposition 2.4 there exists only one h_i such that $g \leq h_i$. Thus, we have the following:

$$\text{tr}_g \text{cd}(x) = \text{cd}(x) - 1 = \left(\sum_{y \in \max \mathcal{G}_{\leq x}} \text{cd}(y) \right) - 1 = \sum_{y \in \max \text{tr}_g \mathcal{G}_{\leq x}} \text{tr}_g \text{cd}(y).$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Define the map

$$\zeta_g: \text{DP}(\text{tr}_g P, \text{tr}_g \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G}) / \text{Ann}(\sigma_g)$$

by $\zeta_g(\sigma_k) = \sigma_h$ where h is any element in \mathcal{G} such that $\bar{h} = k$.

Remark 4.10. In the realizable case, this construction can be view geometrically: consider a generic hyperplane H containing the flat g . The intersection of the subspace arrangement with H describes a subspace arrangement in H whose poset of intersection is $\text{tr}_g L$. Moreover, the natural closed inclusion between the two wonderful compactification induces a surjective map $\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \text{DP}(\text{tr}_g P, \text{tr}_g \mathcal{G})$ with kernel $\text{Ann}(\sigma_g)$. The map ζ_g is its pseudo-inverse.

Lemma 4.11. For $g \in \mathcal{G}$ with $\text{cd}(g) > 1$, the map ζ_g is well defined and an isomorphism. Moreover $\deg(\alpha) = \deg(-\sigma_g \zeta_g(\alpha))$ for all $\alpha \in \text{DP}(\text{tr}_g P, \text{tr}_g \mathcal{G})$.

Proof. We show that the map ζ_g does not depend on the choice of h : suppose that exist $h, f \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\bar{h} = \bar{f}$. By symmetry we may assume $h \not\geq f$. Since $g \vee h = \bar{h} = \bar{f} = g \vee f$, we have $\bar{h} \in \mathcal{G}$, so replacing f with $g \vee f$ we assume $f > h$. Notice that $\text{cd}(f) = \text{cd}(h) + 1$ and $f = g \vee h$ so

$$\sigma_g(\sigma_h - \sigma_f) = \sigma_f(\sigma_h - \sigma_f) = 0.$$

We verify that the relations (i) and (ii) of Theorem 2.9 are sent to zero. Consider an antichain $A \subset \text{tr}_g \mathcal{G}$ and $k \in \text{tr}_g \mathcal{G}$ such that $k \geq \bigvee A$, set $n = \text{tr}_g \text{cd}(k) - \text{tr}_g \text{cd}(\bigvee A)$. Let $h \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\bar{h} = k$ and $B \subset \mathcal{G}$ such that $\bar{b}_i = a_i$ for all i . We have

$$\sigma_g \zeta_g \left(\sigma_k^n \prod_{a \in A} (\sigma_a - \sigma_k) \right) = \sigma_g \sigma_h^n \prod_{b \in B} (\sigma_b - \sigma_h).$$

Notice that $\text{cd}(h) - \text{cd}(\bigvee B) = n$ unless $h \geq g$ and $\bigvee B \not\geq g$ which is $\text{cd}(h) - \text{cd}(\bigvee B) = n + 1$. The non trivial case is the latter and notice that $h = g \vee \bigvee B$. We use the relations to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_g \zeta_g \left(\sigma_k^n \prod_{a \in A} (\sigma_a - \sigma_k) \right) &= \sigma_g \sigma_h^n \prod_{b \in B} (\sigma_b - \sigma_h) \\ &= \sigma_h^{n+1} \prod_{b \in B} (\sigma_b - \sigma_h) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

We have proven that ζ_g is well defined.

The map is surjective because for each $h \in \mathcal{G}$ we have $\zeta_g(\sigma_{\bar{h}}) = \sigma_h$. Finally applying Proposition 4.8 we obtain the sought isomorphism.

For the last statement it is enough to notice that $\sigma_g \zeta_g(x_{\hat{1}}^{r-1}) = x_{\hat{1}}^r$. \square

Let $P = (E, \text{cd})$ be a polymatroid, \mathcal{G} be a building set and $g \in \mathcal{G}$ any element. The restriction of the polymatroid to the flat g is $P^g = (E^g, \text{cd}^g)$ where $E^g = \{h \in E \mid h \leq g\}$. The contraction of $P = (E, \text{cd})$ to the flat g is $P_g = (E_g, \text{cd}_g)$ where $E_g = E \setminus E^g$ and $\text{cd}_g(h) = \text{cd}(h \vee g) - \text{cd}(g)$.

Define $L^g = [\hat{0}, g]$, $\mathcal{G}^g = \mathcal{G} \cap L^g$, $L_g = [g, \hat{1}]$, and

$$\mathcal{G}_g = \{h \vee g \mid h \in \mathcal{G} \setminus [\hat{0}, g]\}.$$

The proof of the following lemma is analogous to the one of Lemma 4.9, so we omit it.

Lemma 4.12. The restriction and the contraction at $g \in \mathcal{G}$ are polymatroids with poset of flats L^g (respectively L_g) and building set \mathcal{G}^g (resp. \mathcal{G}_g).

Remark 4.13. In the case of matroids M , we have for every $e \in E$ that $M_e = \text{tr}_e M$ is the contraction of the matroid.

Define the map

$$\psi_g: \text{DP}(P^g, \mathcal{G}^g) \otimes \text{DP}(P_g, \mathcal{G}_g) \rightarrow \text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G}) / \text{Ann}(x_g)$$

by $\psi_g(\sigma_h \otimes 1) = \sigma_h$ and $\psi_g(1 \otimes \sigma_{g \vee h}) = \sigma_h$.

Lemma 4.14. For all $g \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \{\hat{1}\}$ the map ψ_g is well defined and an isomorphism. Moreover $\deg(\alpha) \deg(\beta) = \deg(x_g \psi_g(\alpha \otimes \beta))$ for all $\alpha \in \text{DP}(P^g, \mathcal{G}^g)$ and $\beta \in \text{DP}(P_g, \mathcal{G}_g)$.

Proof. We verify that $\psi_g(1 \otimes \sigma_{g \vee h})$ does not depend on the choice of the element h . Suppose that exist $h, f \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $g \vee h = g \vee f$ and $h, f \not\leq g$. By symmetry we may assume $h \not\leq f$. Replacing f with $g \vee f$ we assume $f > h$, then

$$x_g(\sigma_h - \sigma_f) = x_g \sum_{\substack{l \geq h \\ l \not\leq g}} x_l = 0,$$

because $\{g, l\}$ cannot be \mathcal{G} -nested since $g < f \leq g \vee l$ and $l \not\leq g$.

We verify that all relations in the domain are mapped to zero. The ones in $\text{DP}(P^g, \mathcal{G}^g)$ holds also in $\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})$ trivially. Consider $h \in \mathcal{G}$ and $S \subset \mathcal{G}$ an antichain such that $\bigvee S \leq h$ and $s \not\leq g$ for all $s \in S$. Set $n = \text{cd}(g \vee h) - \text{cd}(g \vee \bigvee S)$. There are two cases:

- if $g \vee h \notin \mathcal{G}$ then $n = \text{cd}(h) - \text{cd}(\bigvee S)$ and

$$x_g \psi_g \left(1 \otimes \sigma_{g \vee h}^n \prod_{a \in S} (\sigma_{g \vee s} - \sigma_{g \vee h}) \right) = x_g \sigma_h^n \prod_{a \in S} (\sigma_s - \sigma_h) = 0,$$

- if $g \vee h \in \mathcal{G}$ then

$$\begin{aligned} x_g \psi_g \left(1 \otimes \sigma_{g \vee h}^n \prod_{s \in S} (\sigma_{g \vee s} - \sigma_{g \vee h}) \right) &= x_g \sigma_{g \vee h}^n \prod_{s \in S} (\sigma_s - \sigma_{g \vee h}) \\ &= \sum_A x_g x_A \sigma_{g \vee h}^n, \end{aligned}$$

where the sum is taken over all sets $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ such that $a_i \geq s_i$ and $a_i \not\leq g \vee h$. Applying Lemma 2.10 to $g \vee h$, $S \cup \{g\}$ and $A \cup \{g\}$ we obtain that each term $x_g x_A \sigma_{g \vee h}^n$ is zero.

