

Diagonal Form of the Varchenko Matrices of Oriented Matroids

Yibo Gao, YiYu Zhang

1 Introduction

Varchenko [4] defined the Varchenko matrix associated to any real hyperplane arrangement and computed its determinant. The definition extends straightforwardly to oriented matroids. Here we will show by explicit construction and proof by contradiction that the Varchenko matrix of an oriented matroid has a diagonal form if and only if it has no degeneracy.

In this paper we will follow the notation in [1] and [3].

1.1 Oriented Matroids

Definition 1.1. A *signed set* E is a set \underline{E} with a partition (E^+, E^-) , where E^+ is the set of *positive* elements of E and E^- is the set of *negative* elements of E . We call $\underline{E} = E^+ \cup E^-$ the *support* of E .

A *signed subset* X of E is a signed set such that $X^+ \subseteq E^+$ and $X^- \subseteq E^-$. X can be identified with a *sign vector* $X \in \{+, 0, -\}^E$: $X_e = +$ if $e \in X^+$, $X_e = -$ if $e \in X^-$, and $X_e = 0$ if $e \in \underline{E} \setminus X$.

Definition 1.2. Let X, Y be two signed sets. The *composition* of X and Y , denoted by $X \circ Y$, is the signed set with $(X \circ Y)^+ = X^+ \cup (Y^+ \setminus X^-)$ and $(X \circ Y)^- = X^- \cup (Y^- \setminus X^+)$.

Define the *opposite* of X to be the signed set $-X$ with $(-X)^+ = X^-$ and $(-X)^- = X^+$.

Definition 1.3. An *oriented matroid* is a pair $\mathcal{M} = (E, \mathcal{V})$ where E is a finite set and \mathcal{V} is a collection of signed subsets of E satisfying the following properties:

- a) $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{V}$,
- b) $\mathcal{V} = -\mathcal{V}$,
- c) for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{V}$, $e \in X^+ \cap Y^-$ and $f \in (\underline{X} \setminus \underline{Y}) \cup (\underline{Y} \setminus \underline{X}) \cup (X^+ \cap Y^+) \cup (X^- \cap Y^-)$, there exists $Z \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $Z^+ \subseteq (X^+ \cup Y^+) \setminus e$, $Z^- \subseteq (X^- \cup Y^-) \setminus e$, and $f \in Z$.

1.2 Pseudosphere

Definition 1.4. Let $\mathbb{S}^d = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} : \|x\| = 1\}$ be the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} . We say that $S \subseteq \mathbb{S}^d$ is a *pseudosphere* if there exists a homeomorphism $H : \mathbb{S}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^d$ such that $S = H(S^{d-1})$, where $S^{d-1} = \{x \in \mathbb{S}^d : x_{d+1} = 0\}$. S divides \mathbb{S}^d into two sides (closed and connected hemispheres) S^+ and S^- with $S^+ \cap S^- = S$.

Definition 1.5. Let $E = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Define a *pseudosphere arrangement* $\mathcal{A} = (S_e)_{e \in E}$ to be a set of pseudospheres in \mathbb{S}^d such that for all $B \subseteq E$:

- a) The intersection $S_B = \bigcap_{e \in B} S_e$ is either empty or homeomorphic to a sphere of some dimension;

b) If $S_B \neq \emptyset$, then for all $S_e \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $S_B \not\subseteq S_e$, the intersection $S_B \cap S_e$ is a pseudosphere in S_B . Furthermore, $S_B \cap S_e$ divides S_B into two sides $S_B \cap S_e^+$ and $S_B \cap S_e^-$.

We say that \mathcal{A} is a *signed pseudosphere arrangement* if, in addition, we designate the positive and negative sides of each $S_e \in \mathcal{A}$.

Define the *dimension* of the intersection $S_B = \bigcap_{e \in B} S_e$ to be the dimension of the sphere homeomorphic to S_B .

Definition 1.6. Let $\mathcal{A} = (S_e)_{e \in E}$ be a pseudosphere arrangement in \mathbb{S}^d .

We call \mathcal{A} a *general arrangement* (or \mathcal{A} is in *general position*) in \mathbb{S}^d if $B \subseteq E$, $|B| \leq d$ implies $\dim(S_B) = d - |B|$ and $B \subseteq E$, $|B| > d$ implies $S_B = \emptyset$.

We say that \mathcal{A} is *semigeneral* (or \mathcal{A} is in *semigeneral position*) in \mathbb{S}^d if $B \subseteq E$ and $S_B \neq \emptyset$ implies $\dim(S_B) = d - |B|$.

Notice that all general arrangements are semigeneral arrangements.

Definition 1.7. Define a *region* R of $\mathcal{A} = (S_e)_{e \in E}$ to be a connected component of the complement of $\bigcup_{e \in E} S_e$ in \mathbb{S}^d . Associate with each region R a sign vector $X^R \in \{+, -\}^E$ such that $X_e^R = +$ if $R \in S_e^+$ and $X_e^R = -$ if $R \in S_e^-$ for all $e \in E$. Note that each region has a unique sign vector. Let $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})$ be the set of regions of \mathcal{A} and set $r(\mathcal{A}) = |\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})|$.

Definition 1.8. Let $L(\mathcal{A})$ be the set of all *nonempty* intersections of pseudospheres in \mathcal{A} , including \mathbb{S}^d as the intersection over the empty set. Partially order $L(\mathcal{A})$ by reverse inclusion. We call $L(\mathcal{A})$ the *intersection poset* of \mathcal{A} .

Notice that the minimum element in $L(\mathcal{A})$ is \mathbb{S}^d .

If $S_B \in L(\mathcal{A})$, define the subarrangement $\mathcal{A}_{S_B} = \{S_i \in \mathcal{A} : S_B \subseteq S_i\}$ and the arrangement $\mathcal{A}^{S_B} = \{S_B \cap S_i \neq \emptyset : S_i \in \mathcal{A} - \mathcal{A}_{S_B}\}$ in S_B .

Theorem 1.9. *There is a one-to-one correspondence between signed essential pseudosphere arrangements in \mathbb{S}^d (up to topological equivalence) and simple rank $d + 1$ oriented matroids (up to isomorphism).*

Theorem 1.9 is a direct consequence of the Topological Representation Theorem of Folkman and Lawrence. (See [1] for a detailed proof.) Therefore we can work with the Varchenko matrix of any pseudosphere arrangement instead.

1.3 The Varchenko Matrix

Definition 1.10. Let $\mathcal{A} = (S_e)_{e \in E}$ be a pseudosphere arrangement and R, R' be regions (not necessarily distinct) of \mathcal{A} . For each $S_e \in \mathcal{A}$ let x_e be an indeterminate. Let $\text{sep}(R, R') = \{e \in E : S_e \text{ separates } R \text{ and } R'\} = \{e \in E : X_e^R = -X_e^{R'}\}$. The set $\text{sep}(R, R')$ is well-defined since each region has to lie in exactly one of S^+ and S^- . Define the *Varchenko matrix* $V(\mathcal{A}) = [V_{RR'}]$ of \mathcal{A} with rows and columns indexed by $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})$ by

$$V_{RR'} = \prod_{S_i \in \text{sep}(R, R')} x_i.$$

Definition 1.11. Define the *Möbius function* of $L(\mathcal{A})$ by $\mu(M, M) = 1$ for all $M \in L(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mu(M, M') = - \sum_{M \leq N < M'} \mu(M, N)$ for all $M < M'$ in $L(\mathcal{A})$.

