

# $k$ -Adjoint Arrangements

Weikang Liang<sup>1</sup>, Suijie Wang<sup>2</sup> and Chengdong Zhao<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>School of Mathematics  
Hunan University  
Changsha 410082, Hunan, P. R. China

<sup>3</sup> School of Mathematics and Statistics  
Central South University  
Changsha 410083, Hunan, P. R. China

Emails: <sup>1</sup>kangkang@hnu.edu.cn, <sup>2</sup>wangsuijie@hnu.edu.cn, <sup>3</sup>cdzhao@csu.edu.cn

## Abstract

In this paper, we introduce the  $k$ -adjoint arrangements as a generalization of the adjoint of a hyperplane arrangement proposed by Bixby and Coullard, which is associated with rank- $k$  elements in the intersection lattice of a given hyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$ . The  $k$ -adjoint of  $\mathcal{A}$  induces a decomposition of the Grassmannian, which we call the  $\mathcal{A}$ -adjoint decomposition. Inspired by the work of Gelfand, Goresky, MacPherson, and Serganova, we generalize the matroid decomposition and refined Schubert decomposition of the Grassmannian from the perspective of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Furthermore, we prove that these three decompositions are equivalent. A notable application involves providing a combinatorial classification of all the  $k$ -dimensional restrictions of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Consequently, we establish the anti-monotonicity property of some combinatorial invariants, such as Whitney numbers of the first kind and the independent numbers.

**Mathematics Subject Classification:** 05B35, 52C35

**Keywords:** Hyperplane arrangement, adjoint arrangement, Grassmannian, Plücker coordinates, Whitney number, independent number

## 1 Introduction

In this paper, we introduce an approach for constructing new hyperplane arrangements using the intersection lattice of a given hyperplane arrangement, which is referred to as the  $k$ -adjoint arrangement. We reveal the connections and applications of  $k$ -adjoint arrangements to the following objects:

- Extending the concept of the adjoint of a hyperplane arrangement, as proposed by Bixby and Coullard [1];
- Providing a new decomposition of the Grassmannian, while also extending two classical decompositions attributed to Gelfand, Goresky, MacPherson, and Serganova [4]. Moreover, we demonstrate the equivalence among these three decompositions;

- Classifying all  $k$ -dimensional restrictions of a given hyperplane arrangement;
- Establishing the anti-monotonicity property of certain combinatorial invariants of a hyperplane arrangement when restricted to different subspaces [2].

Of utmost initial motivation to us is a fundamental question: how to classify the combinatorial structure of a given hyperplane arrangement restricted to different subspaces. To rigorously formulate our question, we recall the basic notation in hyperplane arrangements. A *hyperplane arrangement*  $\mathcal{A}$  is a finite collection of hyperplanes in the vector space  $\mathbb{F}^n$  over a field  $\mathbb{F}$ . Throughout this paper, we assume that  $\mathcal{A}$  is *linear* and *essential*, i.e.,  $\bigcap_{H \in \mathcal{A}} H = \{0\}$ . Let  $L(\mathcal{A})$  be the *intersection lattice* of  $\mathcal{A}$  consisting of subspaces  $X = \bigcap_{H \in \mathcal{B}} H$  for all  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ , equipped with a partial order induced from the reverse inclusion, where the minimal element is set to be  $\mathbb{F}^n = \bigcap_{H \in \emptyset} H$ . It is known that  $L(\mathcal{A})$  is graded with the rank function  $\text{rank}(X) = n - \dim(X)$ . Let

$$L_k(\mathcal{A}) := \{X \in L(\mathcal{A}) \mid \text{rank}(X) = k\}.$$

Given a subspace  $U$  of  $V$ , the *restriction* of  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $U$  is the arrangement in  $U$  defined by

$$\mathcal{A}|_U = \{H \cap U \mid H \in \mathcal{A} \text{ and } U \not\subseteq H\}.$$

If  $\dim(U) = k$ ,  $\mathcal{A}|_U$  is called a  $k$ -dimensional restriction of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Consequently, the initial question can be rephrased as classifying all  $k$ -dimensional restrictions of  $\mathcal{A}$ , or in other words, characterizing  $L(\mathcal{A}|_U)$  for all  $k$ -dimensional subspaces  $U$ .

We address the question by introducing a new hyperplane arrangement associated with  $L_k(\mathcal{A})$ , called the  $k$ -adjoint of  $\mathcal{A}$ . We primarily noted that our question is equivalent to finding a geometric decomposition of the Grassmannian  $Gr(k, n, \mathbb{F})$  ( $Gr(k, n)$  for simplicity), which stands for the set of all  $k$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}^n$ . Let  $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  and let  $\mathbb{F}^{\binom{[n]}{k}}$  be the  $\binom{[n]}{k}$ -dimensional vector space over  $\mathbb{F}$  with columns indexed by  $k$ -subsets of  $[n]$ . Then  $U \in Gr(k, n)$  can be specified as the row space of a  $k \times n$  matrix  $A$ , known as a matrix representative of  $U$ . The maximal minor of  $A$  with the column index set  $I$  is denoted by  $\Delta_I(U)$ . Then up to a nonzero scalar,  $\Delta(U) = (\Delta_I(U))_{I \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \in \mathbb{F}^{\binom{[n]}{k}}$  is independent of the choice of matrix representatives of  $U$ . In 1988, Bixby and Coullard [1] noticed that  $L_{n-1}(\mathcal{A})$  yields an adjoint of the hyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$ . As an extension, our definition of  $k$ -adjoint of  $\mathcal{A}$  is as follows.

