

ON CONNECTED SUBGRAPH ARRANGEMENTS

LORENZO GIORDANI, TILMAN MÖLLER, PAUL MÜCKSCH, AND GERHARD RÖHRLE

ABSTRACT. In [CK24], Cuntz and Kühne introduced a particular class of hyperplane arrangements stemming from a given graph, so called *connected subgraph arrangements*. In this note we strengthen some of the result from [CK24] and prove new ones for members of this class. For instance, we show that aspherical members withing this class stem from a rather restricted set of graphs. Specifically, if \mathcal{A}_G is an aspherical connected subgraph arrangement, then \mathcal{A}_G is free with the unique possible exception when the underlying graph G is the complete graph on 4 nodes.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction and Main Results	1
2. Preliminaries	4
3. Projective Uniquenes: Proof of Theorem 1.2	12
4. Accuracy: Proof of Theorem 1.4	14
5. Inductive Freeness: Evidence for Conjecture 1.5	15
6. Inductive Factoredness: Proof of Theorem 1.7	15
7. Aspherical \mathcal{A}_G : Proof of Theorem 1.8	18
8. Combinatorial Formality: Proof of Theorem 1.9	22
9. On ideal subarrangements of \mathcal{A}_G	23
10. Rank-generating functions of the poset of regions	26
Acknowledgments	28
References	28

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

In [CK24], Cuntz and Kühne introduced a special class of hyperplane arrangements stemming from a given graph, so called *connected subgraph arrangements*. They include such prominent classes as the braid arrangements and resonance arrangements among many others. In this

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 52C35, 14N20, 20F55; Secondary 32S22.

Key words and phrases. free arrangements, factored arrangements, formal arrangements, $K(\pi, 1)$ arrangements.

note we strengthen some of the result proved in [CK24] and prove some new theorems for members of this class.

We first recall the definition from [CK24]. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let \mathbb{K} be a field and let $V = \mathbb{K}^n$. Let x_1, \dots, x_n be the dual basis in V^* of the standard \mathbb{K} -basis of V . Let $G = (N, E)$ be an undirected graph with vertex set $N = [n]$ and edge set E . For $I \subseteq N$, let $G[I]$ be the induced subgraph of G on the set of vertices I . For $I \subseteq N$, define the hyperplane

$$H_I := \ker \sum_{i \in I} x_i.$$

Definition 1.1. With the notation as above, the *connected subgraph arrangement* $\mathcal{A}_G(\mathbb{K})$ in V is defined as

$$\mathcal{A}_G(\mathbb{K}) := \{H_I \mid \emptyset \neq I \subseteq N \text{ if } G[I] \text{ is connected}\}.$$

In case $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{Q}$, we write $\mathcal{A}_G := \mathcal{A}_G(\mathbb{Q})$.

In [CK24], Cuntz and Kühne classified all connected subgraph arrangements over \mathbb{Q} which are free, factored, simplicial or supersolvable. The purpose of this note is firstly to strengthen several of these results and secondly to prove new ones.

All properties of arrangements we study in this note are compatible with the product construction for arrangements. For a simple graph G , the connected subgraph arrangement \mathcal{A}_G is the product of the connected subgraph arrangements stemming from the connected components of G . Thus there is no harm in assuming that G is connected throughout.

A property for arrangements is said to be *combinatorial* if it only depends on the intersection lattice of the underlying arrangement. Our first main theorem shows that the class of connected subgraph arrangements is very special in the sense that essentially every property we may formulate for members of this class is combinatorial. This is formally captured by the notion of projective uniqueness, see Definition 3.1.

Theorem 1.2. *Let G be a connected graph. Then \mathcal{A}_G is projectively unique.*

Theorem 1.2 implies that for the class of all rational arrangements whose underlying matroid admits a realization over \mathbb{Q} as a connected subgraph arrangement freeness is combinatorial. In particular, Terao's conjecture over \mathbb{Q} is valid within this class, cf. [Z90, Prop. 2.3]. Likewise, asphericity is combinatorial within this class. Whether both these properties are combinatorial in general are longstanding and wide open problems, see [OT92, Conj. 4.138] and [FR00, Prob. 3.8].

Theorem 1.2 is proved in Section 3. The results there show that the theorem holds for any fixed field \mathbb{K} .

In [CK24, Thm. 1.6] Cuntz and Kühne classified all free members among the \mathcal{A}_G :

Theorem 1.3. *The connected subgraph arrangement \mathcal{A}_G is free if and only if G is a path-graph, a cycle-graph, an almost-path-graph, or a path-with-triangle-graph (Definition 2.1).*

We strengthen Theorem 1.3 as follows, where we look at the stronger freeness property of *accuracy*, see Definition 2.10.

Theorem 1.4. *The arrangement \mathcal{A}_G is free if and only if it is accurate.*

Thanks to Theorem 1.2, the concept of accuracy is combinatorial with the class of connected subgraph arrangements. It is not clear whether this notion is combinatorial in general, see [MRT24, Rem. 1.3(ii)]. Theorem 1.4 is proved in §4.

While it follows from Theorem 1.2 that freeness within the class of connected subgraph arrangements is a combinatorial property, it is viable to ask whether each of the families among the free connected subgraph arrangements belongs to a general class satisfying a stronger combinatorial freeness property. For instance, if G is a cycle graph or a path graph, then \mathcal{A}_G is inductively free [CK24, Prop. 3.1, Cor. 8.11]. For the notion of *inductive freeness*, see Definition 2.4. Moreover, thanks to [CK24, Thm. 4.1], \mathcal{A}_G is MAT-free for $G = A_{n,k}$. For the notion of *MAT-freeness* freeness, see Definition 2.8. MAT-freeness is a combinatorial property for arrangements, [CM20, Lem. 18]. Cuntz and Mücksch raised the question whether MAT-freeness implies inductive freeness [CM20, Ques. 3]. This appears to be the case for the class of connected subgraph arrangements. For, computational evidence up to rank 8 suggests the following strengthening of Theorem 1.3.

Conjecture 1.5. *The arrangement \mathcal{A}_G is free if and only if it is inductively free.*

It is not known whether the family \mathcal{A}_G , where $G = \Delta_{n,k}$ is a path-with-triangle-graph (Definition 2.1) satisfies a stronger combinatorial freeness property. We give further evidence for Conjecture 1.5 in §5.

Note, an analogue of Theorem 1.3 for free multiplicities on \mathcal{A}_G is studied in [MRW24].

In [CK24, Thm. 1.8(1)] Cuntz and Kühne classified all factored members among the connected subgraph arrangements.

Theorem 1.6. *The connected subgraph arrangement \mathcal{A}_G is factored if and only if either G is a path graph P_n or a path-with-triangle graph $\Delta_{n,1}$ for $n \geq 2$.*

We strengthen Theorem 1.6 as follows.

Theorem 1.7. *The arrangement \mathcal{A}_G is factored if and only if it is inductively factored.*

For the notions of factoredness and inductive factoredness, see Definitions 2.13 and 2.22. Theorem 1.7 is proved in §6.

Recall the graphs G from Theorem 1.3 (Definition 2.1). If $G = P_n$, then \mathcal{A}_G is supersolvable ([CK24, Thm. 1.8(2)]), so it is $K(\pi, 1)$, by [OT92, Prop. 5.12, Thm. 5.113]. Moreover, \mathcal{A}_{C_3} is factored, so is also $K(\pi, 1)$, owing to [Pa95]. In general, \mathcal{A}_G is not $K(\pi, 1)$. Indeed, the following theorem shows that the graphs G of possible aspherical connected subgraph arrangements \mathcal{A}_G are extremely restricted.

In general, $K(\pi, 1)$ arrangements need not be free, e.g. see [OT92, Fig. 5.4]. However, for connected subgraph arrangements, this does seem to be the case.

Theorem 1.8. *If \mathcal{A}_G is $K(\pi, 1)$, then \mathcal{A}_G is free with the possible exception when $G = K_4$.*

While \mathcal{A}_{K_4} is not free, it is unknown at present whether \mathcal{A}_{K_4} is $K(\pi, 1)$. Theorem 1.8 is proved in §7.

A hyperplane arrangement is called formal provided all linear dependencies among the defining forms of the hyperplanes are generated by ones corresponding to intersections of codimension two. The significance of this notion stems from the fact that complex arrangements with aspherical complements are formal, [FR87, Thm. 4.2]. In addition, free arrangements are known to be formal, [Y93, Cor. 2.5], and factored arrangements are formal, [MMR24, Thm. 1.1]. In our next result we show that any connected subgraph arrangement \mathcal{A}_G is combinatorially formal, see Definition 8.1.

Theorem 1.9. *For a fixed field \mathbb{K} , $\mathcal{A}_G(\mathbb{K})$ is combinatorially formal.*

The proof of this theorem which is presented in §8 is based on results from [MMR24]. Note that Theorem 1.9 is false for general 0/1-arrangements, as, for instance, the generic rational 3-arrangement given by $Q(\mathcal{A}) = xyz(x + y + z)$ is clearly not formal.

In our final section §9 we investigate ideal subarrangements $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ of the connected subgraph arrangements \mathcal{A}_G when G is an almost path graph $A_{n,k}$. For instance, generalizing [CK24, Thm. 4.1], in Proposition 9.2 we show that each ideal subarrangement $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ of $\mathcal{A}_{A_{n,k}}$ is also MAT-free. We go on to determine certain subarrangement $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ of $\mathcal{A}_{A_{n,k}}$ which are inductively factored and $K(\pi, 1)$, see Proposition 9.8.

For general information about arrangements we refer the reader to [OT92].

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Hyperplane arrangements. Let $V = \mathbb{C}^n$ be an n -dimensional complex vector space. A *hyperplane arrangement* is a pair (\mathcal{A}, V) , where \mathcal{A} is a finite collection of hyperplanes in V . Usually, we simply write \mathcal{A} in place of (\mathcal{A}, V) .

The *lattice* $L(\mathcal{A})$ of \mathcal{A} is the set of subspaces of V of the form $H_1 \cap \dots \cap H_i$ where $\{H_1, \dots, H_i\}$ is a subset of \mathcal{A} . For $X \in L(\mathcal{A})$, we have two associated arrangements, firstly $\mathcal{A}_X := \{H \in \mathcal{A} \mid X \subseteq H\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, the *localization of \mathcal{A} at X* , and secondly, the *restriction of \mathcal{A} to X* , (\mathcal{A}^X, X) , where $\mathcal{A}^X := \{X \cap H \mid H \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_X\}$. The lattice $L(\mathcal{A})$ is a partially ordered set by reverse inclusion: $X \leq Y$ provided $Y \subseteq X$ for $X, Y \in L(\mathcal{A})$.

Throughout, we only consider arrangements \mathcal{A} such that $0 \in H$ for each H in \mathcal{A} . These are called *central*. In that case the *center* $T(\mathcal{A}) := \bigcap_{H \in \mathcal{A}} H$ of \mathcal{A} is the unique maximal element in $L(\mathcal{A})$ with respect to the partial order. A *rank* function on $L(\mathcal{A})$ is given by $r(X) := \text{codim}_V(X)$. The *rank* of \mathcal{A} is defined as $r(\mathcal{A}) := r(T(\mathcal{A}))$.

Following [CK24, §2.3], we call a rational arrangement \mathcal{A} a *0/1-arrangement* if all hyperplanes in \mathcal{A} are of the form $H_I = \ker \sum_{i \in I} x_i$ for some $I \subseteq [n]$. Of course, by Definition 1.1, connected subgraph arrangements are 0/1-arrangements.


The following families of graphs play a central role in the investigation of free simple connected subgraph arrangements. They are equally crucial for our study.

Definition 2.1 ([CK24]).


- The *path-graph* P_n on n vertices.




- The *almost-path-graph* $A_{n,k}$ on $n + 1$ vertices, where $1 \leq k \leq n$. Draw a path-graph on n vertices, add an additional vertex $n + 1$, and connect the vertices k and $n + 1$ by an edge.



- The *cycle-graph* C_n on n vertices. Draw n vertices and connect vertex 1 and 2, 2 and 3, \dots , n and 1.



- The *path-with-triangle-graph* $\Delta_{n,k}$, where $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$. Draw a path-graph on n vertices, add an additional vertex $n + 1$, and connect the vertices k and $n + 1$ by an edge as well as the vertices $k + 1$ and $n + 1$.



2.2. Free arrangements. Free arrangements play a crucial role in the theory of arrangements; see [OT92, §4] for the definition and basic properties. If \mathcal{A} is free, then we can associate with \mathcal{A} the multiset of its *exponents*, denoted $\text{exp } \mathcal{A}$. We sometimes write $(e_1, \dots, e_\ell)_\leq$ for the ordered set of exponents, i.e. to indicate that $e_1 \leq e_2 \leq \dots \leq e_\ell$.