Furthermore, define $\mu(M) = \mu(\mathbb{S}^d, M)$.

Define the *characteristic polynomial* of \mathcal{A} to be $\chi_{\mathcal{A}}(t) = \sum_{M \in L(\mathcal{A})} \mu(M) t^{\dim(M)}$.

Theorem 1.12 (Varchenko [4]). *Let \mathcal{A} be a real arrangement. If $M \in L(\mathcal{A})$, set $x_M = \prod_{M \subseteq H} x_H$, $n(M) = r(\mathcal{A}^M)$ and $p(M) = |\chi'_{\mathcal{A}^M}(1)|$. Then*

$$\det V(\mathcal{A}) = \prod_{M \in L(\mathcal{A}), M \neq \hat{0}} (1 - x_M^2)^{n(M)p(M)}.$$




Figure 1: General arrangement of 3 (pseudo)lines in S^2 .

For example, the Varchenko matrix of the arrangement in Fig. 1 is

$$V = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & x_1 & x_1x_2 & x_1x_3 & x_3 & x_2x_3 & x_1x_2x_3 \\ x_1 & 1 & x_2 & x_3 & x_1x_3 & x_1x_2x_3 & x_2x_3 \\ x_1x_2 & x_2 & 1 & x_2x_3 & x_1x_2x_3 & x_1x_3 & x_3 \\ x_1x_3 & x_3 & x_2x_3 & 1 & x_1 & x_1x_2 & x_2 \\ x_3 & x_1x_3 & x_1x_2x_3 & x_1 & 1 & x_2 & x_1x_2 \\ x_2x_3 & x_1x_2x_3 & x_1x_3 & x_1x_2 & x_2 & 1 & x_1 \\ x_1x_2x_3 & x_2x_3 & x_3 & x_2 & x_1x_2 & x_1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

and $\det(V) = (1 - x_1^2)^3(1 - x_2^2)^3(1 - x_3^2)^3$.

Definition 1.13. Let $R_k, R_m, R_n \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})$, where k, m, n are not necessarily distinct. Define the *distance* $l_k(m, n)$ between R_k and $R_m \cup R_n$ to be the product of the indeterminates x_e of all pseudospheres S_e that separate both R_k, R_m and R_k, R_n , i.e., $X_e^{R_m} = X_e^{R_n} = -X_e^{R_k}$. Thus,

$$l_k(m, n) = \prod_{S_e \in \text{sep}(R_k, R_m) \cap \text{sep}(R_k, R_n)} x_e.$$

Observe that by definition of V , $V_{mn} = \frac{V_{mk} \cdot V_{kn}}{l_k(m, n)^2}$.

1.4 Diagonal Form

Definition 1.14. Let $E = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and A be an $n \times n$ square matrix over the ring $\mathbb{Z}[x_e : e \in E]$. For all $k \leq n$, define $\text{gcd}(A, k)$ to be the greatest common divisor of all the determinants of $k \times k$ submatrices of A .

Definition 1.15. We say that the square matrix A is *equivalent* to the square matrix B over the ring R , denoted by $A \sim B$, if there exist matrices P, Q over R such that $\det(P), \det(Q)$ are units in R and $PAQ = B$. Equivalently, $A \sim B$ if and only if we can get from A to B by a series of row and column operations (subtracting a multiple of a row/column from another row/column, or multiplying a row/column by a unit in R).

Lemma 1.16. \sim is an equivalence relation.

Proof. The properties of reflexivity and symmetry are obvious.

For transitivity, suppose that $A \sim B$ and $B \sim C$. Assume $PAQ = B$, $SBT = C$ where $\det(P), \det(Q), \det(S), \det(T)$ are all units.

Then $(SP)A(QT) = C$. Moreover, $\det(SP) = \det(S)\det(P)$ is a unit and similarly $\det(QT)$, so $A \sim C$. \square

Lemma 1.17. If $A \sim B$, then $\gcd(A, k) = \gcd(B, k)$ for all $k = 1, 2, \dots$, and $\text{rank}(A) = \text{rank}(B)$.

Proof. Follow the same arguments in Theorem 6.5 in Section 6.1 of [2]. \square

Definition 1.18. Let A be an $n \times n$ square matrix over the ring R . We say that A has a *diagonal form* over R if there exists a diagonal matrix $D = \text{diag}(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n)$ in R such that $A \sim D$. In particular, if $d_i | d_{i+1}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$, then we call D the *Smith normal form* (SNF) of A in R .

It is known that the SNF of a matrix exists and is unique if we are working over a principal ideal domain. But the SNF of a matrix may not exist if we are working over R , the ring of integer polynomials. For example, the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} x & 0 \\ 0 & x+2 \end{bmatrix}$ does not have an SNF over R .

Lemma 1.19. If the SNF of a matrix A exists, then it is unique up to units.

Proof. Let D be one of the SNFs of A .

Suppose that $A \sim D = \text{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_n)$ where $d_k | d_{k+1}$, $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$.

It is easy to see that $\gcd(D, k) = d_1 \cdots d_k$ so by Lemma 1.17, $d_1 \cdots d_k = \gcd(A, k)$, $1 \leq k \leq n$.

Given A , these equations and the condition that $d_k | d_{k+1}$ for $k = 1, \dots, n - 1$ are sufficient to solve for d_k . Namely, $d_k = 0$ if $\gcd(A, k) = 0$ and d_k equals a unit times $\gcd(A, k) / \gcd(A, k - 1)$ otherwise. Here, $\gcd(A, 0) = 1$. \square

Lemma 1.20. If $A \sim B$ and if one of A, B has SNF, then the other also has SNF and $\text{SNF}(A) = \text{SNF}(B)$.

Proof. Follows directly from the transitivity of \sim and the uniqueness of SNF. \square

Definition 1.21. Let A be a matrix over the ring $\mathbb{Z}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$. Define $A_{x_1=f_1(q), x_2=f_2(q), \dots, x_n=f_n(q)}$ to be the matrix over the ring $\mathbb{Z}[q]$ obtained by replacing each x_i by $f_i(q)$ in A .

For example, when V is a Varchenko matrix, the matrix $V_{x=q, \dots, z=q}$ is called the *q -Varchenko matrix*.