The map ψ_g is surjective because either $h \in \mathcal{G}^g$ or $g \vee h \in \mathcal{G}_g$ for all $h \in \mathcal{G}$. We apply Proposition 4.8, $\text{DP}(L, \mathcal{G}) / \text{Ann}(x_g)$ is a Poincaré duality algebra of dimension $\text{cd}(\hat{1}) - 2$. The algebra $\text{DP}(P^g, \mathcal{G}^g) \otimes \text{DP}(P_g, \mathcal{G}_g)$ is Poincaré duality of dimension $(\text{cd}(g) - 1) + (\text{cd}(\hat{1}) - \text{cd}(g) - 1)$ (here is the only point where we use $g \neq \hat{1}$). Since ψ_g is surjective between Poincaré duality algebras of the same dimension, it is an isomorphism.

For the last statement we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 x_g \psi_g(x_g^{\text{cd}(g)-1} \otimes x_{\hat{1}}^{\text{cd}(\hat{1})-\text{cd}(g)-1}) &= x_g \sigma_g^{\text{cd}(g)-1} x_{\hat{1}}^{\text{cd}(\hat{1})-\text{cd}(g)-1} \\
 &= (x_g - \sigma_g) \sigma_g^{\text{cd}(g)-1} x_{\hat{1}}^{\text{cd}(\hat{1})-\text{cd}(g)-1} \\
 &= -x_{\hat{1}} \sigma_g^{\text{cd}(g)-1} x_{\hat{1}}^{\text{cd}(\hat{1})-\text{cd}(g)-1} \\
 &= -x_{\hat{1}}^{\text{cd}(\hat{1})-1},
 \end{aligned}$$

so $\deg(x_g^{\text{cd}(g)-1}) \deg(x_{\hat{1}}^{\text{cd}(\hat{1})-\text{cd}(g)-1}) = (-1)^{\text{cd}(\hat{1})} = \deg(-x_{\hat{1}}^{\text{cd}(\hat{1})-1})$. \square

4.3. Hard Lefschetz and Hodge-Riemann.

Definition 4.15. The σ -cone $\Sigma \subset \text{DP}^1(P, \mathcal{G})$ is the convex cone

$$\Sigma_{P, \mathcal{G}} = \left\{ - \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} d_g \sigma_g \mid d_g > 0 \right\}.$$

Let $a \in E$ be an atom in L , i.e. the interval $(\hat{0}, a)$ is empty. Consider the set

$$\{g \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \{a\} \mid g \neq \overline{S} \text{ for all } S \subseteq E \setminus \{a\}\}, \quad (9)$$

of all elements $g \in \mathcal{G}$ that cannot be written as the closure of some subset $S \subset E$ not containing a . Define $E(a)$ as the disjoint union of $E \setminus \{a\}$ and the minimal elements of the set in (9). Define the pair $P(a) = (E(a), \text{cd})$, where with a slightly abuse of notation

$$\text{cd}(\{e_1, \dots, e_l, g_1, \dots, g_k\}) = \text{cd}(\{e_1, \dots, e_l\} \cup g_1 \cup \dots \cup g_k).$$

We also define $\mathcal{G}(a) = \mathcal{G} \setminus \{a\}$. The polymatroid $P(a)$ depends on \mathcal{G} but we omit this dependency in our notation.

The proof of the following lemma is analogous to the one of Lemma 4.9, so we omit it.

Lemma 4.16. The pair $P(a) = (E(a), \text{cd})$ is a polymatroid and $\mathcal{G}(a)$ is a building set for the poset of flats of $P(a)$.

Lemma 4.17. For an atom $a \in E$, $a \neq \hat{1}$, consider the element $\mu_0 = (x_a - \sigma_a)^{\text{cd}(a)}$. There exists an isomorphism:

$$p_a: \text{DP}(P_a, \mathcal{G}_a) \rightarrow \text{DP}(P(a), \mathcal{G}(a)) / \text{Ann}(\mu_0).$$

Moreover $\deg(\alpha) = \deg(\mu_0 p_a(\alpha))$ for all $\alpha \in \text{DP}(P_a, \mathcal{G}_a)$.

Proof. Notice that μ_0 is a multiple of x_a because $\sigma_a^{\text{cd}(a)} = 0$, hence $\text{Ann}(x_a) \subseteq \text{Ann}(\mu_0)$. Define the morphism p_a as the composition of the inclusion $\text{DP}(P_a, \mathcal{G}_a) \rightarrow \text{DP}(P^a, \mathcal{G}^a) \otimes \text{DP}(P_a, \mathcal{G}_a)$ with ψ_a and the projection $\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G}) / \text{Ann}(x_a) \rightarrow \text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G}) / \text{Ann}(\mu_0)$. Explicitly $p_a(\sigma_{a \vee h}) = [\sigma_h]$ for all $h \neq a$. The range of the map p_a is equal to $\text{DP}(P(a), \mathcal{G}(a)) / \text{Ann}(\mu_0)$, so the morphism in the statement is well

defined and surjective. Since $a \neq \hat{1}$ we have $\mu_0 \neq 0$ and by Proposition 4.8 the map p_a is an isomorphism, because both algebras satisfy Poincaré duality of dimension $\text{cd}(\hat{1}) - \text{cd}(a) - 1$.

For the last statement we have $\mu_0 p_a(x_{\hat{1}}^{\text{cd}(\hat{1}) - \text{cd}(a) - 1}) = (-1)^{\text{cd}(a)} x_{\hat{1}}^{\text{cd}(\hat{1}) - 1}$ and so $\deg(x_{\hat{1}}^{\text{cd}(\hat{1}) - \text{cd}(a) - 1}) = (-1)^{\text{cd}(\hat{1}) - \text{cd}(a) - 1} = \deg((-1)^{\text{cd}(a)} x_{\hat{1}}^{\text{cd}(\hat{1}) - 1})$. \square

Lemma 4.18. Let $a \in E$, $a \neq \hat{1}$, be an atom and $\mu_0 = (x_a - \sigma_a)^{\text{cd}(a)}$. Consider the polynomial $p(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\text{cd}(a)} \binom{\text{cd}(a)}{i} x^i (x_a - \sigma_a)^{\text{cd}(a) - i}$, then

$$\text{DP}(P(a), \mathcal{G}(a))[x] / (x \text{Ann}(\mu_0), p(x)) \cong \text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G}).$$

Proof. Define the morphism

$$\text{DP}(P(a), \mathcal{G}(a))[x] \rightarrow \text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})$$

by $\sigma_g \mapsto \sigma_g$ and $x \mapsto -x_a$. By Lemmas 4.14 and 4.17 the elements of the form $x \text{Ann}(\mu_0)$ are in the kernel. Also $p(x)$ is in the kernel because its image is $(-\sigma_a)^{\text{cd}(a)} = 0$. Clearly, the map is surjective. It is injective by Proposition 4.8 because domain and codomain are Poincaré duality algebra of the same dimension equal to $\text{cd}(\hat{1}) - 1$. \square

Theorem 4.19. Let C be a Poincaré duality algebra and $p(x) = x^d + \mu_{d-1}x^{d-1} + \dots + \mu_0 = 0 \in C[x]$ be a homogeneous polynomial with $\mu_0 \neq 0$. Let $B = C / \text{Ann}(\mu_0)$ and $A = C[x] / (x \text{Ann}(\mu_0), p(x))$. Let $\ell \in C^1$ be an element satisfying $\text{HR}_C(\ell)$ and $\text{HR}_B(\ell)$. Then $\text{HR}_A(\ell + \epsilon x)$ holds for sufficiently small positive ϵ .

In the above theorem the degree function on B is induced by μ_0 , i.e. $\deg_B(\alpha) = \deg_C(\alpha\mu_0)$. Since the top degrees coincides $A^{\text{top}} = C^{\text{top}}$, we also implicitly assume that $\deg_A = \deg_C$.

The proof of Theorem 4.19 is the same of the proof of [AHK18, Proposition 8.2], so we omit it.

Lemma 4.20. The following holds:

- (1) For all $g \in \mathcal{G}$, $g \neq \hat{1}$ the natural map

$$\text{DP}^1(P, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \text{DP}^1(P^g, \mathcal{G}^g) \oplus \text{DP}^1(P_g, \mathcal{G}_g)$$

induced by the quotient by $\text{Ann}(x_g)$ composed with ψ_g^{-1} , maps $\Sigma_{P, \mathcal{G}}$ in $\Sigma_{P^g, \mathcal{G}^g} \times \Sigma_{P_g, \mathcal{G}_g}$.

- (2) For all $g \in \mathcal{G}$ the morphism

$$\text{DP}^1(P, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \text{DP}^1(\text{tr}_g P, \text{tr}_g \mathcal{G})$$

induced by the quotient by $\text{Ann}(\sigma_g)$ composed with ζ_g^{-1} , maps $\Sigma_{P, \mathcal{G}}$ in $\Sigma_{\text{tr}_g P, \text{tr}_g \mathcal{G}}$.

