

SUPERSPACE COINVARIANTS AND HYPERPLANE ARRANGEMENTS

ROBERT ANGARONE, PATRICIA COMMINS, TREVOR KARN, SATOSHI MURAI,
AND BRENDON RHOADES

ABSTRACT. Let Ω be the *superspace ring* of polynomial-valued differential forms on affine n -space. The natural action of the symmetric group \mathfrak{S}_n on n -space induces an action of \mathfrak{S}_n on Ω . The *superspace coinvariant ring* is the quotient SR of Ω by the ideal generated by \mathfrak{S}_n -invariants with vanishing constant term. We give the first explicit basis of SR , proving a conjecture of Sagan and Swanson. Our techniques use the theory of hyperplane arrangements. We relate SR to instances of the Solomon-Terao algebras of Abe-Maeno-Murai-Numata and use exact sequences relating the derivation modules of certain ‘southwest closed’ arrangements to obtain the desired basis of SR .

1. INTRODUCTION

Let \mathbb{K} be a field of characteristic 0 and let n be a positive integer. We let (x_1, \dots, x_n) be a list of n commuting variables and write $S := \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ for the polynomial ring over these variables. The *superspace ring* of rank n is the tensor product

$$(1.1) \quad \Omega := \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n] \otimes \wedge\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n\}$$

where $(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n)$ is a list of n anticommuting variables. The ring Ω is a bigraded \mathbb{K} -algebra with $\Omega_{i,j} = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]_i \otimes \wedge^j\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n\}$. Borrowing terminology from physics, we refer to the x -variables as *bosonic* and the θ -variables as *fermionic*. Regarding Ω as an algebra of polynomial-valued differential forms on affine n -space, we have the *Euler operator* or *total derivative* $d : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ given by

$$(1.2) \quad df := \sum_{i=1}^n \partial_i(f) \cdot \theta_i,$$

where the partial derivative $\partial_i = \partial/\partial x_i$ treats θ -variables as constants. The symmetric group \mathfrak{S}_n acts ‘diagonally’ on Ω by subscript permutation, viz.

$$(1.3) \quad w \cdot x_i := x_{w(i)} \quad w \cdot \theta_i := \theta_{w(i)} \quad (w \in \mathfrak{S}_n, 1 \leq i \leq n).$$

Quotients of the ring Ω have received increasing attention in recent years with ties to Chern plethysm [6], Tutte polynomials of vector configurations [19], and delta conjecture modules [16, 17]. A *differential ideal* is a (two-sided) ideal in Ω which is closed under the Euler operator d . One way to construct a bigraded differential ideal in Ω is to take the *differential closure* of a singly graded ideal $J \subseteq S$: the smallest differential ideal in Ω which contains J . Consider the type A *coinvariant ideal* $(S_+^{\mathfrak{S}_n}) \subset S$ generated by \mathfrak{S}_n -invariants with vanishing constant term. We write $I \subset \Omega$ for the differential closure of $(S_+^{\mathfrak{S}_n})$. Solomon proved [24] that I admits a straightforward generating set: it is generated by \mathfrak{S}_n -invariants in Ω with vanishing constant term. The *superspace coinvariant ring* is the quotient

$$(1.4) \quad SR := \Omega/I$$

of Ω by I . The ring SR is a bigraded \mathfrak{S}_n -module.

The superspace coinvariant ring SR has been the subject of a significant amount of recent research. In 2018, the Fields Institute Combinatorics Group¹ made a family of conjectures on the

¹Nantel Bergeron, Laura Colmenarajo, Shu Xiao Li, John Machacek, Robin Sulzgruber, and Mike Zabrocki

algebraic structure of SR which predicted its bigraded \mathfrak{S}_n -character; see [33]. Swanson-Wallach [29, 30] gave a conjectural description of the Macaulay inverse system of SR and Sagan-Swanson [20] gave a conjectural basis of SR . Despite superficial similarity between SR and other algebraic objects [10, 16, 17] which exhibit analogous algebraic behavior, these conjectures resisted proof. A large source of difficulty was the inscrutable Gröbner theory of the ideal $I \subset \Omega$, making the quotient $SR = \Omega/I$ resistant to ‘straightening’ arguments.

In 2023, Rhoades and Wilson [18] used algebraic techniques to calculate the bigraded Hilbert series of SR , confirming a conjecture of the Fields Group, and proved the Operator Conjecture of Swanson-Wallach [29, 30] on the Macaulay inverse system $I^\perp \subseteq \Omega$. The Hilbert series of SR is consistent with a conjectural monomial basis of SR predicted by Sagan and Swanson. In order to state the Sagan-Swanson conjecture, we need some notation.

For any subset $J \subseteq [n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$, the J -staircase $(\text{st}(J)_1, \dots, \text{st}(J)_n)$ is defined recursively by

$$(1.5) \quad \text{st}(J)_1 = \begin{cases} 1 & 1 \notin J, \\ 0 & 1 \in J, \end{cases} \quad \text{st}(J)_i = \begin{cases} \text{st}(J)_{i-1} + 1 & i \notin J, \\ \text{st}(J)_{i-1} & i \in J. \end{cases}$$

For example, if $n = 5$ and $J = \{2, 4\}$ we have $(\text{st}(J)_1, \dots, \text{st}(J)_5) = (1, 1, 2, 2, 3)$. We let $\mathcal{M}(J)$ be the family of bosonic monomials

$$(1.6) \quad \mathcal{M}(J) := \{x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n} : a_i < \text{st}(J)_i\}$$

which fit under the J -staircase. In our example $n = 5$ and $J = \{2, 4\}$ we have

$$\mathcal{M}(J) = \{x_3x_4x_5^2, x_3x_4x_5, x_3x_4, x_3x_5^2, x_3x_5, x_3, x_4x_5^2, x_4x_5, x_4, x_5^2, x_5, 1\}.$$

Observe that $\mathcal{M}(J) = \emptyset$ when $1 \in J$. Given a subset $J \subseteq [n]$, let θ_J be the corresponding product of θ -variables with increasing subscripts. The *superspace Artin monomials* are given by

$$(1.7) \quad \mathcal{M} := \bigsqcup_{J \subseteq [n]} \mathcal{M}(J) \cdot \theta_J.$$

When $n = 3$ we have

$$\mathcal{M} = \{x_2x_3^2, x_2x_3, x_2, x_3^2, x_3, 1\} \sqcup \{x_2x_3\theta_3, x_2\theta_3, x_3\theta_3, \theta_3\} \sqcup \{x_3\theta_2, \theta_2\} \sqcup \{\theta_2\theta_3\}.$$

Conjecture 1.1. (Sagan-Swanson [20]) *The set \mathcal{M} descends to a basis of SR .*

We will prove Conjecture 1.1, giving the first explicit basis of the quotient SR ; see Corollary 8.2. Our starting point is the following transfer principle of Rhoades and Wilson [18] which allows us to trade a single problem in supercommutative algebra for a family of problems in commutative algebra. Given $J \subseteq [n]$, let $f_J \in S$ be the polynomial

$$(1.8) \quad f_J := \prod_{j \in J} x_j \times \left(\prod_{i=j+1}^n (x_j - x_i) \right).$$

Recall that if $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq S$ is an ideal and $f \in I$, the *colon ideal* (or *ideal quotient*) $\mathfrak{a} : f \subseteq S$ is given by

$$(1.9) \quad \mathfrak{a} : f = \{g \in S : fg \in \mathfrak{a}\}.$$

It is not hard to see that $\mathfrak{a} : f$ is an ideal in S containing \mathfrak{a} . Rhoades and Wilson proved [18] that the colon ideals $(S_+^{\mathfrak{S}_n}) : f_J$ exhibit the following dichotomy:

- (1) if $1 \in J$ then $(S_+^{\mathfrak{S}_n}) : f_J$ is the unit ideal S , and
- (2) if $1 \notin J$ then $(S_+^{\mathfrak{S}_n}) : f_J$ is generated by a homogeneous regular sequence $p_{J,1}, \dots, p_{J,n} \in S$ with $\deg(p_{J,i}) = \text{st}(J)_i$.

The polynomials $p_{J,i}$ appearing in [18] have a complicated definition involving partial derivatives.

Theorem 1.2. (Rhoades-Wilson [18]) *For each $J \subseteq [n]$, suppose that $\mathcal{B}(J) \subseteq S$ is a set of homogeneous polynomials which descends to a basis of $S/((S_+^{\mathbb{C}^n}) : f_J)$. Then*

$$\mathcal{B} := \bigsqcup_{J \subseteq [n]} \mathcal{B}(J) \cdot \theta_J$$

descends to a basis of SR .

Theorem 1.2 was crucial for calculating the Hilbert series of SR and gives a recipe for finding bases of SR . The Sagan-Swanson Conjecture 1.1 would follow if we could show that $\mathcal{M}(J)$ descends to a basis of the commutative quotient $S/((S_+^{\mathbb{C}^n}) : f_J)$. However, prior to this paper, this recipe resisted execution. Although the set $\mathcal{M}(J)$ was shown [18] to descend to a basis of $S/((S_+^{\mathbb{C}^n}) : f_J)$ when $J = \{r, r+1, \dots, n\}$ is a ‘terminal’ subset of $[n]$, the mysterious Gröbner theory of the ideals $(S_+^{\mathbb{C}^n}) : f_J$ obstructed a proof for general J . In this paper we will prove (Theorem 8.1) that $\mathcal{M}(J)$ descends to a basis for all J by developing a surprising connection to the theory of hyperplane arrangements.

Let $V = \mathbb{K}^n$ be the standard n -dimensional vector space over \mathbb{K} . In this paper, a *hyperplane* will be a linear codimension 1 subspace $H \subset V$ and a *hyperplane arrangement* will be a finite set \mathcal{A} of hyperplanes. Two arrangements which will be important to us are the *braid arrangement* \mathcal{A}_{Φ^+} given by the kernels of the linear forms

$$(1.10) \quad \Phi^+ := \{x_i - x_j : 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}$$

and the *augmented braid arrangement* $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\Phi}^+}$ corresponding to

$$(1.11) \quad \tilde{\Phi}^+ := \{x_i - x_j : 1 \leq i < j \leq n\} \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$$

where $x_1, \dots, x_n \in V^*$ are the usual coordinate functions.

Any hyperplane arrangement \mathcal{A} in V has an associated *derivation module* $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$ of polynomial vector fields on V which are parallel to the hyperplanes of \mathcal{A} ; see Section 2 for details. The set $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$ has the structure of an S -module; the arrangement \mathcal{A} is *free* if $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$ is a free S -module.

The derivation module $\text{Der}(S)$ of the polynomial ring S is a free S -module of rank n . More specifically, we have

$$(1.12) \quad \text{Der}(S) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n S \cdot \partial_i$$

where $\partial_i : S \rightarrow S$ acts by differentiation with respect to x_i . For a fixed degree $d \geq 0$, any choice of images $\{\mathfrak{c}(\partial_i) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ of degree d homogeneous polynomials $\mathfrak{c}(\partial_i) \in S$ induces a unique S -module homomorphism $\mathfrak{c} : \text{Der}(S) \rightarrow S$. For any arrangement \mathcal{A} in V , we have a natural containment $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \text{Der}(S)$ of derivation modules.

Definition 1.3. Given \mathcal{A} and \mathfrak{c} as above, write $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq S$ for the ideal $\mathfrak{c}(\text{Der}(\mathcal{A})) \subseteq S$. The *Solomon-Terao algebra* is the quotient ring

$$(1.13) \quad \mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}; \mathfrak{c}) := S/\mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{A}}.$$

The homogeneity assumption on \mathfrak{c} implies that $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}; \mathfrak{c})$ is a graded quotient of S . Definition 1.3 is slightly more general than the Solomon-Terao algebras defined by Abe, Maeno, Murai, and Numata [3]; see Section 4. When the arrangement \mathcal{A} is free and \mathfrak{c} satisfies certain technical conditions, the Solomon-Terao algebras provide a vast array of quotients of S cut out by complete intersections; see Lemma 4.3. Furthermore, short exact sequences involving derivation modules of certain triples of arrangements induce short exact sequences of the corresponding Solomon-Terao algebras (Lemma 7.1).

We introduce a family of *southwest arrangements* \mathcal{A} as subarrangements of $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\Phi}^+}$. The southwest arrangements are shown to be free (Proposition 5.3). If we let $\mathfrak{i} : \text{Der}(S) \rightarrow S$ be the S -module

map induced by $\mathbf{i} : \partial_i \mapsto 1$ for all i , we show (Proposition 6.1) that for appropriate southwest arrangements \mathcal{A} the Solomon-Terao algebra $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}; \mathbf{i})$ coincides with the quotient $S/((S_+^{\mathbb{C}^n}) : \tilde{f}_J)$ where $\tilde{f}_J \in S$ has the same definition as f_J , but without the x_j factors. Southwest arrangements admit a recursive structure under deletion and restriction (Lemma 5.2) which gives rise to short exact sequences leading to an inductive proof (Theorem 8.1) that $\mathcal{M}(J)$ descends to a basis of $S/((S_+^{\mathbb{C}^n}) : f_J)$ for all subsets $J \subseteq [n]$, thereby proving (Corollary 8.2) the Sagan-Swanson Conjecture 1.1. We use similar methods and a family of arrangements \mathcal{A}_J distinct from southwest arrangements to obtain (Corollary 6.5) a simpler regular sequence which cuts out the ideal $(S_+^{\mathbb{C}^n}) : f_J$ appearing in Theorem 1.2.