Lemma 1.22. Let A, B be matrices over the ring $\mathbb{Z}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$. If $A \sim B$, then

$$A_{x_1=f_1(q), x_2=f_2(q), \dots, x_n=f_n(q)} \sim B_{x_1=f_1(q), x_2=f_2(q), \dots, x_n=f_n(q)}.$$

2 The Main Result

Theorem 2.1. *Let $E = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ be a finite set and $\mathcal{A} = (S_i)_{i \in E}$ be a pseudosphere arrangement in \mathbb{S}^d . Let x_i be an indeterminate corresponding to S_i for all $i \in E$. Then its corresponding Varchenko matrix V has a diagonal form if and only if \mathcal{A} is in semigeneral position. In that case, the diagonal form of V has diagonal entries $\prod_{i \in B} (1 - x_i^2)$ for all $B \subseteq E$ such that $S_B \in L(\mathcal{A})$.*

Corollary 2.2. *Let \mathcal{A} be a semigeneral pseudosphere arrangement in \mathbb{S}^d . The q -Varchenko matrix V_q of \mathcal{A} has an SNF over the ring $\mathbb{Z}[q]$. The diagonal entries of its SNF are of the form $(1 - q^2)^k$, $k = 0, 1, \dots, d$, and the multiplicity of $(1 - q^2)^k$ equals the number of elements in $L(\mathcal{A})$ with dimension $d - k$.*

Corollary 2.3. *Let \mathcal{A} be a semigeneral pseudosphere arrangement in \mathbb{S}^d and V its Varchenko matrix. Then*

$$\det(V) = \prod_{i \in E} (1 - x_i^2)^{m_i}, \text{ where } m_i = |\{S_B \in L(\mathcal{A}) : S_B \subseteq S_i\}|.$$

Thus, our proof also serves as an alternative proof for a special case of Theorem 1.12.

3 Construction of the Diagonal Form of the Varchenko Matrices of Semigeneral Arrangements

In this section, we will prove the sufficient condition of Theorem 2.1 by explicitly constructing the diagonal form of the Varchenko matrix of a semigeneral arrangement.

Assume as before that we are working in \mathbb{S}^d .

Definition 3.1. Define $\varphi : \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_N] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_N]$ to be the function satisfying the following properties:

- (a) $\varphi(p + q) = \varphi(p) + \varphi(q)$ for all $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_N]$.
- (b) $\varphi(p \cdot q) = \varphi(p)\varphi(q)$ for all monomials $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_N]$ such that $\gcd(p, q) = 1$.
- (c) For all $i = 1, \dots, N$, $\varphi(x_i^k) = x_i^2$ for $k \geq 2$ and $\varphi(x_i^k) = x_i^k$ for $k = 0, 1$.
- (d) $\varphi(0) = 0$.

It is easy to check that φ is well-defined and unique. In fact, $\varphi(p)$ is obtained from p by replacing all exponents $e \geq 3$ by 2.

Proposition 3.2. *For all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ and $p \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_N]$,*

- a) $\varphi(x_i^2(1 - x_i^2 \cdot p)) = x_i^2 \cdot \varphi(1 - p)$;
- b) $\varphi((1 - x_i^2)(1 - x_i^2 \cdot p)) = 1 - x_i^2$.

Proof. The above identities follow directly from the definition of φ . □

Definition 3.3. A set of regions $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})$ encompasses a point $x \in \mathbb{S}^d$ if the interior of the closure of these regions contains x .

Definition 3.4. A set of regions $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})$ encompasses an element $M \in L(\mathcal{A})$ if there exists a point $x \in M$ such that \mathcal{B} encompasses x . Let $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}) = \{M : M \in L(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{B} \text{ encompasses } M\}$.




Figure 2: General position of 5 (pseudo)lines in \mathbb{S}^2 ; region R_i is labeled as i .

Notice that $\mathcal{C}(\emptyset) = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{C}(\{R\}) = \{\mathbb{S}^d\}$ for any $R \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})$.

In other words, an element M is encompassed by a set of regions \mathcal{B} if a nonzero part of M is encompassed by some regions in \mathcal{B} .

In Figure 3, for example, all points on the segment of S_3 between region R_3 and R_4 are encompassed by the set of regions $\{R_1, R_2, R_3, R_4, R_5\}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{C}(\{R_1, R_2, R_3, R_4, R_5\}) = \{\mathbb{S}^2, S_1, S_2, S_3, S_5\}$ and $\mathcal{C}(\{R_1, R_2, R_3, R_4, R_5, R_6\}) = \{\mathbb{S}^2, S_1, S_2, S_3, S_5, S_3 \cap S_5\}$.

Definition 3.5. Fix a numbering of the regions of \mathcal{A} . We say that region R_k is the *first to encompass* M for some $M \in L(\mathcal{A})$ if $M \in \mathcal{C}(\{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_k\})$ and $M \notin \mathcal{C}(\{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_{k-1}\})$.

One can see that $\gcd(V_{jk}, x_{i_1}x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_m}) \neq 1$ for any $1 \leq j < k$, where $M = S_{i_1} \cap \cdots \cap S_{i_m}$.

For example, in Figure 3, we see that region R_5 is the *first to encompass* S_5 and region R_6 is the *first to encompass* $S_3 \cap S_5$.

Lemma 3.6. Let R_1 be the region with $X^{R_1} = \{+\}^E$. There exists a numbering π (and order of coloring) of $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $|\mathcal{C}(\{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_k\})| = k$, for any $k = 0, 1, \dots, r(\mathcal{A})$.

Let $\mathcal{B}^{(k)} = \{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_k\}$ be the set of the regions with the first k indices. Set $M^{(k)} = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}^{(k)}) \setminus \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}^{(k-1)})$. Then for any $k = 1, \dots, r(\mathcal{A})$, π has the following properties:

- The interior of the closure of $\cup \mathcal{B}^{(k)}$ is connected.
- For all $M \in L(\mathcal{A})$, $\{x : x \in M, \mathcal{B}^{(k)} \text{ encompasses } x\}$ is connected.
- If R_k is the first to encompass $M = S_B, B \subseteq E$, then R_k is the first colored region in $\bigcap_{i \in B} S_i^-$.
- For all $M \in L(\mathcal{A})$, M is cut into connected closed sections M_1, M_2, \dots by all pseudospheres $S_i \in \mathcal{A}$ that intersect M . Let $R_{M_i}^{(k)} = \{R_j : 1 \leq j \leq k, M_i \in \overline{R_j}\}$. Then the interior of the closure of $\bigcup_{R \in R_{M_i}^{(k)}} R$ is connected.

Lemma 3.6 is saying that there is a way for us to add (and color) regions of $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})$ one by one such that whenever we add (and color) a region, we can encompass exactly one new element in $L(\mathcal{A})$.

The labeling of the regions in Figure 3 is such a numbering. The interior of the closure of $\{R_1, R_2, R_3, R_4, R_5\}$ and $\{R_1, R_2, R_3, R_4, R_5, R_6\}$ are connected. If we add R_6 to the closure of $\{R_1, R_2, R_3, R_4, R_5\}$, R_6 is the first colored region in $S_3^+ \cap S_5^-$, i.e., it comes before R_7, R_8, \dots, R_{12} . Property (d) is saying that the interior of the closure of all colored regions around any intersection point, (pseudo)line segment or (pseudo)ray is connected.

Proof. We will prove Lemma 3.6 by induction on k , the number of regions added and colored. The base case $k = 1$ is trivial since we encompass \mathbb{S}^d after adding the first region R_1 .

Suppose Lemma 3.6 holds after adding the first $k - 1$ regions.

Let M be the element of the smallest dimension in $\{M \in L(\mathcal{A}) : \exists R \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}) \setminus \mathcal{B}^{(k-1)} \text{ such that } \overline{R} \cap \bigcup B^{(k-1)} \text{ encompasses } M\}$. Suppose M is the intersection of s pseudospheres S_{a_1}, \dots, S_{a_s} . Let R_k be the uncolored region such that $\overline{R_k} \cap \bigcup B^{(k-1)}$ encompasses M .