Terao's *Factorization Theorem* [Ter81] shows that the Poincaré polynomial of a free arrangement \mathcal{A} factors into linear terms given by the exponents of \mathcal{A} (cf. [OT92, Thm. 4.137]):

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose that \mathcal{A} is free with $\exp \mathcal{A} = \{b_1, \dots, b_\ell\}$. Then*

$$\pi(\mathcal{A}, t) = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} (1 + b_i t).$$

Terao's celebrated *Addition-Deletion Theorem* [Ter80] plays a fundamental role in the study of free arrangements, [OT92, Thm. 4.51].

Theorem 2.3. *Suppose that $\mathcal{A} \neq \Phi_\ell$. Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}'')$ be a triple of arrangements. Then any two of the following statements imply the third:*

- (i) \mathcal{A} is free with $\exp \mathcal{A} = \{b_1, \dots, b_{\ell-1}, b_\ell\}$;
- (ii) \mathcal{A}' is free with $\exp \mathcal{A}' = \{b_1, \dots, b_{\ell-1}, b_\ell - 1\}$;
- (iii) \mathcal{A}'' is free with $\exp \mathcal{A}'' = \{b_1, \dots, b_{\ell-1}\}$.

Theorem 2.3 motivates the notion of an *inductively free* arrangement, [OT92, Def. 4.53].

Definition 2.4. The class \mathcal{IF} of *inductively free* arrangements is the smallest class of arrangements subject to

- (i) $\Phi_\ell \in \mathcal{IF}$ for each $\ell \geq 0$;
- (ii) if there exists a hyperplane $H_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ such that both \mathcal{A}' and \mathcal{A}'' belong to \mathcal{IF} , and $\exp \mathcal{A}'' \subseteq \exp \mathcal{A}'$, then \mathcal{A} also belongs to \mathcal{IF} .

Clearly, inductively free arrangements are free. However, the latter class properly contains the former, cf. [OT92, Ex. 4.59].

Remark 2.5. It is possible to describe an inductively free arrangement \mathcal{A} by means of a so called *induction table*, cf. [OT92, §4.3, p. 119]. In this process we start with an inductively free arrangement and add hyperplanes successively ensuring that part (ii) of Definition 2.4 is satisfied. This process is referred to as *induction of hyperplanes*. This procedure amounts to choosing a total order on \mathcal{A} , say $\mathcal{A} = \{H_1, \dots, H_m\}$, so that each of the subarrangements $\mathcal{A}_i := \{H_1, \dots, H_i\}$ and each of the restrictions $\mathcal{A}_i^{H_i}$ is inductively free for $i = 1, \dots, m$. In the associated induction table we record in the i -th row the information of the i -th step of this process, by listing $\exp \mathcal{A}'_i = \exp \mathcal{A}_{i-1}, H_i$, as well as $\exp \mathcal{A}''_i = \exp \mathcal{A}_i^{H_i}$, for $i = 1, \dots, m$.

2.3. MAT-Free arrangements. Next we recall the so-called Multiple Addition Theorem (MAT) from [ABC⁺16].

Theorem 2.6 ([ABC⁺16, Thm. 3.1]). *Let $\mathcal{A}' = (\mathcal{A}', V)$ be a free arrangement with $\exp(\mathcal{A}') = (e_1, \dots, e_\ell)_\leq$ and let $1 \leq p \leq \ell$ be the multiplicity of the highest exponent, i.e.*

$$e_1 \leq e_2 \leq \dots \leq e_{\ell-p} < e_{\ell-p+1} = \dots = e_\ell =: e.$$

Let H_1, \dots, H_q be hyperplanes in V with $H_i \notin \mathcal{A}'$ for $i = 1, \dots, q$. Define

$$\mathcal{A}''_j := (\mathcal{A}' \cup \{H_j\})^{H_j} = \{H \cap H_j \mid H \in \mathcal{A}'\}, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, q.$$

Assume that the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1) $X := H_1 \cap \cdots \cap H_q$ is q -codimensional.
- (2) $X \not\subseteq \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{A}'} H$.
- (3) $|\mathcal{A}'| - |\mathcal{A}''_j| = e$ for $1 \leq j \leq q$.

Then $q \leq p$ and $\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{A}' \cup \{H_1, \dots, H_q\}$ is free with

$$\exp(\mathcal{A}) = (e_1, \dots, e_{\ell-q}, e+1, \dots, e+1)_{\leq}.$$

We often consider the addition of several hyperplanes using Theorem 2.6. This motivates the next terminology.

Definition 2.7. Let \mathcal{A}' and $\{H_1, \dots, H_q\}$ be as in Theorem 2.6 such that conditions (1)–(3) are satisfied. Then the addition of $\{H_1, \dots, H_q\}$ to \mathcal{A}' resulting in $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}' \cup \{H_1, \dots, H_q\}$ is called an *MAT-step*.

An iterative application of Theorem 2.6 motivates the following natural concept.

Definition 2.8 ([CM20, Def. 3.2, Lem. 3.8]). An arrangement \mathcal{A} is called *MAT-free* if there exists an ordered partition

$$\pi = (\pi_1 | \cdots | \pi_n)$$

of \mathcal{A} such that the following hold. Set $\mathcal{A}_0 := \emptyset_{\ell}$ and

$$\mathcal{A}_k := \bigcup_{i=1}^k \pi_i \quad \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq n.$$

Then for every $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ suppose that

- (1) $\text{rk}(\pi_{k+1}) = |\pi_{k+1}|$,
- (2) $\bigcap_{H \in \pi_{k+1}} H \not\subseteq \bigcup_{H' \in \mathcal{A}_k} H'$,
- (3) $|\mathcal{A}_k| - |(\mathcal{A}_k \cup \{H\})^H| = k$ for each $H \in \pi_{k+1}$,

i.e. $\mathcal{A}_{k+1} = \mathcal{A}_k \cup \pi_{k+1}$ is an MAT-step.

An ordered partition π with these properties is called an *MAT-partition* for \mathcal{A} .

Remark 2.9. Suppose that \mathcal{A} is MAT-free with MAT-partition $\pi = (\pi_1 | \cdots | \pi_n)$. Then we have:

- (a) for each $1 \leq k \leq n$, \mathcal{A}_k is MAT-free with MAT-partition $(\pi_1 | \cdots | \pi_k)$,
- (b) \mathcal{A} is free and the exponents $\exp(\mathcal{A}) = (e_1, \dots, e_{\ell})_{\leq}$ of \mathcal{A} are given by the block sizes of the dual partition of π :

$$e_i := |\{k \mid |\pi_k| \geq \ell - i + 1\}|,$$

- (c) $|\pi_1| > |\pi_2| \geq \cdots \geq |\pi_n|$.

Proof. Statement (a) is clear by Definition 2.8. Statements (b) and (c) follow readily from Theorem 2.6 and a simple induction. \square

2.4. Accurate arrangements. We also consider the following stronger notion of freeness from [MR21].

Definition 2.10. A free arrangement \mathcal{A} with $\exp(\mathcal{A}) = (e_1 \leq e_2 \leq \dots \leq e_\ell)$ is *accurate*, if for every $1 \leq d \leq \ell$, there exists an intersection $X_d \in L(\mathcal{A})$ of dimension d such that the restriction \mathcal{A}^{X_d} is free with $\exp(\mathcal{A}^{X_d}) = (e_1 \leq e_2 \leq \dots \leq e_d)$.

The main theorem in [MR21, Thm. 1.2] shows that MAT-freeness implies *accuracy*. It is also known that the braid arrangement \mathcal{A}_G for G a path graph is accurate, [MR21, Thm. 1.6]. In [CK24, Thm. 4.1], the authors show that \mathcal{A}_G is MAT-free for $G = A_{n,k}$.

2.5. Nice arrangements. The notion of a *nice* or *factored* arrangement goes back to Terao [Ter92]. It generalizes the concept of a supersolvable arrangement. We recall the relevant notions and results from [Ter92] (cf. [OT92, §2.3]).

Definition 2.11. Let $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_s)$ be a partition of \mathcal{A} . Then π is called *independent*, provided for any choice $H_i \in \pi_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$, the resulting s hyperplanes are linearly independent, i.e. $r(H_1 \cap \dots \cap H_s) = s$.

Definition 2.12. Let $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_s)$ be a partition of \mathcal{A} and let $X \in L(\mathcal{A})$. The *induced partition* π_X of \mathcal{A}_X is given by the non-empty blocks of the form $\pi_i \cap \mathcal{A}_X$.

Definition 2.13. The partition π of \mathcal{A} is *nice* for \mathcal{A} or a *factorization* of \mathcal{A} provided

- (i) π is independent, and
- (ii) for each $X \in L(\mathcal{A}) \setminus \{V\}$, the induced partition π_X admits a block which is a singleton.

If \mathcal{A} admits a factorization, then we also say that \mathcal{A} is *factored* or *nice*.

Remark 2.14. The class of nice arrangements is closed under taking localizations. For, if \mathcal{A} is non-empty and π is a nice partition of \mathcal{A} , then the non-empty parts of the induced partition π_X form a nice partition of \mathcal{A}_X for each $X \in L(\mathcal{A}) \setminus \{V\}$; cf. the proof of [Ter92, Cor. 2.11].

We recall the main results from [Ter92] (cf. [OT92, §3.3]) that motivated Definition 2.13. Let $A(\mathcal{A})$ be the *Orlik-Solomon algebra*, introduced by Orlik and Solomon in [OS80], see also [OT92]. Let $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_s)$ be a partition of \mathcal{A} and let

$$[\pi_i] := \mathbb{K} + \sum_{H \in \pi_i} \mathbb{K}a_H$$

be the \mathbb{K} -subspace of $A(\mathcal{A})$ spanned by 1 and the set of \mathbb{K} -algebra generators a_H of $A(\mathcal{A})$ corresponding to the members in π_i . So the Poincaré polynomial of the graded \mathbb{K} -vector space $[\pi_i]$ is just $\text{Poin}([\pi_i], t) = 1 + |\pi_i|t$. Consider the canonical \mathbb{K} -linear map

$$(2.15) \quad \kappa : [\pi_1] \otimes \dots \otimes [\pi_s] \rightarrow A(\mathcal{A})$$

given by multiplication. We say that π gives rise to a *tensor factorization* of $A(\mathcal{A})$ if κ is an isomorphism of graded \mathbb{K} -vector spaces. In this case $s = r$, as r is the top degree of $A(\mathcal{A})$, and thus we get a factorization of the Poincaré polynomial of $A(\mathcal{A})$ into linear terms

$$(2.16) \quad \text{Poin}(A(\mathcal{A}), t) = \prod_{i=1}^r (1 + |\pi_i|t).$$

For $\mathcal{A} = \Phi_\ell$ the empty arrangement, we set $[\emptyset] := \mathbb{K}$, so that $\kappa : [\emptyset] \cong A(\Phi_\ell)$.

In [OST84, Thm. 5.3], Orlik, Solomon and Terao showed that a supersolvable arrangement \mathcal{A} admits a partition π which gives rise to a tensor factorization of $A(\mathcal{A})$ via κ in (2.15) (cf. [OT92, Thm. 3.81]).

In [Ter92, Thm. 2.8], Terao proved that π gives rise to a tensor factorization of the Orlik-Solomon algebra $A(\mathcal{A})$ via κ as in (2.15) if and only if π is nice for \mathcal{A} , see Theorem 2.17 (cf. [OT92, Thm. 3.87]). Note that κ is not an isomorphism of \mathbb{K} -algebras.

Theorem 2.17. *Let \mathcal{A} be a central ℓ -arrangement and let $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_s)$ be a partition of \mathcal{A} . Then the \mathbb{K} -linear map κ defined in (2.15) is an isomorphism of graded \mathbb{K} -vector spaces if and only if π is nice for \mathcal{A} .*

Corollary 2.18. *Let $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_s)$ be a factorization of \mathcal{A} . Then the following hold:*

(i) $s = r = r(\mathcal{A})$ and

$$\text{Poin}(A(\mathcal{A}), t) = \prod_{i=1}^r (1 + |\pi_i|t);$$

(ii) the multiset $\{|\pi_1|, \dots, |\pi_r|\}$ only depends on \mathcal{A} ;

(iii) for any $X \in L(\mathcal{A})$, we have

$$r(X) = |\{i \mid \pi_i \cap \mathcal{A}_X \neq \emptyset\}|.$$

The following is immediate from Corollary 2.18 and Theorem 2.2.