**Definition 1.1.** For each  $X \in L_k(\mathcal{A})$  and  $I \in \binom{[n]}{k}$ , let

$$a_I = (-1)^{\sum_{i \in I} i - \frac{|I|(|I|+1)}{2}} \Delta_{[n]-I}(X).$$

Then the adjoint  $\sigma X$  of  $X$  is a hyperplane in  $\mathbb{F}^{\binom{[n]}{k}}$  defined by

$$\sigma X = \left\{ (x_I)_{I \in \binom{[n]}{k}} : \sum_{I \in \binom{[n]}{k}} a_I \cdot x_I = 0 \right\}.$$

*The hyperplane arrangement*

$$\mathcal{A}^{(k)} = \{\sigma X \mid X \in L_k(\mathcal{A})\}$$

in  $\mathbb{F}^{\binom{[n]}{k}}$  is called  $k$ -adjoint of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

The concept of  $k$ -adjoint plays a central role in constructing a new geometric decomposition of the Grassmannian, as demonstrated below. For any  $T \in L(\mathcal{A}^{(k)})$ , the relative interior of  $T$  in  $\mathcal{A}^{(k)}$  is defined by

$$\text{relint}_{\mathcal{A}^{(k)}}(T) = T - \bigcup_{T \not\subseteq \sigma X \in \mathcal{A}^{(k)}} \sigma X.$$

Let

$$\mathcal{S}_T = \{U \in Gr(k, n) \mid \Delta(U) \in \text{relint}(\mathcal{A}^{(k)}|_T)\}.$$

As will be seen in Section 3, the Grassmannian can be decomposed as

$$Gr(k, n) = \bigsqcup_{T \in L(\mathcal{A}^{(k)})} \mathcal{S}_T,$$

called  $\mathcal{A}$ -adjoint decomposition of  $Gr(k, n)$ , and each  $\mathcal{S}_T$  is called an  $\mathcal{A}$ -adjoint stratum.

Gelfand, Goresky, MacPherson and Serganova [4] provided three equivalent decompositions of the Grassmannian. Inspired by their work, we propose two additional decompositions of the Grassmannian associated with a given hyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$ , the  $\mathcal{A}$ -matroid decomposition and the refined  $\mathcal{A}$ -Schubert decomposition, which are equivalent to the  $\mathcal{A}$ -adjoint decomposition. Roughly speaking, the  $\mathcal{A}$ -matroid decomposition classifies matroid structures of all  $k$ -dimensional restrictions of  $\mathcal{A}$ . The refined  $\mathcal{A}$ -Schubert decomposition is defined by introducing the  $\mathcal{A}$ -Schubert cells using the normal vectors of  $\mathcal{A}$  instead of the standard orthonormal basis of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . When  $\mathcal{A}$  is the Boolean arrangement, they both reduce to the two decompositions in [4]. Detailed definitions for these decompositions can be found in Section 3, and their equivalence is stated in the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.2.** *For a given hyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , the  $\mathcal{A}$ -matroid decomposition, the  $\mathcal{A}$ -adjoint decomposition and the refined  $\mathcal{A}$ -Schubert decomposition are equivalent decompositions of the Grassmannian.*

At this point, Theorem 1.2 answers the question raised at the beginning of the paper, namely the  $k$ -dimensional restrictions  $\mathcal{A}|_U$  has the same intersection lattice as  $U$  runs over  $\mathcal{S}_T$  for each fixed  $T \in L(\mathcal{A}^{(k)})$ . When  $T$  runs over the lattice  $L(\mathcal{A}^{(k)})$ , we are naturally led to explore the relationships on combinatorial invariants of  $\mathcal{A}|_U$  for  $U \in \mathcal{S}_T$ . We find that signless Whitney numbers  $|w_i(\mathcal{A}|_U)|$  of the first kind and the independent numbers  $I_i(\mathcal{A}|_U)$  exhibit the anti-monotonicity property, as stated below.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a hyperplane arrangement in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\mathcal{A}^{(k)}$  be the  $k$ -adjoint of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Assume that  $T_1, T_2 \in L(\mathcal{A}^{(k)})$  with  $T_1 \leq T_2$ . If  $U_j \in \mathcal{S}_{T_j}$  for  $j = 1, 2$ , then we have*

- (1)  $I_i(\mathcal{A}|_{U_1}) \geq I_i(\mathcal{A}|_{U_2})$ ;
- (2)  $|w_i(\mathcal{A}|_{U_1})| \geq |w_i(\mathcal{A}|_{U_2})|$ ,

where  $I_i$  is the independent number of size  $i$  and  $w_i$  is the  $i$ -th Whitney number of the first kind.

## 2 $k$ -Adjoint Arrangement

In this section, the basic properties of the  $k$ -adjoint are preliminarily explored, along with the motivation behind our construction. We also calculate the  $k$ -adjoint of the product of two hyperplane arrangements. As a consequence, we obtain the  $k$ -adjoint of the Boolean arrangement.

Given a hyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $\mathbb{F}^n$ , let  $L_k(\mathcal{A}) = \{X \in L(\mathcal{A}) \mid \text{rank}(X) = k\}$ . Recall Definition 1.1 that for each subspace  $X \in L_k(\mathcal{A})$ , its  $k$ -adjoint  $\sigma X$  is a hyperplane in  $\mathbb{F}^{\binom{[n]}{k}}$  given by

$$\sigma X: \sum_{I \in \binom{[n]}{k}} a_I \cdot x_I = 0, \quad (2.1)$$

where

$$a_I = (-1)^{\sum_{i \in I} i - \frac{1}{2}|I|(|I|+1)} \Delta_{[n]-I}(X).$$

Then the collection of all these  $\sigma X$  forms the  $k$ -adjoint  $\mathcal{A}^{(k)}$  of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

*Remark 2.1.* The concept of  $k$ -adjoint is a generalization of adjoint arrangement due to Bixby and Coullard [1]. For  $k = n - 1$ , all members of  $L_{n-1}(\mathcal{A})$  are one-dimensional subspaces, denoted by  $L_{n-1}(\mathcal{A}) = \{\mathbb{F}\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbb{F}\mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbb{F}\mathbf{u}_s\}$ , where each  $\mathbb{F}\mathbf{u}_i$  is the subspace spanned by  $\mathbf{u}_i$ . Let  $\mathbf{u}_i = (u_{i,1}, u_{i,2}, \dots, u_{i,n})^T$ . By invoking (2.1), we get

$$\sigma(\mathbb{F}\mathbf{u}_i) = \left\{ (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{F}^n : \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^j u_{i,j} x_j = 0 \right\}. \quad (2.2)$$

Implicitly stated by Bixby and Coullard, the adjoint arrangement  $\mathcal{K} = \{K_{\mathbf{u}_1}, K_{\mathbf{u}_2}, \dots, K_{\mathbf{u}_s}\}$  is a linear arrangement in  $\mathbb{F}^n$ , where  $K_{\mathbf{u}_i}$  is defined by

$$K_{\mathbf{u}_i} = \left\{ (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{F}^n : \sum_{j=1}^n u_{i,j} x_j = 0 \right\}. \quad (2.3)$$

By comparing (2.2) and (2.3), we see that  $L(\mathcal{A}^{(n-1)})$  is exactly the same as  $L(\mathcal{K})$ , which implies our  $k$ -adjoint generalizes Bixby and Coullard's adjoint. Additionally, it is worth noting that there are three trivial special cases to be considered:

- The 0-adjoint of  $\mathcal{A}$  is the origin in  $\mathbb{F}$ ;

- The 1-adjoint of  $\mathcal{A}$  is itself;
- The  $n$ -adjoint of  $\mathcal{A}$  is the empty arrangement in  $\mathbb{F}$ .