Claim 3.7. $|\mathcal{C}(\{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_k\})| - |\mathcal{C}(\{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_{k-1}\})| \leq 1$.

Suppose that $M^{(k)} = \mathcal{C}(\{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_k\}) \setminus \mathcal{C}(\{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_{k-1}\}) \neq \emptyset$. Then:

(i) If $s = 1$, then $M \in M^{(k)}$ is some pseudosphere $S \in \mathcal{A}$;

(ii) If $s \geq 2$, then $M \in M^{(k)} \in L(\mathcal{A})$ and $\dim(M) = d - s$.

Furthermore, the four properties in Lemma 3.6 remain true.

In other words, after adding a new region R_k , we encompass at most one new element $M \in L(\mathcal{A})$.

Proof of Claim. (i) If $s = 1$, then the closure of any uncolored region is connected to at most one colored region by some pseudosphere. Let R_k be connected by S_a to some $R_m, 1 \leq m \leq k - 1$. Hence we definitely have $S_a \in \mathcal{C}(B^{(k)})$. Note that R_k is connected to only one colored region, so $|M^{(k)}| \leq 1$. Therefore $M^{(k)} \subseteq \{S_a\}$.


We want to show that the four properties still hold after adding R_k . Property (a) remains true by the induction hypothesis on $k - 1$ regions. If $M^{(k)} = \{S_a\}$, then R_k has to be the only colored region in S_a^- , so $S_a \in \mathcal{C}(B^{(k-1)})$, $\{x : x \in S_a, \mathcal{B}^{(k)} \text{ encompasses } x\} = \overline{R_k} \cap \overline{R_m}$ is connected and nonempty. Therefore (c) remains true. Note that for any $M \in \mathcal{C}(B^{(k-1)})$, $\{x : x \in M, \mathcal{B}^{(k)} \text{ encompasses } x\} = \{x : x \in M, \mathcal{B}^{(k-1)} \text{ encompasses } x\}$, which is connected by our induction hypothesis. Hence (b) still holds. Observe that R_{M_i} is changed after we add R_k only if $M \in \overline{R_k}$. Since R_k is the only colored region in S_a^- : (1) $M \in S_a$, in which case $M_i \in \overline{R_k} \cap \overline{R_m}$. Now $\bigcup_{R \in R_{M_i}^{(k-1)}} R$ is connected by the induction hypothesis and R_k, R_m are connected by part of S_a of positive measure, so $\overline{R_k} \cap (\bigcup_{R \in R_{M_i}^{(k-1)}} R)$ is also connected. (2) R_k is the only colored region bordered by M_i . Therefore property (d) remains true.

(ii) If $s \geq 2$, then by our induction hypothesis (d), R_k is the only uncolored region of the 2^s regions whose closure contain $M = S_{a_1} \cap \dots \cap S_{a_s}$. For all $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$, let S_{a_i} connect R_k, R_{m_i} , where $1 \leq m_1 \neq \dots \neq m_s \leq k - 1$. Clearly $M \in \mathcal{C}(B^{(k)})$.

Assume to the contrary that we encompass at least two elements $M \neq \widetilde{M} \in L(\mathcal{A})$ by adding R_k . If \widetilde{M} is some pseudosphere H , then at least one of R_{m_1}, \dots, R_{m_s} would be on the same side of H as R_k . By the induction hypothesis (c), this implies that H has been encompassed before adding R_k , a contradiction to our assumption.

Hence \widetilde{M} has to be the intersection of $\widetilde{S}_1, \dots, \widetilde{S}_t, 1 \leq t \leq d$, all of which border R_k . Denote the t regions connected to R_k by \widetilde{M} as $\widetilde{R}_1, \dots, \widetilde{R}_t$. All \widetilde{R}_i have to be colored before we add R_k , or we wouldn't encompass \widetilde{M} by adding R_k . Let $K_t = \bigcap_{i=1}^t \widetilde{S}_i^{\widetilde{X}_i}$, where $\widetilde{X}_i = +$ if $R_k \in \widetilde{S}_i^+$ and $\widetilde{X}_i = -$ if $R_k \in \widetilde{S}_i^-$. Hence K_t is an infinite section of the entire space that is formed by $\widetilde{S}_1, \dots, \widetilde{S}_t$ with \widetilde{M} as its tip that contains R_k . Similarly let $K_s = \bigcap_{j=1}^s S_j^{X_j^k}$, where $X_j^k = +$ if $R_k \in S_j^+$ and $X_j^k = -$ if $R_k \in S_j^-$.

(1) If $\{\widetilde{S}_i, 1 \leq i \leq t\} \cap \{S_{a_i}, 1 \leq i \leq s\} = \emptyset$, then a nontrivial part of \widetilde{M} is inside the interior of K_s and a nontrivial part of M is inside the interior of K_t . Hence we can find a region R_{m_j} that is contained in K_t . Note that R_{m_j} and \widetilde{R}_i are on different sides of S_{a_j} for all i . Using the induction

Figure 3: Examples of case (ii) in \mathbb{S}^2 .

hypothesis (a), R_{m_j} and $\bigcup \widetilde{R}_i$ have to be connected by colored regions on both sides of S_{a_j} . Let R' be one of the regions connecting R_{m_j} and $\bigcup \widetilde{R}_i$ such that R' is bordered by S_{a_j} and R' is on the same side of S_{a_j} as $\bigcup \widetilde{R}_i$. Pick any $v \neq j$ such that R_{m_v} and R_{m_j} are on different sides of S_{a_j} . Therefore R_{m_v} and R' are on the same side of S_{a_j} . Since R_k is an uncolored region between R' and R_{m_v} , we can find a pseudoline $l \subset S_{a_j} \cap L(\mathcal{A})$ such that l has nontrivial segments on the boundaries of R' , R_k and R_{m_v} . We see that l is encompassed before we add R_k but $\{x : x \in l, \mathcal{B}^{(k-1)} \text{ encompasses } x\}$ is not connected, which is a contradiction to the induction hypothesis (b).

(2) If there exist some $S_{a_j} \in \{\widetilde{S}_i, 1 \leq i \leq t\} \cap \{S_{a_i}, 1 \leq i \leq s\}$, then there exist regions R_{m_v} and \widetilde{R}_v such that R_{m_v} , \widetilde{R}_v and R_k are on the same side of S_{a_j} . Note that S_{a_j} borders \widetilde{R}_v , and R_k is an uncolored region between R_{m_v} and \widetilde{R}_v . Again we can find a pseudoline $l \subset S_{a_j}$, and $l \in L(\mathcal{A})$ has nontrivial segments on the boundaries of R_k , R_{m_v} and \widetilde{R}_v . Now l is encompassed before we add R_k but $\{x : x \in l, \mathcal{B}^{(k-1)} \text{ encompasses } x\}$ is not connected, which is a contradiction to the induction hypothesis (b).

Hence we conclude that $M^{(k)} \subseteq \{M\}$.