- (3) For an atom $a \in E$, $a \neq \hat{1}$ the natural map

$$\text{DP}^1(P(a), \mathcal{G}(a)) \rightarrow \text{DP}^1(P_a, \mathcal{G}_a)$$

induced by the quotient by $\text{Ann}(\mu_0)$ composed with p_a^{-1} , maps $\Sigma_{P(a),\mathcal{G}(a)}$ in $\Sigma_{P_a,\mathcal{G}_a}$.

Proof.

(1) Let $l = -\sum_{h \in \mathcal{G}} d_h \sigma_h$ be an element of the σ -cone, we have that

$$\psi_g^{-1}([l]) = -\sum_{h \leq g} d_h \sigma_h \otimes 1 - \sum_{h \not\leq g} d_h \otimes \sigma_{g \vee h}.$$

It may occur that there are two different $h, h' \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $g \vee h = g \vee h'$ but, also in this case, the coefficient of $1 \otimes \sigma_{g \vee h}$ is still negative. It follows that $\psi_g^{-1}([l]) \in \Sigma_{P^g, \mathcal{G}^g} \times \Sigma_{P_g, \mathcal{G}_g}$.

(2) Let $l = -\sum_{h \in \mathcal{G}} d_h \sigma_h$ be an element of the σ -cone, we have that

$$\zeta_g^{-1}([l]) = -\sum_{h \in \mathcal{G}} d_h \sigma_{\bar{h}}.$$

It may occur that there are two different $h, h' \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\bar{h} = \bar{h}'$ but, also in this case, the coefficient of $\sigma_{\bar{h}}$ is still negative. Thus, $\zeta_g^{-1}([l]) \in \Sigma_{\text{tr}_g P, \text{tr}_g \mathcal{G}}$.

(3) Let $l = -\sum_{h \in \mathcal{G}} d_h \sigma_h$ be an element of the σ -cone, we have that

$$p_a^{-1}([l]) = -\sum_{h \in \mathcal{G}} d_h \sigma_{a \vee h}.$$

It may occur that there are two different $h, h' \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $a \vee h = a \vee h'$ but, also in this case, the coefficient of $\sigma_{a \vee h}$ is still negative. It follows that $p_a^{-1}([l]) \in \Sigma_{P_a, \mathcal{G}_a}$.

□

Theorem 4.21. For every element ℓ the σ -cone $\Sigma_{P, \mathcal{G}}$ the conditions $\text{HL}_{\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})}(\ell)$ and $\text{HR}_{\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})}(\ell)$ hold.

Proof. We prove the statement by induction on $|\mathcal{G}|$ and $\text{cd}(\hat{1})$. The base case is $|\mathcal{G}| = 1$, so $\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G}) = \mathbb{Q}[x_{\hat{1}}]/(x_{\hat{1}}^{\text{cd}(\hat{1})})$. In this case it is known that $-\lambda x_{\hat{1}}$ satisfies Hard Lefschetz and Hodge Riemann for all positive λ .

For the inductive step consider a polymatroid P , a building set \mathcal{G} , and an element $\ell \in \Sigma_{P, \mathcal{G}}$. Under the morphisms of Lemma 4.20 Item 2 ℓ is mapped in $\Sigma_{\text{tr}_g P, \text{tr}_g \mathcal{G}}$ for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$. Therefore by inductive hypothesis the image of ℓ in $\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})/\text{Ann}(\sigma_g)$ satisfies Hodge Riemann relations for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$. Notice also that ℓ is a sum of $-\sigma_g$ with positive coefficients. By [AHK18, Proposition 7.15], $\text{HL}_{\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})}(\ell)$ holds.

We want to prove that the Hodge Riemann relations holds for all $\ell \in \Sigma_{P, \mathcal{G}}$. By [AHK18, Proposition 7.16] it is enough to prove $\text{HR}_{\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})}(\ell)$ for some $\ell \in \Sigma_{P, \mathcal{G}}$. We want to apply Theorem 4.19: consider any atom $a \in E$, since $|\mathcal{G}| > 1$ then $a \neq \hat{1}$. Set $C = \text{DP}(P(a), \mathcal{G}(a))$ and $p(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\text{cd}(a)} \binom{\text{cd}(a)}{i} x^i (x_a - \sigma_a)^{\text{cd}(a)-i}$; Lemma 4.17 ensure that $B = \text{DP}(P_a, \mathcal{G}_a)$ and Lemma 4.18 that $A = \text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})$. Let $\ell \in \Sigma_{P(a), \mathcal{G}(a)}$, then under the

morphism $C \rightarrow B$ (Lemma 4.20 Item 3) the class ℓ is mapped in $\Sigma_{P_a, \mathcal{G}_a}$. By inductive hypothesis we have $\text{HR}_{\text{DP}(P(a), \mathcal{G}(a))}(\ell)$ and $\text{HR}_{\text{DP}(P_a, \mathcal{G}_a)}(\ell)$, hence $\text{HR}_{\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})}(\ell - \epsilon x_a)$ for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$.

Moreover if ϵ is small enough then $\ell - \epsilon x_a$ belongs to $\Sigma_{P, \mathcal{G}}$. Indeed using the Möbius inversion formula we have

$$x_a = \sum_{g \geq a} \mu_{\mathcal{G}}(a, g) \sigma_g$$

(where we consider \mathcal{G} as a sub-poset of L). Let $\ell = -\sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} d_g \sigma_g$, taking ϵ smaller than

$$\min_{g \geq a} \left\{ \left| \frac{d_g}{\mu_{\mathcal{G}}(a, g)} \right| \right\},$$

then $\ell - \epsilon x_a \in \Sigma_{P, \mathcal{G}}$. This concludes the proof. \square

Remark 4.22. Our σ -cone is contained in the ample cone of every realization. Indeed consider 3 distinct lines in \mathbb{C}^3 and let P be the polymatroid realized by this subspace arrangement. The wonderful model is the blowup of \mathbb{P}^2 in 3 distinct points, there are two cases. If the three points are collinear the ample cone coincides with the σ -cone. Otherwise the three points are in general position and the ample cone is

$\{-d_{\hat{1}}x_{\hat{1}} - d_ax_a - d_bx_b - d_cx_c \mid d_{\hat{1}} > d_a + d_b, d_{\hat{1}} > d_a + d_c, d_{\hat{1}} > d_b + d_c\}$
that strictly contains the σ -cone.

Remark 4.23. If we restrict to the case of matroids with arbitrary building sets, the generator $x_{\hat{1}}$ can be eliminated using the relation $x_{\hat{1}} = -\sum_{g \geq e, g \neq \hat{1}} x_g$ for any $e \in E$. Thus the Hard Lefschetz theorem (and so the Hodge Riemann relations) can be proven for the entire ample cone using as generators $\{x_g\}_{g \neq \hat{1}}$ instead of $\{\sigma_g\}_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$ and Lemma 4.14 instead of Lemma 4.11.

5. THE RELATIVE LEFSCHETZ DECOMPOSITION

In this section we provide a decomposition of $\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})$ as $\text{DP}(P \setminus a, \mathcal{G} \setminus a)$ -module. This is analogous to the semi-small decomposition of [BHM⁺20a], but in this more general setting the corresponding map is not always semi-small.

Indeed, consider an arrangement of hyperplanes \mathcal{A} and the deleted arrangement $\mathcal{A}' = \mathcal{A} \setminus \{H\}$ for some hyperplane $H \in \mathcal{A}$. There is a projection map between the wonderful models $Y_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow Y_{\mathcal{A}'}$ (constructed using the maximal building sets). This map is semi-small and induces the semi-small decomposition of the Chow ring.

In the case of subspace arrangements, the projection between the wonderful models exists but is not semi-small, because the dimension of the fiber of the blow up is too big. Therefore, the proof of the Kähler package done in [BHM⁺20a] for matroids cannot be adapted to polymatroids.

Definition 5.1. Let $P = (E, \text{cd})$ be a polymatroid with poset of flats L and building set \mathcal{G} . An element $a \in E$ is an *atom* if the closure of a covers $\hat{0}$ in L .

For an atom a define the polymatroid $P \setminus a$ on the ground set $E \setminus \{a\}$ with the restricted codimension function cd . The building set $\mathcal{G} \setminus a$ is the intersection of \mathcal{G} with the poset of flats of $P \setminus a$.