The methods in this paper have parallels in Hessenberg theory. Let G be a simple complex Lie group with Borel subgroup B and maximal torus T . Let $\mathfrak{g} \supseteq \mathfrak{b} \supseteq \mathfrak{t}$ be the corresponding Lie algebras. If $\mathfrak{h} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ is a Hessenberg subspace, we have a corresponding *regular nilpotent Hessenberg variety* $X_{\mathfrak{h}}$ which is a closed subvariety of the flag variety G/B .

If $H^*(X_{\mathfrak{h}})$ is the singular cohomology ring of $X_{\mathfrak{h}}$ with real coefficients, there is a surjective Borel map $\mathbb{R}[t] \twoheadrightarrow H^*(X_{\mathfrak{h}})$ which realizes $H^*(X_{\mathfrak{h}})$ as a quotient of the polynomial ring $\mathbb{R}[t]$. The Hessenberg subspace \mathfrak{h} also corresponds to an ideal \mathcal{I} in the positive root poset Φ^+ attached to G . Abe, Horiguchi, Masuda, Murai, and Sato proved [2] (using different language) that $H^*(X_{\mathfrak{h}})$ is the Solomon-Terao algebra associated to the ideal subarrangement $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ of the Weyl arrangement with respect to the map $\mathbf{a} : \partial_i \mapsto x_i$. This uniform presentation of $H^*(X_{\mathfrak{h}})$ allowed Abe et. al. to deduce numerous properties of these rings, including the Kähler package (despite the failure of the $X_{\mathfrak{h}}$ to be smooth). Harada, Horiguchi, Murai, Precup, and Tymoczko [11] showed that $H^*(X_{\mathfrak{h}})$ admits an Artin-like basis in type A.

The Solomon-Terao algebras arise surprisingly in two seemingly unrelated contexts: Hessenberg varieties and superspace coinvariant theory. In Section 9 we discuss the problem of finding other applications of these algebras.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In **Section 2** we give general background on commutative algebra and hyperplane arrangements. **Section 3** is devoted to the proof of a key lemma on when a product of elements in $\tilde{\Phi}^+$ lies in the coinvariant ideal. In **Section 4** we study general properties of Solomon-Terao algebras and prove a result (Lemma 4.4) which relates the ideals $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{B}}, \mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq S$ for certain subarrangements $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$. **Section 5** introduces southwest arrangements, finds bases for their derivation modules, and derives a short exact sequence for the derivation modules of triples of arrangements arising in Terao's Addition-Deletion Theorem. **Section 6** defines and studies the arrangements \mathcal{A}_J . We use the derivation modules of these arrangements to give a simpler regular sequence generating the ideals $(S_+^{\mathbb{C}^n}) : f_J$. In **Section 7** we derive monomial bases for Solomon-Terao algebras corresponding to southwest arrangements. **Section 8** applies the theory of southwest arrangements to prove the Sagan-Swanson Conjecture. We conclude in **Section 9** with some open problems.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. Commutative algebra. As explained in the introduction, we let $S = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ where \mathbb{K} is a field. If $V = \mathbb{K}^n$, we will sometimes identify $S = \mathbb{K}[V]$ with the ring of regular maps $V \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$.

For any $1 \leq i \leq n$ we have a partial derivative operator $\partial_i : S \rightarrow S$. These operators commute, so for any polynomial $f = f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in S$ we have a differential operator $\partial f : S \rightarrow S$ given by

$$(2.1) \quad \partial f := f(\partial_1, \dots, \partial_n).$$

This gives rise to an S -module structure $(-) \odot (-) : S \times S \rightarrow S$ given by

$$(2.2) \quad f \odot g := \partial f(g).$$

Let $A = \bigoplus_{d \geq 0} A_d$ be a graded \mathbb{K} -vector space in which each graded piece A_d is finite-dimensional. The *Hilbert series* of A is the formal power series

$$(2.3) \quad \text{Hilb}(A; q) := \sum_{d \geq 0} \dim_{\mathbb{K}} A_d \cdot q^d.$$

Let $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq S$ be an ideal and let $f \in S$. As in the introduction, the *colon ideal* $\mathfrak{a} : f$ is the ideal in S given by $\{g \in S : fg \in \mathfrak{a}\}$. It is not hard to see that $\mathfrak{a} : f$ is an ideal containing \mathfrak{a} . Furthermore, we have an exact sequence

$$(2.4) \quad 0 \longrightarrow S/(\mathfrak{a} : f) \xrightarrow{\times f} S/\mathfrak{a}$$

induced by multiplication by f . If $f, g \in S$ we have $\mathfrak{a} : fg = (\mathfrak{a} : f) : g$ and a corresponding exact sequence

$$(2.5) \quad 0 \longrightarrow S/(\mathfrak{a} : fg) \xrightarrow{\times g} S/(\mathfrak{a} : f).$$

A sequence $f_1, \dots, f_r \in S$ of polynomials is called *regular* if $(f_1, \dots, f_r) \neq S$ and for each i , the map

$$(2.6) \quad S/(f_1, \dots, f_{i-1}) \xrightarrow{\times f_i} S/(f_1, \dots, f_{i-1})$$

is an injection. If each f_i is homogeneous, we have $r \leq n$ and

$$(2.7) \quad \text{Hilb}(S/(f_1, \dots, f_r); q) = \frac{(1 - q^{\deg f_1}) \dots (1 - q^{\deg f_r})}{(1 - q)^n}.$$

An ideal $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq S$ is a *complete intersection* if \mathfrak{a} is generated by a regular sequence. Let $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq S$ be a homogeneous ideal. The quotient S/\mathfrak{a} is *Artinian* if it is a finite-dimensional \mathbb{K} -vector space. If $f_1, \dots, f_n \in S$ have positive degree, then f_1, \dots, f_n is a regular sequence if and only if S/\mathfrak{a} is Artinian.

Let $A = \bigoplus_{d=0}^m A_d$ be a finite-dimensional graded \mathbb{K} -algebra with $A_m \neq 0$. The algebra A is a *Poincaré duality algebra (PDA)* if $A_m \cong \mathbb{K}$ is 1-dimensional and if, for all d , the multiplication map $A_d \times A_{m-d} \rightarrow A_m \cong \mathbb{K}$ given by $(a, b) \mapsto ab$ is a *perfect pairing*. (The map $(a, b) \mapsto ab$ is a perfect pairing if $(a, b) \mapsto 0$ for all $b \in A_{m-d}$ implies $a = 0$ and $(a, b) \mapsto 0$ for all $a \in A_d$ implies $b = 0$.) The integer $m > 0$ is the *socle degree* of A . If a homogeneous ideal $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq S$ is a complete intersection generated by a regular sequence f_1, \dots, f_n of length n , it is known that S/\mathfrak{a} is a PDA of socle degree $\sum_{i=1}^n (\deg f_i - 1)$. The following lemma will be crucial.

Lemma 2.1. (Abe-Horiguchi-Masuda-Murai-Sato [2, Lem. 2.4]) *Suppose $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{a}' \subseteq S$ are homogeneous ideals and $f \in S$ is a homogeneous polynomial of degree k with $f \notin \mathfrak{a}$. Suppose $\mathfrak{a}' \subseteq (\mathfrak{a} : f)$. If S/\mathfrak{a}' is a PDA of socle degree m and S/\mathfrak{a} is a PDA of socle degree $m + k$ then $\mathfrak{a}' = (\mathfrak{a} : f)$.*

In [2] Lemma 2.1 is stated over the field \mathbb{R} of real numbers, but its proof goes through over any field.

2.2. Arrangement combinatorics. Let V be an n -dimensional \mathbb{K} -vector space with dual space $V^* = \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{K}}(V, \mathbb{K})$. Fixing a basis $\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n$ of V yields a dual basis x_1, \dots, x_n of V^* and identifications $\mathbb{K}[V] = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n] = S$.

As in the introduction, a *(linear) hyperplane* in V is a codimension 1 linear subspace $H \subset V$. If $\alpha \in V^* - \{0\}$, we write H_α for the hyperplane given by the kernel of $\alpha : V \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$. Conversely, a hyperplane $H \subset V$ is the kernel of a unique $\alpha \in V^* - \{0\}$, up to a nonzero scalar.

An *arrangement* in V is a finite set \mathcal{A} of hyperplanes in V . The arrangement \mathcal{A} is *essential* if

$$(2.8) \quad \bigcap_{H \in \mathcal{A}} H = \{0\}.$$

A *flat* of \mathcal{A} is an intersection $X \subseteq V$ of hyperplanes in \mathcal{A} (including the ‘empty intersection’ V). The *intersection poset* $\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{A})$ is the collection of flats in \mathcal{A} ordered by reverse containment: we have $X \leq_{\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{A})} Y$ if and only if $Y \subseteq X$. Since we are considering linear arrangements only, the poset $\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{A})$ is a lattice with minimum $\hat{0} = V$ and maximum $\hat{1} = \bigcap_{H \in \mathcal{A}} H$. The arrangement \mathcal{A} is *supersolvable* if $\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{A})$ admits a maximal chain of modular elements (see [26]). In particular, supersolvability is a *combinatorial property* of \mathcal{A} : it only depends on the intersection lattice $\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{A})$.

Let P be a finite poset. The *Möbius function* $\mu_P : P \times P \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is defined recursively by

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{cases} \mu_P(x, x) = 1 & \text{for all } x \in P, \\ \mu_P(x, y) = 0 & \text{if } x \not\leq_P y, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{x \leq_P z \leq_P y} \mu_P(x, z) = 0 \text{ for all } x <_P y.$$

If \mathcal{A} is an arrangement, the *characteristic polynomial* of \mathcal{A} is given by

$$(2.10) \quad \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(t) := \sum_{X \in \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{A})} \mu_{\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{A})}(\hat{0}, X) \cdot t^{\dim X}.$$

If \mathcal{A} is an arrangement in V and $H \in \mathcal{A}$ is a hyperplane, we define two new arrangements as follows. The *deletion* $\mathcal{A} \setminus H$ is the subarrangement obtained from \mathcal{A} by removing the hyperplane H . The *restriction* \mathcal{A}^H is the arrangement in H given by

$$(2.11) \quad \mathcal{A}^H = \{H' \cap H : H' \in \mathcal{A}, H' \neq H\}.$$

2.3. Derivation modules. A *derivation* of S is a \mathbb{K} -linear map $\theta : S \rightarrow S$ which satisfies the Leibniz rule: $\theta(fg) = f\theta(g) + g\theta(f)$ for all $f, g \in S$. The set $\text{Der}(S)$ of derivations $\theta : S \rightarrow S$ has the structure of an S -module via $(f\theta)(g) = f \cdot \theta(g)$ for $f, g \in S$. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, the partial derivative operator $\partial_i : S \rightarrow S$ is a derivation, and the set $\{\partial_1, \dots, \partial_n\}$ forms a free S -basis for $\text{Der}(S)$. A derivation $\theta \in S$ is *homogeneous of degree d* if $\theta = f_1\partial_1 + \dots + f_n\partial_n$ where each $f_1, \dots, f_n \in S$ is homogeneous of degree d .

Let \mathcal{A} be a hyperplane arrangement in $V = \mathbb{K}^n$ with hyperplanes H_1, \dots, H_m given by the kernels of the linear forms $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m \in V^*$. The *defining polynomial* of \mathcal{A} is the product $Q(\mathcal{A}) := \prod_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \in S$. The polynomial $Q(\mathcal{A})$ is defined up to a nonzero scalar. A derivation $\theta \in \text{Der}(S)$ of S is called a *derivation of \mathcal{A}* if $\theta(Q(\mathcal{A}))$ is divisible by $Q(\mathcal{A})$. The *derivation module* of \mathcal{A} is the set $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$ of all derivations of \mathcal{A} ; this is an S -submodule of $\text{Der}(S)$. For any arrangement \mathcal{A} we have

$$(2.12) \quad \text{Der}(\mathcal{A}) = \bigcap_{H \in \mathcal{A}} \text{Der}(H).$$

In particular, if $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ is a subarrangement of \mathcal{A} then $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \text{Der}(\mathcal{B})$. The arrangement \mathcal{A} is *free* if $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$ is a free S -module.

If \mathcal{A} is a free arrangement, the module $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$ will admit a homogeneous S -basis $\{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_n\}$ where the multiset of degrees $e_i := \deg \rho_i$ is uniquely determined. The degrees e_1, \dots, e_n are called the *exponents* of \mathcal{A} . Terao’s Factorization Theorem [32] asserts that the characteristic polynomial of a free arrangement factors over \mathbb{Z} as

$$(2.13) \quad \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(t) = \prod_{i=1}^n (t - e_i).$$

Showing that the characteristic polynomial of an arrangement does not factor over \mathbb{Z} is often a practical way to show that an arrangement is not free, but there exist nonfree arrangements \mathcal{A} for which $\chi_{\mathcal{A}}(t)$ factors over \mathbb{Z} . On the other hand, it is known that every supersolvable arrangement is free. However, there are free arrangements which are not supersolvable.