The following lemma characterizes a relationship between a given  $k$ -dimensional subspace and the elements in  $L_k(\mathcal{A})$ , which is the basis for defining  $k$ -adjoint.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Fix  $U \in Gr(k, n)$ . Then for any  $X \in L_k(\mathcal{A})$ ,  $\mathbb{F}^n = X \oplus U$  if and only if  $\Delta(U) \notin \sigma X$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $A_U$  and  $A_X$  be matrix representatives of  $U$  and  $X$  respectively. Note that  $X$  is of dimension  $n - k$ , and hence we define an  $n \times n$  matrix by

$$M_{U,X} = \begin{bmatrix} A_U \\ A_X \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2.4)$$

Then  $\mathbb{F}^n = U \oplus X$  if and only if  $\det M_{U,X} \neq 0$ . Employing Laplace's expansion theorem on the first  $k$  rows, we obtain

$$\det M_{U,X} = \sum_{I \in \binom{[n]}{k}} (-1)^{\sum_{i \in I} i - \frac{1}{2}|I|(|I|+1)} \Delta_{[n]-I}(X) \Delta_I(U). \quad (2.5)$$

It immediately follows from the definition of  $\sigma X$  in (2.1) that  $\mathbb{F}^n = U \oplus X$  if and only if  $\Delta(U) \notin \sigma X$ . ■

In the following, we shall discuss the  $k$ -adjoint of the product of two hyperplane arrangements. Denote by  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathbb{F}^n)$  the hyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $\mathbb{F}^n$ . The product  $(\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}, \mathbb{F}^{m+n})$  of two hyperplane arrangement  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathbb{F}^n)$  and  $(\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{F}^m)$  is defined by

$$\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} = \{H \oplus \mathbb{F}^m \mid H \in \mathcal{A}\} \cup \{\mathbb{F}^n \oplus K \mid K \in \mathcal{B}\}.$$

A hyperplane arrangement is called *reducible* if it can be written as a product of two hyperplane arrangements. There is a natural isomorphism of lattices

$$\pi: L(\mathcal{A}) \times L(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow L(\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}) \quad (2.6)$$

given by the map  $\pi(Y, Z) = Y \oplus Z$ , for example see [5, Proposition 2.14].

**Definition 2.3.** *The tensor  $(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}, \mathbb{F}^n \otimes \mathbb{F}^m)$  of two hyperplane arrangements  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathbb{F}^n)$  and  $(\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{F}^m)$  is defined by*

$$\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B} = \{H \otimes \mathbb{F}^m + \mathbb{F}^n \otimes K \mid H \in \mathcal{A} \text{ and } K \in \mathcal{B}\}.$$

Note that this is well-defined since  $\dim(H \otimes \mathbb{F}^m + \mathbb{F}^n \otimes K) = nm - 1$  for  $H \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $K \in \mathcal{B}$ .

**Lemma 2.4.** Let  $\{e_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$  and  $\{e'_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq m}$  be bases of  $\mathbb{F}^n$  and  $\mathbb{F}^m$  respectively. Assume that  $H \subseteq \mathbb{F}^n$  and  $K \subseteq \mathbb{F}^m$  are hyperplanes defined by

$$H = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i e_i \mid a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 + \cdots + a_n x_n = 0 \right\};$$

$$K = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq j \leq m} y_j e'_j \mid b_1 y_1 + b_2 y_2 + \cdots + b_m y_m = 0 \right\}.$$

Then the hyperplane  $H \otimes \mathbb{F}^m + \mathbb{F}^n \otimes K$  of  $\mathbb{F}^n \otimes \mathbb{F}^m$  is given by

$$H \otimes \mathbb{F}^m + \mathbb{F}^n \otimes K = \left\{ \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq n \\ 1 \leq j \leq m}} z_{i,j} e_i \otimes e'_j \mid \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq n \\ 1 \leq j \leq m}} a_i b_j z_{i,j} = 0 \right\}.$$

*Proof.* Let

$$P = \left\{ \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq n \\ 1 \leq j \leq m}} z_{i,j} e_i \otimes e'_j \mid \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq n \\ 1 \leq j \leq m}} a_i b_j z_{i,j} = 0 \right\}.$$

For any  $v = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i e_i \in \mathbb{F}^n$  and  $w = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq m} y_j e'_j \in \mathbb{F}^m$ , we have

$$v \otimes w = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq n \\ 1 \leq j \leq m}} x_i y_j e_i \otimes e'_j \in P$$

if and only if

$$\sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq n \\ 1 \leq j \leq m}} a_i b_j x_i y_j = \left( \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} a_i x_i \right) \left( \sum_{1 \leq j \leq m} b_j y_j \right) = 0.$$

Thus  $v \in H$  or  $w \in K$  implies  $v \otimes w \in P$ . Then  $H \otimes \mathbb{F}^m + \mathbb{F}^n \otimes K \subseteq P$ . Moreover,  $H \otimes \mathbb{F}^m + \mathbb{F}^n \otimes K = P$  since they are of the same dimension.  $\blacksquare$

The following proposition is a decomposition formula of the  $k$ -adjoint of reducible hyperplane arrangements.