Lemma 2.19. *Let (\mathcal{A}, π) be a factored arrangement which is also free. Then $\exp \mathcal{A} = \{|\pi_1|, \dots, |\pi_\ell|\}$.*

2.6. Inductively factored arrangements. Following Jambu and Paris [JP95] and [HR16], we introduce further notation. Suppose that \mathcal{A} is non-empty and let $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_s)$ be a partition of \mathcal{A} . Let $H_0 \in \pi_1$ and let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}'')$ be the triple associated with H_0 . We have the *induced partition* π' of \mathcal{A}' consisting of the non-empty parts $\pi'_i := \pi_i \cap \mathcal{A}'$. Further, we have the *restriction map* $\varrho = \varrho_{\pi, H_0} : \mathcal{A} \setminus \pi_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}''$ given by $H \mapsto H \cap H_0$, depending on π and H_0 . Let $\pi''_i := \varrho(\pi_i)$ for $i = 2, \dots, s$. Clearly, imposing that $\pi'' = (\pi''_2, \dots, \pi''_s)$ is again a partition of \mathcal{A}'' entails that ϱ is onto.

Here is the analogue for nice arrangements of Terao's Addition-Deletion Theorem (cf. Theorem 2.3) for free arrangements from [HR16].

Theorem 2.20. Suppose $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_s)$ is a partition of $\mathcal{A} \neq \Phi_\ell$. Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}'')$ be the triple associated with $H_0 \in \pi_1$. Then any two of the following statements imply the third:

- (i) π is nice for \mathcal{A} ;
- (ii) π' is nice for \mathcal{A}' ;
- (iii) $\varrho : \mathcal{A} \setminus \pi_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}''$ is bijective and π'' is nice for \mathcal{A}'' .

Definition 2.21. Suppose $\mathcal{A} \neq \Phi_\ell$. Let $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_s)$ be a partition of \mathcal{A} . Let $H_0 \in \pi_1$ and let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}'')$ be the triple associated with H_0 . We say that H_0 is *distinguished* (with respect to π) provided π induces a factorization π' of \mathcal{A}' , i.e. the non-empty subsets $\pi_i \cap \mathcal{A}'$ form a nice partition of \mathcal{A}' . Note that since $H_0 \in \pi_1$, we have $\pi_i \cap \mathcal{A}' = \pi_i \neq \emptyset$ for $i = 2, \dots, s$.

The Addition-Deletion Theorem 2.20 for nice arrangements motivates the following stronger notion of factorization, cf. [JP95].

Definition 2.22 ([HR16, Def. 3.8]). The class \mathcal{IFAC} of *inductively factored* arrangements is the smallest class of pairs (\mathcal{A}, π) of arrangements \mathcal{A} along with a partition π subject to

- (i) $(\Phi_\ell, (\emptyset)) \in \mathcal{IFAC}$ for each $\ell \geq 0$;
- (ii) if there exists a partition π of \mathcal{A} and a hyperplane $H_0 \in \pi_1$ such that for the triple $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}'')$ associated with H_0 the restriction map $\varrho = \varrho_{\pi, H_0} : \mathcal{A} \setminus \pi_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}''$ is bijective and for the induced partitions π' of \mathcal{A}' and π'' of \mathcal{A}'' both (\mathcal{A}', π') and (\mathcal{A}'', π'') belong to \mathcal{IFAC} , then (\mathcal{A}, π) also belongs to \mathcal{IFAC} .

If (\mathcal{A}, π) is in \mathcal{IFAC} , then we say that \mathcal{A} is *inductively factored with respect to π* , or else that π is an *inductive factorization* of \mathcal{A} . Usually, we say \mathcal{A} is *inductively factored* without reference to a specific inductive factorization of \mathcal{A} .

Remark 2.23. Definition 2.22 of inductively factored arrangements differs from the one given by Jambu and Paris [JP95] in that, apart from the mere technicalities of incorporating empty arrangements and for defining \mathcal{IFAC} for pairs of arrangements and partitions rather than for partitions of arrangements, in part (ii) we do not assume from the outset that π is a factorization of \mathcal{A} . This is possible by virtue of the Addition-Deletion Theorem 2.20. However, this comes at the cost of the bijectivity requirement for the associated restriction map ϱ .

Remark 2.24. (i). If \mathcal{A} is inductively factored, then \mathcal{A} is inductively free, by [HR16, Prop. 3.14]. The latter can be described by an induction table, see Remark 2.5. The proof of [HR16, Prop. 3.14] shows that if π is an inductive factorization of \mathcal{A} and $H_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ is distinguished with respect to π , then the triple $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}'')$ with respect to H_0 is a triple of inductively free arrangements. Thus an induction table of \mathcal{A} can be constructed, compatible with suitable inductive factorizations of the subarrangements \mathcal{A}_i .

(ii). Now suppose \mathcal{A} is inductively free and let $\mathcal{A} = \{H_1, \dots, H_n\}$ be a choice of a total order on \mathcal{A} , so that each of the subarrangements $\mathcal{A}_0 := \Phi_\ell$, $\mathcal{A}_i := \{H_1, \dots, H_i\}$ and each of the restrictions $\mathcal{A}_i^{H_i}$ is inductively free for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Then, starting with the empty partition for Φ_ℓ , we can attempt to build inductive factorizations π_i of \mathcal{A}_i consecutively, resulting in an inductive factorization $\pi = \pi_n$ of $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_n$. This is achieved by invoking Theorem 2.20 repeatedly in order to derive that each π_i is an inductive factorization of \mathcal{A}_i . For this it suffices to check the conditions in part (iii) of Theorem 2.20, i.e., that $\exp \mathcal{A}_i''$ is given by the sizes of the parts of π_i not containing H_i and that the induced partition π_i'' of \mathcal{A}_i'' is a factorization. The fact that H_i is distinguished with respect to π_i is part of the inductive hypothesis, as $\pi_i' = \pi_{i-1}$ is an inductive factorization of $\mathcal{A}_i' = \mathcal{A}_{i-1}$.

We then add the inductive factorizations π_i of \mathcal{A}_i as additional data into an induction table for \mathcal{A} (or else record to which part of π_{i-1} the new hyperplane H_i is appended to). The data in such an extended induction table together with the ‘‘Addition’’ part of Theorem 2.20 then proves that \mathcal{A} is inductively factored. We refer to this technique as *induction of factorizations* and the corresponding table as an *induction table of factorizations* for \mathcal{A} .

We illustrate this induction of factorizations procedure in Tables 1 and 2. As for the usual induction process for free arrangements, induction for factorizations is sensitive to the chosen order on \mathcal{A} .

2.7. $K(\pi, 1)$ -arrangements. A complex ℓ -arrangement \mathcal{A} is called *aspherical*, or a $K(\pi, 1)$ -arrangement (or that \mathcal{A} is $K(\pi, 1)$ for short), provided the complement $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A})$ of the union of the hyperplanes in \mathcal{A} in \mathbb{C}^ℓ is aspherical, i.e. is a $K(\pi, 1)$ -space. That is, the universal covering space of $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A})$ is contractible and the fundamental group $\pi_1(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A}))$ of $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A})$ is isomorphic to the group π . This is an important topological property, for the cohomology ring $H^*(X, \mathbb{Z})$ of a $K(\pi, 1)$ -space X coincides with the group cohomology $H^*(\pi, \mathbb{Z})$ of π . The crucial point here is that the intersections of codimension 2 determine the fundamental group $\pi_1(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A}))$ of $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A})$.

By Deligne’s seminal result [Del72], complexified simplicial arrangements are $K(\pi, 1)$. Likewise for complex supersolvable arrangements, cf. [FR85] and [Ter86] (cf. [OT92, Prop. 5.12, Thm. 5.113]).

2.8. Local Properties. A property for arrangements is called *local* if it is preserved under localizations, [CK24, Def. 6.1]. Typical examples of local properties of arrangements are freeness [OT92, Thm. 4.37], inductive freeness [HRS17, Thm 1.1], factoredness [OT92, Cor. 3.90], and asphericity, see Remark 7.1. We record two graph theoretic constructions from [CK24] which allow us to control local properties of the \mathcal{A}_G .

Let $G = (N, E)$ be a graph. Let $S \subset N$ be a subset of nodes and let $G[S]$ be the *induced subgraph on S* . Then $\mathcal{A}_{G[S]}$ is a localization of \mathcal{A}_G ; cf. proof of [CK24, Lem. 6.2]. Let $e \in E$ be an edge. Denote by G/e the *graph with contracted edge e* , i.e. the graph in which the vertices of e are identified to a single vertex, and multiple edges or loops are discarded. Then $\mathcal{A}_{G/e}$ is a localization of \mathcal{A}_G ; cf. proof of [CK24, Lem. 6.4].

Lemma 2.25 ([CK24, Lem. 6.2, Lem. 6.4]). *Let $G = (N, E)$ be a graph. Assume the connected subgraph arrangement \mathcal{A}_G has the local arrangement property P .*

- (i) *Let $S \subset N$ be a subset of nodes. Then $\mathcal{A}_{G[S]}$ also has property P .*

(ii) Let $e \in E$ be an edge of G . Then $\mathcal{A}_{G/e}$ also has property P .

3. PROJECTIVE UNIQUENES: PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

Definition 3.1. Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be two arrangements in a \mathbb{K} -vector space V .

- (i) \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are *linearly isomorphic* if there is a $\varphi \in \text{GL}(V)$ such that $\mathcal{B} = \{\varphi(H) \mid H \in \mathcal{A}\}$; denoted by $\mathcal{A} \cong \mathcal{B}$.
- (ii) \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are *L -equivalent* if $L(\mathcal{A})$ and $L(\mathcal{B})$ are isomorphic as posets; denoted by $\mathcal{A} \cong_L \mathcal{B}$.
- (iii) \mathcal{A} is *projectively unique* if for any arrangement \mathcal{C} in V we have: $\mathcal{C} \cong_L \mathcal{A}$ implies $\mathcal{C} \cong \mathcal{A}$.

Remark 3.2. The term “projectively unique” originates in the dual point of view. Every hyperplane arrangement \mathcal{A} in V yields a dual point configuration in the projective space $\mathbb{P}(V)$, denoted by \mathcal{A}^* , see [Z90, §2]. Two arrangements \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} in V are linearly isomorphic if and only if there is a projective transformation φ^* which maps \mathcal{A}^* to \mathcal{B}^* .

Example 3.3. (i). Let \mathcal{A} be a generic arrangement in $V = \mathbb{K}^\ell$ with $|\mathcal{A}| = \ell + 1$. Then $\mathcal{A} = \{H_1, \dots, H_\ell, H'\}$ where $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell \in V^*$ with $H_i = \ker(\alpha_i)$ and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell$ form a basis of V^* . If $\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^\ell a_i \alpha_i \in V^*$ with $\ker(\gamma) = H'$, then by the genericity of \mathcal{A} we have $a_i \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell$. Hence, after rescaling the α_i , we see that \mathcal{A} is linearly isomorphic to $\{\ker(x_1), \dots, \ker(x_\ell), \ker(\sum_{i=1}^\ell x_i)\}$, where x_1, \dots, x_ℓ is some basis of V^* . Thus, \mathcal{A} is projectively unique.

(ii). Let $V = \mathbb{Q}^2$ and x, y be a basis of V^* . Let $\mathcal{A} = \{\ker(x), \ker(y), \ker(x+y), \ker(x+2y)\}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{\ker(x), \ker(y), \ker(x+y), \ker(x+3y)\}$ be arrangements in V . Then clearly $\mathcal{A} \cong_L \mathcal{B}$ but \mathcal{A} is not linearly isomorphic to \mathcal{B} . Thus, \mathcal{A} (resp. \mathcal{B}) is not projectively unique.

Fix a field \mathbb{K} . Let \mathcal{A} be a \mathbb{K} -arrangement. We specify what we mean by a subarrangement of \mathcal{A} being generated by a subset (or subarrangement) of \mathcal{A} (cf. [C22, Def. 3.4] for an equivalent formulation for arrangements of rank 3).

Definition 3.4. Let $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \mathcal{A}$. Set $\text{Gen}_0(\mathcal{A}, S) := S$ and inductively

$$\text{Gen}_{i+1}(\mathcal{A}, S) := \left\{ H \in \mathcal{A} \mid \exists J \subseteq L(\text{Gen}_i(\mathcal{A}, S)) : H = \sum_{X \in J} X \right\}$$

for $i \geq 0$. Then we say that

$$\langle S \rangle_{\mathcal{A}} := \bigcup_{i \geq 0} \text{Gen}_i(\mathcal{A}, S) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$$

is the subarrangement of \mathcal{A} *generated by* S . If $\langle S \rangle_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A}$, then we say that S generates \mathcal{A} .

Lemma 3.5. Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be two arrangements in V . Suppose $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, $\emptyset \neq T \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ such that $\langle S \rangle_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A}$ and $\langle T \rangle_{\mathcal{B}} = \mathcal{B}$, i.e. S generates \mathcal{A} and T generates \mathcal{B} . If \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are L -equivalent via a poset isomorphism $\psi : L(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow L(\mathcal{B})$ and $\varphi \in \text{GL}(V)$ such that

$\psi(S) = \varphi(S) = T$ and $\psi(H) = \varphi(H)$ for all $H \in S$, then φ extends to a linear isomorphism between the whole arrangements, i.e. $\varphi(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{B}$.

