

# Generalization of the addition and restriction theorems from free arrangements to the class of projective dimension one

Takuro Abe

July 1, 2022

## Abstract

We study a generalized version of Terao's famous addition theorem for free arrangements to the category of those with projective dimension one. Namely, we give a criterion to determine the algebraic structure of logarithmic derivation modules of the addition when the deletion and restrictions are free with a mild condition. Also, we introduce a class of divisionally SPOG arrangements whose SPOGness depends only on the intersection lattice like Terao's famous conjecture on combinatoriality of freeness.

## 1 Introduction

Let  $\mathbb{K}$  be a field,  $V = \mathbb{K}^\ell$ ,  $S = \text{Sym}^*(V^*) = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_\ell]$  be the coordinate ring of  $V$ . For the derivation module  $\text{Der } S := \bigoplus_{i=1}^\ell S \partial_{x_i}$  and a hyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A} = \{H_1, \dots, H_n\}$ , where  $H_i$  is defined as a zero locus of a non-zero linear form  $\alpha_{H_i} \in V^*$ , the **logarithmic derivation module**  $D(\mathcal{A})$  is defined by

$$D(\mathcal{A}) := \{\theta \in \text{Der } S \mid \theta(\alpha_H) \in S\alpha_H \ (\forall H \in \mathcal{A})\}.$$

$D(\mathcal{A})$  is an  $S$ -graded reflexive module of rank  $\ell$ , but not free in general. So we say that  $\mathcal{A}$  is **free** with **exponents**  $\exp(\mathcal{A}) = (d_1, \dots, d_\ell)$  if  $D(\mathcal{A}) \simeq \bigoplus_{i=1}^\ell S[-d_i]$ . In this article  $\exp(\mathcal{A})$  indicates a **multiset**. If  $\mathcal{A} \neq \emptyset$ , then the Euler derivation  $\theta_E \in D(\mathcal{A})$  forms a direct summand of  $D(\mathcal{A})$ . So we may assume that  $d_1 = 1 = \deg \theta_E$  when  $\mathcal{A} \neq \emptyset$  is free.

Free arrangements have been a central topic in the research of hyperplane arrangements. Among them, the most important problem is so called the

**Terao's conjecture** asking whether the freeness of  $\mathcal{A}$  depends only on the intersection lattice

$$L(\mathcal{A}) := \{\cap_{H \in \mathcal{B}} H \mid \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{A}\}.$$

In other words, the freeness is combinatorial. This is completely open, but it was shown in [10] that the minimal free resolution of  $D(\mathcal{A})$  is not combinatorial. To approach Terao's conjecture, one of the main tools is Terao's addition-deletion theorem. For the purpose of this article, we exhibit it in a slightly different way compared as usual:

**Theorem 1.1** (Addition and restriction theorems, [8]). *Let  $H \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{A}' := \mathcal{A} \setminus \{H\}$  and let  $\mathcal{A}^H := \{H \cap L \mid L \in \mathcal{A}'\}$ . Assume that  $\mathcal{A}'$  is free with  $\exp(\mathcal{A}') = (1, d_2, \dots, d_\ell)$ . Then the following two conditions are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\mathcal{A}$  is free.
- (2)  $\mathcal{A}^H$  is free and  $|\exp(\mathcal{A}') \cap \exp(\mathcal{A}^H)| = \ell - 1$ .

In each case, for  $d_i := \exp(\mathcal{A}') \setminus \exp(\mathcal{A}^H)$ , it holds that

$$\exp(\mathcal{A}) = (1, d_2, \dots, d_{i-1}, d_i+1, d_{i+1}, \dots, d_\ell), \quad \exp(\mathcal{A}^H) = (1, d_2, \dots, d_{i-1}, d_{i+1}, \dots, d_\ell).$$

In general the condition  $|\exp(\mathcal{A}') \cap \exp(\mathcal{A}^H)| = \ell - 1$  above is described as  $\exp(\mathcal{A}') \supset \exp(\mathcal{A}^H)$ . However, note that  $|\exp(\mathcal{A}') \cap \exp(\mathcal{A}^H)| < \ell - 1$  often occurs even when both  $\mathcal{A}'$  and  $\mathcal{A}^H$  are free. So we have a first question in this article:

**Problem 1.2.** *Assume that  $\mathcal{A}'$  is free. Then which  $\mathcal{A}$  makes  $\mathcal{A}^H$  free?*

Also, recent developments show the following projective dimension version of the addition theorem. Note that  $\mathcal{A}$  is free if and only if  $\text{pd } \mathcal{A} = 0$ .

**Theorem 1.3** (Theorem 1.11, [4]). (1) *Assume that  $\text{pd } \mathcal{A}' = \text{pd } \mathcal{A}^H = 0$ . Then  $\text{pd } \mathcal{A} \leq 1$ .*

- (2) *Assume that  $\text{pd } \mathcal{A}' = 0$  and  $\text{pd } \mathcal{A} \leq 1$ . Then  $\text{pd } \mathcal{A}^H = 0$ .*

Now we have the second question in this article which is related to Problem 1.2:

**Problem 1.4.** *Can we describe an algebraic structure of  $D(\mathcal{A})$  when  $\mathcal{A}'$  and  $\mathcal{A}^H$  are both free, but  $|\exp(\mathcal{A}') \cap \exp(\mathcal{A}^H)| < \ell - 1$ ?*

Explicitly, we want to know the minimal free resolution of  $D(\mathcal{A})$  under the above condition. Contrary to these problems, when  $\mathcal{A}$  is free, we can describe  $D(\mathcal{A}')$ , which was proved in [2]. To see this result, let us recall the definition of SPOG.