**Proposition 2.5.** Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathbb{F}^n)$  and  $(\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{F}^m)$  be two hyperplane arrangements. Then we have

$$(\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B})^{(k)} = \prod_{i=0}^k \mathcal{A}^{(i)} \otimes \mathcal{B}^{(k-i)}.$$

In general, we have

$$(\mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{A}_q)^{(k)} = \prod_{i_1 + i_2 + \cdots + i_q = k} \mathcal{A}_1^{(i_1)} \otimes \mathcal{A}_2^{(i_2)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{A}_q^{(i_q)}.$$

*Proof.* Restricting the natural isomorphism in (2.6) to  $L_k(\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B})$ , we get the bijection

$$\pi^{-1}: L_k(\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}) \longrightarrow \bigcup_{i=0}^k L_i(\mathcal{A}) \times L_{k-i}(\mathcal{B}).$$

Given  $X \in L_k(\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B})$ , let

$$\pi^{-1}(X) = (Y, Z) \in L_\ell(\mathcal{A}) \times L_{k-\ell}(\mathcal{B})$$

for some  $\ell$ , and hence  $X = Y \oplus Z$ . Let  $A_Y$  and  $A_Z$  be matrix representatives of  $Y$  and  $Z$  respectively. Then we obtain a matrix representative of  $X$  given by

$$A_X = \underbrace{\left[ \begin{array}{cc} A_Y & O \\ O & A_Z \end{array} \right]}_{n+m} \left. \begin{array}{l} \vphantom{\left[ \begin{array}{cc} A_Y & O \\ O & A_Z \end{array} \right]} \\ \vphantom{\left[ \begin{array}{cc} A_Y & O \\ O & A_Z \end{array} \right]} \end{array} \right\} \begin{array}{l} n - \ell \\ m - (k - \ell) \end{array}$$

where  $O$  denotes the zero matrix of the corresponding size. For any  $J \in \binom{[n+m]}{k}$ , write  $J = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k\}$  with  $j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_k$ . Let  $J_1 = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_\ell\}$  and  $J_2 = \{j_{\ell+1}, j_{\ell+2}, \dots, j_k\}$ . Then, elementary linear algebra implies that

$$\Delta_{[n+m]-J}(A_X) = \begin{cases} \Delta_{[n]-J_1}(A_Y) \Delta_{[m]-(J_2-n)}(A_Z), & \text{if } j_\ell \leq n < j_{\ell+1}; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Here we use  $J_2 - n$  to denote the set obtained by decreasing all elements in  $J_2$  by  $n$ . Combining this with the definition of  $k$ -adjoint in (2.1), we get

$$\sigma X: (-1)^{k(k-\ell)} \sum_{I_1 \in \binom{[n]}{\ell}} \sum_{I_2 \in \binom{[m]}{k-\ell}} a_{I_1} b_{I_2} x_{I_1 \cup (I_2+n)} = 0,$$

where

$$a_{I_1} = (-1)^{\sum_{i_1 \in I_1} i_1 - \frac{1}{2}|I_1|(|I_1|+1)} \Delta_{[n]-I_1}(Y)$$

and

$$b_{I_2} = (-1)^{\sum_{i_2 \in I_2} i_2 - \frac{1}{2}|I_2|(|I_2|+1)} \Delta_{[m]-I_2}(Z).$$

By Lemma 2.4, we see that

$$\sigma X = \left( \sigma Y \otimes \mathbb{F}^{\binom{[m]}{k-\ell}} + \mathbb{F}^{\binom{[n]}{\ell}} \otimes \sigma Z \right) \oplus \left( \bigoplus_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq k \\ i \neq \ell}} \mathbb{F}^{\binom{[n]}{k-i}} \otimes \mathbb{F}^{\binom{[m]}{i}} \right),$$

which completes the proof. ■

We shall provide a concrete example of the  $k$ -adjoint. Recall that the Boolean arrangement in  $\mathbb{F}^n$  is defined as

$$B_n = \{x_i = 0 \mid i \in [n]\}. \quad (2.7)$$

**Corollary 2.6.** *The  $k$ -adjoint of Boolean arrangement  $B_n^{(k)}$  is isomorphic to the Boolean arrangement  $B_{\binom{n}{k}}$  in  $\mathbb{F}^{\binom{n}{k}}$ .*

*Proof.* Note that

$$B_n = \underbrace{B_1 \times B_1 \times \cdots \times B_1}_n.$$

Applying Proposition 2.5, the result follows from facts that  $B_1^{(0)} = B_1$ ,  $B_1^{(1)} = \emptyset$  and  $B_1 \otimes B_1 = B_1$ .  $\blacksquare$

*Example 2.7.* We illustrate by taking  $n = 4$  and  $k = 2$  and list all the subspaces of rank 2 in  $L(B_4)$  by its matrix representatives as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad X_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad X_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \\ X_4 &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad X_5 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad X_6 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of  $k$ -adjoint, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma X_1: x_{34} = 0, \quad \sigma X_2: -x_{24} = 0, \quad \sigma X_3: x_{23} = 0, \\ \sigma X_4: x_{14} = 0, \quad \sigma X_5: -x_{13} = 0, \quad \sigma X_6: x_{12} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

We see that  $B_4^{(2)}$  is indeed isomorphic to the Boolean arrangement  $B_6$ .

### 3 $\mathcal{A}$ -Decompositions of the Grassmannian and their Equivalence

This section focuses on elucidating three decompositions of the real Grassmannian via a given hyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$ . Inspired by the celebrated work of Gelfand, Goresky, MacPherson and Serganova [4], we shall introduce the  $\mathcal{A}$ -matroid decomposition and the refined  $\mathcal{A}$ -Schubert decomposition. The primary goal of this section is to establish the equivalence among the  $\mathcal{A}$ -matroid decomposition, the refined  $\mathcal{A}$ -Schubert decomposition, and our  $\mathcal{A}$ -adjoint decomposition, as shown in Theorem 1.2.

#### 3.1 Three $\mathcal{A}$ -Decompositions of the Grassmannian

Throughout this section, we assume that

$$\mathcal{A} = \{H_1, \dots, H_m\}$$

is a hyperplane arrangement in Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , where each  $H_i$  is given by its normal vector  $\alpha_i$  for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ , that is,

$$H_i = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle \alpha_i, v \rangle = 0\}$$



with  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  denoting the standard inner product in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . We now proceed to provide detailed definitions for the three  $\mathcal{A}$ -decompositions of the Grassmannian.