3. COINVARIANT IDEAL MEMBERSHIP

Let $V = \mathbb{K}^n$. Recall from the introduction that $\Phi^+ \subseteq V^*$ is given by the type A positive roots $\Phi^+ = \{x_i - x_j : 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}$ and $\tilde{\Phi}^+ = \Phi^+ \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$. We will need a criterion to determine which products of linear forms in $\tilde{\Phi}^+$ lie in the coinvariant ideal $(S_+^{\mathfrak{S}_n})$. The goal of this technical section is to prove such a criterion (Lemma 3.2). It may be best to skip this section on a first reading of this paper.

3.1. Symmetric polynomials and $(S_+^{\mathfrak{S}_n})$. We will need standard terminology related to symmetric polynomials. For $n \geq 0$, a *partition* λ of n is a weakly decreasing sequence $\lambda = (\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots)$ which satisfies $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \dots = n$. We write $\lambda \vdash n$ to mean that λ is a partition of n , and allow trailing zeros at the end of a partition, so that $(4, 2, 2, 1) = (4, 2, 2, 1, 0, 0) \vdash 9$. We write $\ell(\lambda)$ for the number of nonzero parts of λ .

For $d > 0$, the *elementary symmetric polynomial* of degree d is the polynomial $e_d \in S$ given by the sum of all squarefree monomials in S of degree d :

$$(3.1) \quad e_d := \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_d \leq n} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_d}.$$

(These are not to be confused with the exponents of a free arrangement.) The *complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial* of degree d is given by the sum of all monomials in S of degree d :

$$(3.2) \quad h_d := \sum_{1 \leq i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_d \leq n} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_d}.$$

By convention, we let $e_0 = h_0 = 1$ and $e_d = h_d = 0$ when $d < 0$. If $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots)$ is a partition, the *Schur polynomial* $s_\lambda \in S$ may be defined by the *Jacobi-Trudi formula*

$$(3.3) \quad s_\lambda = \det (h_{\lambda_i - i + j})_{1 \leq i, j \leq \ell(\lambda)}.$$

If $A \subseteq [n]$ and $f \in S^{\mathfrak{S}_n}$ is a symmetric polynomial, write $f(A)$ for the polynomial f in the variable set $\{x_a : a \in A\}$ obtained by setting all variables with indices outside of A to zero. We write $\delta_n \in S$ for the classical Vandermonde determinant

$$(3.4) \quad \delta_n := \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (x_i - x_j) = \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_n} \text{sign}(w) \cdot x_{w(1)}^{n-1} x_{w(2)}^{n-2} \cdots x_{w(n)}^0.$$

We record some useful facts about the coinvariant ideal $(S_+^{\mathfrak{S}_n}) \subseteq S$.

Lemma 3.1. *Recall that $(-)\odot(-) : S \times S \rightarrow S$ is the action of S on itself by partial differentiation.*

- (1) *Given $f \in S$, we have $f \in (S_+^{\mathfrak{S}_n})$ if and only if $f \odot \delta_n = 0$.*
- (2) *If $A \subseteq [n]$ and a partition λ satisfies $\lambda_1 > n - |A|$, we have $s_\lambda(A) \in (S_+^{\mathfrak{S}_n})$.*
- (3) *If $[n] = A \sqcup B$ we have $h_d(A) \equiv (-1)^d e_d(B)$ for each $d \geq 0$ where the congruence is modulo $(S_+^{\mathfrak{S}_n})$.*

Proof. Item (1) is a well-known result of Steinberg [27]. When λ has only one part so that $s_{(\lambda_1)} = h_{\lambda_1}$, Item (2) follows by inducting on $n - |A|$, using the identities

$$(3.5) \quad h_d(A) = h_d(A \cup \{a\}) - x_a h_{d-1}(A \cup \{a\})$$

for all $a \notin A$ together with $h_d = h_d([n]) \in (S_+^{\mathfrak{S}_n})$ for all $d > 0$. For general λ , the Jacobi-Trudi identity says that

$$s_\lambda(A) = \det (h_{\lambda_i - i + j}(A))_{1 \leq i, j \leq \ell(\lambda)}$$

and the conclusion of (2) follows by expanding this determinant along the first row, applying that $s_{(\lambda_1)}(A) \in (S_+^{\mathfrak{S}_n})$.

For Item (3), introduce a new variable t . We have

$$\prod_{i=1}^n (1 - x_i t) \equiv 1 \pmod{(S_+^{\mathfrak{S}^n})}.$$

This implies that

$$\prod_{b \in B} (1 - x_b t) \equiv \prod_{a \in A} \frac{1}{1 - x_a t} \pmod{(S_+^{\mathfrak{S}^n})}$$

and the conclusion follows by comparing the coefficients of t^d on both sides. \square

3.2. The cospanning lemma. For any subset $T \subseteq \tilde{\Phi}^+$, write the product of the elements in T as

$$(3.6) \quad f(T) := \prod_{\alpha \in T} \alpha.$$

For reasons related to Solomon-Terao algebras of arrangements, it will be important to know when the product $f(T)$ lies in the coinvariant ideal $(S_+^{\mathfrak{S}^n})$. There is a clean answer: we have $f(T) \notin (S_+^{\mathfrak{S}^n})$ if and only if $T \subseteq \tilde{\Phi}^+$ is cospanning as a subset of V^* .

Lemma 3.2. *We have $f(T) \in (S_+^{\mathfrak{S}^n})$ if and only if the complement $\tilde{\Phi}^+ - T$ of T does not span V^* .*

In this proof we will use the well-known fact that $s_\lambda(A) = 0$ if $\ell(\lambda) > |A|$. This follows from the combinatorial interpretation of s_λ as the content generating function of semistandard tableaux of shape λ .

Proof. Suppose first that $\tilde{\Phi}^+ - T$ does not span V^* . There exists a partition $[n] = A \sqcup B$ with $A, B \neq \emptyset$ such that

$$x_a \in T \text{ for each } a \in A \text{ and } \pm(x_a - x_b) \in T \text{ for all } a \in A \text{ and } b \in B.$$

It suffices to show that

$$(3.7) \quad \prod_{a \in A} x_a \times \prod_{\substack{a \in A \\ b \in B}} (x_a - x_b) \in (S_+^{\mathfrak{S}^n})$$

since the displayed polynomial divides $f(T)$. We have

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \prod_{a \in A} x_a \times \prod_{\substack{a \in A \\ b \in B}} (x_a - x_b) &= \prod_{a \in A} x_a \times \prod_{a \in A} \left(\sum_{d=0}^{|B|} (-1)^d x_a^{|B|-d} e_d(B) \right) \\ &\equiv \prod_{a \in A} x_a \times \prod_{a \in A} \left(\sum_{d=0}^{|B|} x_a^{|B|-d} h_d(A) \right) \pmod{(S_+^{\mathfrak{S}^n})} \end{aligned}$$

where the congruence applies Lemma 3.1 (3). However, we have

$$\prod_{a \in A} x_a \times h_{|B|}(A) = e_{|A|}(A) \cdot h_{|B|}(A) = s_{(|B|, 1^{|A|})}(A) + s_{(|B|+1, 1^{|A|-1})}(A) = s_{(|B|+1, 1^{|A|-1})}(A) \in (S_+^{\mathfrak{S}^n})$$

where the second equality uses the Pieri rule and the third uses the fact that number of parts of $(|B|, 1^{|A|})$ is $|A| + 1$. The ideal membership is justified by Lemma 3.1 (2). Equation (3.8) therefore

continues as

$$(3.9) \quad \prod_{a \in A} x_a \times \prod_{a \in A} \left(\sum_{d=0}^{|B|} x_a^{|B|-d} h_d(A) \right) \\ \equiv \left(\prod_{a \in A} x_a \right)^2 \times \prod_{a \in A} \left(\sum_{d=0}^{|B|-1} x_a^{|B|-d-1} h_d(A) \right) \pmod{(S_+^{\mathfrak{S}^n})}.$$

However, we have

$$(3.10) \quad \left(\prod_{a \in A} x_a \right)^2 \times h_{|B|-1}(A) = e_{|A|}(A)^2 \cdot h_{|B|-1}(A) = s_{(|B|+1, 2^{|A|-1})}(A) \in (S_+^{\mathfrak{S}^n})$$

where the second equality follows from the Pieri rule and the fact that $s_\lambda(A)$ vanishes whenever $\ell(\lambda) > |A|$. The containment is again justified by Lemma 3.1 (2). Equation (3.9) may be rewritten as

$$(3.11) \quad \left(\prod_{a \in A} x_a \right)^2 \times \prod_{a \in A} \left(\sum_{d=0}^{|B|-1} x_a^{|B|-d-1} h_d(A) \right) \\ \equiv \left(\prod_{a \in A} x_a \right)^3 \times \prod_{a \in A} \left(\sum_{d=0}^{|B|-2} x_a^{|B|-d-2} h_d(A) \right) \pmod{(S_+^{\mathfrak{S}^n})}.$$

Continuing in this fashion, we eventually see that the quantity in Equation (3.8) satisfies

$$(3.12) \quad \prod_{a \in A} x_a \times \prod_{a \in A} \left(\sum_{d=0}^{|B|} x_a^{|B|-d} h_d(A) \right) \equiv \left(\prod_{a \in A} x_a \right)^{|B|+1} = s_{(|B|+1)^{|A|}}(A) \equiv 0 \pmod{(S_+^{\mathfrak{S}^n})}$$

where the equality is the definition of the Schur function indexed by an $|A|$ -by- $(|B|+1)$ rectangle and the congruence once again applies Lemma 3.1 (2).

Now assume that $\tilde{\Phi}^+ - T$ does span V^* . There exists a forest F on the vertex set $[n]$ with trees

$$F = \tau_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \tau_r$$

such that

- for all edges $i < j$ belonging to the same tree of F , we have $x_i - x_j \in \tilde{\Phi}^+ - T$, and
- for each $1 \leq c \leq r$, there exists a vertex i_c in τ_c such that $x_{i_c} \in \tilde{\Phi}^+ - T$.

For each vertex i of τ_c with $i \neq i_c$, there is a unique path $i = v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k = i_c$ from i to i_c in τ_c . We write $t(i)$ for the vertex v_1 which is adjacent to i in this path. It follows that $f(T)$ divides

$$(3.13) \quad \prod_{c=1}^r \prod_{\substack{i \in \tau_c \\ i \neq i_c}} x_i \times \prod_{\substack{1 \leq i < j \leq n \\ i \not\sim j}} (x_i - x_j)$$

where in the second product $i \not\sim j$ means that i and j are not connected by an edge in F .

It suffices to show that the expression (3.13) does not lie in $(S_+^{\mathfrak{S}^n})$. Equivalently (by Lemma 3.1 (1)) we need to show that

$$(3.14) \quad \left(\prod_{c=1}^r x_{i_c} \times \prod_{\substack{1 \leq i < j \leq n \\ i \not\sim j}} (x_i - x_j) \right) \odot \delta_n \neq 0.$$

where $(-) \odot (-)$ is the action of S on itself by partial differentiation.

The expression (3.13) is almost the Vandermonde determinant δ_n . In fact, we have

$$(3.15) \quad \prod_{c=1}^r \prod_{\substack{i \in \tau_c \\ i \neq i_c}} (x_i - x_{t(i)}) \times \prod_{\substack{1 \leq i < j \leq n \\ i \not\sim j}} (x_i - x_j) = \pm \delta_n.$$

Temporarily ignoring signs, the terms appearing in the monomial expansion of (3.13) are therefore a subset of the terms appearing in the monomial expansion of (3.15). Although any term in the expansion of (3.15) which is not of the form

$$\pm x_{w(1)}^{n-1} x_{w(2)}^{n-2} \cdots x_{w(n-1)}^1 x_{w(n)}^0$$

for some $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ will cancel, and other terms may survive cancellation in (3.13), it is not hard to see that

each term of the form $\pm x_{w(1)}^{n-1} x_{w(2)}^{n-2} \cdots x_{w(n-1)}^1 x_{w(n)}^0$ for $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ appears in the expansion of (3.15) precisely once (with no cancellation),

so that

each term of the form $\pm x_{w(1)}^{n-1} x_{w(2)}^{n-2} \cdots x_{w(n-1)}^1 x_{w(n)}^0$ for $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ which appears in the expansion of (3.13) appears precisely once (with no cancellation), and has the same sign as the corresponding term in the expansion of (3.15).

Since the Vandermonde determinant expands as

$$\delta_n = \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_n} \text{sign}(w) x_{w(1)}^{n-1} x_{w(2)}^{n-2} \cdots x_{w(n-1)}^1 x_{w(n)}^0,$$

the desired nonvanishing in (3.14) will hold if we can establish that at least one term of the form $\pm x_{w(1)}^{n-1} x_{w(2)}^{n-2} \cdots x_{w(n-1)}^1 x_{w(n)}^0$ for $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ appears in the monomial expansion of (3.13). A combinatorial argument showing this is as follows.