**Definition 1.5** ([2]). We say that  $\mathcal{A}$  is **SPOG** with  $\text{POexp}(\mathcal{A}) = (1, d_2, \dots, d_\ell)$  and **level**  $d$  if there is a minimal free resolution of the following:

$$0 \rightarrow S[-d-1] \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\ell} S[-d_i] \oplus S[-d] \rightarrow D(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow 0.$$

Here  $d_1 = 1$ . For the generator  $\theta_E, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_\ell, \theta$  with  $\deg \theta_i = d_i$  and  $\deg \theta = d$  for the SPOG module  $D(\mathcal{A})$ ,  $\theta_E, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_\ell$  is called an **SPOG generator** and  $\theta$  a **level element**.

It was proved in [2] (see Theorem 2.4) that  $\mathcal{A}'$  is SPOG if  $\mathcal{A}$  is free and  $\mathcal{A}'$  is not free. Interestingly, in this case the structure of  $D(\mathcal{A}')$  is independent of that of  $D(\mathcal{A}^H)$ . However, in general  $\mathcal{A}$  is neither free nor SPOG even if  $\mathcal{A}'$  is free. When  $\text{pd } \mathcal{A}' = \text{pd } \mathcal{A}^H = 0$ , then  $\text{pd } \mathcal{A} \leq 1$  by Theorem 1.3. Also Theorem 1.1 shows that one additional condition for exponents say that  $\text{pd } \mathcal{A} = 0$ . So a weaker condition for exponents when  $\text{pd } \mathcal{A}' = \text{pd } \mathcal{A}^H = 0$  could determine the minimal free resolution of  $D(\mathcal{A})$ . Namely, we can show the following, which answers Problems 1.2 and 1.4 partially:

**Theorem 1.6.** Let  $\mathcal{A}'$  be free with  $\exp(\mathcal{A}') = (1, d_2, \dots, d_\ell)_{\leq}$ . Let  $d_j < d := d_i + d_j + |\mathcal{A}^H| - |\mathcal{A}'| \leq d_{j+1}$  for some  $i < j$ . Then the following two conditions are equivalent:

- (1)  $\mathcal{A}^H$  is free with  $\exp(\mathcal{A}^H) = (1, d_2, \dots, \hat{d}_i, \dots, \hat{d}_j, \dots, d_\ell) \cup (d)$
- (2)  $\mathcal{A}$  is SPOG with  $\text{POexp}(\mathcal{A}) = (1, d_2, \dots, d_i + 1, \dots, d_j + 1, \dots, d_\ell)$  and level  $d$ .

Theorem 1.6 can be regarded as an extension of the addition and restriction theorems (Theorem 1.1). Namely, Theorem 1.1 is the theorem to determine the minimal free resolution of  $D(\mathcal{A})$  as an SPOG-module when  $|\exp(\mathcal{A}') \cap \exp(\mathcal{A}^H)| = \ell - 2$ . The condition  $d \leq d_{j+1}$  is necessary, see Example 4.6 for details.

Now go back to Teraso's conjecture. As we have seen, SPOG arrangements can be regarded as a close arrangements to free arrangements. Thus to study Teraso's conjecture by using an inductive approach, it is important to study combinatorial dependency of SPOG arrangements. For that purpose, let us introduce the following class of arrangements.

**Definition 1.7.** We say that  $\mathcal{A}$  is **stair-SPOG** if there is  $H \in \mathcal{A}$  such that both  $\mathcal{A}' := \mathcal{A} \setminus \{H\}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^H$  are stair-free (see Definition 2.6 and Theorem 2.7), and  $\exp(\mathcal{A}')$ ,  $\exp(\mathcal{A}^H)$  and  $|\mathcal{A}'| - |\mathcal{A}^H|$  satisfy the conditions in Theorem 1.6. Let  $\text{STSPOG}_\ell$  denotes the set of stair-SPOG arrangements and let

$$\text{STSPOG} := \bigcup_{\ell \geq 2} \text{STSPOG}_\ell.$$

**Theorem 1.8.**  $\mathcal{A}$  is SPOG if  $\mathcal{A} \in STSPOG$ . Moreover, if there is  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  such that  $\mathcal{A} \in STSPOG$  and  $L(\mathcal{A}) \simeq L(\mathcal{B})$ , then  $\mathcal{B}$  is SPOG too.

The organization of this article is as follows. In §2 we introduce several results and definitions for the proof of main results in this article. In §3 we prove some useful results on the cardinality of the set of minimal generators. In §4 we prove main results of this article. Several examples are also exhibited in §4. In §5 we study the addition theorem from the viewpoint of the cardinality of the set of minimal generators. §6 is devoted to investigate Yoshinaga-type formulation of our new addition theorem.

**Acknowledgements.** The first author is partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP21H00975.

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section let us gather several definitions and results for the proof of main results in this article. First recall some combinatorics of arrangements. For the intersection lattice  $L(\mathcal{A})$ , we can define the **Möbius function**  $\mu : L(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  by  $\mu(V) = 1$  and by

$$\mu(X) := - \sum_{X \subsetneq Y \subset V, Y \in L(\mathcal{A})} \mu(Y)$$

for  $X \in L(\mathcal{A}) \setminus \{V\}$ . The generating function of  $\mu$  is defined by

$$\chi(\mathcal{A}; t) := \sum_{X \in L(\mathcal{A})} \mu(X) t^{\dim X}$$

is called the **characteristic polynomial** of  $\mathcal{A}$ , which is a combinatorial invariant. Now let us recall several useful results on  $D(\mathcal{A})$ .

**Theorem 2.1** (Terao's polynomial  $B$ , [8]). *Let  $\mathcal{C} \setminus \{H\} = \mathcal{C}'$ . Then there is a homogeneous polynomial  $B \in S/\alpha_H S$  of degree  $|\mathcal{C}| - 1 - |\mathcal{C}^H|$  such that*

$$D(\mathcal{C}')(\alpha_H) := \{\theta(\alpha_H) \mid \theta \in D(\mathcal{C}')\} \in (\alpha_H, B).$$

We say such  $B$  a **polynomial**  $B$  of  $(\mathcal{C}, H)$ .