First, let us review the definition of the  $\mathcal{A}$ -adjoint decomposition as mentioned in the introduction. For any  $X \in L(\mathcal{A})$ , the relative interior of  $X$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  is defined by

$$\text{relint}(X) = \text{relint}_{\mathcal{A}}(X) = X - \bigcup_{X \not\subseteq H \in \mathcal{A}} H. \quad (3.1)$$

Then the ambient space  $\mathbb{R}^n$  can be written as the disjoint union of relative interior of  $X$  for  $X \in L(\mathcal{A})$ , that is,

$$\mathbb{R}^n = \bigsqcup_{X \in L(\mathcal{A})} \text{relint}(X).$$

Refer to [7, p. 410]. In particular, as we consider the  $k$ -adjoint arrangements in  $\mathbb{R}^{\binom{[n]}{k}}$ , we have

$$\mathbb{R}^{\binom{[n]}{k}} = \bigsqcup_{T \in L(\mathcal{A}^{(k)})} \text{relint}(T),$$

which induces the following decomposition of  $Gr(k, n)$ .

**Definition 3.1.** For any  $T \in L(\mathcal{A}^{(k)})$ , let

$$\mathcal{S}_T = \{U \in Gr(k, n) \mid \Delta(U) \in \text{relint}(T)\}.$$

Then we call

$$Gr(k, n) = \bigsqcup_{T \in L(\mathcal{A}^{(k)})} \mathcal{S}_T \quad (3.2)$$

the  $\mathcal{A}$ -adjoint decomposition of the Grassmannian and each  $\mathcal{S}_T$  is called an  $\mathcal{A}$ -adjoint stratum.

To define  $\mathcal{A}$ -matroid decomposition of the Grassmannian, recall that a *matroid*  $M$  on the set  $[m]$  is a “rank function” defined on all the subsets  $J \subseteq [m]$ , which satisfies the following matroid axioms:

- (R1)  $\text{rank}(\emptyset) = 0$ ,
- (R2)  $\text{rank}(I) \leq \text{rank}(J)$  if  $I \subseteq J$ ,
- (R3)  $\text{rank}(I \cup J) + \text{rank}(I \cap J) \leq \text{rank}(I) + \text{rank}(J)$ .

For a comprehensive introduction to matroids, consult [6]. We call  $\text{rank}([m])$  the *rank* of the matroid  $M$ , and it is conventionally denoted by  $\text{rank}(M)$ . A subset  $I$  of  $[m]$  is a *basis* of  $M$  if  $|I| = \text{rank}(I) = \text{rank}(M)$ . A matroid is called *loopless* if the rank of every singleton set is non-zero. For the remainder of this text, we always assume that the matroids under consideration are loopless. For  $U \in Gr(k, n)$ , the restriction of  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $U$  is a hyperplane arrangement in  $U$  defined by

$$\mathcal{A}|_U = \{U \cap H_i \mid U \not\subseteq H_i \in \mathcal{A}\}.$$

Each normal of  $U \cap H_i$  in  $U$  is given by the orthogonal projection of  $\alpha_i$  onto  $U$ , denoted by  $\beta_i = \text{Proj}_U(\alpha_i)$ . Thus, we obtain a rank- $k$  matroid  $M(\mathcal{A}|_U)$  on  $[m]$  with rank function

$$\text{rank}(J) = \text{rank}\{\beta_j \mid j \in J\}$$

for each  $J \subseteq [m]$ .

**Definition 3.2.** For any rank- $k$  matroid  $M$  on  $[m]$ , let

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{A}}(M) = \{U \in \text{Gr}(k, n) \mid M(\mathcal{A}|_U) = M\}.$$

Then the Grassmannian  $\text{Gr}(k, n)$  has the  $\mathcal{A}$ -matroid decomposition

$$\text{Gr}(k, n) = \bigsqcup_M \Omega_{\mathcal{A}}(M), \quad (3.3)$$

where  $M$  runs over all rank- $k$  matroids on  $[m]$ . Note that  $\Omega_{\mathcal{A}}(M)$  might be empty for some matroids  $M$ . Each  $\Omega_{\mathcal{A}}(M)$  is called an  $\mathcal{A}$ -matroid stratum.

From the above definition, for  $U_1, U_2 \in \Omega_{\mathcal{A}}(M)$ ,  $M(\mathcal{A}|_{U_1}) = M(\mathcal{A}|_{U_2})$  implies that both  $L(\mathcal{A}|_{U_1})$  and  $L(\mathcal{A}|_{U_2})$  are the same lattice, see [7, p. 425 Proposition 3.6]. Therefore, the  $\mathcal{A}$ -matroid decomposition (3.3) indeed gives a classification of lattices  $L(\mathcal{A}|_U)$  for all  $k$ -dimensional subspaces  $U$ . It also should be noted that if we take  $\mathcal{A}$  to be the Boolean arrangement  $B_n$  given in (2.7), the  $\mathcal{A}$ -matroid decomposition coincides with GGMS's matroid decomposition in [4, page 12, 1.2 Definition].

The last decomposition generalizes the classical Schubert decomposition by employing the hyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$ . Basic notation and concepts on Schubert decomposition can be found in [3]. The standard order on  $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$  yields the  $\mathcal{A}$ -flag

$$\mathbb{R}^n = F_0 \supseteq F_1 \supseteq F_2 \supseteq \dots \supseteq F_m = \{0\},$$

where  $F_i = F_i(\mathcal{A}) = \bigcap_{j=1}^i H_j$ . For a  $k$ -subset  $I = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k\}$  of  $[m]$  with elements ordered increasingly, we define the  $\mathcal{A}$ -Schubert cell determined by  $I$  as

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{A}}[I] = \left\{ U \in \text{Gr}(k, n) \mid \begin{array}{l} \dim(U \cap F_{i_{\ell-1}}) = k - \ell + 1 \\ \dim(U \cap F_{i_{\ell}}) = k - \ell \end{array} \right\}. \quad (3.4)$$

All these  $\mathcal{A}$ -Schubert cells together form a decomposition of the Grassmannian, that is,

$$\text{Gr}(k, n) = \bigsqcup_{I \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \Omega_{\mathcal{A}}[I], \quad (3.5)$$

which is called  $\mathcal{A}$ -Schubert decomposition. When  $\mathcal{A}$  is chosen as the Boolean arrangement  $B_n$ , the  $\mathcal{A}$ -Schubert cells are identical to the classical Schubert cells, making (3.5) the classical Schubert decomposition.