The terms of (3.15) correspond to orientations \mathcal{O} of the complete graph on $[n]$, and the terms of (3.13) correspond to orientations \mathcal{O}' in which each tree τ_c of the forest F is oriented away from its root vertex i_c . To build such an \mathcal{O}' corresponding to a permutation, start by orienting each tree of F away from its root vertex. Choose a leaf j_1 of F arbitrarily, and orient every non-oriented edge involving j_1 towards j_1 . There are $n-1$ edges oriented towards j_1 , so the factor $x_{j_1}^{n-1}$ will appear in the corresponding term. Ignoring j_1 and its incident edges, choose another leaf j_2 of F arbitrarily, and orient every non-oriented edge involving j_2 towards j_2 . There are $n-2$ edges oriented towards j_2 , so the factor $x_{j_2}^{n-2}$ will appear in the corresponding term. Iterating, we obtain an orientation \mathcal{O}' which yields the term $\pm x_{j_1}^{n-1} x_{j_2}^{n-2} \cdots x_{j_n}^0$, which corresponds to the permutation with one-line notation $[j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n] \in \mathfrak{S}_n$. \square

4. SOLOMON-TERAO ALGEBRAS

A S -module map $\mathfrak{c} : \text{Der}(S) \rightarrow S$ is determined by its images $\mathfrak{c}(\partial_i) \in S$ on the basis elements ∂_i of $\text{Der}(S)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. We say that \mathfrak{c} is *homogeneous of degree d* if each $\mathfrak{c}(\partial_i) \in S$ is homogeneous of degree d . As in the introduction, if \mathcal{A} is an arrangement in \mathbb{K}^n we write $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{A}} := \mathfrak{c}(\text{Der}(\mathcal{A}))$ for the image of $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \text{Der}(S)$ under \mathfrak{c} . Since $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$ is an S -submodule of $\text{Der}(S)$, the subset $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq S$ is an ideal in the ring S . If the map \mathfrak{c} is homogeneous, the ideal $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is also homogeneous. We will only consider homogeneous maps \mathfrak{c} . As in the introduction, we define the *Solomon-Terao algebra* to be the quotient ring $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{c}) := S/\mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{A}}$.

Solomon-Terao algebras have arisen ‘naturally’ in the context of Hessenberg theory [2] with the S -module map $\mathfrak{a} : \text{Der}(S) \rightarrow S$ given by $\mathfrak{a} : \partial_i \mapsto x_i$. For our applications to superspace coinvariant theory we will consider Solomon-Terao algebras with respect to the map $\mathfrak{i} : \text{Der}(S) \rightarrow S$ defined by

$\mathfrak{i} : \partial_i \mapsto 1$ for all i . In this section we establish some simple facts about Solomon-Terao algebras in general.

Remark 4.1. *In earlier work, Abe, Maeno, Murai, and Numata defined [3] a class of quotients of S called “Solomon-Terao algebras.” Their definition depends on a hyperplane arrangement \mathcal{A} in \mathbb{K}^n and a homogeneous polynomial $h \in S$. Abe et. al. define the Solomon-Terao algebra to be quotient of S by the ideal $\{\theta(h) : \theta \in \text{Der}(\mathcal{A})\}$. This is equivalent to considering the S -module map $\mathfrak{c} : \text{Der}(S) \rightarrow S$ given by $\partial_i \mapsto \partial_i(h)$ for all i . Our algebras $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{c})$ are therefore slightly more general than those in [3]. However, both examples $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{a})$ and $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{i})$ of Solomon-Terao algebras which have arisen in applications arise from the construction of Abe et. al., using the polynomials $h = \frac{1}{2}(x_1^2 + \cdots + x_n^2)$ and $h = x_1 + \cdots + x_n$.*

Solomon-Terao algebras behave well in the context of free arrangements. To begin, we record a well-known lemma relating the exponents of a free arrangement to the number of hyperplanes.

Lemma 4.2. *Let \mathcal{A} be a free arrangement with exponents e_1, \dots, e_n . Then \mathcal{A} contains $e_1 + \cdots + e_n$ hyperplanes.*

Proof. By (2.13), the characteristic polynomial of \mathcal{A} factors as

$$(4.1) \quad \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(t) = \sum_{X \in \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{A})} \mu_{\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{A})}(\hat{0}, X) \cdot t^{\dim(X)} = \prod_{i=1}^n (t - e_i).$$

Comparing the coefficient of t^{n-1} on both sides yields the result. \square

We next show that, if \mathcal{A} is free and the ST algebra $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{c})$ has finite positive dimension over \mathbb{K} , then $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{c})$ is a Poincaré duality algebra and its Hilbert series can be described by exponents.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\mathfrak{c} : \text{Der}(S) \rightarrow S$ be an S -module map of homogeneous degree $d \geq 0$ and let \mathcal{A} be a free arrangement in \mathbb{K}^n with exponents e_1, \dots, e_n . Exactly one of the following items about the Solomon-Terao algebra $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{c})$ is true.*

- (1) *We have $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{c}) = 0$.*
- (2) *The algebra $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{c})$ has infinite dimension over \mathbb{K} .*
- (3) *The ideal $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq S$ is a complete intersection and the algebra $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{c})$ is a Poincaré duality algebra with Hilbert series*

$$\text{Hilb}(\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{c}); q) = \frac{(1 - q^{e_1+d}) \cdots (1 - q^{e_n+d})}{(1 - q)^n}$$

and socle degree $e_1 + \cdots + e_n + n(d - 1) = |\mathcal{A}| + n(d - 1)$.

Proof. Let ρ_1, \dots, ρ_n be a free basis for $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$ with $\deg \rho_i = e_i$. The ideal $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq S = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is generated by the n elements $\mathfrak{c}(\rho_1), \dots, \mathfrak{c}(\rho_n) \in S$. If (1) and (2) fail to hold, then $(\mathfrak{c}(\rho_1), \dots, \mathfrak{c}(\rho_n)) \neq S$ and $S/\mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is Artinian. It follows from the discussion in Section 2.1 that $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a complete intersection so $S/\mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{c})$ is a Poincaré Duality algebra. The claimed Hilbert series follows from (2.7) because $\deg \mathfrak{c}(\rho_i) = e_i + d$. The final equality in (3) is a consequence of Lemma 4.2. \square

Let us show that conditions (1) and (2) in Lemma 4.3 can occur. Consider the map $\mathfrak{i} : \text{Der}(S) \rightarrow S$ given by $\mathfrak{i} : \partial_i \mapsto 1$ for all i . The Solomon-Terao algebra of the empty arrangement \emptyset in \mathbb{K}^n is

$$\mathcal{ST}(\emptyset, \mathfrak{i}) = S/\mathfrak{i}_{\emptyset} = S/(1) = 0.$$

On the other hand, if $n = 2$ and $\mathcal{A} = \{x_1 + x_2 = 0\}$, it is not hard to see that \mathcal{A} is a free arrangement and derivation module of \mathcal{A} has S -basis $\{\partial_1 - \partial_2, x_2\partial_1 - x_1\partial_2\}$. Since $\mathfrak{i}(\partial_1 - \partial_2) = 1 - 1 = 0$ and $\mathfrak{i}(x_2\partial_1 - x_1\partial_2) = x_2 - x_1$, we see that

$$\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{i}) = \mathbb{K}[x_1, x_2]/\mathfrak{i}_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathbb{K}[x_1, x_2]/(x_2 - x_1)$$

is an infinite-dimensional \mathbb{K} -vector space.

There are conditions on \mathfrak{c} which guarantee that (1) and (2) in Lemma 4.3 never occur. If $d > 0$, the ideal $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq S$ lives in strictly positive degrees so that (1) is impossible. Degree reasons also forbid (1) when $e_1, \dots, e_n > 1$. When \mathfrak{c} is the map $\mathfrak{a} : \partial_i \mapsto x_i$ and $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$, neither (1) nor (2) can occur. See [3, Proposition 2.8]. Since we are considering the degree 0 map $\mathfrak{i} : \partial_i \mapsto 1$, we will need to be mindful of the full trichotomy in Lemma 4.3.

Let \mathcal{A} be a free arrangement and let $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ be a subarrangement which is also free. Since $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \text{Der}(\mathcal{B})$, the Solomon-Terao algebra $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{c})$ projects onto $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{B}, \mathfrak{c})$. Under mild hypotheses, we can be more precise about the nature of this projection as follows. Recall that $Q(\mathcal{A}), Q(\mathcal{B}) \in S$ are the defining polynomials of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} . Since $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, we have $Q(\mathcal{B}) \mid Q(\mathcal{A})$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let \mathcal{A} be a free arrangement in \mathbb{K}^n and let $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ be a free subarrangement. Let $\mathfrak{c} : \text{Der}(S) \rightarrow S$ be a homogeneous map. Assume the following.*

- *The big Solomon-Terao algebra $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{c})$ is Artinian.*
- *The quotient $Q(\mathcal{A})/Q(\mathcal{B})$ does not lie in $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{A}}$.*

Then $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{B}} = \mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{A}} : (Q(\mathcal{A})/Q(\mathcal{B}))$ as ideals in S .

Proof. It follows from the definitions that multiplication by $Q(\mathcal{A})/Q(\mathcal{B})$ carries $\text{Der}(\mathcal{B})$ into $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$. Applying the map \mathfrak{c} shows that $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{B}} \subseteq \mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{A}} : (Q(\mathcal{A})/Q(\mathcal{B}))$ as ideals in S . This also shows $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{c})$ and $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{B}, \mathfrak{c})$ are nonzero since the second bullet point tells that $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{A}} : (Q(\mathcal{A})/Q(\mathcal{B}))$ is not a unit ideal. The first bullet point, the fact that $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{B}}$, and Lemma 4.3 imply that $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{c})$ and $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{B}, \mathfrak{c})$ are Poincaré duality algebras of socle degrees $|\mathcal{A}| + n(d - 1)$ and $|\mathcal{B}| + n(d - 1)$, respectively, where d is the degree of \mathfrak{c} . Since

$$(4.2) \quad \deg(Q(\mathcal{A})/Q(\mathcal{B})) = \deg Q(\mathcal{A}) - \deg Q(\mathcal{B}) = |\mathcal{A}| - |\mathcal{B}| = (|\mathcal{A}| + n(d - 1)) - (|\mathcal{B}| + n(d - 1)),$$

the second bullet point gives us license to apply Lemma 2.1 to prove the result. \square

Lemma 4.4 realizes certain Solomon-Terao ideals as colon ideals. We will show that a family of ideals closely related to the colon ideals $(S_+^{\mathbb{C}^n}) : f_J$ appearing in Theorem 1.2 fits into the framework of Lemma 4.4.

5. SOUTHWEST ARRANGEMENTS

5.1. Southwest combinatorics. Theorem 1.2 gives a transfer principle between the superspace coinvariant ring $SR = \Omega/I$ and quotients of the classical polynomial ring S by colon ideals $(S_+^{\mathbb{C}^n}) : f_J$ where each f_J is a product of $(x_i - x_j)$'s and x_i 's. We want to put these latter commutative quotients in a context amenable to Lemma 4.4. For this, it is natural to consider hyperplanes given by the kernels of linear forms in $\tilde{\Phi}^+$. This motivates the following definition.

For $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, write $H_{i,j} \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ for the hyperplane $x_i = x_j$. For $1 \leq j \leq n$, write


$$H_{0,j} = H_j = H_{x_j}$$

for the coordinate hyperplane $x_j = 0$. Let $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\Phi}^+} = \{H_{i,j} : 1 \leq i < j \leq n\} \cup \{H_j : 1 \leq j \leq n\}$. Our notational conventions yield $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\Phi}^+} = \{H_{i,j} : 0 \leq i < j \leq n\}$.

Definition 5.1. A subarrangement $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\Phi}^+}$ is a *southwest arrangement* if it satisfies the following condition:

$$H_{i,j} \in \mathcal{A} \text{ and } j > i + 1 \text{ imply } H_{i,j-1} \in \mathcal{A}.$$


The ‘‘southwest’’ terminology is motivated by the following picture. We give the linear forms in $\tilde{\Phi}^+$ the partial order $(x_a - x_d) \geq (x_b - x_c)$ if $0 \leq a \leq b < c \leq d \leq n$, where we identify $x_d \leftrightarrow x_0 - x_d$. This gives rise to an augmented version of the type A positive root poset, shown here in the case $n = 5$.



A subarrangement of $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\Phi}^+}$ is southwest if its hyperplanes are closed under moving southwest in this poset. This is a weaker condition than being an order ideal of $\tilde{\Phi}^+$. When $n = 5$, the southwest arrangement

$$(5.1) \quad \mathcal{A} = \{H_1, H_2, H_{1,2}, H_{1,3}, H_{2,3}, H_{1,4}, H_{2,4}, H_{3,4}, H_{2,5}\}$$

may be illustrated as follows, where hyperplanes correspond to black dots.



For any southwest arrangement \mathcal{A} , we associate an h -sequence $h(\mathcal{A}) = (h_1, \dots, h_n)$ by

$$(5.2) \quad h_i = h_i(\mathcal{A}) := |\mathcal{A} \cap \{H_i, H_{1,i}, H_{2,i}, \dots, H_{i-1,i}\}|.$$

In terms of the poset structure on $\tilde{\Phi}^+$, the number h_i counts black dots in the i^{th} northwest-to-southeast diagonal. The above example has $h(\mathcal{A}) = (h_1, \dots, h_5) = (1, 2, 2, 3, 1)$. It will turn out that (h_1, \dots, h_n) are the exponents of a southwest arrangement \mathcal{A} .