Proof. Set $G_i := \text{Gen}_i(\mathcal{A}, S)$, and $G'_i := \text{Gen}_i(\mathcal{B}, T)$. We argue by induction that $\varphi(G_i) = G'_i$ for all $i \geq 0$ which implies the statement. By assumption, the statement is clear for $i = 0$. Let $H' \in G'_{i+1}$. Then $H' = \sum_{X' \in J'} X'$ for some $J' \subseteq L(G'_i)$. But $L(G'_i) = \psi(L(G_i))$ and by the induction hypothesis $G'_i = \psi(G_i) = \varphi(G_i)$. Thus, with $J = \psi^{-1}(J') = \varphi^{-1}(J') \subseteq L(G_i)$, for $H = \sum_{X \in J} X \in G_{i+1}$ we have $\varphi(\sum_{X \in J} X) = \sum_{X' \in J'} X' = H'$. \square

Proposition 3.6. *Let \mathcal{A} be an essential and irreducible arrangement in $V \cong \mathbb{K}^\ell$. Suppose there is a subset S of \mathcal{A} such that $\langle S \rangle_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A}$ and $|S| = \ell + 1$. Then \mathcal{A} is projectively unique.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{A} is irreducible, after an appropriate coordinate change we may assume without loss of generality that $S = \{H_1 = \ker(x_1), \dots, H_\ell = \ker(x_\ell), H_{\ell+1} = \ker(\sum_{i=1}^\ell x_i)\}$ where x_1, \dots, x_ℓ is a basis for V^* (cf. Example 3.3(i)). Let \mathcal{B} be another arrangement in V which is L -equivalent to \mathcal{A} via $\psi : L(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow L(\mathcal{B})$ and set $T := \psi(S)$. Since ψ is a poset isomorphism, we have $\langle T \rangle_{\mathcal{B}} = \mathcal{B}$. Moreover, T spans a generic subarrangement of \mathcal{B} with $\ell + 1$ hyperplanes, say $T = \{\psi(H_1) = \ker(\beta_1), \dots, \psi(H_\ell) = \ker(\beta_\ell), \psi(H_{\ell+1}) = \ker(\gamma)\}$. After rescaling $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_\ell$ by suitable scalars, we can assume $\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^\ell \beta_i$ and note that $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_\ell$ yield a basis for V^* . Thus, if we take $\varphi \in \text{GL}(V)$ as the unique linear map which is dual to the transformation of V^* which maps x_1, \dots, x_ℓ to $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_\ell$, we have $\psi(S) = \varphi(S) = T$ and $\varphi(H) = \psi(H)$ for all $H \in S$. Since $\langle S \rangle_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A}$, we can construct inductively a lattice isomorphism $\psi : L(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow L(\mathcal{B})$ such that $\psi(S) = T$ via $\psi(\text{Gen}_i(S, \mathcal{A})) = \text{Gen}_i(T, \mathcal{B})$. By Lemma 3.5, \mathcal{B} is linearly isomorphic to \mathcal{A} which concludes the proof. \square

Finally, Theorem 1.2 is an immediate consequence of our next result.

Proposition 3.7. *Let G be a connected graph on $[n]$ and let $S := \{\ker x_1, \dots, \ker x_n, \ker(x_1 + \dots + x_n)\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_G$. Then $\langle S \rangle_{\mathcal{A}_G} = \mathcal{A}_G$. In particular, \mathcal{A}_G is projectively unique over \mathbb{Q} .*

Proof. Let $\emptyset \neq I \subseteq [n]$ such that the induced subgraph $G[I]$ of G on I is connected, i.e. $H_I = \ker(\sum_{i \in I} x_i) \in \mathcal{A}_G$. Then define

$$X := \bigcap_{i \in I} \ker(x_i) \text{ and}$$

$$Y := \ker(x_1 + \dots + x_n) \cap \bigcap_{j \in [n] \setminus I} \ker(x_j).$$

Both X and Y belong to the lattice of intersections of the subarrangement S of \mathcal{A}_G , $\dim X = n - |I|$, $\dim Y = |I| - 1$, $\dim(X \cap Y) = 0$, and $X, Y \subseteq H_I$. It follows that $H_I = X + Y \in \langle S \rangle_{\mathcal{A}_G}$. Since $\emptyset \neq I \subseteq [n]$ is arbitrary such that the induced subgraph $G[I]$ of G on I is connected, the result follows thanks to Proposition 3.6. \square

Remark 3.8. Proposition 3.6 applies more generally to 0/1-arrangements \mathcal{A} over \mathbb{Q} which satisfy the condition of Proposition 3.7.

4. ACCURACY: PROOF OF THEOREM 1.4

In this section we characterize accuracy for connected subgraph arrangements. The arrangement \mathcal{A}_G is free if and only if G is a path, almost-path, path-with-triangle, or cycle graph. All of these arrangements are known to be accurate, the only exception being the path-with-triangle graph. The path graph and the cycle graph are isomorphic to the braid arrangement and the cone over the Shi arrangement, respectively. The braid arrangement is accurate, see [MR21, Thm. 1.6]. Also, the cone over the Shi arrangement was shown to be accurate in [MR21, Thm. 1.8]. The almost-path graph is MAT-free, and hence accurate due to [MR21, Thm. 1.2]. We are left to show that $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta_{n,k}}$ is accurate. We first need to study the automorphism group of the almost-path graph arrangement.

Remark 4.1. The arrangement $\mathcal{A}_{A_{n,k}}$ contains three independent path-graph arrangements $\mathcal{A}_{P_1}, \mathcal{A}_{P_{k-1}},$ and $\mathcal{A}_{P_{n-k}}$ corresponding to each of the three branches of the almost-path graph. It follows that the automorphism group of the arrangement contains the product of the automorphism groups of these three path graph arrangements, namely $\mathfrak{S}_2 \times \mathfrak{S}_k \times \mathfrak{S}_{n-k+1}$. Denoting by $\text{Aut}(A_{n,k})$ the automorphism group of the graph $A_{n,k}$ we consider the subgroup

$$(4.2) \quad \mathcal{G} := \text{Aut}(A_{n,k}) \times \mathfrak{S}_2 \times \mathfrak{S}_{k-1} \times \mathfrak{S}_{n-k+1}$$

of the automorphism group of $\mathcal{A}_{A_{n,k}}$. More precisely, we obtain the following groups depending on n and k :

- $\text{Aut}(A_{3,2}) \times (\mathfrak{S}_2 \times \mathfrak{S}_2 \times \mathfrak{S}_2)$ for $(n, k) = (3, 2)$,
- $(\text{Aut}(A_{n,2}) \times (\mathfrak{S}_2 \times \mathfrak{S}_2)) \times \mathfrak{S}_{n-2}$ for $(n, k) = (n, 2)$,
- $\mathfrak{S}_2 \times (\text{Aut}(A_{2k-1,k}) \times (\mathfrak{S}_k \times \mathfrak{S}_k))$ for $(n, k) = (2k-1, k)$,
- $\mathfrak{S}_2 \times \mathfrak{S}_k \times \mathfrak{S}_{n-k+1}$ otherwise (here $\text{Aut}(A_{n,k})$ is trivial).

From the description above, we deduce that the action of the group \mathcal{G} from (4.2) on $\mathcal{A}_{A_{n,k}}$ has exactly $4 - g$ orbits, where g is the minimal number of generators of $\text{Aut}(A_{n,k})$. In the general case when $\text{Aut}(A_{n,k}) = 1$, there are

- (1) three orbits each corresponding to a path graph branch of $A_{n,k}$,
- (2) one orbit consisting of all hyperplanes H_I with $k \in I$.

When $\text{Aut}(A_{n,k})$ is non-trivial, some of the first three orbits are merged together, namely, those corresponding to branches of the same length.

We now prove accuracy for $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta_{n,k}}$. Consider the connected subgraph arrangement $\mathcal{A}_{A_{n+1,k+1}}$ with its set of ordered exponents $(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{n+2})_{\leq}$, and its MAT-partition $\pi = (\pi_1 \dots, \pi_{n+2})$, where $\pi_d = \{H_I \mid |I| = d\}$. For every hyperplane H in the same orbit of $x_{k+1} = 0$, i.e. for $H = H_I$ with $k+1 \in I$, we have

$$\mathcal{A}_{\Delta_{n,k}} = \mathcal{A}_{A_{n+1,k+1}}^H.$$

Because $\mathcal{A}_{A_{n+1,k+1}}$ is MAT-free, [MR21, Thm. 3.9] implies that for each $1 \leq k \leq n$ and every $|\pi_{k+1}| \leq q \leq |\pi_k|$, there exists a subset $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \pi_k$ with $|\mathcal{C}| = q$ such that, for $X = \bigcap_{H \in \mathcal{C}} H$, of dimension $n+2-q$, the restriction $\mathcal{A}_{A_{n+1,k+1}}^X$ is free with exponents $(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{n+2-q})_{\leq}$. This

is how the accuracy of MAT-free arrangements is proven in general. Now we observe that for some $H \in \pi_i \setminus \mathcal{C}$, we still have that $\mathcal{A}_{A_{n+1,k+1}}^{X \cap H}$ is free with exponents $(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{n+1-q})_{\leq}$. Because an element H_I with $k+1 \in I$ exists in every block of the MAT-partition π of $\mathcal{A}_{A_{n+1,k+1}}$, we can always choose such an element for every choice of X . Finally, we observe that $\exp(\mathcal{A}_{\Delta_{n,k}}) = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{n+1})_{\leq} \subseteq (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{n+2})_{\leq} = \exp(\mathcal{A}_{A_{n+1,k+1}})$. Therefore, we can conclude that

$$\mathcal{A}_{\Delta_{n,k}}^X = (\mathcal{A}_{A_{n+1,k+1}}^H)^X = \mathcal{A}_{A_{n+1,k+1}}^{X \cap H}$$

is again free with the right exponents, that is, $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta_{n,k}}$ is accurate. \square

There is a natural stronger notion of accuracy as in Definition 2.10. We say that the free arrangement \mathcal{A} is *flag-accurate*, if \mathcal{A} is accurate and if the tuple of flats $(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_\ell)$ from Definition 2.10 can be chosen to be a flag in $L(\mathcal{A})$, see [MRT24, Def. 1.1]. It is shown in [MRT24, Cor. 1.7] that Coxeter arrangements are flag-accurate and in [MRT24, Thm. 1.14] that all Shi arrangements are also flag-accurate. Consequently, the connected subgraph arrangements \mathcal{A}_G are flag-accurate provided G is a path graph or a cycle graph. It follows from [MRT24, Lem. 3.1] and [CK24, Thm. 4.1, Prop. 5.1, Thm. 5.4] that $\mathcal{A}_{A_{n+1,k+1}}$ is flag-accurate if and only if $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta_{n,k}}$ is flag-accurate for all n and k . So potentially, this gives an inductive means to derive this property also for almost-path graphs and path-with-triangle graphs. Moreover, it is shown in [MRT24, Thm. 4.8] that ideal arrangements up to rank 8 are also flag-accurate. Thus \mathcal{A}_G is flag-accurate for $G = A_{n,k}$ for $3 \leq n \leq 8$ and $2 \leq k \leq 3$. In view of these results and of Theorem 1.4, we put forward the following.

Conjecture 4.3. *\mathcal{A}_G is free if and only if it is flag-accurate.*

It is clear that flag-accuracy is a combinatoral property which only depend on the lattice of intersections. This is not known for accuracy, though; see [MRT24, Rem. 1.3].

5. INDUCTIVE FREENESS: EVIDENCE FOR CONJECTURE 1.5


According to Theorem 1.3, \mathcal{A}_G is free if and only if G is a path, a cycle, an almost path, or a path-with-triangle graph. For G a path graph, \mathcal{A}_G is supersolvable, by [CK24, Cor. 8.11], and supersolvable arrangements are inductively free, thanks to work of Jambu and Terao [JT84, Thm. 4.2]. For G a cycle, Cuntz and Kühne show in [CK24, Prop. 3.1] that \mathcal{A}_G is inductively free. Thus in order to derive Conjecture 1.5 we need to show that \mathcal{A}_G is inductively free for G an almost path or a path-with-triangle graph.