**Theorem 2.2** (Terao's factorization, [9]). *Assume that  $\mathcal{A}$  is free with  $\exp(\mathcal{A}) = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_\ell)$ , then*

$$\chi(\mathcal{A}; t) = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} (t - d_i).$$

For  $H \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{C}' := \mathcal{C} \setminus \{H\}$  we have the following **Euler exact sequence**

$$(2.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow D(\mathcal{C}') \xrightarrow{\alpha_H} D(\mathcal{C}) \xrightarrow{\rho} D(\mathcal{C}^H).$$

This is not right exact in general, but it is when  $\mathcal{C}'$  is free as follows.

**Theorem 2.3** (Free surjection theorem (FST), Theorem 1.13, [4]). *Let  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}' \cup \{H\}$  and assume that  $\mathcal{C}'$  is free. Then  $\rho = \rho^H : D(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{C}^H)$  is surjective.*

At the end of this section we gather results on freeness and SPOGness.

**Theorem 2.4** (Theorem 1.4, [2]). *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be free with  $\exp(\mathcal{A}) = (d_1, \dots, d_\ell)$ ,  $H \in \mathcal{A}$  and assume that  $\mathcal{A}' := \mathcal{A} \setminus \{H\}$  is not free. Then  $\mathcal{A}'$  is SPOG with  $\text{POexp}(\mathcal{A}') = (d_1, \dots, d_\ell)$  and level  $d := |\mathcal{A}'| - |\mathcal{A}^H|$ .*

**Theorem 2.5** (Division theorem, Theorem 1.1, [1]). *Assume that  $\mathcal{A}^H$  is free and  $\chi(\mathcal{A}^H; t) \mid \chi(\mathcal{A}; t)$ . Then  $\mathcal{A}$  is free. Thus if we can show the freeness of  $\mathcal{A}$  by using several times of the division theorem, then the freeness of  $\mathcal{A}$  is combinatorial, and such a free arrangement is called the **divisionally free arrangements**.*

**Definition 2.6** (Definition 4.2, [3]). *We say that  $\mathcal{A}$  is **stair-free** if the freeness of  $\mathcal{A}$  can be proved by using the addition and division theorems.*

**Theorem 2.7** (Theorem 4.3, [3]). *If  $\mathcal{A}$  is stair-free, then its freeness depends only on  $L(\mathcal{A})$ .*

### 3 Cardinality of the minimal set of generators

In this section we show some new results on the cardinality of a minimal set of generators for  $D(\mathcal{A})$ , which will play a key role to prove our main theorem.

**Definition 3.1.** *For an arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$ , let  $g(\mathcal{A})$  denote the cardinality of a minimal set of generators for  $D(\mathcal{A})$ . Clearly it is independent of the choice of the set of minimal generators.*

First we know the following easy facts.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Assume that  $\mathcal{A}'$  is free. If  $\mathcal{A}^H$  is free, then  $g(\mathcal{A}) \leq 2\ell - 2$ .*

**Proof.** By Theorem 2.3, we can choose  $\theta_E, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{\ell-1} \in D(\mathcal{A})$  as preimages of the basis for  $D(\mathcal{A}^H)$ . Let  $\theta_E, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_\ell$  be a basis for  $D(\mathcal{A}')$ . Then the Euler exact sequence (2.1) shows that

$$\theta_E, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{\ell-1}, \alpha_H \varphi_2, \dots, \alpha_H \varphi_\ell$$

generate  $D(\mathcal{A})$ , hence  $g(\mathcal{A}) \leq \ell - 1 + \ell - 1 = 2\ell - 2$ .  $\square$

On  $g(\mathcal{A})$  the following proposition is fundamental.

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}'$  be free, and  $\theta_E, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_\ell$  form a basis for  $D(\mathcal{A}')$ . Assume that the minimum number of basis elements not belonging to  $D(\mathcal{A})$  is  $s$ . So we may assume that  $\theta_i \notin D(\mathcal{A})$  ( $2 \leq i \leq s+1$ ) and  $\theta_i \in D(\mathcal{A})$  ( $i \geq s+2$ ). Then  $g(\mathcal{A}) \geq \ell + s - 1$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $\alpha_H = x_1$ , and Terao's polynomial  $B \in S' := \mathbb{K}[x_2, \dots, x_\ell]$ . Let us show that we may choose derivations  $\varphi_j \in D(\mathcal{A})$  ( $j = 1, \dots, k$ ) of the form  $\sum_{i=2}^{s+1} f_i^j \theta_i$  such that  $f_i^j \in S'$  are of positive degrees, and

$$\theta_E, \alpha_H \theta_2, \dots, \alpha_H \theta_{s+1}, \theta_{s+2}, \dots, \theta_\ell$$

together with derivations  $\varphi_j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, k$ ) form a minimal set of generators for  $D(\mathcal{A})$ . Since  $\deg f_i^j > 0$ , we know that  $\theta_{s+2}, \dots, \theta_\ell, \theta_E$  cannot be removable. Since  $f_i^j \in S'$ , it is also clear that  $\alpha_H \theta_2, \dots, \alpha_H \theta_{s+1}$  are not removable either. Assume that  $\varphi_i$  is removable. We may assume that  $i = 1$  without loss of generality. Since  $f_i^j \in S'$ , it can be expressed as

$$\varphi_1 = \sum_{i=2}^k g_i \varphi_i$$

for  $g_i \in S'$ . Continue this among  $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k$  to make them minimal. Then we obtain the desired minimal set of generators of the above form. Since their images by  $\rho$  generate the rank  $(\ell - 1)$ -module  $D(\mathcal{A}^H)$  due to Theorem 2.3,

$$|\{\theta_E, \theta_{s+2}, \dots, \theta_\ell, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k\}| = k + 1 + \ell - s - 1 = \ell + k - s \geq \ell - 1.$$