Now, for any permutation  $\sigma \in S_m$ , the new ordering  $\sigma(1) < \sigma(2) < \dots < \sigma(m)$  on  $[m]$  gives rise to a new  $\mathcal{A}$ -flag

$$\mathbb{R}^n = F_0^\sigma \supseteq F_1^\sigma \supseteq F_2^\sigma \supseteq \dots \supseteq F_m^\sigma = \{0\},$$

where  $F_i^\sigma = F_i^\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = \bigcap_{j=1}^i H_{\sigma(j)}$ . Thus we obtain a permuted  $\mathcal{A}$ -Schubert cells  $\Omega_{\mathcal{A}}^\sigma[I]$  by replacing  $F_i$  with  $F_i^\sigma$  in (3.4). As  $\sigma$  varying over all permutations, the common refinement of  $m!$  permuted  $\mathcal{A}$ -Schubert cells defines a decomposition of  $Gr(k, n)$  below.

**Definition 3.3.** For any map  $f: S_m \rightarrow \binom{[m]}{k}$ , let

$$C_f = \bigcap_{\sigma \in S_m} \Omega_{\mathcal{A}}^\sigma[f(\sigma)].$$

Then the  $\mathcal{A}$ -Schubert decomposition (3.5) induces the refined  $\mathcal{A}$ -Schubert decomposition as follows

$$Gr(k, n) = \bigsqcup_{f: S_m \rightarrow \binom{[m]}{k}} C_f. \quad (3.6)$$

## 3.2 Equivalence of Three $\mathcal{A}$ -Decompositions

This section is dedicated to proving Theorem 1.2, which establishes the equivalence between the  $\mathcal{A}$ -matroid decomposition, the  $\mathcal{A}$ -adjoint decomposition, and the refined  $\mathcal{A}$ -Schubert decomposition defined in the previous subsection. The proof will be divided into two parts. The equivalence between the  $\mathcal{A}$ -matroid decomposition and the  $\mathcal{A}$ -adjoint decomposition relies on some crucial lemmas. The proof of the equivalence between the  $\mathcal{A}$ -adjoint decomposition and the refined  $\mathcal{A}$ -Schubert decomposition is similar to the one in [4], and we provide a complete proof for the sake of self-containment of the paper.

For any  $U \in Gr(k, n)$ , we denote

$$L_U(\mathcal{A}) = \{X \in L(\mathcal{A}) \mid X \oplus U = \mathbb{R}^n\}.$$

We will see that  $L_U(\mathcal{A})$  plays a key role in the proof of the equivalence between the  $\mathcal{A}$ -matroid decomposition and the  $\mathcal{A}$ -adjoint decomposition. Several lemmas below discuss the properties of  $L_U(\mathcal{A})$ .

**Lemma 3.4.** For all  $U \in Gr(k, n)$ ,  $L_U(\mathcal{A}) \neq \emptyset$ .

*Proof.* We proceed to find an  $X \in L_k(\mathcal{A})$  such that  $X \oplus U = \mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_{n-k}$  be a basis of  $U^\perp$ . Since  $\mathcal{A}$  is essential, we can extend  $\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_{n-k}$  to a basis of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  by adding some normal vectors  $\alpha_{i_1}, \alpha_{i_2}, \dots, \alpha_{i_k}$  of hyperplanes in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Denote  $Y$  the subspace spanned by these normals. We set  $X = H_{i_1} \cap H_{i_2} \cap \dots \cap H_{i_k}$ . Then we have  $X = Y^\perp$  and  $Y \oplus U^\perp = \mathbb{R}^n$ . It follows that  $X \oplus U = \mathbb{R}^n$ , as desired.  $\blacksquare$

Note that the normal vectors of hyperplanes in  $\mathcal{A}|_U$  come from the orthogonal projection of the normal vectors of hyperplanes of  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $U$ . The following lemma gives a sufficient and necessary condition for some of these projective normals to be independent.

**Lemma 3.5.** Let  $U \in Gr(k, n)$  and  $J \subseteq [m]$ . Let  $\beta_j = \text{Proj}_U(\alpha_j)$  be the orthogonal projection of  $\alpha_j$  on  $U$  for each  $j \in J$ . Then  $\{\beta_j\}_{j \in J}$  is linearly independent in  $U$  if and only if

$$\dim \left( U \cap \bigcap_{j \in J} H_j \right) = k - |J|. \quad (3.7)$$

*Proof.* Assume that  $\{\beta_j\}_{j \in J}$  is linearly independent in  $U$ . We denote by  $W = \text{span}\{\beta_j \mid j \in J\}$  the subspace of  $U$ . For any  $\gamma \in W \cap \bigcap_{j \in J} H_j$ , we have

$$0 = \langle \gamma, \alpha_j \rangle = \langle \text{Proj}_U(\gamma), \alpha_j \rangle = \langle \gamma, \text{Proj}_U(\alpha_j) \rangle = \langle \gamma, \beta_j \rangle$$

for all  $j \in J$ . Hence  $\gamma \in W^\perp$ , which implies that  $\gamma = 0$  and so

$$W \cap \bigcap_{j \in J} H_j = \{0\}.$$

Then the dimension formula in  $U$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \left( U \cap \bigcap_{j \in J} H_j \right) &= \dim \left( W + \left( U \cap \bigcap_{j \in J} H_j \right) \right) + \dim \left( W \cap \left( U \cap \bigcap_{j \in J} H_j \right) \right) - \dim(W) \\ &\leq k - |J|, \end{aligned}$$

Obviously,  $\dim \left( U \cap \bigcap_{j \in J} H_j \right) \geq k - |J|$ , which makes the equality in (3.7) hold.