Now we want to show that the four properties remain true after adding R_k . Suppose R_k is the first to encompass $M^{(k)}$. If R_k is not the first colored region in K_s , then we can find R_j , $1 \leq j \leq k-1$ that is the colored region closest to $M^{(k)}$ in K_s before we add R_k . If R_j is strictly inside the interior of K_s , then we can apply the argument in part (1) of (ii) above, where R_j is equivalent to \widetilde{R}_i . Else use the argument in (ii).(2) where R_j is equivalent to \widetilde{R}_v . In both cases we can find an encompassed pseudoline on the boundary of K_s whose encompassed parts are not connected, a contradiction to the induction hypothesis (b). Therefore R_k has to be the first colored region in K_s , so property (c) remains true for k . Properties (a), (b) and (d) follow immediately.

Hence we've completed the induction. \square

Note that after adding all regions in $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})$, we encompass all elements $M \in L(\mathcal{A})$. Since \mathcal{A} is semigeneral, $|L(\mathcal{A})| = |\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})|$. Therefore we add exactly one new element after adding (and coloring) a new region, i.e., $|\mathcal{C}(\{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_k\})| = k$ for all $k = 0, 1, \dots, r(\mathcal{A})$. \square

Now we are ready to show the diagonal form of the Varchenko matrix of an arrangement in semigeneral position with the numbering constructed in Lemma 3.6.

Definition 3.8. Let P be a symmetric matrix of dimension N . If $P_{k,k} \mid P_{k,n}$ for all $n = 1, \dots, N$, define $T^{(k)}$ to be the following matrix operation:

$$(T^{(k)}P)_{m,n} = P_{m,n} - \frac{P_{m,k} \cdot P_{n,k}}{P_{k,k}} \text{ for all } m, n = 1, \dots, N, (m, n) \neq (k, k);$$

$$(T^{(k)}P)_{k,k} = P_{k,k}.$$

In other words, we can apply $T^{(k)}$ to P only when $P_{k,k} \mid P_{k,i}$ for all i . For each $i \neq k$, we subtract row i by $\frac{P_{k,i}}{P_{k,k}}$ times row k to get P' . After operating on all rows, we then subtract column j of P' by $\frac{P_{k,j}}{P_{k,k}}$ times column k of P' to get $T^{(k)}P$. It is easy to check that $T^{(k)}$ is a well-defined operation. The resulting matrix is also symmetric and the entries $(i, k), (k, i)$ are 0 for all $i \neq k$.

Set $V^{(0)} = V$. For all $k = 0, 1, \dots, r(\mathcal{A})$, let $V^{(k)}$ be the matrix obtained by applying $T^{(1)}, \dots, T^{(k)}$ in order to V . Denote entry (m, n) of $V^{(k)}$ as $V_{m,n}^{(k)}$. Let $M^{(k)} = S_{a_1} \cap S_{a_2} \cap \dots \cap S_{a_s}$ and $A_k = \{S_{a_1}, S_{a_2}, \dots, S_{a_s}\}$.

Claim 3.9. a) $V_{k,k}^{(k)} = \prod_{a \in A_k} (1 - x_a^2)$;

b) $V_{m,n}^{(k)} = 0$ for all $m \neq n \leq k$; $V_{m,m}^{(k)} = V_{m,m}^{(m)}$ for all $m \leq k$;

c) $V_{m,n}^{(k)} = V_{m,n} \cdot \varphi\left(\prod_{i=1}^k (1 - l_i^2(m, n))\right)$ if at least one of m, n is greater than k .

Proof. We will justify the claims by induction on k . The claims hold for the base case $k = 0$ by the definition of $V^{(0)} = V$.

Suppose that the claims hold for $k - 1$.

It follows from Lemma 3.6.c that k is the first and only colored region in $\mathcal{K}_{a_1 a_2 \dots a_s}$. For all $1 \leq i \leq s$, there exists a unique r_i such that $1 \leq r_i \leq k - 1$ and S_{a_i} connects r_i and k , i.e., $\text{sep}(r_i, k) = \{S_{a_i}\}$; $r_i \neq r_j$ for all $i \neq j$.

Remark 3.10. $V_{m,k}^{(k-1)} = V_{m,k} \cdot V_{k,k}^{(k-1)}$ or 0.

Proof. If m is not in the polygonal pyramid $\mathcal{K}_{a_1 a_2 \dots a_s}$, then m and k are on different sides of at least one pseudosphere, say S_{a_1} . Thus $S_{a_1} \notin \text{sep}(r_1, m)$, i.e., $\text{sep}(r_1, m) \cap \text{sep}(r_1, k) = \text{sep}(r_1, m) \cap \{S_{a_1}\} = \emptyset$. Therefore $l_{r_1}(m, k) = 1$. By the induction hypothesis, we have

$$V_{m,k}^{(k-1)} = V_{m,k} \cdot \varphi\left(\left(1 - l_{r_1}^2(m, k)\right) \cdot \prod_{j=1, j \neq r_1}^{k-1} (1 - l_j^2(m, k))\right) = 0.$$

If m is in $\mathcal{K}_{a_1 a_2 \dots a_s}$, then m and k are on the same side of S_{a_i} for all $1 \leq i \leq s$. Therefore, for any region $j = 1, 2, \dots, k - 1$, at least one of $\{S_{a_1}, \dots, S_{a_s}\}$ separates j and $m \cap k$, say S_{a_l} , $l \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$. Since $S_{a_l} \in \text{sep}(j, m)$, we can deduce that $x_{a_l} \mid l_j(m, k)$. Note that for all $1 \leq i \leq s$, $S_{a_i} \in \text{sep}(r_i, m)$, i.e., $\text{sep}(r_i, m) \cap \text{sep}(r_i, k) = \text{sep}(r_i, m) \cap \{S_{a_i}\} = \{S_{a_i}\}$. Therefore $l_{r_i}(m, k) = x_{a_i}$. Applying the results of Proposition 3.2.b, we get

$$\begin{aligned} V_{m,k}^{(k-1)} &= V_{m,k} \cdot \varphi\left(\left(1 - l_{r_1}^2(m, k)\right) \cdots \left(1 - l_{r_s}^2(m, k)\right) \cdot \prod_{\substack{j=1, \\ j \neq r_1, \dots, r_s}}^{k-1} (1 - l_j^2(m, k))\right) \\ &= V_{m,k} \cdot (1 - x_{a_1}^2)(1 - x_{a_2}^2) \cdots (1 - x_{a_s}^2). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{k,k}^{(k-1)} &= V_{k,k} \cdot \varphi\left(\prod_{j=1}^{k-1} (1 - l_j^2(k, k))\right) \\
&= \varphi\left((1 - l_{r_1}^2(k, k)) \cdots (1 - l_{r_s}^2(k, k)) \cdot \prod_{\substack{j=1, \\ j \neq r_1, \dots, r_s}}^{k-1} (1 - l_j^2(k, k))\right) \\
&= (1 - x_{a_1}^2)(1 - x_{a_2}^2) \cdots (1 - x_{a_s}^2). \tag{1}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$V_{m,k}^{(k-1)} = V_{m,k} \cdot (1 - x_k^2) = V_{m,k} \cdot V_{k,k}^{(k-1)}.$$