So  $g(\mathcal{A}) = \ell + k \geq \ell + s - 1$ .  $\square$

For the rest of this section recall the following:

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $i < j$ ,  $\mathcal{A}'$  be free with basis  $\theta_E, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_\ell$ ,  $\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{A}' \cup \{H\}$  and assume that  $\theta_k \in D(\mathcal{A})$  for  $k \neq i, j$ , and  $\theta_i, \theta_j \notin D(\mathcal{A})$ . Let  $\theta_i(\alpha_H) = f_i \alpha_H + g_i B$ ,  $\theta_j(\alpha_H) = f_j \theta_H + g_j B$  by Theorem 2.1. Then  $(g_i, g_j) = 1$  and  $D(\mathcal{A})$  is generated by  $\{\theta_k\}_{k \neq i, j} \cup \{\alpha_H \theta_i, \alpha_H \theta_j, g_j \theta_i - g_i \theta_j\}$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{A}$  is SPOG.*

**Proof.** The same proof as Theorem 1.9 in [2] shows that  $\mathcal{A}$  is SPOG (see Proposition 3.6, [7] too).  $\square$

An immediate corollary of Proposition 3.3 is as follows:

**Corollary 3.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}'$  be free and assume that  $g(\mathcal{A}) = \ell + 1$ . Then  $\mathcal{A}$  is SPOG.*

**Proof.** By Proposition 3.3,  $g(\mathcal{A}) = \ell + 1$  only when  $s \leq 2$ .  $s = 0$  cannot occur, and  $s = 1$  implies that  $\mathcal{A}$  is free by the addition theorem, thus  $g(\mathcal{A}) = \ell$ . So  $s = 2$  is necessary. In this case, Proposition 3.4 shows that  $\mathcal{A}$  is SPOG.  $\square$

Since the freeness of  $\mathcal{A}^H$  and  $\mathcal{A}'$  compels that  $\text{pd } \mathcal{A} \leq 1$  by Theorem 1.3, it is natural to study which condition on  $g(\mathcal{A})$  makes the arrangement  $\mathcal{A}^H$  free.

**Theorem 3.6.** *Let  $\ell \geq 3$  and  $\mathcal{A}'$  be free. Then  $\mathcal{A}^H$  is free if  $g(\mathcal{A}) \leq \ell + 2$ .*

**Proof.** By the addition and restriction theorems, Theorem 2.3, Corollary 3.5 and the explicit form of SPOG generators as in Proposition 3.4, the statement follows if  $g(\mathcal{A}) \leq \ell + 1$ . Assume that  $g(\mathcal{A}) = \ell + 2$ . Then by Proposition 3.3, we have a basis  $\theta_E, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_\ell$  for  $D(\mathcal{A}')$  such that  $\theta_i \notin D(\mathcal{A})$  for  $i \geq \ell - 2$  and  $\theta \in D(\mathcal{A})$  for  $i \leq \ell - 3$ . We may assume that  $\alpha_H = x_1$ . Also for the polynomial  $B$  of  $(\mathcal{A}, H)$ , we may assume that  $B \in \mathbb{K}[x_2, \dots, x_\ell]$  and  $\theta_i(x_1) = f_i B$  modulo  $x_1$  and  $f_i \in \mathbb{K}[x_2, \dots, x_\ell]$  as in the proof of Proposition 3.3. Then clearly  $D(\mathcal{A})$  has a minimal set of generators with cardinality  $\ell + 2$  of the form

$$\theta_E, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{\ell-3}, x_1\theta_{\ell-2}, x_1\theta_{\ell-1}, x_1\theta_\ell, \varphi_1, \varphi_2,$$

where  $\varphi_j$  is of the linear combination of  $\theta_{\ell-2}, \theta_{\ell-1}, \theta_\ell$  over  $\mathbb{K}[x_2, \dots, x_\ell]$ . By Theorem 2.3, the images of  $\theta_E, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{\ell-3}, \varphi_2, \varphi_3$  by  $\rho$  have to generate  $D(\mathcal{A}^H)$ . Since  $\text{rank}_{S/\alpha_H S} D(\mathcal{A}^H) = \ell - 1$ , it holds that  $\mathcal{A}^H$  is free.  $\square$

By using results above, we can show the following proposition which is fundamental on the relation between free and SPOG arrangements.

**Proposition 3.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be SPOG,  $H \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}' := \mathcal{A} \setminus \{H\}$ . If  $\mathcal{A}'$  is free, then there is SPOG generators  $\theta_1 = \theta_E, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_\ell$ , a level element  $\varphi$  and two distinct integers  $1 < s < t \leq \ell$  such that*

$$\theta_E, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{s-1}, \theta_s/\alpha_H, \theta_{s+1}, \dots, \theta_{t-1}, \theta_t/\alpha_H, \theta_{t+1}, \dots, \theta_\ell$$

*form a free basis for  $D(\mathcal{A}')$ .*

**Proof.** By Proposition 3.3 and the assumption that  $g(\mathcal{A}) = \ell + 1$ , for the basis  $\theta_E, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_\ell$  for  $D(\mathcal{A}')$ , we may assume that  $\varphi_i \in D(\mathcal{A})$  ( $i \leq \ell - 2$ ) and  $\varphi_{\ell-1}, \varphi_\ell \notin D(\mathcal{A})$ . Then

$$\theta_E, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_{\ell-2}, \alpha_H \varphi_{\ell-1}, \alpha_H \varphi_\ell, f_\ell \varphi_{\ell-1} - f_{\ell-1} \varphi_\ell$$

form a minimal set of generators for  $D(\mathcal{A})$ , where  $\varphi_i(\alpha_H) = f_i B$  modulo  $\alpha_H$  for  $i = \ell - 1, \ell$  and  $B$  is Terao's polynomial, which is the required generators for  $D(\mathcal{A})$ .  $\square$

## 4 Proof of main results

In this section let us prove Theorems 1.6 and 1.8.