We observe that the arrangements $\mathcal{A}_{A_{n,2}}$ are particular ideal arrangements in the root system of type D_{n+1} , cf. [CK24, Ex. 1.4]. The latter are known to be inductively free, [Rö17, Thm. 1.7]. Thus we know in particular that $\mathcal{A}_{A_{n,2}}$ is inductively free for $n \geq 4$. In the same vein, for $n = 5, 6, 7$ the arrangements $\mathcal{A}_{A_{n,3}}$ are certain ideal arrangements in the root system of type E_{n+1} . As all ideal arrangements are inductively free, owing to [CRS19, Thm. 1.4], so are $\mathcal{A}_{A_{n,3}}$, for $n = 5, 6, 7$.

6. INDUCTIVE FACTOREDNESS: PROOF OF THEOREM 1.7

According to Theorem 1.6, \mathcal{A}_G is factored if and only if G is a path graph or $G = \Delta_{n,1}$ for some $n \geq 2$. For G a path graph, \mathcal{A}_G is supersolvable, by [CK24, Cor. 8.11] and supersolvable arrangements are inductively factored, cf. [JP95] or [HR16, Prop. 3.11].

Thus, in order to derive Theorem 1.7 we need to show that \mathcal{A}_G is inductively factored for $G = \Delta_{n,1}$ with $n \geq 2$. For that purpose we present an induction table for an inductive factorization π of $\Delta_{n,1}$ for each $n \geq 2$. We require the following auxiliary result. Let P_n be path graph on n nodes. Here we use the following labelling of $\Delta_{n,1}$:



Lemma 6.1. *For $n \geq 2$, consider the n -arrangement $\mathcal{B}_n = \mathcal{A}_{P_n} \cup \{H_1, \dots, H_{n-1}\}$, where $H_k = \ker(2x_0 + x_1 + \dots + x_k)$ for $k = 1, \dots, n-1$. Let $\pi = \pi^n$ be the partition of \mathcal{B}_n given by:*

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1 &:= \{\ker(x_0)\} \\ \pi_k &:= \{\ker(x_j + \dots + x_{k-1}) \mid j = 0, \dots, k\} \cup \{H_{k-1}\} \text{ for } k = 2, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

Then π is an inductive factorization of \mathcal{B}_n . In particular, \mathcal{B}_n is inductively free with $\exp(\mathcal{B}_n) = (1, 3, 4, \dots, n+1)$.

Proof. We aim to show that H_1, \dots, H_{n-1} forms an inductive chain (in that order) from the supersolvable arrangement \mathcal{A}_{P_n} to \mathcal{B}_n . For that purpose define $\mathcal{A}_0 := \mathcal{A}_{P_n}$ and $\mathcal{A}_i := \mathcal{A}_{P_n} \cup \{H_1, \dots, H_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Both arrangements \mathcal{B}_2 and \mathcal{A}_0 are inductively factored. We proceed by induction on n and i , assuming that \mathcal{B}_{n-1} and \mathcal{A}_{i-1} are inductively factored, with $\lambda = \lambda^{i-1}$ an inductive factorization for \mathcal{A}_{i-1} given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_k &:= \pi_k \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, i-1, \\ \lambda_k &:= \{\ker(x_j + \dots + x_{k-1}) \mid j = 0, \dots, k\} \text{ for } k = i, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

Note that after a change of coordinates for \mathcal{A}_{P_n} , like the one in [CK24, Ex. 1.2], the partition λ^0 given by

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1^0 &:= \pi_1, \\ \lambda_k^0 &:= \{\ker(x_j + \dots + x_{k-1}) \mid j = 0, \dots, k\} \text{ for } k = 2, \dots, n, \end{aligned}$$

is the inductive factorization for the rank n braid arrangement corresponding to the maximal chain of modular flats

$$\{x_0 = x_1\} < \{x_0 = x_1 = x_2\} < \dots < \{x_0 = x_1 = \dots = x_n\}.$$

Then one checks that the restriction to H_{i-1} yields the arrangement \mathcal{B}_{n-1} with the inductive partition π^{n-1} . Similarly, thanks to the chosen factorization, one sees by inspection that the map $\varrho: \mathcal{A}_{i-1} \setminus \lambda_{i-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{i-1}''$ is bijective for each i . Consequently, π is an inductive factorization of \mathcal{B}_n . We give the induction table for the inductive factorization in Table 1 below. \square

(\mathcal{A}'_i, π'_i)	$\exp \mathcal{A}'_i$	α_{H_i}	$(\mathcal{A}''_i, \pi''_i)$	$\exp \mathcal{A}''_i$
$(\mathcal{A}_0, \lambda^0)$	$1, 2, 3, 4, \dots, n$	$2x_0 + x_1$	$(\mathcal{B}_{n-1}, \pi^{n-1})$	$1, 3, 4, \dots, n-1$
$(\mathcal{A}_1, \lambda^1)$	$1, 3, 3, 4, \dots, n$	$2x_0 + x_1 + x_2$	$(\mathcal{B}_{n-1}, \pi^{n-1})$	$1, 3, 4, \dots, n-1$
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots
$(\mathcal{A}_{n-2}, \lambda^{n-2})$	$1, 3, 4, 5, \dots, n, n$	$2x_0 + x_1 + \dots + x_{n-1}$	$(\mathcal{B}_{n-1}, \pi^{n-1})$	$1, 3, 4, \dots, n-1$
(\mathcal{B}_n, π^n)	$1, 3, 4, \dots, n+1$			

TABLE 1. Induction Table of Factorizations for \mathcal{B}_n

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Recall from [CK24, Thm. 5.4] that \mathcal{A}_G is free for $G = \Delta_{n,1}$ with $\exp(\mathcal{A}_G) = (1, 3, 4, \dots, n+1, n+1)$. We claim that the following partition $\pi = \pi^{n+1}$ is an inductive factorization for $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta_{n,1}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1 &:= \{\ker(x_0 + x_1)\}, \\ \pi_k &:= \{\ker(x_i + \dots + x_k) \mid i = 0, \dots, k\} \text{ for } k = 2, \dots, n; \text{ (} k+1 \text{ hyperplanes),} \\ \pi_{n+1} &:= \{\ker(x_0 + x_2 + \dots + x_k) \mid k = 2, \dots, n\} \cup \{\ker(x_0), \ker(x_1)\} \text{ (} n+1 \text{ hyperplanes).} \end{aligned}$$

Note that this is identical to the partition in the proof of [CK24, Prop. 8.9]. We argue by induction on $n \geq 2$. For $n = 2$ one checks that π is inductive. By induction we assume that π given above is an inductive factorization for $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta_{n-1,1}}$.

We claim that H_1, \dots, H_{n+2} is an inductive chain (in that order) from $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta_{n-1,1}}$ to $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta_{n,1}}$, where:

$$\begin{aligned} H_i &= \ker(x_{i-1} + \dots + x_n) \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n+1 \\ H_{n+2} &= \ker(x_0 + x_2 + \dots + x_n). \end{aligned}$$

For $i = 1, \dots, n+1$, let $\mathcal{A}_i := \mathcal{A}_{\Delta_{n-1,1}} \cup \{H_1, \dots, H_i\}$ and $\lambda = \lambda^i$ be the corresponding partition obtained from the partition $\pi = \pi^{n-1}$ of $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta_{n-1,1}}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_k &:= \pi_k \text{ for } 1 \leq k \leq n-1 \\ \lambda_n &:= \{H_1, \dots, H_i\} \\ \lambda_{n+1} &:= \pi_n; \end{aligned}$$

the last hyperplane is added to the block λ_{n+1} , unlike the others, yielding the arrangement $\mathcal{A}_{n+2} = \mathcal{A}_{\Delta_{n,1}}$ and its inductive partition $\lambda^{n+2} = \pi^n$.

In the first $n+1$ addition steps the restriction arrangement is always $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta_{n-1,1}}$ with the respective inductive factorization π^{n-1} , and for example by using [CK24, Lem. 2.10], the map ϱ can be seen to be always bijective.

For the last hyperplane, the restriction is different: we leave the class of connected subgraph arrangements, but just for one hyperplane: $\mathcal{A}''_{\Delta_{n,1}} \cong \mathcal{A}_{\Delta_{n-1,1}} \cup \{\ker(x_0 - x_1)\}$, with the associated partition $(\pi^n)''$ obtained by adding the extra hyperplane $\ker(x_0 - x_1)$ to the $(n-1)$ -st

(and penultimate) block of the inductive partition π^{n-1} of $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta_{n-1,1}}$.

Now, we prove that this arrangement is inductively factored. By choosing as distinguished hyperplane $\ker(x_0 - x_1)$, clearly, the deletion is $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta_{n-1,1}}$, and the restriction turns out to be the arrangement \mathcal{B}_{n-1} with the respective inductive factorization from Lemma 6.1. Hence, thanks to this lemma we are done. See Table 2 for the induction table of this inductive factorization of $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta_{n,1}}$. \square

(\mathcal{A}'_i, π'_i)	$\exp \mathcal{A}'_i$	α_{H_i}	$(\mathcal{A}''_i, \pi''_i)$	$\exp \mathcal{A}''_i$
$(\mathcal{A}_{\Delta_{n-1,1}}, \pi)$	$1, 3, 4, \dots, n, n$	$x_0 + \dots + x_n$	$(\mathcal{A}_{\Delta_{n-1,1}}, \pi)$	$1, 3, 4, \dots, n, n$
$(\mathcal{A}_1, \lambda^1)$	$1, 3, 4, \dots, n, 1, n$	$x_1 + \dots + x_n$	$(\mathcal{A}_{\Delta_{n-1,1}}, \pi)$	$1, 3, 4, \dots, n, n$
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots
$(\mathcal{A}_n, \lambda^n)$	$1, 3, 4, \dots, n, n, n$	x_n	$(\mathcal{A}_{\Delta_{n-1,1}}, \pi)$	$1, 3, 4, \dots, n, n$
$(\mathcal{A}_{n+1}, \lambda^{n+1})$	$1, 3, 4, \dots, n, n+1, n$	$x_0 + x_2 + \dots + x_n$	$(\mathcal{A}''_{\Delta_{n,1}}, \pi'')$	$1, 3, 4, \dots, n+1, n$
$(\mathcal{A}_{\Delta_{n,1}}, \pi)$	$1, 3, 4, \dots, n+1, n+1$			

TABLE 2. Induction Table of Factorizations for $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta_{n,1}}$

7. ASPHERICAL \mathcal{A}_G : PROOF OF THEOREM 1.8

Remark 7.1. Thanks to an observation by Oka, asphericity is a local property in the sense of §2.8, e.g., see [Pa93, Lem. 1.1].

We recall the concept of a generic arrangement from [OT92, Def. 5.22].

Remark 7.2. An ℓ -arrangement \mathcal{A} with $\text{rank}(\mathcal{A}) = r$ is called *generic* if every subarrangement \mathcal{B} of \mathcal{A} of cardinality r is linearly independent and $|\mathcal{A}| > r$, [OT92, Def. 5.22]. Due to work of Hattori, generic arrangements are not aspherical, cf. [OT92, Cor. 5.23].

The following is the list from [CK24] of minimal graphs G subject to \mathcal{A}_G being not free.





FIGURE 1. The graphs G_1 up to G_8

We show next that \mathcal{A}_G is not $K(\pi, 1)$ for each G in Figure 1 with the possible exception of $G_2 = K_4$. We begin with G_1 :

Proposition 7.3. *The connected subgraph arrangement $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_{G_1}$ stemming from the graph*



is not $K(\pi, 1)$.

Proof. Consider the rank 3 localization $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{A}_X$ for the subspace

$$X = H_2 \cap H_4 \cap H_{[4]} = \{x_2 = x_4 = x_1 + x_3 = 0\}.$$

This arrangement is defined by

$$Q(\mathcal{B}') = x_2 x_4 (x_2 + x_4) (x_1 + x_2 + x_3) (x_1 + x_3 + x_4) (x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4)$$

which is linearly isomorphic to the essential 3-arrangement \mathcal{B} defined by

$$Q(\mathcal{B}) = yz(x+y)(x+z)(y+z)(x+y+z)$$

under the linear transformation $\begin{pmatrix} x_1 + x_3 \\ x_2 \\ x_4 \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \\ z \end{pmatrix}$. For $t \in \mathbb{C}$, consider the arrangement

$\mathcal{B}(t)$ defined by $Q(\mathcal{B}(t)) = yz(x+y+tz)(x+z)(y+z)(x+y+z)$. We have $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(0)$ and $\mathcal{B} \cong \mathcal{B}(t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{1, 2\}$. Furthermore, for t real and $t > 2$, the arrangement

$\mathcal{B}(t)$ has a “simple triangle”. Defining the 1-parameter family $(\mathcal{B}(2(e^{t\pi i} + 1)) \mid 1 \leq t \leq 2)$,

we observe that this is a *lattice isotopy* in the sense of [Ra89]. Thus, the arrangements $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(0) = \mathcal{B}(2(e^{\pi i} + 1))$ and $\mathcal{B}(4) = \mathcal{B}(2(e^{2\pi i} + 1))$ have diffeomorphic complements.