Conversely, we assume that (3.7) holds. Invoking dimension formula again, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \left( \bigcap_{j \in J} H_j \right) &= \dim \left( U + \bigcap_{j \in J} H_j \right) + \dim \left( U \cap \bigcap_{j \in J} H_j \right) - \dim U \\ &\leq n + (k - |J|) - k = n - |J|. \end{aligned}$$

Also  $n - |J| \leq \dim \left( \bigcap_{j \in J} H_j \right)$ . So we have  $\{\alpha_j \mid j \in J\}$  is linearly independent and

$$\mathbb{R}^n = U + \bigcap_{j \in J} H_j. \quad (3.8)$$

Next we show that  $\{\beta_j \mid j \in J\}$  is also linearly independent. Suppose that

$$\sum_{j \in J} b_j \beta_j = 0 \quad (3.9)$$

for  $b_j \in \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $\alpha = \sum_{j \in J} b_j \alpha_j$ . It follows from (3.9) that  $\text{Proj}_U(\alpha) = 0$ , that is,  $\alpha \in U^\perp$ . It is also easy to see that  $\alpha \in \left(\bigcap_{j \in J} H_j\right)^\perp$ . Hence we have

$$\alpha \in U^\perp \cap \left(\bigcap_{j \in J} H_j\right)^\perp = \left(U + \bigcap_{j \in J} H_j\right)^\perp = \{0\},$$

where the last equality is due to (3.8). Thus we have  $\alpha = 0$ . It follows that  $b_j = 0$  for all  $j \in J$ , since  $\{\alpha_i \mid i \in J\}$  is linearly independent. This complete the proof.  $\blacksquare$

**Corollary 3.6.** *Given  $U \in \text{Gr}(k, n)$ , a subset  $J \subseteq [m]$  forms a basis of  $M(\mathcal{A}|_U)$  if and only if  $\bigcap_{j \in J} H_j \in L_U(\mathcal{A})$ .*

It is known that the lattice  $L(\mathcal{A}|_U)$  is exactly the same as the lattice of flats of  $M(\mathcal{A}|_U)$ , see [7, p. 425 Proposition 3.6]. Hence Corollary 3.6 implies the lattice  $L(\mathcal{A}|_U)$  is uniquely determined by the set  $L_U(\mathcal{A})$ . Now we arrive at a proof of Theorem 1.2.

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* First, we show that  $\mathcal{A}$ -adjoint decomposition of  $\text{Gr}(k, n)$  is equivalent to  $\mathcal{A}$ -matroid decomposition. We take some  $U \in \mathcal{S}_T$  for a non-empty stratum  $\mathcal{S}_T$  in the  $\mathcal{A}$ -adjoint decomposition. The definition of  $\text{relint}_{\mathcal{A}^{(k)}}(T)$  in (3.1) gives that

$$U \in \mathcal{S}_T \iff \begin{cases} \Delta(U) \in \sigma X, & \text{if } T \subseteq \sigma X; \\ \Delta(U) \notin \sigma X, & \text{if } T \not\subseteq \sigma X. \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 2.2, we see that  $X \in L_U(\mathcal{A})$  if and only if  $\Delta(U) \notin \sigma X$ . Hence the relation above is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} U \in \mathcal{S}_T &\iff \begin{cases} X \notin L_U(\mathcal{A}), & \text{if } T \subseteq \sigma X; \\ X \in L_U(\mathcal{A}), & \text{if } T \not\subseteq \sigma X. \end{cases} \\ &\iff L_U(\mathcal{A}) = \{X \in L_k(\mathcal{A}) \mid T \not\subseteq \sigma X\} \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

So  $L_U(\mathcal{A})$  is independent of the choice of  $U \in \mathcal{S}_T$ . It follows from Corollary 3.6 that  $M(\mathcal{A}|_U)$  is invariant as  $U$  runs over  $\mathcal{S}_T$ .

Next we show the equivalence between the  $\mathcal{A}$ -matroid decomposition and the refined  $\mathcal{A}$ -Schubert decomposition. For a non-empty stratum  $C_f$  in the refined  $\mathcal{A}$ -Schubert decomposition (3.3), choose some

$$U \in C_f = \bigcap_{\sigma \in S_m} \Omega_{\mathcal{A}}^\sigma[f(\sigma)].$$

We proceed to demonstrate that the rank function of  $M(\mathcal{A}|_U)$  is completely determined by  $f$ . For any subset  $J$  of  $[m]$  with its elements ordered increasingly, there exists a  $\tau \in S_m$  such that

$$J = \{\tau(1), \tau(2), \dots, \tau(|J|)\}. \quad (3.11)$$

Set  $f(\tau) = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k\}$  in increasing order, then there exists a unique  $s$  such that  $i_s \leq |J| < i_{s+1}$ , where we adopt the convention that  $i_0 = 0$  and  $i_{m+1} = m + 1$ . Since  $U \in C_f \subseteq \Omega_{\mathcal{A}}^\tau[f(\tau)]$ , we obtain that

$$\text{rank}_{M(\mathcal{A}|U)}(J) = k - \dim(U \cap F_{i_s}^\tau) = s. \quad (3.12)$$

Notice that (3.12) is independent of the choice of permutations satisfying (3.11). Indeed, given another permutation  $\tau' \in S_m$  with  $J = \{\tau'(1), \tau'(2), \dots, \tau'(|J|)\}$ , we set  $f(\tau') = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k\}$  and let  $t$  be the unique integer satisfying  $j_t \leq |J| < j_{t+1}$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} s &= k - \dim(U \cap F_{i_s}^\tau) = k - \dim\left(U \cap \bigcap_{\ell=1}^{|J|} H_{\tau(\ell)}\right) \\ &= k - \dim\left(U \cap \bigcap_{\ell=1}^{|J|} H_{\tau'(\ell)}\right) \\ &= k - \dim(U \cap F_{j_t}^{\tau'}) \\ &= t. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore all the subspaces  $U \in C_f$  will give rise to the same matroid.

Conversely, for each non-empty matroid stratum  $\Omega_{\mathcal{A}}(M)$  in the  $\mathcal{A}$ -matroid decomposition (3.1), we take  $U \in \Omega_{\mathcal{A}}(M)$ . Given  $\sigma \in S_m$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , we have

$$\text{rank}_{M(\mathcal{A}|U)}(\sigma(1), \sigma(2), \dots, \sigma(i)) = k - \dim(U \cap F_i^\sigma).$$

This shows that  $\dim(U \cap F_i^\sigma)$  are determined by  $M$  for all  $i$ . Now we set  $f(\sigma) = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k\}$ , where each  $i_\ell$  satisfies that

$$\dim(U \cap F_{i_\ell}^\sigma) = \dim(U \cap F_{i_{\ell-1}}^\sigma) - 1.$$

Thus  $\Omega_{\mathcal{A}}(M) \subseteq \Omega_{\mathcal{A}}^\sigma[f(\sigma)]$ . If we allow  $\sigma$  to vary, then we obtain a map  $f$  from  $S_m$  to  $\binom{[m]}{k}$  such that

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{A}}(M) \subseteq \bigcap_{\sigma \in S_m} \Omega_{\mathcal{A}}^\sigma[f(\sigma)] = C_f.$$

This completes the proof. ■

## 4 Combinatorial invariants

In this section, we will present a proof of Theorem 1.3, which establishes the anti-monotonicity property of the independent numbers and Whitney numbers as they vary across different  $\mathcal{A}$ -adjoint strata.