**Proof of Theorem 1.6.** First prove (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1). It is easy to see that, for the basis  $\theta_E, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_\ell$  for  $D(\mathcal{A}')$  with  $\deg \varphi_k = d_k$ , the SPOG generator for  $D(\mathcal{A})$  is of the form  $\{\theta_k\}_{k \neq i, j} \cup \{\alpha_H \theta_k\}_{k=i, j} \cup \{f_j \theta_i - f_i \theta_j\}$  by Proposition 3.4. Thus Theorem 2.3 shows that  $D(\mathcal{A}^H)$  is generated by the image of  $\{\theta_k\}_{k \neq i, j} \cup \{f_j \theta_i - f_i \theta_j\}$ . Since  $\text{rank}_S D(\mathcal{A}^H) = \ell - 1$ , it follows that  $\mathcal{A}^H$  is free with given exponents.

Conversely, prove (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2). Assume that  $\mathcal{A}^H$  is free with the given exponents above. In this assumption, Terao's addition theorem shows that  $\mathcal{A}$  is not free since  $\exp(\mathcal{A}^H) \not\subset \exp(\mathcal{A}')$ . By Theorem 2.3, the Euler restriction map  $\rho^H : D(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{A}^H)$  is surjective. Thus there are  $S$ -independent derivations  $\theta_E, \theta_2, \dots, \hat{\theta}_i, \dots, \hat{\theta}_j, \dots, \theta_\ell, \theta \in D(\mathcal{A})$  such that  $\deg \theta_k = d_k$ ,  $\deg \theta = d$ , and their images by  $\rho^H$  form a basis for  $D(\mathcal{A}^H)$ . Let  $\theta_E, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_\ell$  be a basis for  $D(\mathcal{A}')$  with  $\deg \varphi_k = d_k$ . We may assume that  $d_i < d_{i+1}$ . By the usual degree argument, we may assume that  $\varphi_k = \theta_k$  for  $k < i$ . Next, assume that  $\varphi_s = \theta_s$  for all  $i \neq s < k$ , where  $k > i$  and  $d_i < d_k < d_j$ . Since  $\theta_k \in D(\mathcal{A}) \subset D(\mathcal{A}')$ , we have an expression

$$\theta_k = \sum_{s \neq i, s=1}^{k-1} f_s \theta_s + \sum_{s=k}^{\ell} f_s \varphi_s + f_i \varphi_i.$$

Note that  $f_t = 0$  if  $d_t > d_k$ . Assume that there is  $t$  with  $d_t = d_k$  and  $f_t \neq 0$ . Then first, take all the sum of  $0 \neq \sum f_s \varphi_s$  for all  $s$  with  $d_s = d_k$ ,  $f_s \neq 0$  and let rename this derivation as  $\varphi_k$ . Then replacing  $\varphi_k$  by  $\varphi_k + \sum_{s \neq i, s=1}^{k-1} f_s \theta_s + f_i \varphi_i = \theta_k \in D(\mathcal{A}')$ , we may assume that  $\theta_k = \varphi_k$ . So let us assume that  $f_t = 0$  for all  $t$  with  $d_t = d_k$ . If  $f_i = 0$ , then  $\theta_k$  is a linear combination of  $\theta_E, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{k-1}$ , a contradiction. So  $f_i \neq 0$  by the independency. Assume that  $\varphi_i \in D(\mathcal{A})$ . Then  $\rho^H(\varphi_i)$  can be expressed as a linear combination of

$\rho^H(\theta_E), \rho^H(\theta_2), \dots, \rho^H(\theta_{i-1})$  by the reason of degrees. Since  $D(\mathcal{A}^H)$  is free, we may assume that  $\alpha_H \mid \varphi_i$ , contradicting the minimality of the generator of  $\theta_E, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_\ell$ . So  $\varphi_i \notin D(\mathcal{A})$ . Since  $\theta_s = \varphi_s \in D(\mathcal{A})$  if  $i \neq s < k$ , it holds that  $f_i \varphi_i \in D(\mathcal{A})$ . So  $\alpha_H \mid f_i$ . Thus the image of  $\theta_k$  by  $\rho^H$  is again a linear combination of the images of  $\theta_E, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{k-1}$ , a contradiction. So we may assume that  $\theta_k = \varphi_k \in D(\mathcal{A})$  for all  $k$  with  $d_i < d_k < d_j$ .

We may assume that  $d_j < d_{j+1}$  or  $d = \ell$ . Now replace  $\theta_k$  by  $\varphi_k$  for  $k < j$  satisfying  $d_k = d_j$  as far as possible. Assume that

$$\theta_k = \sum_{s \neq i, s=1}^{k-1} f_s \theta_s + \sum_{s=k}^{\ell} f_s \varphi_s + f_i \varphi_i$$

and  $f_s = 0$  for all  $s$  with  $d_s = d_j = d_k$ . Then the same argument as in the previous paragraph implies that  $\alpha_H \mid f_i$ , and thus  $\rho^H(\theta_k)$  cannot be a part of basis for  $D(\mathcal{A}^H)$ . Hence first, take all the sum of  $0 \neq \sum f_s \varphi_s$  for all  $s$  with  $d_s = d_k = d_j$ ,  $f_s \neq 0$  and let rename this non-zero derivation as  $\varphi_k$ . Then replacing  $\varphi_k$  by  $\varphi_k + \sum_{s \neq i, s=1}^{k-1} f_s \theta_s + f_i \varphi_i = \theta_k \in D(\mathcal{A})$ , it holds that  $\varphi_k = \theta_k$  for  $j+1 > k \neq i, j$ . Note that  $\varphi_j \notin D(\mathcal{A})$  by the same proof of  $\varphi_i \notin D(\mathcal{A})$ .