Define a map

$$\theta_a: \text{DP}(P \setminus a, \mathcal{G} \setminus a) \rightarrow \text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})$$

by $\theta_a(\sigma_h) = \sigma_{\bar{h}}$ where \bar{h} is the closure of h in P . Define the subalgebra $\text{DP}_{(a)} = \text{Im}(\theta_a)$.

Lemma 5.2. The map θ_a is injective.

Proof. Consider a standard monomial $\sigma_S^b \in \text{DP}(P \setminus a, \mathcal{G} \setminus a)$ and let $\bar{S} = \{\bar{h} \mid h \in S\}$. We have $\theta_a(\sigma_S^b) = \sigma_{\bar{S}}^b$ and it is enough to prove that $\sigma_{\bar{S}}^b$ is a standard monomial. Notice that $\bar{h} \vee \bar{g} = \overline{h \vee g}$ and the map between the two poset of flats is an inclusion. Therefore \bar{S} is \mathcal{G} -nested. Since $\text{cd}(h) = \text{cd}(\bar{h})$, then $\sigma_{\bar{S}}^b$ is a standard monomial. \square

Let $S_a = \{g \in \mathcal{G} \mid a \in g \text{ and } g \setminus \{a\} \in L\}$ be the set of all flats such that a is a coloop for that flat.

Remark 5.3. Notice that $\theta_a(x_g) = x_g + x_{g \cup \{a\}}$, where we use the convention that $x_h = 0$ if h is not a flat of P . Moreover $\text{DP}_{(a)}$ is generated as algebra by σ_g with $g \notin S_a$ and as vector space by the monomial σ_S^b with $S \cap S_a = \emptyset$.

For $f \in S_a$ define DP_f as the $\text{DP}_{(a)}$ -submodule of $\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})$ generated by $x_f, x_f^2, \dots, x_f^{n_f}$, where

$$n_f = \text{cd}(f) - \text{cd}(f \setminus \{a\}) - 1 + |F(P, \mathcal{G}, f \setminus \{a\})|.$$

For a graded module $M = \bigoplus_i M^i$ we define $M[k]$ to be the graded module such that $(M[k])^i = M^{i+k}$.

Theorem 5.4. Let a be an atom, then:

$$x_f^k \text{DP}_{(a)}[-k] \cong \text{DP}((P \setminus a)^{f \setminus a}, (\mathcal{G} \setminus a)^{f \setminus a}) \otimes \text{DP}(P_f, \mathcal{G}_f), \quad (10)$$

$$\text{DP}_f = \bigoplus_{k=1}^{n_f} x_f^k \text{DP}_{(a)}, \quad (11)$$

$$\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G}) = \text{DP}_{(a)} \oplus \bigoplus_{f \in S_a} \text{DP}_f. \quad (12)$$

as $\text{DP}_{(a)}$ -modules. Moreover, the last decomposition is orthogonal with respect to the Poincaré pairing, with the exception of the addenda $\text{DP}_{(a)}$ and $\text{DP}_{\hat{1}}$ (if a is a coloop).

Before the proof of the above theorem we need some lemmas.

Lemma 5.5. For all $f \in S_a$ and $k \leq n_f$ we have

$$x_f \sigma_f^{k-1} \text{DP}_{(a)}[-k] \cong \text{DP}((P \setminus a)^{f \wedge a}, (\mathcal{G} \setminus a)^{f \wedge a}) \otimes \text{DP}(P_f, \mathcal{G}_f), \quad (13)$$

and these modules are in direct sum in $\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})$.

Proof. Notice that, for $k \leq n_f$ we have

$$\text{DP}((\text{tr}_f^{k-1}(P^f)) \setminus a, (\text{tr}_f^{k-1}(\mathcal{G}^f)) \setminus a) = \text{DP}((P \setminus a)^{f \wedge a}, (\mathcal{G} \setminus a)^{f \wedge a}).$$

Using Lemmas 4.11 and 4.14 we obtain the isomorphism

$$x_f \sigma_f^{k-1} \text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})[-k] \simeq \text{DP}(\text{tr}_f^{k-1}(P^f), \text{tr}_f^{k-1}(\mathcal{G}^f)) \otimes \text{DP}(P_f, \mathcal{G}_f).$$

It is easy to check that the above isomorphism restricts to the one in eq. (13). For the second claim suppose that there exist a linear combination

$$\sum_{k=l}^{n_f} \sigma_f^{k-1} p_k = 0,$$

for some $p_k \in \text{DP}((P \setminus a)^{f \wedge a}, (\mathcal{G} \setminus a)^{f \wedge a})$ with $p_l \neq 0$. The above equality implies

$$\sum_{k=l}^{n_f} \sigma_f^{k-l} p_k = 0$$

in $\text{DP}(\text{tr}_f^{l-1} P^f, \text{tr}_f^{l-1} \mathcal{G}^f)$. Therefore p_l belongs to the ideal generated by σ_f (where f is the top element in the poset of flats of $\text{tr}_f^{l-1} P^f$). The ideal (σ_f) is linearly generated by all monomials σ_T^b with $f \in T$. This yields a contradiction since $p_l \in \text{DP}((P \setminus a)^{f \wedge a}, (\mathcal{G} \setminus a)^{f \wedge a})$ and does not contain the generator σ_f . \square

Lemma 5.6. For all elements $f, g \in S_a$ such that $f \not\geq g$ we have $x_f \sigma_g = x_f \sigma_{g \setminus \{a\}}$. Moreover, we have

$$\text{DP}_f = \bigoplus_{k=1}^{n_f} x_f \sigma_f^{k-1} \text{DP}_{(a)}.$$

Proof. Consider $h \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $h \geq g \setminus \{a\}$ and $h \not\geq g$, we need to prove that $x_f x_h = 0$. Notice that $\{f, h\}$ is an antichain, $f \vee g \in \mathcal{G}$ and so $(f \vee g) \vee h \in \mathcal{G}$ because $g \setminus \{a\} \neq \hat{0}$. Therefore

$$f \vee h = (f \vee a) \vee ((g \setminus \{a\}) \vee h) = f \vee g \vee h \in \mathcal{G},$$

and $\{f, h\}$ is not \mathcal{G} -nested that implies $x_f x_h = 0$.

For the second statement it is sufficient to prove that $x_f \sigma_f^{k-1} = x_f^k + z$ with some $z \in \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} x_f^j \text{DP}_{(a)}$. We write $\sigma_f = x_f + \sum_{g>f} b_g \sigma_g$ for some coefficients $b_g \in \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore,

$$x_f \sigma_f = x_f^2 + x_f \sum_{\substack{g>f \\ g \notin S_a}} b_g \sigma_g + x_f \sum_{\substack{g>f \\ g \in S_a}} b_g \sigma_{g \setminus \{a\}},$$

and all the addendum (except x_f^2) belongs to $x_f \text{DP}_{(a)}$. An inductive argument on the exponent k concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 5.7. The submodules $\text{DP}_{(a)}$ and DP_f for all $f \in S_a$ generate $\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})$.

Proof. We prove that each monomial σ_S^b belongs to the submodule $M := \text{DP}_{(a)} + \sum_{F \in S_a} \text{DP}_F$ by complete induction on $f = \min(S \cap S_a)$ and on $b(f)$.

The base case is $S \cap S_a = \emptyset$ and so $\sigma_S^b \in \text{DP}_{(a)}$. For the inductive step notice that $S \cap S_a$ is \mathcal{G} -nested, so it is a chain. Call $f = \min(S \cap S_a)$ and suppose that all monomials $\sigma_S^{b'}$ with $b'(f) < b(f)$ and all monomials $\sigma_{S'}^{b'}$ with $\min(S' \cap S_a) > f$ lie in M .

Let $\{g_1, \dots, g_l\} = F(P, \mathcal{G}, f \setminus \{a\})$ be the set of \mathcal{G} -factors of $f \setminus \{a\}$. We have the relation

$$\sigma_f^{\text{cd}(f) - \text{cd}(f \setminus \{a\})} \prod_{i=1}^k (\sigma_{g_i} - \sigma_f) = 0,$$

so in the case $b(f) > n_f$ we can rewrite $\sigma_f^{b(f)} \sigma_{T \setminus \{f\}}$ as sum of monomials with $b'(f) < b(f)$ using the above relation and the fact that $g_i \notin S_a$.