The class of southwest arrangements generalize a family of arrangements which arise in type A Hessenberg theory [1, 2] corresponding to order ideals $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \Phi^+$ of the type A positive root poset. Such ideal arrangements are in one-to-one correspondence with *Hessenberg functions* $h : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ which satisfy $h(1) \leq \dots \leq h(n)$ and $h(i) \geq i$ for all i ; this motivates our use of h .² Unlike in the Hessenberg case, there can be multiple southwest arrangements \mathcal{A} with the same h -sequence.

Southwest arrangements and their h -functions behave nicely under deletion of and restriction to certain coordinate hyperplanes H_p . We define southwest arrangements in H_{x_p} in the natural way using the ordered basis $\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{p-1}, \mathbf{e}_{p+1}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n$ of H_p . We also use the abbreviation

$$(5.3) \quad \mathcal{A}^{(p)} := \mathcal{A}^{H_p}$$

for the restriction of an arrangement \mathcal{A} to the p^{th} coordinate hyperplane H_p .

Lemma 5.2. *Let \mathcal{A} be a southwest arrangement in \mathbb{K}^n with $h(\mathcal{A}) = (h_1, \dots, h_n)$. Assume that \mathcal{A} contains at least one coordinate hyperplane and write $p := \max\{k : H_k \in \mathcal{A}\}$. Then*

- (1) $\mathcal{A} \setminus H_p$ is a southwest arrangement with

$$h(\mathcal{A} \setminus H_p) = (h_1, \dots, h_{p-1}, h_p - 1, h_{p+1}, \dots, h_n).$$


²One also needs to replace $h(i) \mapsto h(i) - i$.

(2) $\mathcal{A}^{(p)}$ is a southwest arrangement in H_p with

$$h(\mathcal{A}^{(p)}) = (h_1, \dots, h_{p-1}, h_{p+1}, \dots, h_n).$$

Proof. Item (1) is clear from the definitions. For Item (2), restriction to H_{x_p} has the effect of setting $x_p \rightarrow 0$ in the linear forms defining the hyperplanes of \mathcal{A} . This leaves linear forms $x_i - x_j$ unchanged if $i, j \neq p$ while carrying $x_i - x_p$ to x_i . In the poset picture of $\tilde{\Phi}^+$, the hyperplanes involving x_p form a V-shaped set. Restriction to H_p eliminates the dots in the northwest-to-southeast portion of the V while moving the black dots in the southwest-to-northeast portion of the V to the top of their northwest-to-southeast diagonals. This process preserves the southwest condition and has the claimed effect on h -sequences. \square

Lemma 5.2 and its proof are best understood by example. If $n = 5$ and \mathcal{A} is the southwest arrangement considered before (see (5.1)), we have $p = 2$. The hyperplane H_2 has ordered basis $\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_3, \mathbf{e}_4, \mathbf{e}_5$ with coordinate functions x_1, x_3, x_4, x_5 and $\mathcal{A}^{(2)}$ is shown below. Observe that $h(\mathcal{A}^{(2)}) = (1, 2, 3, 1)$.



5.2. Southwest algebra. Solomon-Terao algebras coming from southwest arrangements are deeply tied to the superspace coinvariant ring SR . Lemma 4.3 says that Solomon-Terao algebras have nice properties for free arrangements. Southwest arrangements are not merely free, but also supersolvable.

Proposition 5.3. *Any southwest arrangement is supersolvable, hence free.*

Proof. Give \mathbb{K}^{n+1} the coordinates x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n . For a simple graph Γ on the vertex set $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$, we have a *graphical arrangement* \mathcal{A}_Γ in \mathbb{K}^{n+1} formed from the hyperplanes $x_i - x_j = 0$ for each edge $i - j$ of Γ . If \mathcal{A} is a southwest arrangement in \mathbb{K}^n , we have a graphical arrangement \mathcal{A}' in \mathbb{K}^{n+1} obtained by replacing each coordinate hyperplane H_k in \mathcal{A} with the hyperplane $x_0 - x_k$. It is easy to see that \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{A}' have isomorphic intersection posets:

$$\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{A}) \cong \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{A}').$$

Since supersolvability is determined by the intersection poset of an arrangement, we see that \mathcal{A} is supersolvable if and only if \mathcal{A}' is supersolvable.

A graph Γ on $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ is *chordal* if it has no induced k -cycles for $k > 3$. If \mathcal{A}_Γ is a graphical arrangement, Stanley proved [26, Cor. 4.10] that

$$\mathcal{A}_\Gamma \text{ is supersolvable} \Leftrightarrow \Gamma \text{ is chordal.}$$

It is not hard to check that if \mathcal{A} is a southwest arrangement, the graphical arrangement \mathcal{A}' corresponds to a chordal graph Γ . Since every supersolvable arrangement is free, we are done. \square

Thanks to the correspondence between subarrangements of $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\Phi}^+}$ and graphical arrangements \mathcal{A}_Γ for graphs Γ on $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$, Proposition 5.3 can be augmented. To extend this augmentation as much as possible, we recall some general material on arrangements.

If $\mathcal{A} = \{H_{\alpha_1}, \dots, H_{\alpha_m}\}$ is a central arrangement in \mathbb{K}^n with $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m \in (\mathbb{K}^n)^*$, the *Orlik-Solomon algebra* $OS(\mathcal{A})$ is defined as follows. Let $E_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the exterior algebra over \mathbb{K} with generators

v_1, \dots, v_m corresponding to the hyperplanes $H_{\alpha_1}, \dots, H_{\alpha_m}$ of \mathcal{A} . The algebra $E_{\mathcal{A}}$ has a boundary operator $\partial : E_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow E_{\mathcal{A}}$ characterized by \mathbb{K} -linearity and

$$(5.4) \quad \partial : v_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{i_r} \mapsto \sum_{j=1}^r (-1)^{j-1} v_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{v_{i_j}} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{i_r}$$

where the hat denotes omission. Let $I_{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq E_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the ideal generated by all elements of the form $\partial(v_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{i_r})$ such that $\{\alpha_{i_1}, \dots, \alpha_{i_r}\}$ is linearly dependent. We set

$$(5.5) \quad \text{OS}(\mathcal{A}) := E_{\mathcal{A}}/I_{\mathcal{A}}.$$

For the definition of Koszul algebras, we refer the reader to Priddy [15].

Proposition 5.4. *Let Γ be a graph on the vertex set $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ and let \mathcal{A}_{Γ} be the corresponding graphical arrangement in \mathbb{K}^{n+1} . Let $\mathcal{A}'_{\Gamma} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\widehat{\Phi}_+}$ be the arrangement obtained from \mathcal{A}_{Γ} by restriction to $x_0 = 0$. The following are equivalent.*

- (1) Γ is chordal.
- (2) \mathcal{A}_{Γ} is supersolvable.
- (3) \mathcal{A}_{Γ} is free.
- (4) The characteristic polynomial $\chi_{\mathcal{A}_{\Gamma}}(t)$ splits over the integers.
- (5) The Orlik-Solomon algebra $\text{OS}(\mathcal{A}_{\Gamma})$ is Koszul.
- (6) The Orlik-Solomon ideal $I_{\mathcal{A}_{\Gamma}}$ is quadratic.

Properties (1) - (6) are also equivalent for the arrangement \mathcal{A}'_{Γ} .

Proposition 5.4 is a collection of known results from the hyperplane arrangements literature. We give the relevant references here.

Proof. For the equivalence of (1)–(4) for the graphical arrangement \mathcal{A}_{Γ} , see [9, Thm. 3.3] and its proof. If \mathcal{A} is any arrangement we have

$$\mathcal{A} \text{ is supersolvable} \Rightarrow \mathcal{A} \text{ is free} \Rightarrow \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(t) \text{ factors over } \mathbb{Z}.$$

Since supersolvability and $\chi_{\mathcal{A}}(t)$ depend only on the intersection poset and since $\mathcal{A}_{\Gamma}, \mathcal{A}'_{\Gamma}$ have the same intersection posets, we see that (1)–(4) are equivalent for \mathcal{A}'_{Γ} , as well. It is known (see e.g. [23, Thm. 4.6]) that

$$\mathcal{A} \text{ is supersolvable} \Rightarrow \text{OS}(\mathcal{A}) \text{ is Koszul}$$

holds for arbitrary arrangements. Schenck and Suciu proved [22, Thm. 6.4] that for graphical arrangements (2), (5), (6) are equivalent. The natural identification between the hyperplanes of \mathcal{A}_{Γ} and those of \mathcal{A}'_{Γ} obtained by setting $x_0 = 0$ induces an isomorphism of exterior algebras $E_{\mathcal{A}_{\Gamma}} \cong E_{\mathcal{A}'_{\Gamma}}$ and an identification of ideals $I_{\mathcal{A}_{\Gamma}} \cong I_{\mathcal{A}'_{\Gamma}}$. Since (2) only depends on the intersection poset, we see that (2), (5), (6) are equivalent for \mathcal{A}'_{Γ} . \square

5.3. Free bases for southwest arrangements. In order to understand Solomon-Terao algebras coming from southwest arrangements, we will use an explicit free basis of their derivation modules. Such a basis may be given as follows. Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\widehat{\Phi}_+}$ be a southwest arrangement. For $0 \leq i < j \leq n$, we define $\alpha_{i,j} = x_i - x_j$ if $i \neq 0$ and $\alpha_{0,j} = x_j$. Define elements $\rho_j^{\mathcal{A}} \in \text{Der}(S)$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$ by the formula

$$(5.6) \quad \rho_j^{\mathcal{A}} := \sum_{k=j}^n \left(\prod_{H_{i,j} \in \mathcal{A}} \alpha_{i,k} \right) \partial_k$$

where $\rho_j^{\mathcal{A}} = \partial_j + \partial_{j+1} + \cdots + \partial_n$ when $\mathcal{A} \cap \{H_{i,j} : i = 0, 1, \dots, j-1\} = \emptyset$. Observe that the degree of $\rho_j^{\mathcal{A}}$ is given by the j^{th} entry h_j of the h -sequence $h(\mathcal{A}) = (h_1, \dots, h_n)$. As an example, if \mathcal{A} is the arrangement from (5.1), then $\rho_4^{\mathcal{A}} = \alpha_{1,4}\alpha_{2,4}\alpha_{3,4}\partial_4 + \alpha_{1,5}\alpha_{2,5}\alpha_{3,5}\partial_5$.

Proposition 5.5. *If \mathcal{A} is a southwest arrangement in \mathbb{K}^n , then $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$ is a free S -module with basis $\rho_1^{\mathcal{A}}, \dots, \rho_n^{\mathcal{A}}$. In particular, the exponents of \mathcal{A} are given by $h(\mathcal{A}) = (h_1, \dots, h_n)$.*

Proof. We abbreviate $\rho_j := \rho_j^{\mathcal{A}}$. Saito's Criterion [21] states that ρ_1, \dots, ρ_n is a free S -basis of $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$ if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1) we have $\rho_j \in \text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$ for each j ,
- (2) $\deg \rho_1 + \dots + \deg \rho_n = |\mathcal{A}|$,
- (3) ρ_1, \dots, ρ_n are linearly independent over S .

Item (2) follows from the definition of the ρ_j . Item (3) follows from the fact that each ρ_j is an S -linear combination of $\partial_j, \dots, \partial_n$ where the coefficient of ∂_j is nonzero. We prove (1) as follows.

Fix $1 \leq j \leq n$ and $\alpha_{s,t} \in \mathcal{A}$. We prove $\alpha_{s,t} \mid \rho_j(\alpha_{s,t})$ in the following case-by-case fashion.

Case 1: *Suppose $t < j$.*

Then $\rho_j(\alpha_{s,t}) = 0$ so that $\alpha_{s,t} \mid \rho_j(\alpha_{s,t})$.

Case 2: *Suppose $s < j \leq t$.*

Since $H_{s,t} \in \mathcal{A}$ implies $H_{s,j} \in \mathcal{A}$ by the southwest condition and

$$\rho_j(\alpha_{s,t}) = \prod_{H_{i,j} \in \mathcal{A}} \alpha_{i,t}$$

by direct computation, we have $\alpha_{s,t} \mid \rho_j(\alpha_{s,t})$.

Case 3: *Suppose $j \leq s$.*

We compute

$$\rho_j(\alpha_{s,t}) = \prod_{H_{i,j} \in \mathcal{A}} \alpha_{i,s} - \prod_{H_{i,j} \in \mathcal{A}} \alpha_{i,t}.$$

This polynomial vanishes if we substitute $x_s = x_t$, which means that $\rho_j(\alpha_{s,t})$ is contained in the ideal $(x_s - x_t) = (\alpha_{s,t})$, as desired. \square

Remark 5.6. *In his Ph.D. thesis, Ziegler developed [35] a systematic method for computing a free basis of the derivation module $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$ of a supersolvable arrangement \mathcal{A} from an M -chain in the intersection lattice $\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{A})$. By Proposition 5.3, this method may be used to find a basis of $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$ for southwest arrangements \mathcal{A} . Thanks to the work of Stanley [26, Cor. 4.10] and Edelman-Reiner [9, Thm. 3.3], Ziegler's method would apply to give an explicit free basis for $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$ whenever $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{F}_+}$ is a subarrangement whose corresponding graph on $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ is chordal. The authors have not computed such a basis at this level of generality.*

5.4. Exact sequences of derivation modules. The form of the free basis in Proposition 5.5 will play an important role in our analysis. Our inductive arguments will also require short exact sequences which connect these modules and the corresponding Solomon-Terao algebras with respect to the map i . These exact sequences arise in the general context of free arrangements, and are closely related to the following Addition-Deletion Theorem of Terao.