Since $\mathcal{B}(4)$ admits a “simple triangle“, and thus is not $K(\pi, 1)$, owing again to [FR87, Cor. 3.3, (3.12)], also \mathcal{B} is not $K(\pi, 1)$. Since \mathcal{B} is linearly isomorphic to \mathcal{A}_X , the latter is not $K(\pi, 1)$. Finally, it follows from Remark 7.1 that neither \mathcal{A} is $K(\pi, 1)$. \square




FIGURE 2. Projective pictures of the arrangements $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(0)$ and $\mathcal{B}(4)$ for $z = 1$ with the “simple triangle” shaded in.

We note that the arrangement \mathcal{B} above is linearly isomorphic to the rank 3 arrangement utilized in [AMR18, Lem. 2.1].

Remark 7.4. It is shown in (the proof of) [MRW24, Prop. 3.1] that for $G = G_7$ and G_8 , \mathcal{A}_G admits a generic localization of rank 4 and 5, respectively. It follows from Remarks 7.1 and 7.2 that \mathcal{A}_G is not $K(\pi, 1)$.

We discuss further obstructions to the $K(\pi, 1)$ property for the \mathcal{A}_G and give additional minimal configurations of connected graphs G for which \mathcal{A}_G fails to be aspherical. These obstructions also stem from the presence of a localization of rank 3 which satisfies the “simple triangle” condition of Falk and Randell, cf. [FR87, Cor. 3.3, (3.12)]. Thus these rank 3 localizations are not $K(\pi, 1)$, and so neither is \mathcal{A}_G , by Remark 7.1. In particular, they include the instances when G is G_3 , G_4 , G_5 , or G_6 from Figure 1.

Proposition 7.5. *If G is one of the graphs in Figure 3, then \mathcal{A}_G is not $K(\pi, 1)$.*

We also note that G_1 can be obtained from graph contractions from $G = G_9$ up to G_{15} , so that \mathcal{A}_{G_1} is a localization of \mathcal{A}_G . It follows from Lemma 2.25, Remark 7.1, and Proposition 7.3 that \mathcal{A}_G is not $K(\pi, 1)$.

Here is an immediate consequence of Proposition 7.5.

Corollary 7.6. *Let $G = K_n$ be the complete graph on n vertices. If $n \geq 5$, then \mathcal{A}_G is not $K(\pi, 1)$. I.e. resonance arrangements of rank at least 5 are not $K(\pi, 1)$.*

Proof. We argue by induction on $n \geq 5$. Owing to Proposition 7.5 and the presence of K_5 in Figure 3, \mathcal{A}_{K_5} is not $K(\pi, 1)$. Now let $n > 5$ and assume that the result holds for K_{n-1} . Let $G = K_n$. Contracting along any edge of G gives K_{n-1} . By our induction assumption, $\mathcal{A}_{K_{n-1}}$ is not $K(\pi, 1)$. The result follows from Lemma 2.25 and Remark 7.1. \square

We are now in a position to address Theorem 1.8.




FIGURE 3. Minimal connected graphs G for which \mathcal{A}_G fails to be $K(\pi, 1)$.

Proof of Theorem 1.8. If \mathcal{A}_G has rank 3, then either $G = P_3$ or C_3 . In both instances \mathcal{A}_G is $K(\pi, 1)$, thanks to [CK24, Thm. 7.2], and free by Theorem 1.3. If \mathcal{A}_G has rank 4, then $G = P_4, C_4, A_{3,2}, \Delta_{3,1}, G_1$ or $G_2 = K_4$. The result now follows from Theorem 1.3 and Proposition 7.3.

If \mathcal{A}_G has rank at least 5, our argument closely follows the line of reasoning of [CK24, Thm. 6.7]: For a given G with at least 5 nodes we use the contraction method from §2.8 and arrive at a suitable induced subgraph $G[S]$ of rank 5 which either belongs to one of our accepted families or it appears in Figure 3. In the latter case, $\mathcal{A}_{G[S]}$ is not $K(\pi, 1)$, thanks to Proposition 7.5. Consequently, owing to Lemma 2.25 and Remark 7.1 also \mathcal{A}_G fails to be $K(\pi, 1)$. We use this repeatedly in the arguments below.

(1). Suppose there is a node v in G of degree at least 4. Let v_1, \dots, v_4 be four distinct neighbours of v . Let $S = \{v, v_1, \dots, v_4\}$. Then the induced subgraph $G[S]$ of G by S is one of the graphs listed in the first two rows of Figure 3. It follows from the argument outlined above that \mathcal{A}_G can't be $K(\pi, 1)$. Consequently, any node in G has degree at most 3.

(2). Assume that G has at least two cycles C_1 and C_2 of length at least three that share at least one edge. Contracting edges results in an induced subgraph $G[S] = G_1$. It follows from Lemma 2.25 and Proposition 7.3 that \mathcal{A}_G fails to be $K(\pi, 1)$. So there is no pair of such cycles in G .

(3). Now suppose G admits at least two cycles of length at least 3 which do not share an edge. Then contracting edges in G to a minimum of 5 nodes leads to an induced subgraph $G[S]$ identical to G_5 in Figure 3. Once again we conclude that \mathcal{A}_G is not $K(\pi, 1)$. So there is no pair of such cycles in G either. So there can be at most one cycle in G .

(4). Next we suppose that G admits a single cycle of length at least 4, but that G itself is not a cycle itself. Since the rank of \mathcal{A}_G is assumed to be at least 5, contracting edges in G leads to an induced subgraph $G[S]$ which is identical to G_6 in Figure 3, as G itself is not a cycle. Once again, we conclude that \mathcal{A}_G must fail to be $K(\pi, 1)$. So there is at most one cycle in G of length 3.

(5). Now suppose that G does admit a cycle of length 3. Then at least one of its nodes is of degree 3 (else $G = C_3$). Suppose there is yet another node in G of degree 3 which does not belong to the 3-cycle. After possibly contracting edges in G we arrive at an induced subgraph $G[S]$ which is identical to G_4 in Figure 3. Yet again, \mathcal{A}_G is not $K(\pi, 1)$. Suppose G admits three nodes of degree three which belong to the cycle of length 3. The induced subgraph of this configuration coincides with the graph G_7 from Figure 1. It follows from Lemma 2.25 and Remark 7.4 that \mathcal{A}_G fails to be $K(\pi, 1)$. So G is $\Delta_{n,k}$, for some $n \geq 4$.

(6). Finally, we consider the case when G is a tree and not itself a path graph. If G admits more than one node of degree 3, then contracting edges leads to an induced subgraph $G[S]$ which is identical to G_3 in Figure 3. So there is at most one node v of degree 3. If the paths attached to the node v all have lengths at least 2, then there is an induced subgraph of G identical to G_8 from Figure 1. It follows from Lemma 2.25 and Remark 7.4 that \mathcal{A}_G fails to be $K(\pi, 1)$. So therefore, G is $A_{n,k}$, for some $n \geq 4$. \square

In view of Theorem 1.8 and its proof above, it would be interesting to know whether \mathcal{A}_G is $K(\pi, 1)$ when $G = C_4$ or $G_2 = K_4$.

8. COMBINATORIAL FORMALITY: PROOF OF THEOREM 1.9

A property for arrangements is said to be *combinatorial* if it only depends on the intersection lattice of the underlying arrangement. Yuzvinsky [Y93, Ex. 2.2] demonstrated that formality is not combinatorial, answering a question raised by Falk and Randell [FR87] in the negative. Yuzvinsky's insight motivates the following notion from [MMR24].

Definition 8.1. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a formal arrangement. We say \mathcal{A} is *combinatorially formal* if every arrangement with an intersection lattice isomorphic to the one of \mathcal{A} is also formal.

The following definitions, which are originally due to Falk for matroids [F02], were adapted for arrangements in [MMR24, §2.4]. Let $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ be a subset of hyperplanes. We say \mathcal{B} is *closed* if $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}_Y$ for $Y = \bigcap_{H \in \mathcal{B}} H$. We call \mathcal{B} *line-closed* if for every pair $H, H' \in \mathcal{B}$ of hyperplanes, we have $\mathcal{A}_{H \cap H'} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$. The *line-closure* $\text{lc}(\mathcal{B})$ of \mathcal{B} is defined as the intersection of all line-closed subsets of \mathcal{A} containing \mathcal{B} . The arrangement \mathcal{A} is called *line-closed* if every line-closed subset of \mathcal{A} is closed. With these notions, we have the following criterion for combinatorial formality, see [F02, Cor. 3.8], [MMR24, Prop. 3.2]:

Proposition 8.2. *Let \mathcal{A} be an arrangement of rank r . Suppose $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ consists of r hyperplanes such that $r(\mathcal{B}) = r$ and $\text{lc}(\mathcal{B}) = \mathcal{A}$. Then \mathcal{A} is combinatorially formal.*

A subset $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ as in Proposition 8.2 is called an *lc-basis* of \mathcal{A} .

Proof of Theorem 1.9. Let G be a connected graph. Let $\mathcal{B} = \{\ker x_i \mid i \in [n]\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_G$. Then it is easy to see that successively all H_I for $I \subseteq [n]$ with $G[I]$ connected belong to the line-closure $\text{lc}(\mathcal{B})$ of \mathcal{B} . Consequently, $\text{lc}(\mathcal{B}) = \mathcal{A}_G$. Since $\text{rk}(\mathcal{A}_G) = n = |\mathcal{B}| = \text{rk}(\mathcal{B})$, it follows from Proposition 8.2 that \mathcal{A}_G is combinatorially formal. \square

There is a stronger notion of formality for an arrangement \mathcal{A} , that of k -formality for $1 \leq k \leq \text{rk}(\mathcal{A})$ due to Brandt and Terao [BT94]. In view of Theorem 1.9 and in view of the fact that all free arrangements are not just formal but are k -formal for all k , one might ask for this stronger notion of k -formality among connected subgraph arrangements.

It was shown in [MRW24, Prop. 3.4] that despite both simple arrangements \mathcal{A}_{G_1} and \mathcal{A}_{G_2} are not free, both admit free multiplicities. It thus follows from [DiP23, Cor. 4.10] that both \mathcal{A}_{G_1} and \mathcal{A}_{G_2} are k -formal for any k . Thus \mathcal{A}_G is k -formal for any k provided the rank of \mathcal{A}_G is at most 4 or \mathcal{A}_G is free. Computational evidence for further non-free small rank connected subgraph arrangements suggests the following.

Conjecture 8.3. *Any \mathcal{A}_G is k -formal for any k .*

9. ON IDEAL SUBARRANGEMENTS OF \mathcal{A}_G

In this section we investigate properties of natural subarrangements of connected subgraph arrangements which are counterparts of ideal subarrangements of Weyl arrangements.

9.1. Arrangements of ideal type in Weyl arrangements. We begin by recalling the construction of ideal arrangements from [ST06, §11]. Let Φ be an irreducible, reduced root system and let Φ^+ be the set of positive roots with respect to some set of simple roots Π . An (*upper*) *order ideal*, or simply *ideal* for short, of Φ^+ , is a subset \mathcal{I} of Φ^+ satisfying the following condition: if $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}$ and $\beta \in \Phi^+$ so that $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi^+$, then $\alpha + \beta \in \mathcal{I}$. Recall the standard partial ordering \preceq on Φ : $\alpha \preceq \beta$ provided $\beta - \alpha$ is a $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ -linear combination of positive roots, or $\beta = \alpha$. Then \mathcal{I} is an ideal in Φ^+ if and only if whenever $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}$ and $\beta \in \Phi^+$ so that $\alpha \preceq \beta$, then $\beta \in \mathcal{I}$.

Following [ST06, §11], we associate with an ideal \mathcal{I} in Φ^+ the arrangement consisting of all hyperplanes with respect to the roots in $\mathcal{I}^c := \Phi^+ \setminus \mathcal{I}$, the complement of \mathcal{I} in Φ^+ . Let $\mathcal{A}(\Phi)$ be the *Weyl arrangement* of Φ , i.e., $\mathcal{A}(\Phi) = \{H_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi^+\}$, where H_α is the hyperplane in the Euclidean space $V = \mathbb{R} \otimes \mathbb{Z}\Phi$ orthogonal to the root α .

Definition 9.1 ([ST06, §11]). Let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \Phi^+$ be an ideal and let $\mathcal{I}^c := \Phi^+ \setminus \mathcal{I}$ be its complement in Φ^+ . The *arrangement of ideal type* associated with \mathcal{I} is the subarrangement $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ of $\mathcal{A}(\Phi)$ defined by

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}} := \{H_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{I}^c\}.$$

We note that \mathcal{I}^c is a lower order ideal in the set of positive roots Φ^+ .