In the case $b(f) \leq n_f$ we have

$$\sigma_S^b = x_f \sigma_f^{b(f)-1} \sigma_{S \setminus \{f\}}^b + (\sigma_f - x_f) \sigma_f^{b(f)-1} \sigma_{S \setminus \{f\}}^b.$$

Using the first assertion of Lemma 5.6, can be show that the element $x_f \sigma_f^{b(f)-1} \sigma_{S \setminus \{f\}}^b$ belongs to $x_f \sigma_f^{b(f)-1} \text{DP}_{(a)} \subset M$. The second addendum $(\sigma_f - x_f) \sigma_f^{b(f)-1} \sigma_{S \setminus \{f\}}^b$ is a linear combination of monomials $\sigma_h \sigma_f^{b(f)-1} \sigma_{S \setminus \{f\}}^b$ with $h > f$ and so belongs to M by inductive hypothesis. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.4. As in Remark 4.1, we may assume that $\hat{1} \in \mathcal{G}$. By Lemmas 5.5 and 5.6, DP_f is a free $\text{DP}((P \setminus a)^{f \setminus a}, (\mathcal{G} \setminus a)^{f \setminus a}) \otimes \text{DP}(P_f, \mathcal{G}_f)$ -module with basis $x_f \sigma_f^{k-1}$ for $k = 1, \dots, n_f$. The elements $\{x_f^k\}_k$ written in the basis $\{x_f \sigma_f^{k-1}\}_k$ for an upper triangular matrix with ones on the diagonal (the inverse of the one given in Lemma 5.6). Eq. (10) and eq. (11) follow.

In order to prove eq. (12) we first prove the orthogonality. Let $f \neq \hat{1}$, the elements DP_f and $\text{DP}_{(a)}$ are orthogonal because the product is contained in DP_f that is zero in degree $\text{cd}(\hat{1}) - 1$. Indeed from eq. (10) and eq. (11), it follows that the top degree of DP_f is $\text{cd}(\hat{1}) - 2$.

Consider generic elements $x_f^b y \in \text{DP}_f$ and $x_g^c z \in \text{DP}_g$ in complementary degrees (with $y, z \in \text{DP}_{(a)}$). The product is zero if f and g are incomparable. Otherwise, by symmetry we may assume $g > f$, hence

$$x_f x_g^c = x_f (x_g + x_{g \setminus \{a\}})^c.$$

Since $x_g + x_{g \setminus \{a\}} \in \text{DP}_{(a)}$ we obtain that the product lie in DP_f . Again the top degree is zero since $f \neq \hat{1}$.

We prove that if a is a coloop then $\text{DP}_{(a)} \cap \text{DP}_{\hat{1}} = 0$. In that case $\text{DP}_{\hat{1}}$ is the ideal generated by $\sigma_{\hat{1}}$. It is linearly generated by all standard monomials σ_S^b with $\hat{1} \in S$. Since $\hat{1} \in S_a$ then $\text{DP}_{(a)} \cap \text{DP}_{\hat{1}} = 0$. The direct sum of eq. (12) follows from the orthogonality of all other addenda together with Lemma 5.7 and Theorem 4.7. \square

6. CHARACTERISTIC POLYNOMIAL

In this section we study the coefficients of the (reduced) characteristic polynomial.

We consider only maximal building sets, so we omit the building set from the notations. Moreover we suppose that the polymatroid is without loops, i.e. $\text{cd}(\{e\}) > 0$ for all $e \in E$.

Let $\alpha = \alpha_P = -x_{\hat{1}}$ and $\beta = \beta_P = \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}_{\max}} x_g$ be two elements in $\text{DP}^1(P)$. We denote by $\mu_L(a, b)$ the Möbius function of L .

Lemma 6.1. For any polymatroid P with $\text{cd}(E) > 0$ and $r = \text{cd}(E) - 1$ we have

$$\deg(\beta_P^r) = (-1)^r + \sum_{g \in L \setminus \{\hat{0}, \hat{1}\}} (-1)^{\text{cd}(g)-1} \deg(\beta_{P_g}^{r-\text{cd}(g)}).$$

Proof. A flag with repetition is $\mathcal{F} = (F_1^{a_1} \subsetneq F_2^{a_2} \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq F_l^{a_l})$ where $a_i > 0$ are the multiplicity of the flats $F_i \in L$. We also require that $\sum_{i=1}^l a_i = r$. Define $x_{\mathcal{F}} = \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{F}|} x_{F_i}^{a_i}$, we will prove that $x_{\mathcal{F}} = 0$ if $\text{cd}(F_1) > a_1$. More generally we have $x_{\mathcal{F}} = 0$ if $\text{cd}(F_i) > \sum_{j=1}^i a_j$ for some i , but we prove and use the implication only for $i = 1$. From the isomorphism ψ_g of Lemma 4.14 we obtain

$$x_{\mathcal{F}} = x_{F_1} \psi_{F_1}((x_{F_1} \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes \beta_{P_g})^{a_1-1} (1 \otimes x_{\mathcal{F}'})),$$

where $\mathcal{F}' = (F_2^{a_2} \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq F_l^{a_l})$. Notice that the degree of $x_{\mathcal{F}'}$ is $r - a_1$ that exceed the top degree of $\text{DP}(P_g)$ that is $r - \text{cd}(F_1)$.

Let $\binom{r}{a}$ be the multinomial coefficient where $a = (a_1, \dots, a_l)$ and $\sum_{i=1}^l a_i = r$. Since $x_f x_g = 0$ if f and g are incomparable, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_P^r &= \sum_{\mathcal{F} \text{ flag of } P} \binom{r}{a} x_{\mathcal{F}} \\ &= \sum_{F \in L \setminus \{\hat{0}\}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{F} \text{ flag of } P \\ F_1 = F}} \binom{r}{a} x_{\mathcal{F}} \\ &= \sum_{F \in L \setminus \{\hat{0}\}} \sum_{k=\text{cd}(F)}^r \binom{r}{k} x_F^k \sum_{\mathcal{F}' \text{ flag of } P_F} \binom{r-k}{a'} x_{\mathcal{F}'} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{F \in L \setminus \{\hat{0}\}} \sum_{k=\text{cd}(F)}^r \binom{r}{k} x_F^k \beta_{P_F}^{r-k}.$$

The addendum relative to $F = \hat{1}$ is exactly $x_{\hat{1}}^r$ and contributes with $(-1)^r$ to $\deg(\beta_P^r)$. It is enough to prove that for every $g \in L \setminus \{\hat{0}, \hat{1}\}$

$$\deg\left(\sum_{k=\text{cd}(g)}^r \binom{r}{k} x_g^k \beta_{P_g}^{r-k}\right) = \deg(\beta_{P_g}^{r-\text{cd}(g)}).$$

We use Lemma 4.14 to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \deg\left(\sum_{k=\text{cd}(g)}^r \binom{r}{k} x_g^k \beta_{P_g}^{r-k}\right) &= \\ &= \sum_{k=\text{cd}(g)}^r \binom{r}{k} \deg((x_g \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes \beta_{P_g})^{k-1} (1 \otimes \beta_{P_g}^{r-k})) \\ &= \sum_{k=\text{cd}(g)}^r (-1)^{k-\text{cd}(g)} \binom{r}{k} \binom{k-1}{\text{cd}(g)-1} \deg(x_g^{\text{cd}(g)-1} \otimes \beta_{P_g}^{r-\text{cd}(g)}) \\ &= \sum_{k=\text{cd}(g)}^r (-1)^{k-1} \binom{r}{k} \binom{k-1}{\text{cd}(g)-1} \deg(\beta_{P_g}^{r-\text{cd}(g)}) \\ &= (-1)^{\text{cd}(g)-1} \deg(\beta_{P_g}^{r-\text{cd}(g)}), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we used the identity

$$\sum_{k=\text{cd}(g)}^r (-1)^k \binom{r}{k} \binom{k-1}{\text{cd}(g)-1} = (-1)^{\text{cd}(g)}$$

that follows from [GKP94, eq. 5.24] with $l = r$, $m = 0$, $n = \text{cd}(g) - 1$, and $s = -1$. \square

Lemma 6.2. For every polymatroid P with poset of flats L and $r = \text{cd}(E) - 1$ with $\text{cd}(E) > 0$ we have

$$\deg(\beta_P^r) = (-1)^{\text{cd}(E)} \mu_L(\hat{0}, \hat{1}).$$

Proof. It is known that $\mu_L(\hat{0}, \hat{1}) = \tilde{\chi}(\Delta(\hat{0}, \hat{1}))$, i.e. the Möbius function coincides with the reduced Euler characteristic of the order complex of the poset $L \setminus \{\hat{0}, \hat{1}\}$ (e.g. see [Rot64]). Let L^{op} be the opposite (dual) lattice of L which is defined on the same set of L but with reversed order, i.e., $x \leq y$ in L^{op} if and only if $y \leq x$ in L . Since the order complex of L and L^{op} are the same simplicial complex, we have

$$\mu_L(\hat{0}, \hat{1}) = \mu_{L^{\text{op}}}(\hat{0}, \hat{1})$$

Define $\deg(\beta_P^0) = 1$ for rank zero polymatroids P . Therefore, the functions $(-1)^{\text{cd}(E)} \deg(\beta_P^r)$ and $\mu_{L^{\text{op}}}(\hat{0}, \hat{1})$ satisfy the same recurrence

relation. One is given by the definition of $\mu_{L^{\text{op}}}(\hat{0}, \hat{1})$ and the other from Lemma 6.1. This concludes the proof. \square