Theorem 5.7. (Terao [31]) *Let \mathcal{A} be an arrangement in \mathbb{K}^n and let $H \in \mathcal{A}$. Any two of the following implies the third.*

- (1) \mathcal{A} is free with exponents (e_1, \dots, e_n) .
- (2) $\mathcal{A} \setminus H$ is free with exponents $(e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}, e_n - 1)$.
- (3) \mathcal{A}^H is free with exponents (e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}) .

Theorem 5.7 is tied to a short exact sequence of derivation modules arrangements and hyperplanes. Let \mathcal{A} be any arrangement in $V = \mathbb{K}^n$ and let $H = H_\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ be a hyperplane corresponding to a linear form α . Write $\bar{S} := S/(\alpha)$. The derivation module $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A}^H)$ therefore sits inside $\bar{S} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} H$. For any $\psi \in \text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$, we have $\alpha \mid \psi(\alpha)$ in S , so that we have a derivation

$$(5.7) \quad \bar{\psi} : \bar{S} \longrightarrow \bar{S} \quad \bar{\psi} : f + (\alpha) \mapsto \psi(f) + (\alpha)$$

of the quotient ring \bar{S} . It turns out [14, Prop. 4.44] that $\bar{\psi} \in \text{Der}(\mathcal{A}^H)$ for all $\psi \in \text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$.³ We therefore have a well-defined map

$$(5.8) \quad \eta_H : \text{Der}(\mathcal{A}) \longrightarrow \text{Der}(\mathcal{A}^H) \quad \eta_H : \psi \mapsto \bar{\psi}.$$

Observe that η_H preserves degree.

The map $\eta_H : \text{Der}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \text{Der}(\mathcal{A}^H)$ has a geometric interpretation as follows. We may regard $\text{Der}(S) = S \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} V$ as the S -module of polynomial vector fields on V . Under this identification, the derivation module $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \text{Der}(S)$ consists of vector fields which are parallel to the hyperplanes of \mathcal{A} . Restricting any such vector field to $H \subset V$ yields a vector field on H which is parallel to the hyperplanes of the restricted arrangement \mathcal{A}^H . The map $\eta_H : \text{Der}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \text{Der}(\mathcal{A}^H)$ is precisely this restriction. The following short exact sequence involving η_H may be found in e.g. [14, Thm.4.46].

Theorem 5.8. *The \mathcal{A} be an arrangement and let $H \in \mathcal{A}$ be a hyperplane which satisfies the conditions of Theorem 5.7. Let α be a linear form with kernel H . We have a short exact sequence*

$$(5.9) \quad 0 \longrightarrow \text{Der}(\mathcal{A} \setminus H) \xrightarrow{\times\alpha} \text{Der}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{\eta_H} \text{Der}(\mathcal{A}^H) \longrightarrow 0$$

where the first map is multiplication by α and the second map is homogeneous of degree 0.

In fact (see [14, Prop. 4.45]), we have an exact sequence

$$(5.10) \quad 0 \longrightarrow \text{Der}(\mathcal{A} \setminus H) \xrightarrow{\times\alpha} \text{Der}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{\eta_H} \text{Der}(\mathcal{A}^H)$$

for any arrangement \mathcal{A} and any hyperplane $H = H_\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$. The condition that \mathcal{A} and H satisfy the conditions of Theorem 5.7 is only required for the surjectivity of η_H .⁴ Importantly for us, triples satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 5.8 arise from essential southwest arrangements as follows. Observe that every essential subarrangement of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{F}_+}$ contains at least one coordinate hyperplane.

Lemma 5.9. *Let \mathcal{A} be an essential southwest arrangement. Define $p := \max\{k : H_k \in \mathcal{A}\}$. The triple $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A} \setminus H_p, \mathcal{A}^{(p)})$ satisfies the conditions of Theorem 5.7.*

Proof. This follows from Lemma 5.2 and Proposition 5.3. □

6. THE ALGEBRA $S/((S_+^{\mathbb{C}^n}) : f_J)$ AND THE ARRANGEMENT \mathcal{A}_J

Recall that we are interested in a basis of the algebra $S/((S_+^{\mathbb{C}^n}) : f_J)$. In this section, we show that this algebra is the Solomon–Terao algebra of a hyperplane arrangement, and as an application we give an explicit generating set of the ideal $(S_+^{\mathbb{C}^n}) : f_J$.

Recall that $\mathfrak{i} : \text{Der}(S) \rightarrow S$ is the S -module homomorphism defined by $\mathfrak{i} : \partial_i \mapsto 1$ for all i . The following result gives a link between Solomon–Terao algebras $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{i})$ of subarrangements $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{F}_+}$ and coinvariant theory.

Proposition 6.1. *Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{F}_+}$ be an arbitrary subarrangement and let*

$$\tilde{\beta}_{\mathcal{A}} := \prod_{\substack{0 \leq i < j \leq n \\ H_{i,j} \notin \mathcal{A}}} \alpha_{i,j}.$$

- (1) *The algebra $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{i})$ is a quotient of the coinvariant ring $S/(S_+^{\mathbb{C}^n})$.*
- (2) *If \mathcal{A} is not essential then $\mathfrak{i}_{\mathcal{A}} = S$ so that $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{i}) = 0$.*
- (3) *If \mathcal{A} is a free arrangement then $\mathfrak{i}_{\mathcal{A}} = (S_+^{\mathbb{C}^n}) : \tilde{\beta}_{\mathcal{A}}$.*

³After a linear change of coordinates, we may assume that $\alpha = x_1$. One checks that $\beta \mid \bar{\psi}(\beta)$ for all linear forms $\beta \in H^*$ corresponding to the hyperplanes of \mathcal{A}^H .

⁴The fact that η_H is surjective can be shown by comparing the Hilbert series of $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A} \setminus H)$, $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$, and $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A}^H)$ and the fact that the sequence (5.10) is exact.

Proof. Recall that $\mathfrak{a} : \text{Der}(S) \rightarrow S$ is the S -module homomorphism defined by $\mathfrak{a} : \partial_i \mapsto x_i$ for all i . It is known that $\mathfrak{a}(\text{Der}(\mathcal{A}_{\Phi^+})) = (S_+^{\mathbb{C}^n})$ (see [2, Theorem 3.9]). On the other hand, the form of the free bases in Proposition 5.5 for the southwest arrangements $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_{\Phi^+}, \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\Phi}^+}$ implies that

$$(6.1) \quad \mathfrak{i}(\text{Der}(\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\Phi}^+})) = \mathfrak{a}(\text{Der}(\mathcal{A}_{\Phi^+})) = (S_+^{\mathbb{C}^n}).$$

Since $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\Phi}^+}$ implies $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\Phi}^+}) \subseteq \text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$, Item (1) follows.

For Item (2), observe that if \mathcal{A} is a nonessential subarrangement of $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\Phi}^+}$ there exist pairwise disjoint subsets T, S_1, \dots, S_r of $[n]$ where $T \neq [n]$ and at least one S_i is nonempty so that

$$(6.2) \quad \bigcap_{H \in \mathcal{A}} H = \{(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{K}^n : a_i = 0 \text{ if } i \in T \text{ and } a_i = a_j \text{ if } i, j \in S_\ell \text{ for some } \ell\}.$$

But this implies

$$(6.3) \quad \sum_{i \in S_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup S_r} \partial_i \in \text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$$

so that $\mathfrak{i}_{\mathcal{A}} = S$.

For Item (3), suppose first that \mathcal{A} is nonessential. By Item (2) we have $\mathfrak{i}_{\mathcal{A}} = S$ and by Lemma 3.2 we have $\tilde{\beta}_{\mathcal{A}} \in (S_+^{\mathbb{C}^n})$ so that $(S_+^{\mathbb{C}^n}) : \tilde{\beta}_{\mathcal{A}} = S$, as well. (This paragraph did not use freeness.)

Now suppose that \mathcal{A} is essential and free. Since $\bigcap_{H \in \mathcal{A}} H = \{0\}$, the derivation module $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$ has no nonzero elements of degree 0, which implies that $\mathfrak{i}_{\mathcal{A}}$ has no nonzero elements of degree 0. Since $\tilde{\beta}_{\mathcal{A}} \notin (S_+^{\mathbb{C}^n})$ by Lemma 3.2 and $\mathfrak{i}(\text{Der}(\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\Phi}^+})) = (S_+^{\mathbb{C}^n})$ by (6.1), Lemma 4.4 applies to prove Item (3). \square

For a subset $J \subseteq [n]$, recall that $f_J = \prod_{j \in J} x_j \left(\prod_{j < i \leq n} (x_j - x_i) \right)$. Proposition 6.1 (3) leads us to consider the arrangement \mathcal{A}_J in \mathbb{K}^n with $\tilde{\beta}_{\mathcal{A}} = f_J$. The hyperplanes of \mathcal{A}_J are therefore

$$(6.4) \quad \mathcal{A}_J = \{H_{x_j - x_i} : j \notin J, i > j\} \cup \{H_{x_j} : j \notin J\}$$

so that $\mathcal{A}_J \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\Phi}^+}$. When $n = 5$ and $J = \{2, 4\}$ the hyperplanes of \mathcal{A}_J are as follows.

$$\begin{array}{cccccc}
 & & & & \bullet & \\
 & & & & x_5 & \\
 & & & \circ & & \bullet \\
 & & & x_4 & & x_1 - x_5 \\
 & & \bullet & & \bullet & \circ \\
 & & x_3 & & x_1 - x_4 & x_2 - x_5 \\
 & \circ & & \bullet & & \circ \\
 & x_2 & & x_1 - x_3 & & x_2 - x_4 & & x_3 - x_5 \\
 \bullet & & \bullet & & \circ & & \bullet & & \circ \\
 x_1 & & x_1 - x_2 & & x_2 - x_3 & & x_3 - x_4 & & x_4 - x_5
 \end{array}$$

In particular, we see that the arrangements \mathcal{A}_J are not usually southwest, and vice versa. Like southwest arrangements, the \mathcal{A}_J have nice combinatorial properties. Recall the notion of $\text{st}(J)_i$ from (1.5).

Lemma 6.2. *The characteristic polynomial of \mathcal{A}_J is given by*

$$\chi_{\mathcal{A}_J}(t) = \prod_{i=1}^n (t - \text{st}(J)_i).$$

In particular, \mathcal{A}_J is supersolvable and free with exponents $(\text{st}(J)_1, \dots, \text{st}(J)_n)$.

Proof. We apply the Finite Fields Method. Let p be a large prime. We have

$$(6.5) \quad \chi_{\mathcal{A}_J}(p) = \# \left((\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^n - \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{A}_J} H \right)$$

where we interpret the hyperplanes of \mathcal{A}_J as living in $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^n$ by reduction modulo p . We are reduced to showing

$$(6.6) \quad \# \left((\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^n - \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{A}_J} H \right) = \prod_{i=1}^n (p - \text{st}(J)_i).$$

To see this, we consider how a typical point $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^n$ which avoids the hyperplanes in \mathcal{A}_J is built. For any $j \notin J$ we have $a_j \neq 0$. Furthermore, for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ the coordinate a_i must be distinct from all of the coordinates a_j for $j < i$ with $j \notin J$. The claimed product formula follows. \square

We note that the supersolvability of \mathcal{A}_J can also be checked by showing that the graph $\Gamma(J)$ on $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ corresponding to \mathcal{A}_J is chordal.

Combining Proposition 6.1 (3) and Lemma 6.2, we get the following presentation of the algebra $S/((S_+^{\mathfrak{S}^n}) : f_J)$.

Theorem 6.3. *For any $J \subset [n]$, we have $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}_J, \mathfrak{i}) = S/((S_+^{\mathfrak{S}^n}) : f_J)$.*

In the rest of this section, as a quick application of the above theorem, we give an explicit generating set of the ideal $(S_+^{\mathfrak{S}^n}) : f_J$. Rhoades and Wilson showed [18, Thm. 4.10] that these ideals are the unit ideal when $1 \in J$, and cut out by a certain regular sequence $p_{J,1}, \dots, p_{J,n}$ when $1 \notin J$. The $p_{J,i}$ appearing in [18] have a complicated and unusual definition involving partial derivatives of complete homogeneous symmetric polynomials in partial variable sets. We will give a simpler regular sequence generating $(S_+^{\mathfrak{S}^n}) : f_J$ by giving a basis of the derivation module of \mathcal{A}_J .

Proposition 6.4. *A free basis of $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A}_J)$ is given by $\rho_1^J, \dots, \rho_n^J$ where*

$$(6.7) \quad \rho_i^J = \begin{cases} \sum_{k=i}^n \left(\prod_{\substack{j \notin J \\ j < i}} (x_j - x_k) \right) x_k \cdot \partial_k & i \notin J, \\ \prod_{\substack{j \notin J \\ j < i}} (x_j - x_i) \cdot \partial_i & i \in J. \end{cases}$$

Proof. We apply Saito's Criterion. Adopting the abbreviation $\rho_i := \rho_i^J$, observe that ρ_i has degree $\text{st}(J)_i$, so that $\deg \rho_1 + \dots + \deg \rho_n = |\mathcal{A}_J|$ by Lemma 6.2. Since ρ_i is an S -linear combination of $\partial_i, \partial_{i+1}, \dots, \partial_n$ where the coefficient of ∂_i is nonzero, we see that $\{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_n\}$ is linearly independent over S .