□

Since $V_{k,k}^{(k-1)} \mid V_{m,k}^{(k-1)}$ for all $m = 1, 2, \dots, r(\mathcal{A})$, we can apply the matrix operation $T^{(k)}$ to $V^{(k-1)}$. By definition of $T^{(k)}$, if $m \neq n \leq k$, then $V_{m,n}^{(k)} = 0$; else,

$$V_{m,n}^{(k)} = V_{m,n}^{(k-1)} - \frac{V_{m,k}^{(k-1)} \cdot V_{n,k}^{(k-1)}}{V_{k,k}^{(k-1)}}. \tag{2}$$

It follows immediately that $V_{k,k}^{(k)} = V_{k,k}^{(k-1)} = (1 - x_{a_1}^2)(1 - x_{a_2}^2) \cdots (1 - x_{a_s}^2)$. Therefore, claim (a) holds for k . In addition, we can deduce from Remark 3.10 that if at least one of m, n is not contained in $\mathcal{K}_{a_1 a_2 \dots a_s}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{m,n}^{(k)} &= V_{m,n}^{(k-1)} - \frac{V_{m,k}^{(k-1)} \cdot V_{n,k}^{(k-1)}}{V_{k,k}^{(k-1)}} = V_{m,n}^{(k-1)} - 0 = V_{m,n} \cdot \varphi\left(\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (1 - l_i^2(m, n))\right) \\
&= V_{m,n} \cdot \varphi\left(\prod_{i=1}^k (1 - l_i^2(m, n))\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that if $m \neq n \leq k$, i.e., neither of m, n is contained in $\mathcal{K}_{a_1 a_2 \dots a_s}$, then by the induction hypothesis $V_{m,n}^{(k)} = V_{m,n}^{(k-1)} = 0$. If $m = n < k$, then $V_{m,m}^{(k)} = V_{m,m}^{(k-1)} = \cdots = V_{m,m}^{(m)}$. Hence claim (b) also holds for k .

In order to prove claim (c), it suffices to show that if m, n are both contained in $\mathcal{K}_{a_1 a_2 \dots a_s}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&V_{m,n} \cdot \varphi\left(\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (1 - l_i^2(m, n))\right) - V_{m,n} \cdot \varphi\left(\prod_{i=1}^k (1 - l_i^2(m, n))\right) = V_{m,n}^{(k-1)} - V_{m,n}^{(k)} \\
&= \frac{V_{m,k}^{(k-1)} \cdot V_{n,k}^{(k-1)}}{V_{k,k}^{(k-1)}} = V_{m,k} \cdot V_{n,k} \cdot V_{k,k}^{(k-1)} = V_{m,n} \cdot l_k^2(m, n) \cdot V_{k,k}^{(k-1)}. \tag{3}
\end{aligned}$$

Using linearity of φ , we can combine the two terms on the left hand side of the above equation:

$$LHS = V_{m,n} \cdot \varphi\left(l_k^2(m, n) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (1 - l_i^2(m, n))\right). \tag{4}$$

So we only need to show that

$$\varphi(l_k^2(m, n) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (1 - l_i^2(m, n))) = l_k^2(m, n) \cdot V_{k,k}^{(k-1)}. \quad (5)$$

Applying Proposition 3.2(a) we know that

$$l_k^2(m, n) \mid \varphi(l_k^2(m, n) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (1 - l_i^2(m, n))); \quad l_k^2(m, n) \mid \varphi(l_k^2(m, n) \cdot l_i^2(m, n)).$$

Hence we can pull out $l_k^2(m, n)$ on the left hand side:

$$\varphi(l_k^2(m, n) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (1 - l_i^2(m, n))) = l_k^2(m, n) \cdot \varphi(\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (1 - \tilde{l}_i^2(m, n))), \quad (6)$$

$$\text{where } \tilde{l}_i^2(m, n) = \frac{\varphi(l_k^2(m, n) \cdot l_i^2(m, n))}{l_k^2(m, n)} \text{ for all } i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1. \quad (7)$$

Note that $\tilde{l}_i(m, n)$ is exactly the *distance* between i and $m \cup n$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{m,n} = \mathcal{A} \setminus (\text{sep}(k, m) \cap \text{sep}(k, n)) = \mathcal{A} \setminus \text{sep}(k, m \cup n)$. Therefore it suffices to show that in $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{m,n}$,

$$\varphi(\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (1 - \tilde{l}_i^2(m, n))) = V_{k,k}^{(k-1)}. \quad (8)$$

Observe that after deleting $\text{sep}(k, m) \cap \text{sep}(k, n)$, either one of m, n , say m , merges with k , or else m and n share a border with k respectively. Applying the results of Remark 3.10, in the first case we have

$$\varphi(\prod_{j=1}^{k-1} (1 - \tilde{l}_j^2(m, n))) = \varphi(\prod_{j=1}^{k-1} (1 - l_j^2(n, k))) = V_{k,k}^{(k-1)}.$$

In the second case, $\text{sep}(r_i, m \cup n) = \text{sep}(r_i, k) \cup \text{sep}(k, m \cup n)$. Therefore, $\tilde{l}_{r_i}(m, n) = l_{r_i}(k, k)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \varphi(\prod_{j=1}^{k-1} (1 - \tilde{l}_j^2(m, n))) \\ &= \varphi((1 - \tilde{l}_{r_1}^2(m, n)) \cdots (1 - \tilde{l}_{r_s}^2(m, n)) \cdot \prod_{\substack{j=1, \\ j \neq r_1, \dots, r_s}}^{k-1} (1 - \tilde{l}_j^2(m, n))) \\ &= (1 - x_{r_1}^2) \cdots (1 - x_{r_s}^2) = V_{k,k}^{(k-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we conclude that claim (c) holds for k , and this completes the induction. \square

An immediate corollary of Claim 3.9 is that when $k = r(\mathcal{A})$, $V_{m,n}^{r(\mathcal{A})} = 0$ for all $m \neq n$. Thus we have reduced V to a diagonal matrix. We know from Lemma 3.6.c that by adding region k we encompass exactly one new element $M^{(k)} \in L(\mathcal{A})$, so each entry $V_{k,k}^{(k)} = \prod_{a \in A_k} (1 - x_a^2)$ appears exactly once on the diagonal of $V^{r(\mathcal{A})}$. Hence we've proven the sufficient condition of Theorem 2.1.

4 Nonexistence of the Diagonal Form of the Varchenko Matrices of Arrangements Not in Semigeneral Positions

In this section, we will prove the necessary condition of Theorem 2.1.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that \mathcal{A} is a finite pseudosphere arrangement in \mathbb{S}^d and $S \notin \mathcal{A}$ is a $(d-1)$ -dimensional pseudosphere. If $V(\mathcal{A} \cup \{S\})$ has a diagonal form, then $V(\mathcal{A})$ also has a diagonal form.*

Proof. Let x_1, \dots, x_n be the indeterminates for pseudospheres in \mathcal{A} and x_{n+1} for S . Set $V = V(\mathcal{A})$ and $V^{(0)} = V(\mathcal{A} \cup \{S\})$.