Notice that if L is a geometric lattice (i.e. the poset of flats of a matroid) then the Möbius function has alternating sign, hence in this case $\deg(\beta^r) \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Definition 6.3. The *characteristic polynomial* of a polymatroid P is

$$\chi_P(\lambda) = \sum_{g \in L} \mu_L(\hat{0}, g) \lambda^{\dim(g)},$$

where $\dim(g) = \text{cd}(\hat{1}) - \text{cd}(g)$. Since $\chi_P(1) = 0$ by the definition of Möbius function, we define the *reduced characteristic polynomial* as

$$\bar{\chi}_P(\lambda) = \frac{\chi_P(\lambda)}{\lambda - 1}$$

This definition of reduced characteristic polynomial coincides with the one in the introduction eq. (1), as stated in [Whi93].

Theorem 6.4. For every polymatroid P , we define $r = \text{cd}(E) - 1$. We have

$$\bar{\chi}_P(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^r (-1)^i \deg_P(\alpha_P^i \beta_P^{r-i}) \lambda^i.$$

Proof. We show that $\bar{\chi}_P(\lambda)$ and the right hand side satisfy the same recurrence:

$$q_P(\lambda) - \lambda q_{\text{tr}_1 P}(\lambda) = -\mu_L(\hat{0}, \hat{1})$$

where L is the poset of flats of P .

Let $\text{tr}_1 L$ be the poset of flats of $\text{tr}_1 P$ and notice that $\mu_L(\hat{0}, g) = \mu_{\text{tr}_1 L}(\hat{0}, g)$ for all g such that $\dim(g) > 1$. Therefore $\chi_P(\lambda) - \lambda \chi_{\text{tr}_1 P}(\lambda)$ is a polynomial of degree one divisible by $\lambda - 1$. Hence $\bar{\chi}_P(\lambda) - \lambda \bar{\chi}_{\text{tr}_1 P}(\lambda)$ is constant and equal to $\bar{\chi}_P(0) = -\mu_L(\hat{0}, \hat{1})$. This proves that $\bar{\chi}_P(\lambda)$ satisfies the recurrence.

Now observe that for $i > 0$ $\deg_P(\alpha_P^i \beta_P^{r-i}) = \deg_{\text{tr}_1 P}(\alpha_{\text{tr}_1 P}^{i-1} \beta_{\text{tr}_1 P}^{r-i})$ by Lemma 4.11. This proves that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^r (-1)^i \deg_P(\alpha_P^i \beta_P^{r-i}) \lambda^i - \lambda \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} (-1)^i \deg_{\text{tr}_1 P}(\alpha_{\text{tr}_1 P}^{i-1} \beta_{\text{tr}_1 P}^{r-i}) \lambda^i &= \\ &= (-1)^r \deg_P(\beta^r), \end{aligned}$$

and so Lemma 6.2 proves the recurrence.

The base case $\text{cd}(E) = 1$ is trivial, so the proof follows. \square

Corollary 6.5. The coefficient of λ^i of the reduced characteristic polynomial $\bar{\chi}_P(\lambda)$ is (up to the sign) the reduced Euler characteristic of the order complex of the poset $(\text{tr}_1^i L) \setminus \{\hat{0}, \hat{1}\}$:

$$[\lambda^i] \bar{\chi}_P(\lambda) = (-1)^{\text{cd}(E)} \tilde{\chi}(\Delta((\text{tr}_1^i L) \setminus \{\hat{0}, \hat{1}\})).$$




FIGURE 1. The Hasse diagram of the poset of flats L of Section 7

Proof. It follows from Theorem 6.4 and lemma 6.2. □

Remark 6.6. The coefficients of the characteristic polynomial χ_P and of the reduced one $\bar{\chi}_P$ do not form a log-concave sequence. Indeed if P_1 is the polymatroid associated to 4 subspaces of codimension 2, 3, 4, 4 in \mathbb{C}^5 in general position, then

$$\chi_{P_1}(\lambda) = \lambda^5 - \lambda^3 - \lambda^2 - 2\lambda + 3$$

that is not log-concave. Let P_2 be the polymatroid on $E = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ with rank defined by $\text{cd}(a) = 2$, $\text{cd}(b) = 3$, $\text{cd}(c) = 4$, $\text{cd}(d) = 4$, $\text{cd}(e) = 1$, by $\text{cd}(A) = 6$ if $|A| \geq 3$ and $\text{cd}(\{x, y\}) = \min\{5, \text{cd}(x) + \text{cd}(y)\}$. The reduced characteristic polynomial is not log-concave because

$$\bar{\chi}_{P_2}(\lambda) = \lambda^5 - \lambda^3 - \lambda^2 - 2\lambda + 6.$$

7. AN EXAMPLE

Let $E = \{a, b, c\}$ and $\text{cd}: 2^E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ the function defined by


$$\begin{aligned} \text{cd}(a) = \text{cd}(b) = 2, \quad \text{cd}(ab) = \text{cd}(c) = 4, \\ \text{cd}(ac) = \text{cd}(bc) = \text{cd}(abc) = 5. \end{aligned}$$

This function defines a polymatroid P with poset of flats L shown in Figure 1. Near every cover relation, the relative codimension of the two flats is shown. This polymatroid is realizable, a realization is the collection in \mathbb{C}^5 of two subspace of dimension 3 and a line in general position.

Consider the (minimal) building set $\mathcal{G} = \{a, b, c, \hat{1}\}$, the nested set complex $n(P, \mathcal{G})$ is shown in Figure 2.

The algebra $B(P, \mathcal{G})$ is generated by $x_a, x_b, x_c, x_{\hat{1}}, e_a, e_b, e_c, e_{\hat{1}}$ with relations:

$$\begin{aligned} e_a e_c = e_b e_c = 0 & & x_a x_c = x_b x_c = 0 \\ x_a e_c = x_b e_c = 0 & & e_a x_c = e_b x_c = 0 \\ (x_a + x_{\hat{1}})^2 = (x_b + x_{\hat{1}})^2 = 0 & & (x_c + x_{\hat{1}})^4 = 0 \\ x_{\hat{1}}^5 = 0 & & x_c x_{\hat{1}} = e_c x_{\hat{1}} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

FIGURE 2. The nested set complex $n(P, \mathcal{G})$.

1	2	1		
3	7	7	3	
1	4	5	4	1

TABLE 1. The dimensions of $B^{2p,q}(P, \mathcal{G})/(e_1)$ in position (p, q) .

1	2	1		
4	9	8	3	
4	11	12	7	1
1	4	5	4	1

TABLE 2. The dimensions of $B^{2p,q}(P, \mathcal{G})$ in position (p, q) .

$$\begin{aligned} x_a x_{\hat{1}}^3 = e_a x_{\hat{1}}^3 = 0 & & x_b x_{\hat{1}}^3 = e_b x_{\hat{1}}^3 = 0 \\ x_a x_b x_{\hat{1}} = e_a x_b x_{\hat{1}} = 0 & & e_a e_b x_{\hat{1}} = x_a e_b x_{\hat{1}} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

The homogeneous component $B^{4,1}(P, \mathcal{G})$ has dimension 12 and the additive basis provided by Corollary 2.8 is:

$$\begin{aligned} e_{\hat{1}} x_a x_b, e_{\hat{1}} x_a x_{\hat{1}}, e_{\hat{1}} x_b x_{\hat{1}}, e_{\hat{1}} x_c^2, e_{\hat{1}} x_{\hat{1}}^2, \\ e_a x_a x_b, e_a x_a x_{\hat{1}}, e_a x_{\hat{1}}^2, e_b x_a x_b, e_b x_a x_{\hat{1}}, e_b x_{\hat{1}}^2, e_c x_c^2. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $B(P, \mathcal{G}) = B(P, \mathcal{G})/(e_{\hat{1}}) \otimes \langle 1, e_{\hat{1}} \rangle$ and their dimensions are reported in Tables 1 and 2.