We are reduced to showing that $\rho_i \in \text{Der}(\mathcal{A}_J)$ for all i . To do this, we argue as follows.

Case 1: $i \notin J$.

For any hyperplane H_α of \mathcal{A}_J , we need to show that $\alpha \mid \rho_i(\alpha)$ in S . For $j \notin J$, we have

$$(6.8) \quad \rho_i(x_j) = \begin{cases} \prod_{\substack{j' \notin J \\ j' < i}} (x_{j'} - x_j) x_j & i \leq j \\ 0 & i > j. \end{cases}$$

In either case we have $x_j \mid \rho_i(x_j)$. The remaining hyperplanes of \mathcal{A}_J have the form $x_j - x_\ell = 0$ for $j \notin J$ and $j < \ell$. Applying ρ_i to the linear form $x_j - x_\ell$ yields

$$(6.9) \quad \rho_i(x_j - x_\ell) = \begin{cases} \prod_{\substack{j' \notin J \\ j' < i}} (x_{j'} - x_j)x_j - \prod_{\substack{j' \notin J \\ j' < i}} (x_{j'} - x_\ell)x_\ell & i \leq j < \ell, \\ -\prod_{\substack{j' \notin J \\ j' < i}} (x_{j'} - x_\ell)x_\ell & j < i \leq \ell, \\ 0 & j < \ell < i. \end{cases}$$

In the first branch, setting $x_j = x_\ell$ makes $\rho_i(x_j - x_\ell)$ vanish so that $(x_j - x_\ell) \mid \rho_i(x_j - x_\ell)$. When $j < i \leq \ell$ as in the second branch, the factor $(x_j - x_\ell)$ appears in the product so that $(x_j - x_\ell) \mid \rho_i(x_j - x_\ell)$. The third branch yields $(x_j - x_\ell) \mid \rho_i(x_j - x_\ell)$ when $j < \ell < i$, as well. This implies that $\rho_i \in \text{Der}(\mathcal{A}_J)$.

Case 2: $i \in J$.

If $j \notin J$, applying ρ_i to the linear form x_j yields 0 because $\partial_i(x_j) = 0$. If $j \notin J$ and $j < \ell$, applying ρ_i to $x_j - x_\ell$ yields

$$(6.10) \quad \rho_i(x_j - x_\ell) = \begin{cases} \prod_{\substack{j' \notin J \\ j' < i}} (x_{j'} - x_i) & \ell = i, \\ 0 & \ell \neq i. \end{cases}$$

Since $x_j - x_i = x_j - x_\ell$ appears in the product in the first branch, we obtain the desired divisibility $(x_j - x_\ell) \mid \rho_i(x_j - x_\ell)$ and conclude that $\rho_i \in \text{Der}(\mathcal{A}_J)$. \square

For $J \subseteq [n]$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$, define a polynomial $g_{J,i} \in S$ by

$$(6.11) \quad g_{J,i} := \mathbf{i}(\rho_i^J) = \begin{cases} \sum_{k=i}^n \left(\prod_{\substack{j \notin J \\ j < i}} (x_j - x_k) \right) x_k & i \notin J, \\ \prod_{\substack{j \notin J \\ j < i}} (x_j - x_i) & i \in J. \end{cases}$$

Corollary 6.5. *Let $J \subseteq [n]$. If $1 \in J$, the ideal $(S_+^{\mathfrak{S}^n}) : f_J$ is the unit ideal. If $1 \notin J$, the ideal $(S_+^{\mathfrak{S}^n}) : f_J$ is generated by the regular sequence $g_{J,1}, \dots, g_{J,n}$.*

Proof. It was established in [18] that $(S_+^{\mathfrak{S}^n}) : f_J$ is the unit ideal if $1 \in J$. (This also follows from Lemma 3.2). Suppose $1 \notin J$. Then $\rho_1^J, \dots, \rho_n^J$ have positive degrees. Up to a nonzero scalar we have

$$(6.12) \quad f_J = Q(\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_+})/Q(\mathcal{A}_J).$$

By Proposition 6.4 and Proposition 6.1 (3) we see that $\mathbf{i}_{\mathcal{A}_J} = (S_+^{\mathfrak{S}^n}) : f_J$ is generated by the regular sequence $\mathbf{i}(\rho_1^J), \dots, \mathbf{i}(\rho_n^J) \in S$. \square

7. MONOMIAL BASES OF SOLOMON-TERAO ALGEBRAS

Our goal is to show that the algebra $S/((S_+^{\mathfrak{S}^n}) : f_J) = \mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}_J, \mathbf{i})$ has the expected monomial basis $\mathcal{M}(J)$ given in the introduction. To do this, we first give a basis of Solomon-Terao algebra $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathbf{i})$ for southwest arrangements \mathcal{A} . The key lemma to do this is the following short exact sequence of Solomon-Terao algebras $\mathcal{ST}(-, \mathbf{i})$ induced by the short exact sequence of derivation modules in Theorem 5.8.

Lemma 7.1. *Let \mathcal{A} be a subarrangement of $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_+}$ and $H = H_\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$. Assume that the triple $(\mathcal{A} \setminus H, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}^H)$ satisfies the conditions of Theorem 5.7.*

(1) *We have $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}^H, \mathbf{i}) = S/(\mathbf{i}_{\mathcal{A}} + (\alpha))$.*

(2) We have a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A} \setminus H, \mathfrak{i}) \xrightarrow{\times \alpha} \mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{i}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}^H, \mathfrak{i}) \longrightarrow 0$$

where the second map is the canonical projection.

Proof. Let $\eta_H : \text{Der}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \text{Der}(\mathcal{A}^H)$ be the surjection appearing in Theorem 5.8. Write $S' := S/(\alpha)$ and let $\pi : S \rightarrow S'$ be the canonical surjection. We have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Der}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\eta_H} & \text{Der}(\mathcal{A}^H) \\ \downarrow \mathfrak{i} & & \downarrow \mathfrak{i} \\ S & \xrightarrow{\pi} & S' \end{array}$$

where the horizontal maps are surjections. We conclude that

$$(7.1) \quad \mathfrak{i}_{\mathcal{A}^H} = \mathfrak{i}(\text{Der}(\mathcal{A}^H)) = (\pi \circ \mathfrak{i})(\text{Der}(\mathcal{A})) = (\mathfrak{i}_{\mathcal{A}} + (\alpha))/(\alpha)$$

so that

$$(7.2) \quad \mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}^H, \mathfrak{i}) = S'/\mathfrak{i}_{\mathcal{A}^H} = S/(\mathfrak{i}_{\mathcal{A}} + (\alpha)).$$

This proves Item (1).

For Item (2), the definition of colon ideals gives the short exact sequence

$$(7.3) \quad 0 \longrightarrow S/(\mathfrak{i}_{\mathcal{A}} : (\alpha)) \xrightarrow{\times \alpha} S/\mathfrak{i}_{\mathcal{A}} \longrightarrow S/(\mathfrak{i}_{\mathcal{A}} + (\alpha)) \longrightarrow 0$$

where the second map is the canonical projection. The middle term in this short exact sequence is $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{i})$. By Item (1), the right term is $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}^H, \mathfrak{i})$. Proposition 6.1 (3) implies that the left term is $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A} \setminus H, \mathfrak{i})$. \square

Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{F}_+}$ be an essential southwest arrangement with h -sequence $h(\mathcal{A}) = (h_1, \dots, h_n)$. Since \mathfrak{i} is homogeneous of degree 0, Lemma 4.3 and Proposition 5.5 imply that $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{i})$ has Hilbert series

$$(7.4) \quad \text{Hilb}(\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{i}); q) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1 - q^{h_i}}{1 - q}.$$

This says that the set $\{x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n} : a_i < h_i \text{ for all } i\}$ of monomials in S have the correct multiset of degrees to descend to a basis of $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{i})$. The main theorem of this section establishes this fact using short exact sequences. The authors are unaware of a straightening or Gröbner-type proof of this result.

Theorem 7.2. *Let \mathcal{A} be an essential southwest arrangement in \mathbb{K}^n with $h(\mathcal{A}) = (h_1, \dots, h_n)$. The set*

$$\{x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n} : a_i < h_i \text{ for all } i\}$$

descends to a \mathbb{K} -basis of $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{i})$.

Proof. Since \mathcal{A} is essential we have $|\mathcal{A}| \geq n$. We use double induction on n and $|\mathcal{A}|$. If $n = 1$ the result is an easy computation. If $|\mathcal{A}| = n$, the ideal $\mathfrak{i}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is generated by n linearly independent homogeneous polynomials of degree 1 so that $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{i}) = S/(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $h(\mathcal{A}) = (1, \dots, 1)$ so the result follows.

Now assume $n > 1$ and $|\mathcal{A}| > n$. Since \mathcal{A} is an essential southwest arrangement, it contains at least one coordinate hyperplane. Let $p := \max\{k : H_k \in \mathcal{A}\}$. Lemma 5.9 and Lemma 7.1 (2) give a short exact sequence

$$(7.5) \quad 0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A} \setminus H_p, \mathfrak{i}) \xrightarrow{\times x_p} \mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{i}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}^{(p)}, \mathfrak{i}) \longrightarrow 0$$

where $\mathcal{A}^{(p)} := \mathcal{A}^{H_p}$. We inductively assume that the theorem holds for the arrangements $\mathcal{A} \setminus H_p$ and $\mathcal{A}^{(p)}$, which are themselves southwest arrangements by Lemma 5.2. Since H_p contributes to h_p , we have $h_p \geq 1$. Our argument splits into cases depending on the value of h_p .

Case 1: We have $h_p > 1$.

Lemma 5.2 states that

$$h(\mathcal{A} \setminus H_p) = (h_1, \dots, h_{p-1}, h_p - 1, h_{p+1}, \dots, h_n) \text{ and } h(\mathcal{A}^{(p)}) = (h_1, \dots, h_{p-1}, h_{p+1}, \dots, h_n).$$

The result for $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathbf{i})$ follows from the form of the short exact sequence (7.5) and induction.

Case 2: We have $h_p = 1$.

In this case the deleted arrangement $\mathcal{A} \setminus H_p$ is not essential. Proposition 6.1 (2) implies that $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A} \setminus H_p, \mathbf{i}) = 0$, so the map $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathbf{i}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}^{(p)}, \mathbf{i})$ appearing in (7.5) induced by setting $x_p = 0$ is an isomorphism. The result for $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathbf{i})$ follows from induction. \square

Remark 7.3. *Theorem 7.2 may be considered as a generalization of the main result in [11], which gave a monomial basis for the cohomology ring of regular nilpotent Hessenberg varieties in type A. Indeed, those cohomology rings are known to be equal to Solomon-Terao algebras $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathbf{a})$ of type A ideal arrangements \mathcal{A} (that is, subarrangements of \mathcal{A}_{Φ^+} which is both southwest-closed and southeast-closed). But by setting $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A} \cup \{H_{x_1}, \dots, H_{x_n}\}$, this algebra also equal to $\mathcal{ST}(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}, \mathbf{i})$ by Proposition 6.1 (3), so Theorem 7.2 also gives a monomial basis for those rings.⁵*

8. ARTIN BASIS OF SR

In this section we apply Theorem 7.2 to the superspace coinvariant ring SR . For $J \subseteq [n]$, recall that $\mathcal{M}(J)$ denotes the following set of monomials in S :

$$\mathcal{M}(J) := \{x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n} : a_i < \text{st}(J)_i \text{ for all } i\}$$

and \mathcal{M} is the set of superspace monomials in Ω :

$$\mathcal{M} := \bigsqcup_{J \subseteq [n]} \mathcal{M}(J) \cdot \theta_J.$$

The following result proves a conjecture of Rhoades and Wilson [18, Conj. 5.5].

Theorem 8.1. *For any subset $J \subseteq [n]$, the family $\mathcal{M}(J)$ descends to a basis of $S/((S_+^{\mathbb{S}^n}) : f_J)$.*

Proof. Rhoades and Wilson showed [18] that the cardinality of $\mathcal{M}(J)$ coincides with the dimension of the vector space $S/((S_+^{\mathbb{S}^n}) : f_J)$, so it is enough to show that $\mathcal{M}(J)$ is \mathbb{K} -linearly independent in $S/((S_+^{\mathbb{S}^n}) : f_J)$. (This also follows from Lemma 4.3 (3) and results in section 6.)