In [Rö17] it is shown that a combinatorial property (see [Rö17, Cond. 1.10]) combined with Terao's fibration theorem [Ter86] provides an inductive method which allows one to deduce that a large class of the arrangements of ideal type $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ are inductively free. In fact all ideal arrangements $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ are inductively free for all types of reduced root systems, thanks to [CRS19, Thm. 1.4].

9.2. Arrangements of ideal type in connected subgraph arrangements. In [CK24, Ex. 1.4], Cuntz and Kühne remark that if G is the underlying simple graph of the Dynkin diagram of a reduced root system Φ , then the corresponding connected subgraph arrangement

\mathcal{A}_G is a particular ideal arrangement $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ as in Definition 9.1 where the hyperplanes in \mathcal{A}_G correspond to the positive roots α in Φ where a simple root has coefficient 0 or 1 in α .

Here Cuntz and Kühne also indicate that if the graph G is not the Dynkin diagram of a reduced root system so that the Coxeter group with underlying Dynkin diagram G is infinite, one may interpret \mathcal{A}_G as a finite ideal subarrangement of the infinite root system associated with G .

Generalizing this interpretation, for a simple graph G we consider the poset of induced connected subgraphs of G ordered by inclusion. A lower order ideal \mathcal{I} in this poset then gives rise to a subarrangement $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ of \mathcal{A}_G (generalizing ideal subarrangements of Weyl arrangements discussed above) to which we also refer as an *ideal subarrangement* of \mathcal{A}_G ; i.e., for such an ideal \mathcal{I} , define

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}} := \{H_I \in \mathcal{A}_G \mid I \in \mathcal{I}\}.$$

It was shown in [ABC⁺16, Thm. 1.1] that all ideal subarrangements $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ of Weyl arrangements are free by means of Theorem 2.6, consequently the $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ are MAT-free, see Definition 2.8. Generalizing this result and generalizing [CK24, Thm. 4.1], we observe next that MAT-freeness also prevails for the class of ideal subarrangements $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ of the connected subgraph arrangements \mathcal{A}_G for G an almost path-graph $A_{n,k}$.

Proposition 9.2. *Let G be an almost path-graph $A_{n,k}$ and let \mathcal{I} be an ideal in the poset of induced subgraphs of $A_{n,k}$, and let $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ the associated ideal subarrangement of \mathcal{A}_G . Then $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is MAT-free.*

Proof. The case $\mathcal{I} = G$ is [CK24, Thm. 4.1]. The argument in the proof of [CK24, Thm. 4.1] generalizes to arrangements stemming from ideals of such posets for non-Dynkin type almost-path-graphs $A_{n,k} \neq E_6, E_7, E_8$. The MAT-partition needed for $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is the same as in the proof of [CK24, Thm. 4.1], simply restricted to the ideal \mathcal{I} : let d be the maximal rank of \mathcal{I} ; define:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_0 &:= \Phi_d \text{ the empty arrangement in } \mathbb{Q}^d \\ \mathcal{A}_i &:= \mathcal{A}_{i-1} \cup \{H_I \mid H_I \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}} \text{ and } |I| = i\} \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq d. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of [CK24, Thm. 4.1] can then be repeated almost verbatim: all hypotheses of Theorem 2.6 are satisfied. The arrangement \mathcal{A}_1 is Boolean, so there is nothing to be shown for the first step $(\mathcal{A}_0, \mathcal{A}_1)$. For the pair $(\mathcal{A}_{i-1}, \mathcal{A}_i)$ we observe that:

- (1) the hyperplanes in $\mathcal{A}_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{i-1}$ are linearly independent, as the argument in the proof of [CK24, Thm. 4.1] shows that all rank i elements of the poset of induced subgraphs are independent;
- (2) the first part entails $\bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{A}_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{i-1}} H \not\subseteq \bigcap_{H' \in \mathcal{A}_{i-1}} H'$;
- (3) the condition $|\mathcal{A}_{i-1}| - |(\mathcal{A}_{i-1} \cup \{H_I\})^{H_I}| = i$ for $H_I \in \mathcal{A}_i \setminus \mathcal{A}_{i-1}$ is proven for $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}} = \mathcal{A}_{A_{n,k}}$, and it clearly only uses elements below H_I in the poset ordering. Because \mathcal{I} is an order ideal, the argument can be repeated in the present case.

This completes the proof of the proposition. □

For \mathcal{A}_G a connected subgraph arrangement and $s \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the ideal subarrangement \mathcal{A}_G^s of \mathcal{A}_G by the hyperplanes H_I where I involves at most s coordinate functions, i.e.,

$$(9.3) \quad \mathcal{A}_G^s := \{H_I \in \mathcal{A}_G \mid |I| \leq s\}.$$

E.g. \mathcal{A}_G^1 is the Boolean subarrangement of \mathcal{A}_G consisting of the coordinate hyperplanes. So \mathcal{A}_G^1 is supersolvable and $K(\pi, 1)$ irrespective of G . We are going to investigate combinatorial and topological properties of the ideal subarrangements \mathcal{A}_G^s of \mathcal{A}_G for $s > 1$ for some prominent classes of graphs G below.

Remark 9.4. Let $G = P_n$ be a path-graph. Then any ideal subarrangement of \mathcal{A}_G is an ideal subarrangement $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ of the Weyl arrangement of type A_n . It is known that each such is supersolvable and thus is also $K(\pi, 1)$, see [Hul16, §6], or [Rö17, Thm. 1.5]. This in particular applies to \mathcal{A}_G^s for any $s \geq 1$.

Proposition 9.5. *Suppose G contains a cycle. Then \mathcal{A}_G^2 is neither free, nor $K(\pi, 1)$. In particular, this is the case if G is a complete graph K_n , a cycle-graph C_n , or a path-with-triangle-graph $\Delta_{n,k}$.*

Proof. Suppose \mathcal{A}_G has rank 3. Then $G = K_3 = C_3 = \Delta_{2,1}$ and \mathcal{A}_G^2 coincides with the arrangement X_3 from [FR87, (3.12)]. Owing to *loc. cit.*, \mathcal{A}_G is neither free, nor $K(\pi, 1)$. Now suppose that the rank of \mathcal{A}_G is at least 4. After possibly contracting edges in G first and then by passing to a suitable induced subgraph, we arrive at a localization \mathcal{A}_{C_3} of \mathcal{A}_G of rank 3, by Lemma 2.25. It follows from the rank 3 case above, [OT92, Thm. 4.37] and Remark 7.1 that \mathcal{A}_G^2 is neither free, nor $K(\pi, 1)$. \square

Remark 9.6. Let β be in Φ^+ . Then $\beta = \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} c_\alpha \alpha$ for $c_\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. The *height* of β is defined to be $\text{ht}(\beta) = \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} c_\alpha$. Let θ be the highest root in Φ . Then $h = \text{ht}(\theta) + 1$ is the *Coxeter number* of W . For $1 \leq t \leq h$, let $\mathcal{I}_t := \{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \mid \text{ht}(\alpha) \geq t\}$ be the ideal consisting of all roots of height at least t . In particular, we have $\mathcal{I}_1 = \Phi^+$ and $\mathcal{I}_h = \emptyset$.

It is shown in [Rö17, Thm. 1.31] that if Φ is of type D_n for $n \geq 4$, E_6 , E_7 , or E_8 , and $\mathcal{I} \supseteq \mathcal{I}_3$ (resp. $\mathcal{I} \supseteq \mathcal{I}_4$), then $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is supersolvable (resp. inductively factored). In particular, if $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_3$ (resp. $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_4$), then $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ consists of all hyperplanes in $\mathcal{A}(\Phi)$ relative to roots of height at most 2 (resp. 3). Using (9.3), it follows that in these cases $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}_3} = \mathcal{A}_G^2$ is supersolvable (resp. $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}_4} = \mathcal{A}_G^3$ is inductively factored), where G is the underlying simple graph of the Dynkin diagram of Φ . Next we show that [Rö17, Thm. 1.31] generalizes to all almost-path-graphs $A_{n,k}$.

In our following two results we present particular ideal subarrangements of \mathcal{A}_G for $G = A_{n,k}$ which are inductively factored.

Proposition 9.7. *Let $G = A_{n,k}$ be the almost-path-graph, for $n \geq 3$ and $k \geq 2$. Then \mathcal{A}_G^2 is supersolvable, and \mathcal{A}_G^3 is inductively factored.*

Proof. The inductive arguments in [Rö17] to derive [Rö17, Thm. 1.31] equally apply to the generalizations for all almost-path-graphs $A_{n,k}$, for both parts. Thanks to [Rö17, Thm. 1.31], for $k = 2$ and any n and for $k = 3$ and $n \leq 7$, both parts above hold. So we may assume

that $n \geq 7$ and $k \geq 4$ and argue by induction on n . Consider the subgraph $G' = A_{n-1,k}$ of G and the induced subarrangement $\mathcal{A}_{G'}$ of \mathcal{A}_G . Let X be the flat in $L(\mathcal{A}_G^2)$ (resp. in $L(\mathcal{A}_G^3)$) given by the intersection of all H_I , where $I \subseteq [n-1]$. Then X is a modular element of corank 1 in \mathcal{A}_G^2 (resp. \mathcal{A}_G^3) and $\mathcal{A}_{G'}$ (resp. $\mathcal{A}_{G'}^3$) coincides with this localization of \mathcal{A}_G^2 at X (resp. \mathcal{A}_G^3 at X). It follows from [Rö17, Thm. 1.12, Lem. 3.1, Lem. 3.4] that $\mathcal{A}_{G'}$ is supersolvable (resp. $\mathcal{A}_{G'}^3$ is inductively factored), since by induction, $\mathcal{A}_{G'}$ is supersolvable (resp. $\mathcal{A}_{G'}^3$ is inductively factored). \square

Next we consider another family of ideal subarrangements $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ of the \mathcal{A}_G for $G = A_{n,k}$ each of its members lies properly in $\mathcal{A}_{A_{n,k}}^4$ and properly contains $\mathcal{A}_{A_{n,k}}^3$.

Proposition 9.8. *Let $G = A_{n,k}$ for $n \geq 4$. Let \mathcal{I} be a lower order ideal in the poset of connected subgraphs of G consisting of subsets $I \subset [n+1]$ subject to $\mathcal{A}_{A_{n,k}}^3 \subsetneq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}} \subsetneq \mathcal{A}_{A_{n,k}}^4$ and $I \neq \{k-1, k, k+1, n+1\}$. Then $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is inductively factored.*

Proof. We argue by induction on n . Let $n = 4$. So $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is an ideal subarrangement of the Weyl arrangement of type D_5 with either 14 or 15 hyperplanes and exponents $\exp \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}} = \{1, 3, 3, 3, 4\}$ or $\{1, 3, 3, 4, 4\}$. One checks directly that in each instance $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is inductively factored. For instance, if $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ admits 15 hyperplanes, then the following is an inductive factorization of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$, where we use the short hand notation abc for $\ker(x_a + x_b + x_c)$:

$$\pi = \{2\}, \{1, 12, 125\}, \{3, 23, 123\}, \{5, 25, 235, 2345\}, \{4, 34, 234, 1234\}.$$

In fact there are four inductive factorizations of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$, but all are equivalent under the automorphism group of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$. Now suppose $n > 4$ and that the statement in the lemma holds for $n-1$. As in the proof of Proposition 9.7, the inductive arguments in [Rö17] to derive [Rö17, Thm. 1.31] equally apply here as well. So that the case for $n-1$ can be obtained as a localization of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ at a modular flat of corank 1 and so the result follows by induction. \square

10. RANK-GENERATING FUNCTIONS OF THE POSET OF REGIONS

Let \mathcal{A} be a hyperplane arrangement in the real vector space $V = \mathbb{R}^\ell$. A *region* of \mathcal{A} is a connected component of the complement $M(\mathcal{A}) := V \setminus \cup_{H \in \mathcal{A}} H$ of \mathcal{A} . Let $\mathcal{R} := \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A})$ be the set of regions of \mathcal{A} . For $R, R' \in \mathcal{R}$, we let $\mathcal{S}(R, R')$ denote the set of hyperplanes in \mathcal{A} separating R and R' . Then with respect to a choice of a fixed base region B in \mathcal{R} , we can partially order \mathcal{R} as follows:

$$R \leq R' \quad \text{if} \quad \mathcal{S}(B, R) \subseteq \mathcal{S}(B, R').$$

Endowed with this partial order, we call \mathcal{R} the *poset of regions of \mathcal{A} (with respect to B)* and denote it by $P(\mathcal{A}, B)$. This is a ranked poset of finite rank, where $\text{rk}(R) := |\mathcal{S}(B, R)|$, for R a region of \mathcal{A} , [Ed84, Prop. 1.1]. The *rank-generating function* of $P(\mathcal{A}, B)$ is defined to be the following polynomial in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[t]$

$$\zeta(P(\mathcal{A}, B); t) := \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}} t^{\text{rk}(R)}.$$

This poset along with its rank-generating function was introduced by Edelman [Ed84].