Let $V^{(1)}$ be the matrix obtained by setting $x_{n+1} = 1$ in $V^{(0)}$. Observe that the i^{th} row (column) and the j^{th} row (column) of $V^{(1)}$ is the same for all $i \neq j$ if $V_{i,j}^{(0)} = x_{n+1}$, i.e., region i and j are separated only by S . Apply row and column operations to eliminate repeated rows (columns), and we will get $V^{(1)} \sim V \oplus \mathbf{0}_k$, where $\mathbf{0}_k$ is the all zero matrix of dimension $k \times k$ and $k = r(\mathcal{A} \cup \{S\}) - r(\mathcal{A})$.

If $V^{(0)}$ has a diagonal form over $\mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}]$, then we can assign an integer value to x_{n+1} and hence $V^{(1)}$ and $V \oplus \mathbf{0}_k$ have a diagonal form over $\mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$.

Let D be the diagonal form of $V \oplus \mathbf{0}_k$. According to Theorem 1.12, $\det(V) \neq 0$; by Lemma 1.17, $\text{rank}(D) = \text{rank}(V^{(1)})$, which is equal to the dimension $r(\mathcal{A})$ of V . Therefore, the number of zeros on D 's diagonal is k .

Note that there exist matrices P, Q of dimension $r(\mathcal{A} \cup \{S\})$ and unit determinant such that $P(V \oplus \mathbf{0}_k) = DQ$. We can also write the matrices in the following way, where D' is the diagonal matrix obtained from eliminating the all zero rows and columns in D :

$$\left[\begin{array}{c|c} P_1 & P_3 \\ \hline P_2 & P_4 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} V & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right] = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} D' & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} Q_1 & Q_2 \\ \hline Q_3 & Q_4 \end{array} \right];$$

$$\left[\begin{array}{c|c} P_1V & 0 \\ \hline P_2V & 0 \end{array} \right] = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} D'Q_1 & D'Q_2 \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right].$$

It is easy to check that $P_2V = 0$, $D'Q_2 = 0$, $P_1V = D'Q_1$.

Since $\det(V) \neq 0$ and $\det(D') \neq 0$, P_2 and Q_2 have only 0 entries. Therefore, $1 = \det(P) = \det(P_1) \det(P_4)$; $1 = \det(Q) = \det(Q_1) \det(Q_4)$. The only units in $\mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ are 1 and -1 , so we can assume that $\det(P_1) = \det(Q_1) = 1$. Thus, D' is a diagonal form of V . \square

Now we've arrived at the main theorem of this section, which is also the necessary condition of Theorem 2.1.

Theorem 4.2. *Let \mathcal{A} be a pseudosphere arrangement in \mathbb{S}^d that is not semigeneral. Then $V(\mathcal{A})$ does not have a diagonal form.*

Proof. Using Lemma 4.1, we can delete as many pseudospheres in \mathcal{A} as possible so that the resulting arrangement, denoted again as \mathcal{A} , satisfies the nonsemigeneral property and the *minimum condition*, i.e., if we delete any pseudosphere, the remaining arrangement will be semigeneral.

Note that there must exist $S_1, \dots, S_p \in \mathcal{A}$ with nonempty intersection such that $\dim(S_1 \cap \dots \cap S_p) \neq d-p$. Hence $\dim(S_1 \cap \dots \cap S_p) \geq d-p+1$. If $\dim(S_1 \cap \dots \cap S_p) \geq d-p+2$, then $\dim(S_2 \cap \dots \cap S_p) \geq$

$d - (p - 1)$, contradicting the minimum condition of \mathcal{A} . Therefore, $\dim(S_1 \cap \cdots \cap S_p) = d - p + 1$. Also by the minimum condition, $\mathcal{A} = \{S_1, \dots, S_p\}$.

Without loss of generality, we can assume that $p = d + 1$ (by projecting all pseudospheres to a smaller subspace). Thus we only need to consider the case of $\mathcal{A} = \{S_1, \dots, S_{d+1}\}$ in \mathbb{S}^d , where the intersection $S_1 \cap \cdots \cap S_{d+1}$ is a single point and any pseudosphere arrangement formed by a subset of \mathcal{A} with cardinality d is semigeneral and nonempty.

Now we can deduce the structure of the intersection poset $L(\mathcal{A})$: $L(\mathcal{A})$ consists of the intersection of any k pseudospheres in \mathcal{A} for all $k = 0, 1, \dots, d - 1$ and the point $S_1 \cap \cdots \cap S_{d+1}$, which is also the intersection of any d pseudospheres in \mathcal{A} . It follows that for all $S \in \mathcal{A}$, \mathcal{A}^S is the pseudosphere arrangement of d pseudospheres of dimension $d - 1$ intersecting at one point in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} , so $r(\mathcal{A}^S) = 2^d - 2$, $r(\mathcal{A}) = 2^{d+1} - 2$.

Let x_1, \dots, x_{d+1} be the indeterminates of the pseudospheres in \mathcal{A} . By Theorem 1.12, $\det V(\mathcal{A}) = (1 - x_1^2)^{2^d - 2} (1 - x_2^2)^{2^d - 2} \cdots (1 - x_{d+1}^2)^{2^d - 2} (1 - x_1^2 \cdots x_{d+1}^2)$.

Set $S_1 \cap \cdots \cap S_{d+1}$ as the origin $(0, 0, \dots, 0)$. Pick any pseudosphere $S \in \mathcal{A}$. Then S separates the space into two half spaces S_1, S_2 . Since \mathcal{A} is symmetric about the origin, exactly half of $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})$ lies in S_1 , i.e., $r(S_1) = \frac{1}{2}r(\mathcal{A}) = 2^d - 1$. We also know that $r(\mathcal{A}^S) = 2^d - 2 = (2^d - 1) - 1$. Thus, for all but one region R in S_1 , the intersection of its closure and S has dimension $d - 1$. The intersection of the closure of R with S is the point $S_1 \cap \cdots \cap S_{d+1}$.

Here comes an important observation: If we restrict to the Varchenko matrix of regions in S_1 , denoted by $\mathcal{R}(S_1)$, we obtain the Varchenko matrix of the pseudosphere arrangement of d pseudospheres in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} in general position. This matrix is equivalent to the Varchenko matrix for $\mathcal{A}^S \cup R$. Intuitively, we can view R as the inner region of the point $S_1 \cap \cdots \cap S_{d+1}$.

We'll prove the theorem by contradiction. Suppose that D is a diagonal form of $V(\mathcal{A})$. Clearly, $V \sim D$.

First, we want to show that in D 's diagonal entries, $1 - x_i$ and $1 + x_i$ must appear in the form of $1 - x_i^2$ for all $i = 1, \dots, d + 1$.

For all $i = 1, \dots, d + 1$, consider $V_{x_i=3, x_j=0 \ \forall j \neq i}$. It can be decomposed into blocks of $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 3 \\ 3 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ and identity matrices, so its SNF has diagonal entries 1 and 8 with multiplicities. Now $D_{x_i=3, x_j=0 \ \forall j \neq i}$ has the same SNF by Lemma 1.20. Note that $1 - x_i = -2$, $1 + x_i = 4$, and their products are all powers of 2, so $D_{x_i=3, x_j=0 \ \forall j \neq i}$ is already in SNF. We have equal numbers of 4 and -2 , so they must pair up in the form of $1 - x_i^2$ or we won't have only 1 and 8 on the diagonal. In addition, $1 - x_i^2$ can appear at most once in each diagonal entry of D .