We introduce the modified polynomial $\tilde{f}_J \in S$ given by

$$(8.1) \quad \tilde{f}_J := \prod_{j \in J} \left(\prod_{i=j+1}^n (x_j - x_i) \right).$$

That is, the polynomial \tilde{f}_J is the same as the polynomial f_J , but with the x_j factors for $j \in J$ removed. Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\Phi}^+}$ be the subarrangement

$$(8.2) \quad \mathcal{A} := \{H_{j,i} : j \notin J, i = j+1, \dots, n\} \cup \{H_{x_1}, H_{x_2}, \dots, H_{x_n}\} = \mathcal{A}_J \cup \{H_{x_k} : k \in J\}.$$

Observe that \mathcal{A} is a southwest arrangement. Furthermore, we have an injection

$$(8.3) \quad S/((S_+^{\mathbb{S}^n}) : f_J) \xrightarrow{\times \prod_{j \in J} x_j} S/((S_+^{\mathbb{S}^n}) : \tilde{f}_J) = \mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathbf{i})$$

⁵To get a basis in [11], one needs to apply a southeast-closed version of the theorem.

where the equality $S/((S_+^{\mathfrak{S}_n}) : \tilde{f}_J) = \mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{i})$ is a consequence of Proposition 5.3 and Proposition 6.1 (3). If $h(\mathcal{A}) = (h_1, \dots, h_n)$, it can be checked that

$$(8.4) \quad h_k = \begin{cases} \text{st}(J)_k & k \notin J, \\ \text{st}(J)_k + 1 & k \in J. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 7.2 says that the set of monomials

$$(8.5) \quad \left\{ x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n} : \begin{array}{l} a_k < \text{st}(J)_k \text{ if } k \notin J, \\ a_k < \text{st}(J)_k + 1 \text{ if } k \in J \end{array} \right\}$$

descends to a basis of $S/((S_+^{\mathfrak{S}_n}) : \tilde{f}_J)$. The injection (8.3) applies to show that

$$(8.6) \quad \mathcal{M}(J) = \{x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n} : a_k < \text{st}(J)_k \text{ for all } k\}$$

is linearly independent in $S/((S_+^{\mathfrak{S}_n}) : f_J)$. □

The Sagan-Swanson Conjecture 1.1 is a consequence of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 8.1.

Corollary 8.2. *The set \mathcal{M} of superspace Artin monomials descends to a basis of SR .*

In his Ph.D. thesis at York University, Kelvin Chan conjectured [7] a (non-monomial) bihomogeneous basis of SR which respects the \mathfrak{S}_n -isotypic decomposition. Proving that Chan’s conjectural basis is a basis would imply the bigraded \mathfrak{S}_n -structure of SR predicted by the Fields Group. However, since the supercommutative-to-commutative transfer principle in Theorem 1.2 is non-equivariant, new ideas will be required to prove Chan’s conjecture.

It may also be interesting to find an analogue of Steinberg’s *descent basis* [28] for the coinvariant ring $S/(S_+^{\mathfrak{S}_n})$ for the superspace coinvariants SR . Such an object could aid in understanding the 0-Hecke module structure of SR ; see [12]. The descent basis consists of monomials, so a transfer principle like Theorem 1.2 might be more applicable here.

9. CONCLUSION

The Solomon-Terao algebras $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{c})$ have seen two major applications. When $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is an ideal subarrangement of a Weyl arrangement and $\mathfrak{a} : \partial_i \mapsto x_i$, the algebra $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{a})$ presents the cohomology of a regular nilpotent Hessenberg variety [2, 3, 11]. When \mathcal{A} is a southwest subarrangement of the augmented Weyl arrangement $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\Phi}^+}$ of type A or $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_J$ and $\mathfrak{i} : \partial_i \mapsto 1$, we established connections between $\mathcal{ST}(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{i})$ and the type A superspace coinvariant ring. This motivates the following question.

Question 9.1. *Do the augmented root system $\tilde{\Phi}^+$, the southwest arrangements, or the \mathcal{A}_J arrangements extend to types other than A?*

An answer to Question 9.1 should be a class of free arrangements whose algebraic properties are tied to the invariant degrees of the Weyl group in question. Ideally, an answer to Question 9.1 could be applied to superspace coinvariant rings of other types. If W is a complex reflection group acting on $V = \mathbb{C}^n$, the natural action of W on V induces an action on the space Ω of polynomial-valued differential forms on V . Solomon [24] gave a uniform description of the structure of the invariant ring Ω^W . The quotient $SR_W := \Omega/(\Omega_+^W)$ is a bigraded W -module, where $(\Omega_+^W) \subseteq \Omega$ is the ideal generated by W -invariants with vanishing constant term. Sagan and Swanson conjectured [20, Conj. 6.17] a basis for SR_W when $W = \mathfrak{S}_{\pm n}$ is the group of $n \times n$ signed permutation matrices. Proving their conjecture could involve establishing a signed permutation analog of Theorem 1.2 so that bases of SR_W could be found using commutative algebra alone.

In type $W = \mathfrak{S}_n$, the dimension of $SR_W = SR$ is given by the number of faces in the *Coxeter complex* attached to W , i.e. the number of ordered set partitions of $[n]$. The singly-graded fermionic Hilbert series is the reversal of the f -vector of the Coxeter complex (counting ordered set partitions

by the number of their blocks). Sagan and Swanson conjecture [20] that the same is true for $W = \mathfrak{S}_{\pm n}$ has type B_n . However, in type F_4 , the fermionic Hilbert series is $1152q^0 + 2304q^1 + 1396q^2 + 244q^3 + q^4$ whereas the reversed f -vector is $(1152, 2304, 1392, 240, 1)$. Can the theory of arrangements explain this near-miss?

Question 9.2. *Let \mathcal{A} be a southwest arrangement. Is there a cohomological interpretation of $ST(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{i})$? What about $ST(\mathcal{A}_J, \mathfrak{i})$ for $J \subseteq [n]$?*

Proposition 6.1 gives an interpretation of the Solomon-Terao algebras in Question 9.2 in terms of colon ideal quotients. In [2] the cohomology rings of regular nilpotent Hessenberg varieties are presented as quotients by colon ideals; the methods of [2] may help in addressing Question 9.2. We remark that the polynomials f_J bear a resemblance to ideal generators for a Borel-type presentation of the cohomology of regular nilpotent Hessenberg varieties in type A due to Abe-Harada-Horiguchi-Masuda [1] and reinterpreted and generalized using arrangements by Abe-Horiguchi-Masuda-Murai-Sato [2].

Question 9.3. *Do other Solomon-Terao algebras $ST(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{c})$ have applications outside of hyperplane arrangements?*

When \mathcal{A} is free, the Solomon-Terao algebra $ST(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{c})$ is a Poincaré duality algebra as soon as it is of positive finite \mathbb{K} -dimension, so Question 9.3 would appear well suited to geometric answers. On the other hand, when \mathcal{A} is not free, it can be difficult to understand the structure of $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$, and the algebra $ST(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{c})$ can be correspondingly mysterious. It would be interesting to calculate and find applications for Solomon-Terao algebras outside the bounds of freeness.

10. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project was initiated at the Minnesota Research Workshop in Algebra and Combinatorics (MRWAC) at the University of Minnesota in May 2023. We thank Elise Catania, Sasha Pevzner, and Sylvester Zhang for organizing this workshop. Further discussions took place at the Hokkaido Summer Institute at the University of Hokkaido and in the Tokyo Metropolitan Government Building in Summer 2023. We thank the University of Minnesota, the University of Hokkaido, and the Tokyo Metropolitan Government for providing excellent working conditions. The authors are grateful to Vic Reiner for helpful conversations. The authors are grateful to Sylvester Zhang for very fruitful discussions and helpful assistance throughout this project. P. Commins was partially supported by the NSF GRFP Award # 2237827. S. Murai was partially supported by KAKENHI 21K0319, 21H00975 and 23K17298. B. Rhoades was partially supported by NSF Grant DMS-2246846.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Abe, M. Harada, T. Horiguchi, and M. Masuda. The cohomology rings of regular nilpotent Hessenberg varieties in Lie type A. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* (2019), no. 17, 5316–5388.
- [2] T. Abe, T. Horiguchi, M. Masuda, S. Murai, and T. Sato. Hessenberg varieties and hyperplane arrangements. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, **764** (2020), 241–286.
- [3] T. Abe, T. Maeno, S. Murai, and Y. Numata. Solomon-Terao algebra of hyperplane arrangements. *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, **71** (4) (2019), 1027–1047.
- [4] H el ene Marie-Louise Barcelo. *On the action of the symmetric group on the Free Lie Algebra and on the homology and cohomology of the partition lattice*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 1988. Thesis (Ph.D.) - University of California, San Diego.
- [5] F. Bergeron. The Bosonic-Fermionic Diagonal Coinvariant Modules Conjecture. To appear, *Open Problems in Algebraic Combinatorics* conference proceedings. [arXiv:2005.00924](https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.00924).
- [6] S. Billey, B. Rhoades, and V. Tewari. Boolean product polynomials, Schur positivity, and Chern plethysm. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, Vol. 2021, Issue 21, 16634–16668.
- [7] K. Chan. *Polarization operators in superspace*. Ph.D. thesis, York University, 2024.

- [8] M. D’Adderio, A. Iraci, and A. Vanden Wyngaerd. Theta operators, refined Delta conjectures, and coinvariants. *Adv. Math.*, **376** (2021), 107447.
- [9] P. Edelman and V. Reiner. Free hyperplane arrangements between A_{n-1} and B_n . *Math. Z.*, **215** (1994), 347–365.
- [10] J. Haglund, B. Rhoades, and M. Shimozono. Ordered set partitions, generalized coinvariant algebras, and the delta conjecture. *Adv. Math.*, **329** (2018), 851–915.
- [11] M. Harada, T. Horiguchi, S. Murai, M. Precup, and J. Tymoczko. A filtration on the cohomology rings of regular nilpotent Hessenberg varieties. *Math. Z.*, **298** (2021), 1345–1382.
- [12] J. Huang and B. Rhoades. Ordered set partitions and the 0-Hecke algebra. *Algebraic Combin.*, **1** (1) (2018), 47–80.
- [13] A. M. Garsia and D. Stanton. Group actions on Stanley-Reisner rings and invariants of permutation groups. **51** (2) (1984), 107–201.
- [14] P. Orlik and H. Terao. *Arrangements of Hyperplanes*. Vol. 300. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [15] S. Priddy, Koszul resolutions, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **152** (1970), 39–60.
- [16] B. Rhoades and A. T. Wilson. Vandermondes in superspace. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **373** (6) (2020), 4483–4516.
- [17] B. Rhoades and A. T. Wilson. Set superpartitions and superspace duality modules. *Forum Math. Sigma*, **10** (2022), e105.
- [18] B. Rhoades and A. Wilson. The Hilbert series of the superspace coinvariant ring. Preprint, 2023. [arXiv:2301.09763](https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.09763).
- [19] B. Rhoades, V. Tewari, and A. Wilson. Tutte polynomials in superspace. Preprint, 2024. [arXiv:2404.01450](https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.01450).
- [20] B. Sagan and J. Swanson. q -Stirling numbers in type B . *European J. Combin.*, **118** (2024), 103899.
- [21] K. Saito. Theory of logarithmic differential forms and logarithmic vector fields. *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math.* **27** (1980), no. 2, 265–291.
- [22] H. Schenck and A. Suciu. Lower Central Series and Free Resolutions of Hyperplane Arrangements. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **9** (2002), 3409–3433.
- [23] B. Shelton, S. Yuzvinsky, Koszul algebras from graphs and hyperplane arrangements, *J. London Math. Soc.* **56** (1997), 477–490.
- [24] L. Solomon. Invariants of finite reflection groups. *Nagoya J. Math.*, **22** (1963), 57–64.
- [25] L. Solomon and H. Terao. A formula for the characteristic polynomial of an arrangement. *Adv. Math.*, **64** (1987), 305–325.
- [26] R. Stanley. An introduction to hyperplane arrangements. In: Miller, E., Reiner, V., Sturmfels, B.(eds.) *Geometric Combinatorics*. IAS/Park City Mathematics Series, vol.13, pp. 389–396. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (2007).
- [27] R. Steinberg. Invariants of Finite Reflection Groups. *Canadian J. Math.*, **12** (1960), 616–618.
- [28] R. Steinberg. On a theorem of Pittie. *Topology*, **14** (1975), 173–177.
- [29] J. Swanson and N. Wallach. Harmonic differential forms for pseudo-reflection groups I. Semi-invariants. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, **182** (2021), Paper No. 105474.
- [30] J. Swanson and N. Wallach. Harmonic differential forms for pseudo-reflection groups II. Bi-degree bounds. *Combin. Theory*, **3** (3) (2023), #17.
- [31] H. Terao. Arrangements of hyperplanes and their freeness. I, II, *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math.* **27** (1980), 1027–1047.
- [32] H. Terao. Generalized exponents of a free arrangement of hyperplanes and Shepherd-Todd-Brieskorn formula. *Invent. Math.* **63** (1981), no. 1, 159–179.
- [33] M. Zabrocki. A module for the Delta conjecture. Preprint, 2019. [arXiv:1902.08966](https://arxiv.org/abs/1902.08966).
- [34] T. Zaslavsky. Facing up to arrangements: face-count formulas for partitions of space by hyperplanes. *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society* **154** (1997), 1–95.
- [35] G. Ziegler. *Algebraic Combinatorics of Hyperplane Arrangements*. Ph.D. Thesis, MIT, 1987.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS
 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
 MINNEAPOLIS, MN, 55455, USA
 Email address: (angar017, commi010, karnx018)@umn.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
 FACULTY OF EDUCATION
 WASEDA UNIVERSITY
 1-6-1 NISHI-WASEDA, SHINJUKU, TOKYO, 169-8050, JAPAN
 Email address: s-murai@waseda.jp

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO
LA JOLLA, CA, 92093, USA
Email address: `bprhoades@ucsd.edu`