Thanks to work of Björner, Edelman, and Ziegler [BEZ90, Thm. 4.4] (see also Paris [Pa95]), respectively Jambu and Paris [JP95, Prop. 3.4, Thm. 6.1], in case of a real arrangement \mathcal{A} which is supersolvable, respectively inductively factored, there always exists a suitable base region B so that $\zeta(P(\mathcal{A}, B); t)$ admits a multiplicative decomposition which is determined by the exponents of \mathcal{A} , i.e.

$$(10.1) \quad \zeta(P(\mathcal{A}, B); t) = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} (1 + t + \dots + t^{e_i}),$$

where $\{e_1, \dots, e_{\ell}\} = \exp \mathcal{A}$ is the set of exponents of \mathcal{A} .

Quite remarkably many classical real arrangements do satisfy the factorization identity (10.1), the most prominent ones being Coxeter arrangements.

Let $W = (W, S)$ be a Coxeter group with associated reflection arrangement $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(W)$ which consists of the reflecting hyperplanes of the reflections in W in the real space $V = \mathbb{R}^n$, where $|S| = n$. The *Poincaré polynomial* $W(t)$ of the Coxeter group W is the polynomial in $\mathbb{Z}[t]$ defined by

$$(10.2) \quad W(t) := \sum_{w \in W} t^{\ell(w)},$$

where ℓ is the length function of W with respect to S . Then $W(t)$ coincides with the rank-generating function of the poset of regions $\zeta(P(\mathcal{A}, B); t)$ of the underlying reflection arrangement $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(W)$ with respect to B being the dominant Weyl chamber of W in V ; see [BEZ90] or [JP95].

The following factorization of $W(t)$ is due to Solomon [Sol66]:

$$(10.3) \quad W(t) = \prod_{i=1}^n (1 + t + \dots + t^{e_i}),$$

where $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ is the set of exponents of W , i.e., the set of exponents of $\mathcal{A}(W)$. So by the comments above, (10.3) coincides with the factorization in (10.1).

Moreover, also the rank-generating function of the poset of regions $\zeta(P(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}, B); t)$ for an ideal arrangement $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ from Definition 9.1 also obeys the factorization identity (10.1); see [ST06], [Rö17] for partial results, and [AHM⁺20, Cor. 1.3] for the general statement.

Let W be a Coxeter group again with reflection arrangement $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(W)$, let X be a member of the intersection lattice $L(\mathcal{A})$, and consider the restricted reflection arrangement \mathcal{A}^X . In general, \mathcal{A}^X is no longer a reflection arrangement. Nevertheless, thanks to [MR19, Thm. 1.3], there always exists a suitable base region B of \mathcal{A}^X in X so that also $\zeta(P(\mathcal{A}^X, B); t)$ satisfies (10.1), provided W is not of type E_8 . In case W is of type E_8 , then $\zeta(P(\mathcal{A}^X, B); t)$ satisfies (10.1), provided X has rank at most 3 with only two exceptions or $\mathcal{A}^X \cong (E_8, D_4)$.

We close with a comment on the rank-generating function of the poset of regions $\zeta(P(\mathcal{A}_G, B); t)$ of the free arrangements \mathcal{A}_G from Theorem 1.3.

Remark 10.4. It follows from Theorems 1.6, 1.7 and [JP95, Prop. 3.4, Thm. 6.1] that \mathcal{A}_G satisfies (10.1) for G a path graph P_n or a path-with-triangle graph $\Delta_{n,1}$ for $n \geq 2$. We checked that (10.1) also holds for \mathcal{A}_G for $G = \Delta_{4,2}$ and $\Delta_{5,2}$.

As discussed in the previous section, for $G = A_{n,2} = D_{n+1}$, $A_{5,3} = E_6$, $A_{6,3} = E_7$, and $A_{7,3} = E_8$, \mathcal{A}_G is a particular ideal arrangement. Thus it follows from [AHM⁺20, Cor. 1.3] that \mathcal{A}_G satisfies (10.1).

Given this strong evidence, it is very plausible that more generally, \mathcal{A}_G fulfills (10.1) for G an almost path graph $A_{n,k}$ or a path-with-triangle graph $\Delta_{n,k}$ for any $n \geq 2$ and any k .

Acknowledgments: The research of this work was supported in part by the DFG (Grant #RO 1072/25-1 (project number: 539865068) to G. Röhrle).

REFERENCES

- [Abe22] T. Abe, *Addition-deletion theorem for free hyperplane arrangements and combinatorics*. J. Algebra **610** (2022), 1–17.
- [ABC⁺16] T. Abe, M. Barakat, M. Cuntz, T. Hoge, and H. Terao, *The freeness of ideal subarrangements of Weyl arrangements*, JEMS, **18** (2016), no. 6, 1339–1348.
- [AHM⁺20] T. Abe, T. Horiguchi, M. Masuda, S. Murai, T. Sato, *Hessenberg varieties and hyperplane arrangements*. J. Reine Angew. Math. **764** (2020), 241–286.
- [AMR18] N. Amend, T. Möller and G. Röhrle, *Restrictions of aspherical arrangements*, Topology Appl. **249** (2018), 67–72.
- [BEZ90] A. Björner, P. Edelman, and G. Ziegler, *Hyperplane arrangements with a lattice of regions*. Discrete Comput. Geom. **5** (1990), no. 3, 263–288.
- [BT94] K. A. Brandt and H. Terao, *Free arrangements and relation spaces*. Discrete Comput. Geom. **12** (1994), no. 1, 49–63.
- [Br73] E. Brieskorn, *Sur les groupes de tresses [d’après V. I. Arnold]*. In *Séminaire Bourbaki, 24ème année (1971/1972)*, Exp. No. 401, pages 21–44. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 317, Springer, Berlin, 1973.
- [C22] M. Cuntz, *A Greedy Algorithm to Compute Arrangements of Lines in the Projective Plane*, Discrete Comput. Geom. **68** (2022), 107–124.
- [CG15] M. Cuntz and D. Geis, *Combinatorial simpliciality of arrangements of hyperplanes*. Beitr. Algebra Geom. **56** (2015), no. 2, 439–458.
- [CK24] M. Cuntz and L. Kühne, *On arrangements of hyperplanes from connected subgraphs*. Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) (to appear) <https://journals.sns.it/index.php/annaliscienze/article/view/6134/1418>
- [CM20] M. Cuntz and P. Mücksch, *MAT-free reflection arrangements*, Electronic J. Comb. **27(1)** (2020), #P1.28.
- [CRS19] M. Cuntz, G. Röhrle, and A. Schauenburg, *Arrangements of ideal type are inductively free*, Internat. J. Algebra Comput. **29** (2019), no. 5, 761–773.
- [Del72] P. Deligne, *Les immeubles des groupes de tresses généralisés*, Invent. Math. **17** (1972), 273–302.
- [DiP23] M. DiPasquale, *A homological characterization for freeness of multi-arrangements*, Math. Ann. **385** (2023), no. 1-2, 745–786.
- [Ed84] P.H. Edelman, *A partial order on the regions of \mathbb{R}^n dissected by hyperplanes*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **283** (1984), no. 2, 617–631.
- [F02] M. Falk, *Line-closed matroids, quadratic algebras, and formal arrangements*, Adv. in Appl. Math., **28** (2002), 250–271.
- [FR85] M. Falk and R. Randell, *The lower central series of a fiber-type arrangement*, Invent. Math. **82** (1985), no. 1, 77–88.

- [FR87] ———, *On the homotopy theory of arrangements*, Complex analytic singularities, 101–124, Adv. Stud. Pure Math., 8, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1987.
- [FR00] ———, *On the homotopy theory of arrangements. II. Arrangements—Tokyo 1998*, 93–125, Adv. Stud. Pure Math., 27, Kinokuniya, Tokyo, 2000.
- [HR16] T. Hoge and G. Röhrle, *Addition–Deletion Theorems for factorizations of Orlik–Solomon algebras and nice arrangements*, European Journal of Combinatorics **55** (2016), 20–40.
- [HR21] ———, *Some remarks on free arrangements*, Tôhoku Math. J. **73** (2021), no. 2, 277–288.
- [HRS17] T. Hoge, G. Röhrle and A. Schauenburg, *Inductive and Recursive Freeness of Localizations of multiarrangements*, in: Algorithmic and Experimental Methods in Algebra, Geometry, and Number Theory, Springer Verlag 2017.
- [Hul16] A. Hultman, *Supersolvability and the Koszul property of root ideal arrangements*, Proc. AMS, **144** (2016), 1401–1413.
- [JP95] M. Jambu and L. Paris, *Combinatorics of Inductively Factored Arrangements*, Europ. J. Combinatorics **16** (1995), 267–292.
- [JT84] M. Jambu and H. Terao, *Free arrangements of hyperplanes and supersolvable lattices*, Adv. in Math. **52** (1984), no. 3, 248–258.
- [MMR24] T. Möller, P. Mücksch, and G. Röhrle, *On Formality and Combinatorial Formality for hyperplane arrangements*, Discrete Comput. Geom. **72**, (2024), 73–90.
- [MR19] T. Möller and G. Röhrle, *Nice Restrictions of Reflection Arrangements*, Archiv Math. **112**(4), (2019), 347–359.
- [MR21] P. Mücksch and G. Röhrle, *Accurate arrangements*, Advances in Math. Vol. 383C, 30 pages (2021).
- [MRT24] P. Mücksch, G. Röhrle, and T.N. Tran *Flag-accurate arrangements*, Innov. Incidence Geom. **21** (2024), no. 1, 57–116.
- [MRW24] P. Mücksch, G. Röhrle and S. Wiesner, *Free multiderivations of connected subgraph arrangements*, preprint (2024).
- [OS80] P. Orlik and L. Solomon, *Combinatorics and topology of complements of hyperplanes*, Invent. math. **56** (1980), 77–94.
- [OST84] P. Orlik, L. Solomon, and H. Terao, *Arrangements of hyperplanes and differential forms*. Combinatorics and algebra (Boulder, Colo., 1983), 29–65, Contemp. Math., **34**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1984.
- [OT92] P. Orlik and H. Terao, *Arrangements of hyperplanes*, Springer-Verlag, 1992.
- [Pa93] L. Paris, *The Deligne complex of a real arrangement of hyperplanes*, Nagoya Math. J. **131** (1993), 39–65.
- [Pa95] ———, *Topology of factored arrangements of lines*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **123** (1995), no. 1, 7–261.
- [Pa95] ———, *The counting polynomial of a supersolvable arrangement*. Adv. Math. **116** (1995), no. 2, 356–364.
- [Ra89] R. Randell, *Lattice-isotopic Arrangements Are Topologically Isomorphic*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **107** (1989), no. 2, 555–559.
- [Rö17] G. Röhrle, *Arrangements of ideal type*, J. Algebra, **484**, (2017), 126–167.
- [Sol66] L. Solomon, *The orders of the finite Chevalley groups*. J. Algebra **3** (1966) 376–393.
- [ST06] E. Sommers and J. Tymoczko, *Exponents for B -stable ideals*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **358** (2006), no. 8, 3493–3509.
- [Ter80] H. Terao, *Arrangements of hyperplanes and their freeness I, II*, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo **27** (1980), 293–320.
- [Ter81] ———, *Generalized exponents of a free arrangement of hyperplanes and Shepherd-Todd-Brieskorn formula*, Invent. Math. **63** no. 1 (1981) 159–179.
- [Ter86] ———, *Modular elements of lattices and topological fibrations*, Adv. in Math. **62** (1986), no. 2, 135–4.
- [Ter92] ———, *Factorizations of the Orlik-Solomon Algebras*, Adv. in Math. **92**, (1992), 45–53.
- [Y93] S. Yuzvinsky, *The first two obstructions to the freeness of arrangements*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **335** (1993), no. 1, 231–244.

[Z90] Ziegler, *Matroid representations and free arrangements*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **320** (1990), no. 2, 525–541.

FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK, RUHR-UNIVERSITÄT BOCHUM, D-44780 BOCHUM, GERMANY

Email address: `lorenzo.giordani@rub.de`

FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK, RUHR-UNIVERSITÄT BOCHUM, D-44780 BOCHUM, GERMANY

Email address: `tilman.moeller@rub.de`

TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT BERLIN, INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, EINSTEINUFER 19, D-10587 BERLIN, GERMANY

Email address: `paul.muecksch+uni@gmail.com`

FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK, RUHR-UNIVERSITÄT BOCHUM, D-44780 BOCHUM, GERMANY

Email address: `gerhard.roehrle@rub.de`