Next express  $\theta$  in the following form by using the fact that  $d = \deg \theta < d_{j+1}$ :

$$(4.1) \quad \theta = \sum_{i \neq k=1}^{j-1} f_k \theta_k + f_i \varphi_i + f_j \varphi_j.$$

By the independency of images of  $\theta_k$  by  $\rho$ , at least one of  $f_i, f_j$  is not zero. Assume that only one of them is not zero, say  $f_i \neq 0$  and  $f_j = 0$ . Then (4.1) combined with the fact that  $\varphi_i \notin D(\mathcal{A})$  shows that  $\alpha_H \mid f_i$ . By replacing  $\theta$  by  $\theta - \sum_{i \neq k=1}^{j-1} f_k$ , we may assume that  $\theta = f_i \varphi_i$  with  $\alpha_H \mid f_i$ . So  $\rho^H(\theta) = 0$ , a contradiction. Thus both  $f_i$  and  $f_j$  are not zero. So replacing  $\theta$  by  $\theta - \sum_{i \neq k=1}^{j-1} f_k \theta_k$ , we may assume that

$$\theta = f_i \varphi_i + f_j \varphi_j.$$

Recall that  $\varphi_i, \varphi_j \notin D(\mathcal{A})$ . By using Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 3.4, letting  $\varphi_i(\alpha_H) = g_i B$  and  $\varphi_j(\alpha_H) = g_j B$  modulo  $\alpha_H$ ,  $(g_i, g_j) = h$  and  $g_i = h h_i$ ,  $g_j = -h h_j$ , it holds that  $\varphi := h_j \varphi_i - h_i \varphi_j \in D(\mathcal{A})$ . By the construction,  $\deg \varphi \leq d = \deg \theta = d_i + d_j - |\mathcal{A}'| + |\mathcal{A}^H| = d_i + d_j - \deg B$ . Assume that  $\deg \varphi < d$ . Then  $h_i \varphi_j - h_j \varphi_i \in D(\mathcal{A})$ , so its image by  $\rho$  is expressed as a linear combination of  $\{\rho(\theta_k)\}_{i, j \neq k=1}^{j-1}$ . Thus

$$h_i \varphi_j - h_j \varphi_i - \sum_{i, j \neq s=1}^{j-1} a_s \theta_s \in \alpha_H D(\mathcal{A}')_{< d_{j+1}} = \alpha_H \langle \{\theta_k\}_{i, j \neq k}^{j-1} \cup \{\varphi_i, \varphi_j\} \rangle_S$$

for some  $a_s \in S$ . So  $\alpha_H \mid h_i$  and  $\alpha_H \mid h_j$ , contradicting  $\varphi_i \notin D(\mathcal{A})$ . Thus we may assume that  $h = 1$  and  $\deg(g_i\varphi_j - g_j\varphi_i) = d = \deg \theta$ . Now express

$$\theta = \sum_{i,j \neq k=1}^{\ell} a_k \theta_k + a_i \varphi_i + a_j \varphi_j.$$

First assume that  $d < d_{j+1}$ . Then the above expression is

$$D(\mathcal{A}) \ni \theta = \sum_{i,j \neq k=1}^{j-1} a_k \theta_k + a_i \varphi_i + a_j \varphi_j.$$

Then Proposition 3.4 shows that  $a_i \varphi_i + a_j \varphi_j$  is of the form  $x_1(b_i \varphi_i + b_j \varphi_j) + c(g_j \theta_i - g_i \theta_j)$ , where  $\alpha_H = x_1$ . If  $c = 0$ , then the same argument as the above shows that  $\rho(\theta) = 0$ , a contradiction. Thus  $c \neq 0$ , and  $\deg \theta = \deg(g_j \theta_i - g_i \theta_j)$  shows that  $c = 1$ . So we may assume that  $\theta = g_i \theta_j - g_j \theta_i$ .

Next assume that  $d = d_{j+1}$ . Then the above expression is

$$D(\mathcal{A}) \ni \theta = \sum_{i,j \neq k=1}^{j-1} a_k \theta_k + \sum_{k=j+1}^p a_k \varphi_k + a_i \varphi_i + a_j \varphi_j.$$

Here  $d = d_{j+1} = \dots = d_p < d_{p+1}$  and  $a_k \in \mathbb{K}$  for  $j+1 \leq k \leq p$ . If some  $a_k \neq 0$  for  $j+1 \leq k \leq p$ , then we may assume, by the same argument as the above, that  $\theta = \varphi_k$  for some  $j+1 \leq k \leq p$ . Clearly this replacement continues in the range of  $j+1 \leq k \leq p$  in such a way that  $\theta_k = \varphi_{k+1}$  for  $j+1 \leq k \leq p-1$ . Thus in the final step, we have

$$D(\mathcal{A}) \ni \theta_p = \sum_{i,j \neq k=1}^{p-1} a_k \theta_k + a\theta + a_i \varphi_i + a_j \varphi_j.$$

Then the same argument shows that both of  $a_i$  and  $a_j$  are not zero, and the independency,  $d_p = d < d_{p+1}$  and Proposition 3.4 shows that  $a_i \varphi_i + a_j \varphi_j = x_1(b_i \varphi_i + b_j \varphi_j) + c(g_j \theta_i - g_i \theta_j)$ . Now exchange  $\theta_p$  and  $\theta$  to obtain that  $\theta = g_j \theta_i - g_i \theta_j$ .