We can ignore the terms $1 - x_1 \cdots x_{d+1}$ and $1 + x_1 \cdots x_{d+1}$ for the moment since we will assign at least one of x_i to 0 in the following steps.

If we set $x_{d+1} = 0$, we will get two blocks of matrices corresponding to a general position using the earlier observation. If we set all other indeterminates equal to the indeterminate q , the diagonal form of $V_{x_{d+1}=0}$ has diagonal entries $(1 - x_{i_1}^2) \cdots (1 - x_{i_k}^2)$ (twice) for all $k = 0, \dots, d - 1$, $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_k \leq d$. Thus, the SNF of $V_{x_i=0, x_j=q, \forall j \neq i}$ has diagonal entries $(1 - q^2)^k$ ($2 \binom{d}{k}$ times) for all $k = 0, 1, \dots, d - 1$.

We call a diagonal entry of D a k -entry if after setting $x_1 = \dots = x_{d+1} = q$, it becomes $(1 - q^2)^k$. All diagonal entries of $D_{x_i=0, x_j=q, \forall j \neq i}$ have the form $(1 - q^2)^k$ for some k so it is already in SNF. Since SNF is unique, $D_{x_i=0, x_j=q, \forall j \neq i}$ has diagonal entries $(1 - q^2)^k$ ($2 \binom{d}{k}$ times) for all $k = 0, 1, \dots, d - 1$.

We then compute the exact number of k -entries in D . The number of k -entries in D is 0 if $k \geq d$; otherwise, there exists some $i \in \{1, \dots, d + 1\}$ such that $D_{x_i=0, x_j=q, \forall j \neq i}$ has a diagonal entry $(1 - q^2)^d$, which leads to a contradiction.

Claim 4.3. *The number of $(d - 2k - 1)$ -entries in D is $2\binom{d+1}{2k+2}$ and the number of $(d - 2k - 2)$ -entries in D is 0.*

Proof. We'll prove the claim by induction on k . It is true when $k = 0$.

If the claim holds for k , i.e., the number of $(d - 2k)$ -entries in D is 0. Assume that the number of $(d - 2k - 1)$ -entries in D is m and $1 - x_i^2$ appears in a_i of these entries.

Set $x_i = 0$ and all other indeterminates equal to q . Since there are exactly $2\binom{d}{d-2k-1}$ number of $(1 - q^2)^{d-2k-1}$'s and no $(d - 2k)$ -entries in D , $m - a_i = 2\binom{d}{d-2k-1}$. Therefore a_i is a constant with respect to i .

By a simple double counting of the total number of $(1 - \square^2)$'s in those entries, where $\square = x_1, \dots, x_{d+1}$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d+1} a_i = \left(m - 2\binom{d}{d-2k-1} \right) \cdot (d+1) = m \cdot (d - 2k - 1).$$

It is easy to check that $m = 2\binom{d+1}{2k+2}$ and $a_i = 2\binom{d+1}{2k+2} - 2\binom{d}{d-2k-1} = 2\binom{d}{2k+2}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, d+1$.

Now if we assign 0 to x_i and q to all other indeterminates, we already have $(1 - q^2)^{d-2k-2}$ occuring $a_i = 2\binom{d}{2k+2}$ times so we do not need more. Therefore, all the $(d - 2k - 2)$ -entries in D must contain $1 - x_i^2$. It is true for all $i = 1, \dots, d+1$ so we have a contradiction unless the number of $(d - 2k - 2)$ -entries is 0.

This completes the induction and proves the claim. \square

If d is even, the number of 0-entries (1's) is 0 in D . In other words, if we assign 1 to all indeterminates, D becomes the all zero matrix with rank 0, while the rank of V becomes 1, which is a contradiction by Lemma 1.17.

If d is odd, we have to take into account the terms $1 - x_1 \cdots x_{d+1}$ and $1 + x_1 \cdots x_{d+1}$. As before, we will first show that they must pair up.

Let $x_1 = 3$, $x_i = 1$ for all $i \geq 2$ in V . Then in V , row i is identical to row j if region i and j are on the same side of S_1 . Eliminating repeated rows with row and column operations, we get $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 3 \\ 3 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \oplus \mathbf{0}$ where $\mathbf{0}$ is the all zero matrix, which has SNF $\{1, 8, 0 \text{ (multiple times)}\}$. Note that when d is odd, there are no 1-entries. Thus 1 and 8 must come from a combination of $1 - x_1 \cdots x_{d+1}$ and $1 + x_1 \cdots x_{d+1}$. Hence they must appear in the form of $1 - x_1^2 \cdots x_{d+1}^2$.

Furthermore, $1 - x_1^2 \cdots x_{d+1}^2$ must appear alone in a 0-entry. Otherwise, since there are no 1-entries in D , after assigning $x_i = 1$ for $i \geq 2$ we will end up with a matrix with only two 1's on the diagonal and 0 everywhere else. Since d is odd, the number of 0-entries is 2. One of them is $1 - x_1^2 \cdots x_{d+1}^2$ and the other one can only be a true 1.

Consider $V_{x_1=\dots=x_{d+1}=3}$ and $D_{x_1=\dots=x_{d+1}=3}$. Since $V_{x_1=\dots=x_{d+1}=3}$ has a submatrix $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 3 \\ 3 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$, so $\gcd(V_{x_1=\dots=x_{d+1}=3}, 2) \leq 8$.

On the diagonal of $D_{x_1=\dots=x_{d+1}=3}$, there is one 1, one $1 - 3^{2d+2}$ and all other entries are multiples of $(1 - 3^2)^2 = 64$ since there is no 1-entry.

Note that $1 - 3^{2d+2} = (1 - 3^2)(1 + 3^2 + 3^4 + \cdots + 3^{2d})$. Since d is odd, so $1 + 3^2 + 3^4 + \cdots + 3^{2d}$ is even and $16 \mid (1 - 3^{2d+2})$. Therefore, $16 \mid \gcd(D_{x_1=\dots=x_{d+1}=3}, 2)$, which leads to a contradiction by Lemma 1.17.

Hence we conclude that $V(\mathcal{A})$ does not have a diagonal form. \square

5 Acknowledgment

This research was conducted during the 2015 summer UROP (Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program) at MIT . We would like to express our gratitude to Prof. Richard P. Stanley for suggesting the topic and supervising the entire project.

References

- [1] Anders Björner, Michel Las Vergnas, Bernd Sturmfels, Neil White, and Gunter M. Ziegler. *Oriented matroids*. Number 46. Cambridge University Press, 1999. [1](#), [2](#)
- [2] Keith Matthews. Mp274 lecture notes. <http://www.numbertheory.org/courses/MP274/smith.pdf>, 1991. [4](#)
- [3] Richard P. Stanley. Introduction to hyperplane arrangements. *IAS/Park City Mathematics series*, 2004. [1](#)
- [4] Alexandre Varchenko. Bilinear form of real configuration of hyperplanes. *Advances in Mathematics*, 97(1):110–144, 1993. [1](#), [3](#)