The other presentation of $B(P, \mathcal{G})$ is given by generators $\sigma_a, \sigma_b, \sigma_c, \sigma_{\hat{1}}, \tau_a, \tau_b, \tau_c, \tau_{\hat{1}}$ and relations:

$$\begin{aligned} (\tau_a - \tau_{\hat{1}})(\tau_c - \tau_{\hat{1}}) = 0 & & (\tau_b - \tau_{\hat{1}})(\tau_c - \tau_{\hat{1}}) = 0 & & \sigma_c^4 = 0 \\ (\sigma_a - \sigma_{\hat{1}})(\sigma_c - \sigma_{\hat{1}}) = 0 & & (\sigma_b - \sigma_{\hat{1}})(\sigma_c - \sigma_{\hat{1}}) = 0 & & \sigma_a^2 = 0 \\ (\sigma_a - \sigma_{\hat{1}})(\tau_c - \tau_{\hat{1}}) = 0 & & (\sigma_b - \sigma_{\hat{1}})(\tau_c - \tau_{\hat{1}}) = 0 & & \sigma_b^2 = 0 \\ (\tau_a - \tau_{\hat{1}})(\sigma_c - \sigma_{\hat{1}}) = 0 & & (\tau_b - \tau_{\hat{1}})(\sigma_c - \sigma_{\hat{1}}) = 0 & & \sigma_{\hat{1}}^5 = 0 \\ (\sigma_c - \sigma_{\hat{1}})\sigma_{\hat{1}} = 0 & & (\tau_c - \tau_{\hat{1}})\sigma_{\hat{1}} = 0 & & (\sigma_a - \sigma_{\hat{1}})\sigma_{\hat{1}}^3 = 0 \\ (\tau_a - \tau_{\hat{1}})\sigma_{\hat{1}}^3 = 0 & & (\sigma_b - \sigma_{\hat{1}})\sigma_{\hat{1}}^3 = 0 & & (\tau_b - \tau_{\hat{1}})\sigma_{\hat{1}}^3 = 0 \\ (\sigma_a - \sigma_{\hat{1}})(\sigma_b - \sigma_{\hat{1}})\sigma_{\hat{1}} = 0 & & (\tau_a - \tau_{\hat{1}})(\sigma_b - \sigma_{\hat{1}})\sigma_{\hat{1}} = 0 & & \\ (\tau_a - \tau_{\hat{1}})(\tau_b - \tau_{\hat{1}})\sigma_{\hat{1}} = 0 & & (\sigma_a - \sigma_{\hat{1}})(\tau_b - \tau_{\hat{1}})\sigma_{\hat{1}} = 0 & & \end{aligned}$$

0	0	1		
0	0	1	3	
0	2	0	1	1
1	0	0	0	0

 TABLE 3. The dimensions of $\text{CM}(P, \mathcal{G})$ in position (p, q) .

0	0	0		
0	0	1	1	
0	2	0	1	0
1	0	0	0	0

 TABLE 4. The dimensions of $H^{2p,q}(B(P, \mathcal{G}), d)$ in position (p, q) .

The homogeneous component $B^{4,1}(P, \mathcal{G})$ has dimension 12 and the additive basis provided by Corollary 2.12 is:

$$\begin{aligned} & \tau_{\hat{1}}\sigma_a\sigma_b, \tau_{\hat{1}}\sigma_a\sigma_{\hat{1}}, \tau_{\hat{1}}\sigma_b\sigma_{\hat{1}}, \tau_{\hat{1}}\sigma_c^2, \tau_{\hat{1}}\sigma_{\hat{1}}^2, \\ & \tau_a\sigma_a\sigma_b, \tau_a\sigma_a\sigma_{\hat{1}}, \tau_a\sigma_{\hat{1}}^2, \tau_b\sigma_a\sigma_b, \tau_b\sigma_a\sigma_{\hat{1}}, \tau_b\sigma_{\hat{1}}^2, \tau_c\sigma_c^2. \end{aligned}$$

The set of critical monomials is:

$$1, \tau_a\sigma_a, \tau_b\sigma_b, \tau_c\sigma_c^3, \tau_{\hat{1}}\sigma_{\hat{1}}^4, \tau_a\tau_b\sigma_a\sigma_b, \tau_a\tau_{\hat{1}}\sigma_a\sigma_{\hat{1}}^2, \tau_b\tau_{\hat{1}}\sigma_b\sigma_{\hat{1}}^2, \tau_c\tau_{\hat{1}}\sigma_c^3, \tau_a\tau_b\tau_{\hat{1}}\sigma_a\sigma_b,$$

and the dimension of $\text{CM}^{2p,q}(P, \mathcal{G})$ are given in Table 3. The rank of the cohomology group of $(B(P, \mathcal{G}), d)$ are given in Table 4

As an example we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(c\mu(ab\hat{1})) &= d(\tau_a\tau_b\tau_{\hat{1}}\sigma_a\sigma_b) = \tau_a\tau_b\sigma_{\hat{1}}\sigma_a\sigma_b \\ &= \tau_b\tau_{\hat{1}}\sigma_b\sigma_{\hat{1}}^2 - \tau_a\tau_{\hat{1}}\sigma_a\sigma_{\hat{1}}^2 = c\mu(b\hat{1}) - c\mu(a\hat{1}) \end{aligned}$$

that coincides with $d((a, b, \hat{1})) = (b, \hat{1}) - (a, \hat{1})$ in the differential algebra $\text{CM}(P, \mathcal{G})$. Moreover in $\text{CM}(P, \mathcal{G})$ we have

$$(a) \cdot (b) = \lambda(a, b) - \lambda(b, a) = (a, b)$$

because $a \prec b$ and it corresponds to the equality

$$c\mu(a)c\mu(b) = \tau_a\sigma_a\tau_b\sigma_b = \tau_a\tau_b\sigma_a\sigma_b = c\mu(ab).$$

The posets related to P and a are shown in Figure 3. The polymatroids $P(a)$ and $P \setminus a$ are equal by coincidence; see below for the poset $P(a)$ relative to the maximal building set.

The σ -cone $\Sigma_{P, \mathcal{G}}$ is given by the linear combinations $-d_a\sigma_a - d_b\sigma_b - d_c\sigma_c - d_{\hat{1}}\sigma_{\hat{1}}$ with positive coefficients $d_g > 0$.

We have $\text{Ann}(x_a) = (x_c, x_b\sigma_{\hat{1}}, \sigma_{\hat{1}}^3)$ and so in $\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})/\text{Ann}(x_a)$ we have $\sigma_c = \sigma_{\hat{1}}$, $(\sigma_b - \sigma_{\hat{1}})\sigma_{\hat{1}} = 0$, and $\sigma_{\hat{1}}^3 = 0$. The last two equations correspond to the defining relation for $\text{DP}(P_a, \mathcal{G}_a)$. Similarly,




FIGURE 3. The Hasse diagram of some posets related to a . The circle nodes are in the corresponding building sets.

$\text{Ann}(\sigma_a) = (\sigma_c - \sigma_{\hat{1}}, \sigma_a, \sigma_{\hat{1}}^4, (\sigma_b - \sigma_{\hat{1}})\sigma_{\hat{1}}^2)$ and these are exactly the equation defining $\text{DP}(\text{tr}_a P, \text{tr}_a \mathcal{G})$ that does not appear in $\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G})$.

The relative Lefschetz decomposition with respect the atom a is

$$\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G}) = \text{DP}_{(a)} \oplus x_a \text{DP}_{(a)},$$

where

$$\text{DP}_{(a)} = \langle 1, \sigma_b, \sigma_c, \sigma_{\hat{1}}, \sigma_b \sigma_{\hat{1}}, \sigma_c^2, \sigma_{\hat{1}}^2, \sigma_b \sigma_{\hat{1}}^2, \sigma_c^3, \sigma_{\hat{1}}^3, \sigma_{\hat{1}}^4 \rangle$$

and

$$\text{DP}_a = x_a \text{DP}_{(a)} = \langle x_a, x_a \sigma_b, x_a \sigma_{\hat{1}}, x_a \sigma_{\hat{1}}^2 \rangle \simeq \text{DP}(P_a, \mathcal{G}_a).$$

The relative Lefschetz decomposition with respect the atom c is

$$\text{DP}(P, \mathcal{G}) = \text{DP}_{(c)} \oplus \text{DP}_{\hat{1}} \oplus \text{DP}_c,$$

where $\text{DP}_{(c)} = \langle 1, \sigma_a, \sigma_b, \sigma_a \sigma_b \rangle$ and the other $\text{DP}_{(c)}$ -modules are $\text{DP}_c = \langle x_c, x_c^2, x_c^3 \rangle$ and $\text{DP}_{\hat{1}} = x_{\hat{1}} \text{DP}_{(c)} \oplus x_{\hat{1}}^2 \text{DP}_{(c)}$. Moreover we have $x_{\hat{1}} \text{DP}_{(c)} \simeq x_{\hat{1}}^2 \text{DP}_{(c)} \simeq \text{DP}((P \setminus c)^{ab}, (\mathcal{G} \setminus c)^{ab})$.