Now continue the replacement of  $\theta_k$  by  $\varphi_k$  for  $k > j$ . Assume that  $\theta_k = \varphi_k$  for  $i, j \neq k < s$ . Let

$$(4.2) \quad \theta_s = \sum_{i,j \neq k=1}^{\ell} a_k \theta_k + a_i \alpha_H \varphi_i + a_j \alpha_H \varphi_j + a\theta.$$

If  $a_k = 0$  for all  $k$  with  $d_k = d_s$ , then replacing  $\theta_s$  by  $\theta_s - \sum_{i,j \neq k=1}^{\ell} a_k \theta_k - a_i \alpha_H \varphi_i - a_j \alpha_H \varphi_j$ , we may assume that  $\theta_s = a\theta$ , contradicting the independency of  $\rho(\theta_E), \{\rho(\theta_k)\}_{i,j \neq k=2}^{\ell}, \rho(\theta)$ . So by the same replacement we may

assume that  $\theta_s = \varphi_s$  up to  $s = \ell$ . Now it holds that  $\varphi_k = \theta_k \in D(\mathcal{A})$  unless  $k = i, j$ . So Proposition 3.4 shows that  $\mathcal{A}$  is SPOG with  $\text{POexp}(\mathcal{A}) = (1, d_2, \dots, d_i + 1, \dots, d_j + 1, \dots, d_\ell)$  and level  $d = d_i + d_j - |\mathcal{A}'| + |\mathcal{A}^H|$ .  $\square$

The following case is the most practical to apply Theorem 1.6.

**Corollary 4.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}'$  be free with  $\text{exp}(\mathcal{A}') = (1, d_2, \dots, d_\ell)_\leq$  and  $d := d_i + d_\ell + |\mathcal{A}^H| - |\mathcal{A}'| > d_\ell$  for some  $i$ . Then the following two conditions are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\mathcal{A}^H$  is free with  $\text{exp}(\mathcal{A}^H) = (1, d_2, \dots, \hat{d}_i, \dots, d_{\ell-1}) \cup (d)$
- (2)  $\mathcal{A}$  is SPOG with  $\text{POexp}(\mathcal{A}) = (1, d_2, \dots, d_{i-1}, d_i + 1, d_{i+1}, \dots, d_{\ell-1}, d_\ell + 1)$  and level  $d$ .

**Proof.** Clear by the proof of Theorem 1.6.  $\square$

Let us apply Theorem 1.6 to some examples.

*Example 4.2.* Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the Weyl arrangement of the type  $A_4$  defined by

$$Q(\mathcal{A}) = \prod_{i=1}^4 x_i \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq 4} (x_i - x_j) = 0.$$

$\mathcal{A}$  is well-known to be free with  $\text{exp}(\mathcal{A}) = (1, 2, 3, 4)$ . Let  $\mathcal{A} \not\cong H : x_1 - x_2 + 2x_3 - 2x_4 = 0$  and let  $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{A} \cup \{H\}$ . Then  $|\mathcal{B}^H| = 9 < 10 = |\mathcal{A}|$ . It is easy to show that  $\mathcal{B}^H$  is free with  $\text{exp}(\mathcal{B}^H) = (1, 4, 4)$ . Since

$$2 + 3 - |\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}^H| = 5 - 1 = 4 \geq 4,$$

Theorem 1.6 shows that  $\mathcal{B}$  is SPOG with  $\text{POexp}(\mathcal{B}) = (1, 3, 4, 4)$  and level 4.

Note that  $Q(\mathcal{B}^H)$  is

$$x_2 x_3 x_4 (x_2 - x_3)(x_2 - x_4)(x_3 - x_4)(x_2 - 2x_3 + 2x_4)(x_2 - 3x_3 + 2x_4)(x_2 - 2x_3 + x_4).$$

Let  $L : x_2 = 0$  and let  $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{B}^{H \cap L}$ . Then it is easy to show that  $\chi(\mathcal{C}; t) = (t - 1)(t - 4)$  and  $\chi(\mathcal{B}^H; t) = (t - 1)(t - 4)^2$ . Thus  $\mathcal{B}^H$  is divisionally free as in Theorem 2.5. Since  $\mathcal{A}$  is divisionally free too, by Theorem 2.2, the freeness and exponents of  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}^H$  are both combinatorial. Thus Theorem 1.6 shows that the SPOGness of  $\mathcal{B}$  is combinatorially determined.

**Proof of Theorem 1.8.** Clear by Theorem 1.6 and Theorem 2.7.  $\square$

We can use Theorem 1.6 to show the combinatorial freeness of arrangements by using a non-free but SPOG arrangements. Let us check it by the following example:

*Example 4.3.* Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the Weyl arrangement of the type  $B_4$  defined by

$$Q(\mathcal{A}) = \prod_{i=1}^4 x_i \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq 4} (x_i^2 - x_j^2) = 0.$$

Let  $\mathcal{A}' := \mathcal{A} \setminus \{H\}$ , where  $H : x_1 = 0$ . Let  $L : x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = 0$ . We know that  $\mathcal{A}'$  is divisionally free with  $\exp(\mathcal{A}') = (1, 3, 5, 6)$ , and  $(\mathcal{A}' \cup \{L\})^L$  is also divisionally free with  $\exp(\mathcal{A}^H) = (1, 5, 7)$ . Thus Theorem 1.6 confirms that  $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{A}' \cup \{L\}$  is SPOG with  $\text{POexp}(\mathcal{B}) = (1, 4, 5, 7)$  and level 7. Next let  $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{B} \cup \{H\}$ . Then  $|\mathcal{C}^H| = 9$ , so  $|\mathcal{B}| - |\mathcal{C}^H| = 16 - 9 = 7$ . Thus the generators of degree 1, 4, 5 for  $D(\mathcal{B})$  are in  $D(\mathcal{C})$  too, and we may assume that one of two generators of degree 7 is in  $D(\mathcal{C})$  by Theorem 2.1. Since the relation in  $D(\mathcal{B})$  are among three derivations of degrees 4, 7, 7 by the explicit construction of SPOG generators and a level element in Proposition 3.4, we know that these 4-basis elements in  $D(\mathcal{C})$  are  $S$ -independent. So  $\mathcal{C}$  is combinatorially free with  $\exp(\mathcal{C}) = (1, 4, 5, 7)$  since the SPOGness of  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $|\mathcal{C}|$  are both combinatorial.