We place our problem within the framework of matroid theory. The concepts of matroids, matroid bases and rank function have already been recalled in Section 3.1. Let  $M$

be a matroid on  $[m]$  with  $\mathbf{B}$  the collection of all its bases. Any subset of a basis is called an independent set, while a dependent set is a subset that is not independent. A circuit is a minimal dependent set, and a flat is a subset of  $[m]$  whose rank increase when adding any other element. It is known that the collection of all flats of  $M$ , ordered by inclusion, forms a lattice  $L(M)$  with a unique minimal element  $\hat{0}$ , i.e., the intersection of all flats. An independent set of  $M$  is called a *broken circuit* if it is obtained from a circuit of  $M$  by removing its maximal element under a given total order. The *characteristic polynomial*  $\chi_M(t)$  of  $M$  is

$$\chi_M(t) = \sum_{x \in L(M)} \mu(\hat{0}, x) t^{k - \text{rank}(x)} = \sum_{i=0}^k w_i t^{k-i},$$

where  $k = \text{rank}(M)$  and  $\mu$  is the Möbius function of  $L(M)$ . Each coefficient  $w_i(M)$  is called the  *$i$ -th Whitney number of the first kind*. Whitney's celebrated NBC (no-broken-circuit) theorem [8] gives a combinatorial interpretation on the Whitney number of the first kind.

**Theorem 4.1** (NBC Theorem [7]). *Let  $M$  be a matroid on  $[m]$ . Then  $|w_i(M)|$  is the number of independent  $i$ -set of  $M$  containing no broken circuit for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$ .*

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  be matroids on  $[m]$ , each with the collection of all bases  $\mathbf{B}_1$  and  $\mathbf{B}_2$ , respectively. If  $\mathbf{B}_1 \supseteq \mathbf{B}_2$ , then we have*

- (1)  $I_i(M_1) \geq I_i(M_2)$ ;
- (2)  $|w_i(M_1)| \geq |w_i(M_2)|$ ,

where  $I_i$  is the independent number of size  $i$  and  $w_i$  is the  $i$ -th Whitney number of the first kind.

*Proof.* The first assertion is clear since any  $i$ -subset of a basis in  $\mathbf{B}_2$  also belongs to a basis in  $\mathbf{B}_1$ . For the second assertion, note that each dependent set of  $M_1$  is dependent in  $M_2$ . Take any circuit  $c_1$  of  $M_1$ , then  $c_1$  is dependent in  $M_2$ . Hence, there exists a circuit  $c_2$  of  $M_2$  contained in  $c_1$ . It follows that each broken circuit of  $M_1$  has a subset which is a broken circuit of  $M_2$ . It means that any subset containing a broken circuit of  $M_1$  must contain a broken circuit of  $M_2$ . Equivalently, any subset containing no broken circuit of  $M_2$  does not contain broken circuit of  $M_1$ . By Whitney's NBC (no-broken-circuit) theorem, we have  $|w_i(M_1)| \geq |w_i(M_2)|$ . ■

Given a hyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A} = \{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m\}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , the linear relations of all its normals give rise to a matroid on  $[m]$ . Note that  $L(M)$  is consistent with  $L(\mathcal{A})$ , and thus the related concepts in the hyperplane arrangement, such as independence number and characteristic polynomial, are naturally inherited from  $M(\mathcal{A})$ . Now we are prepared to prove Theorem 1.3.

*Proof of Theorem 1.3.* We claim that  $L_{U_2}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq L_{U_1}(\mathcal{A})$ . Recall that in the proof of Theorem 1.2, for  $j = 1, 2$  we have

$$U_j \in \mathcal{S}_{T_j} \iff L_{U_j}(\mathcal{A}) = \{X \in L_k(\mathcal{A}) \mid T_j \not\subseteq \sigma X\}. \quad (4.1)$$

For any  $X \in L_{U_2}(\mathcal{A})$ ,  $T_2 \not\subseteq \sigma X$  by (4.1). It follows from  $T_2 \subseteq T_1$  that  $T_1 \not\subseteq \sigma X$ . So we have  $X \in L_{U_1}(\mathcal{A})$  as claimed. To prove Theorem 1.3, it suffices to show that each basis of  $M(\mathcal{A}|_{U_2})$  is a basis of  $M(\mathcal{A}|_{U_1})$  in accordance with Lemma 4.2. For any basis  $J$  of  $M(\mathcal{A}|_{U_2})$ ,  $\bigcap_{j \in J} H_j \in L_{U_2}(\mathcal{A})$  by Corollary 3.6. Since  $L_{U_2}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq L_{U_1}(\mathcal{A})$ , it follows that  $J$  also serves as a basis for  $M(\mathcal{A}|_{U_1})$ , again by Corollary 3.6. The proof is complete. ■

**Acknowledgments.** This work was done under the auspices of the National Science Foundation of China (12101613).

## References

- [1] Bixby, R. E., Coullard, C. R.: Adjoints of binary matroids. *European J. Combin.* 9, no. 2, 139–147 (1988)
- [2] Chen, B., Fu, H., Wang, S.: Parallel translates of represented matroids. (English summary) *Adv. in Appl. Math.* 127, Paper No. 102176, 11 pp. (2021)
- [3] Fulton, W.: *Young tableaux. With applications to representation theory and geometry.* London Mathematical Society Student Texts, 35. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (1997)
- [4] Gel'fand, I. M., Goresky, R. M., MacPherson, R. D. and Serganova, V. V.: Combinatorial geometries, convex polyhedra, and Schubert cells. *Adv. in Math.* 63, no. 3, 301–316 (1987).
- [5] Orlik, P., Terao, H.: *Arrangements of hyperplanes.* Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences, 300. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (1992)
- [6] Oxley, J.: *Matroid theory.* Second edition. Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 21. Oxford University Press, Oxford, (2011)
- [7] Stanley, R. P.: *An introduction to hyperplane arrangements.* Geometric combinatorics, 389–496, IAS/Park City Math. Ser., 13, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, (2007)
- [8] Whitney, H.: A logical expansion in mathematics. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 38, no. 8, 572–579, (1932)