Maximal building set. Now consider the same polymatroid P with the maximal building set $\mathcal{G}_{\max} = \{a, b, c, ab, \hat{1}\}$. The polymatroid $P(a)$ relative to the maximal building set is shown in Figure 4 and the groundset $E(a)$ is $\{b, c, ab\}$. This polymatroid $P(a)$ associated with \mathcal{G}_{\max} is different from the polymatroid $P(a)$ defined from the minimal building set \mathcal{G} (shown in Figure 3d).




FIGURE 4. The Hasse diagram of the poset of flats of $P(a)$ with maximal building set

The characteristic polynomial is $\chi_P(\lambda) = \lambda^5 - 2\lambda^3 + 1$ and the reduced one is

$$\bar{\chi}_P(\lambda) = \lambda^4 + \lambda^3 - \lambda^2 - \lambda - 1$$

We have $\alpha = -x_{\hat{1}}$, $\beta = x_a + x_b + x_c + x_{ab} + x_{\hat{1}}$ and $\deg(\alpha^4) = 1$, $\deg(\alpha^3\beta) = -1$, $\deg(\alpha^2\beta^2) = -1$, $\deg(\alpha\beta^3) = 1$, and $\deg(\beta^4) = -1$.

REFERENCES

- [AA17] Marcelo Aguiar and Federico Ardila, *Hopf monoids and generalized permutahedra*, 2017.
- [AHK18] Karim Adiprasito, June Huh, and Eric Katz, *Hodge theory for combinatorial geometries*, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **188** (2018), no. 2, 381–452. MR 3862944
- [BDF20] Christin Bibby, Graham Denham, and Eva Maria Feichtner, *A Leray model for the Orlik-Solomon algebra*, 2020.
- [BEST21] Andrew Berget, Christopher Eur, Hunter Spink, and Dennis Tseng, *Tautological classes of matroids*, 2021.
- [BHM⁺20a] Tom Braden, June Huh, Jacob P. Matherne, Nicholas Proudfoot, and Botong Wang, *A semi-small decomposition of the Chow ring of a matroid*, 2020.
- [BHM⁺20b] ———, *Singular Hodge theory for combinatorial geometries*, 2020.
- [BLZ15] Pavle V. M. Blagojević, Wolfgang Lück, and Günter M. Ziegler, *Equivariant topology of configuration spaces*, *J. Topol.* **8** (2015), no. 2, 414–456. MR 3356767
- [dCM02] Mark Andrea A. de Cataldo and Luca Migliorini, *The hard Lefschetz theorem and the topology of semismall maps*, *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)* **35** (2002), no. 5, 759–772. MR 1951443
- [dCM09] ———, *The decomposition theorem, perverse sheaves and the topology of algebraic maps*, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* **46** (2009), no. 4, 535–633. MR 2525735
- [DCP95] Corrado De Concini and Claudio Procesi, *Wonderful models of subspace arrangements*, *Selecta Math. (N.S.)* **1** (1995), no. 3, 459–494. MR 1366622
- [Des18] Priyavrat Deshpande, *The Goresky-MacPherson formula for toric arrangements*, 2018.
- [DGM00] Pierre Deligne, Mark Goresky, and Robert MacPherson, *L’algèbre de cohomologie du complément, dans un espace affine, d’une famille*

- finie de sous-espaces affines*, Michigan Math. J. **48** (2000), 121–136, Dedicated to William Fulton on the occasion of his 60th birthday. MR 1786483
- [dLS01] Mark de Longueville and Carsten A. Schultz, *The cohomology rings of complements of subspace arrangements*, Math. Ann. **319** (2001), no. 4, 625–646. MR 1825401
- [Edm70] Jack Edmonds, *Submodular functions, matroids, and certain polyhedra*, Combinatorial Structures and their Applications (Proc. Calgary Internat. Conf., Calgary, Alta., 1969), Gordon and Breach, New York, 1970, pp. 69–87. MR 0270945
- [FK04] Eva Maria Feichtner and Dmitry N. Kozlov, *Incidence combinatorics of resolutions*, Selecta Math. (N.S.) **10** (2004), no. 1, 37–60. MR 2061222
- [FY04] Eva Maria Feichtner and Sergey Yuzvinsky, *Chow rings of toric varieties defined by atomic lattices*, Invent. Math. **155** (2004), no. 3, 515–536. MR 2038195
- [GJLR20] Elisa Gorla, Relinde Jurrius, Hiram H. López, and Alberto Ravagnani, *Rank-metric codes and q -polymatroids*, J. Algebraic Combin. **52** (2020), no. 1, 1–19. MR 4128042
- [GKP94] Ronald L. Graham, Donald E. Knuth, and Oren Patashnik, *Concrete mathematics*, second ed., Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, MA, 1994, A foundation for computer science. MR 1397498
- [GM88] Mark Goresky and Robert MacPherson, *Stratified Morse theory*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)], vol. 14, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988. MR 932724
- [HH02] Jürgen Herzog and Takayuki Hibi, *Discrete polymatroids*, J. Algebraic Combin. **16** (2002), no. 3, 239–268 (2003). MR 1957102
- [HK12] June Huh and Eric Katz, *Log-concavity of characteristic polynomials and the Bergman fan of matroids*, Math. Ann. **354** (2012), no. 3, 1103–1116. MR 2983081
- [Huh12] June Huh, *Milnor numbers of projective hypersurfaces and the chromatic polynomial of graphs*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **25** (2012), no. 3, 907–927. MR 2904577
- [HW17] June Huh and Botong Wang, *Enumeration of points, lines, planes, etc.*, Acta Math. **218** (2017), no. 2, 297–317. MR 3733101
- [JW09] Michael Jöllenbeck and Volkmar Welker, *Minimal resolutions via algebraic discrete Morse theory*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **197** (2009), no. 923, vi+74. MR 2488864
- [Len13] Matthias Lenz, *The f -vector of a representable-matroid complex is log-concave*, Adv. in Appl. Math. **51** (2013), no. 5, 543–545. MR 3118543
- [Mor78] John W. Morgan, *The algebraic topology of smooth algebraic varieties*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1978), no. 48, 137–204. MR 516917
- [MP20] Luca Moci and Roberto Pagaria, *On the cohomology of arrangements of subtori*, 2020.
- [Pos09] Alexander Postnikov, *Permutohedra, associahedra, and beyond*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN (2009), no. 6, 1026–1106. MR 2487491
- [Rot64] Gian Carlo Rota, *On the foundations of combinatorial theory. I. Theory of Möbius functions*, Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete **2** (1964), 340–368 (1964). MR 174487

- [Sch03] Alexander Schrijver, *Combinatorial optimization. Polyhedra and efficiency. Vol. B*, Algorithms and Combinatorics, vol. 24, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003, Matroids, trees, stable sets, Chapters 39–69. MR 1956925
- [Wel76] Dominic J. A. Welsh, *Matroid theory*, Academic Press [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], London-New York, 1976, L. M. S. Monographs, No. 8. MR 0427112
- [Whi93] Geoff Whittle, *Characteristic polynomials of weighted lattices*, Adv. Math. **99** (1993), no. 2, 125–151. MR 1219581
- [Yuz99] Sergey Yuzvinsky, *Rational model of subspace complement on atomic complex*, Publ. Inst. Math. (Beograd) (N.S.) **66(80)** (1999), 157–164, Geometric combinatorics (Kotor, 1998). MR 1765044
- [Yuz02] ———, *Small rational model of subspace complement*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **354** (2002), no. 5, 1921–1945. MR 1881024

ROBERTO PAGARIA

Università di Bologna, Dipartimento di Matematica, PIAZZA DI PORTA SAN DONATO 5 - 40126 BOLOGNA, ITALY.

Email address: roberto.pagaria@unibo.it

GIAN MARCO PEZZOLI

Università di Bologna, Dipartimento di Matematica, PIAZZA DI PORTA SAN DONATO 5 - 40126 BOLOGNA, ITALY.

Email address: gianmarco.pezzoli2@unibo.it