Unfortunately, there are cases in which  $\mathcal{A}'$  and  $\mathcal{A}^H$  are free,  $\mathcal{A}$  SPOG but Theorem 1.6 cannot be applied.

*Example 4.4.* Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the Weyl arrangement of the type  $\mathcal{A}_4$  and let  $H : x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = 0$ . Say that  $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{A} \cup \{H\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{B}^H$  is free with  $\exp(\mathcal{B}^H) = (1, 4, 5) \not\subseteq (1, 2, 3, 4) = \exp(\mathcal{A})$ . We can check that  $\mathcal{B}$  is SPOG with  $\text{POexp}(\mathcal{B}) = (1, 3, 4, 4)$  and level 5 by using Macaulay2 in [5], but we cannot apply Theorem 1.6.

**Problem 4.5.** *Generalize Theorem 1.6 to all the case when  $\mathcal{A}'$  and  $\mathcal{A}^H$  are free,  $\ell - 2 \leq |\exp(\mathcal{A}') \cap \exp(\mathcal{A}^H)| \leq \ell - 1$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  not free. More explicitly, could it be possible that  $\mathcal{A}'$ ,  $\mathcal{A}^H$  are both free but  $\mathcal{A}$  not SPOG? Even in this case  $\text{pd}_S D(\mathcal{A}) = 1$ .*

In fact, the condition  $d \leq d_{j+1}$  is necessary. Let us see the following example.

*Example 4.6.* Let  $\mathcal{A}'$  be an arrangement in  $\mathbb{R}^4$  defined by

$$Q(\mathcal{A}') = (x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4) \prod_{i=1}^4 x_i \prod_{i=2}^4 (x_1 + x_i) \prod_{i=2}^4 (x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 - x_i).$$

Then  $\mathcal{A}'$  is free with  $\exp(\mathcal{A}') = (1, 3, 3, 4)$ . Let  $H = x_2 + x_3 + x_4$  and let  $\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{A}' \cup \{H\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{A}^H$  is free with  $\exp(\mathcal{A}^H) = (1, 4, 5)$ . So  $\exp(\mathcal{A}') \cap$

$\exp(\mathcal{A}^H) = \{1, 4\}$ . However, Macaulay2 in [5] shows that  $D_0(\mathcal{A})$  is not SPOG but has a following minimal free resolution:

$$0 \rightarrow S[-5] \oplus S[-6] \rightarrow S[-4]^3 \oplus S[-5]^2 \rightarrow D_0(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow 0.$$

Since  $d = 5 = 3 + 3 - |\mathcal{A}'| + |\mathcal{A}^H| > 4$ , the condition  $d \leq d_{j+1}$  in Theorem 1.6 is necessary.

If we remove the assumption on  $\exp(\mathcal{A}')$  and  $\exp(\mathcal{A}^H)$  in Theorem 1.6, we have an example related to Problem 4.5.

*Example 4.7.* Let

$$Q(\mathcal{A}') = \prod_{i=1}^4 x_i \prod_{i=1}^3 (x_i^2 - x_4^2)(x_i^2 - 4x_4^2) \prod_{i=2}^3 (x_i^2 - 9x_4^2)(x_i^2 - 16x_4^2).$$

Then  $\mathcal{A}'$  is free with  $\exp(\mathcal{A}') = (1, 5, 7, 9)$ . Let  $H_1 : x_2 + x_3 + 7x_4 = 0$  and  $H_2 : x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = 0$  and let  $\mathcal{A}_i := \mathcal{A}' \cup \{H_i\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{A}_1$  is SPOG with  $\text{POexp}(\mathcal{A}_1) = (1, 5, 8, 10)$  and level 15. So Theorem 1.6 shows that  $\mathcal{A}^H$  is free with exponents  $(1, 5, 15)$  and vice versa. On the other hand,  $\mathcal{A}_2^{H_2}$  is free with exponents  $(1, 10, 11)$ , and  $D(\mathcal{A}_2)$  has a minimal free resolution

$$0 \rightarrow S[-11] \oplus S[-12] \rightarrow S[-6] \oplus S[-8] \oplus S[-10]^2 \oplus S[-11] \rightarrow D_0(\mathcal{A}_2) \rightarrow 0.$$

So in general exponents case, it could occur that  $\mathcal{A}$  is of projective dimension one, not SPOG,  $\mathcal{A}'$  and  $\mathcal{A}^H$  are free.

Note that the freeness of  $\mathcal{A}^H$  follows from  $g(\mathcal{A}) \leq 6$  and the freeness of  $\mathcal{A}'$  by Theorem 3.6.

## References

- [1] T. Abe, Divisionally free arrangements of hyperplanes. *Invent. Math.* **204** (2016), no. 1, 317–346.
- [2] T. Abe, Plus-one generated and next to free arrangements of hyperplanes. *Int. Math. Res. Not.* **2022** (2022), no. 12, 9233–9261.
- [3] T. Abe, Addition-deletion theorem for free hyperplane arrangements and combinatorics. arXiv:1811.03780.
- [4] T. Abe, Projective dimensions of hyperplane arrangements. arXiv:2009.04101 (2020).

- [5] D. R. Grayson and M. E. Stillman. Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry. Available at <http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2/>.
- [6] P. Orlik and H. Terao, *Arrangements of hyperplanes*. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, **300**. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992.
- [7] Y. Sakai, Graphs and plus-one generated arrangements of hyperplanes. Master Thesis (Japanese), 2020.
- [8] H. Terao, Arrangements of hyperplanes and their freeness I, II. *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo* **27** (1980), 293–320.
- [9] H. Terao, Generalized exponents of a free arrangement of hyperplanes and Shephard-Todd-Brieskorn formula. *Invent. math.* **63** (1981), 159–179.
- [10] G. M. Ziegler, Combinatorial construction of logarithmic differential forms. *Adv. Math.* **76** (1989), 116–154.