

B-SPLINES, POLYTOPES AND THEIR CHARACTERISTIC D-MODULES

KETIL TVEITEN

ABSTRACT. Given a polytope $\sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, its characteristic distribution δ_σ generates a D -module which we call the *characteristic D -module of σ* and denote by M_σ . More generally, the characteristic distributions of a cell complex K with polyhedral cells generate a D -module M_K , which we call the *characteristic D -module of the cell complex*. We prove various basic properties of M_K , and show that under mild topological conditions on K , the D -module theoretic direct image of M_K coincides with the module generated by the B -splines associated to the cells of K (considered as distributions). We also give techniques for computing D -annihilator ideals of polytopes.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper concerns the D -module generated by the characteristic function of a polytope (or polyhedral cell complex) in \mathbb{R}^m ; we will call it the *characteristic D -module* of the polytope. To consider the D -module generated by a function is a very natural construction, and in contrast to what is generally the case, the geometric content is very explicit here, encoded via the submodules generated by the characteristic functions of the faces of the polytope.

De Concini and Procesi in [5] give an extensive treatment of certain B -splines (in particular, those arising from the projection of a box or a coordinate orthant, these being most useful for applications), using tools from D -module theory and combinatorics. A B -spline is a function given by integrating over the fibers of a projection, which is precisely the kind of construction the D -module theoretic direct image is intended to capture (see e.g. [10]). We can observe that the D -module generated by a B -spline should correspond in this sense to the direct image of the characteristic D -module of a suitable polytope. The aim of this paper is primarily to make this correspondence explicit, and give criteria for when it holds precisely; and so to provide a description of a class of D -module direct images, examples of which are in short supply in the literature.

Sections 2 and 3 describe the characteristic modules; these are constructed from linear semialgebraic sets in a very natural way. Section 3 in particular answers another interesting question: what differential equations do the characteristic functions satisfy, equivalently what is their D -annihilator ideal? This seems to have been an open problem for arbitrary polytopes, and a complete (though not efficient) solution is given here. Section 4 describes the direct images of the characteristic modules, including their higher direct images, and (Theorem 4.15) their connection to the B -spline module of De Concini and Procesi.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14F10, 32C38, 52B11.

Key words and phrases. D -modules, B -splines.

We will fix the following notation: X, Y and Z denote $\mathbb{C}^m, \mathbb{C}^s$ and \mathbb{C}^{m-s} , respectively. For any affine space H , $\mathbb{C}[H]$ denotes the ring of polynomials on H , D_H the ring of polynomial-coefficient differential operators on H ; D_H is called the *Weyl algebra* (in $\dim(H)$ variables), and is isomorphic to the \mathbb{C} -algebra generated by variables $x_1, \dots, x_{\dim(H)}, \partial_1, \dots, \partial_{\dim(H)}$ subject to the relations $[\partial_i, x_i] = 1$ and all other elements commute. We give \mathbb{R}^m its standard Euclidean structure, with induced Lebesgue measure dx on \mathbb{R}^m and all its subspaces; and similarly for X . We denote the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^m by e_1, \dots, e_m .

2. POLYHEDRAL CELL COMPLEXES AND THE CHARACTERISTIC MODULE

Definition 2.1. We will by *polytope* or *polyhedral cell* mean a closed simply-connected semialgebraic set in \mathbb{R}^m defined by linear polynomials, with dimension equal to the dimension of its affine hull. We do not make any requirements on convexity or compactness, but the requirement of closedness is essential. A *face* of a polytope σ is a polytope contained in σ , defined by the same polynomials as σ , with some inequalities replaced by equalities; in particular σ is a face of itself, each component of the boundary of σ is a face of σ , and the empty set is a face of every polytope. A *facet* is a face of codimension one. A *vertex* is a face of dimension zero.

By *polyhedral cell complex* we mean a union of polyhedral cells subject to the requirement that the intersection of any two cells is a face of both (this is like a simplicial complex, but we allow more general cells). In particular, the cell complex consisting of a single polytope σ and all its faces, is denoted $\widehat{\sigma}$.

The affine hull of a polytope σ is denoted by H_σ .

Definition 2.2. The *characteristic distribution* δ_σ of a polytope σ is defined by

$$\delta_\sigma(\phi) = \int_\sigma \phi \, dx$$

for a test function ϕ , where \int_σ is the $\dim(\sigma)$ -dimensional integral taken with respect to the appropriate restriction to H_σ of the standard measure. The Weyl algebra acts on δ_σ by

$$(p(x)\partial^\alpha \cdot \delta_\sigma)(\phi) = \int_\sigma (-1)^{|\alpha|} \partial^\alpha (p(x)\phi(x)) \, dx$$

If we denote the facets of a cell σ by σ_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, and let their outward unit normal vectors (relative to H_σ) be denoted n_i , we have the following relations, which we call the *standard relations*.

Proposition 2.3 (Standard relations). (i) *If $\dim(\sigma) > 0$, then for any directional derivative ∂_v where v is a vector tangent to H_σ , we have*

$$\partial_v \cdot \delta_\sigma = - \sum_i \langle v | n_i \rangle \delta_{\sigma_i}.$$

(ii) *Let $I(\sigma)$ denote the defining ideal of H_σ . For any $p \in I(\sigma)$, we have*

$$p \cdot \delta_\sigma = 0.$$

As σ is a polyhedral body, H_σ is an affine space defined by $m - \dim(\sigma)$ equations of degree 1, and the corresponding polynomials generate $I(\sigma)$.

Proof. (i) is Stokes' theorem, and (ii) is clear. \square

The set of standard relations for a polytope $\sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is spanned by $\dim(\sigma)$ relations of type 2.3(ii) and $\text{codim}(\sigma)$ relations of type 2.3(i); this is because H_σ is defined by $\text{codim}(\sigma)$ equations.

Example 2.4. Let I be the unit interval $[0, 1]$ in \mathbb{R}^1 , with coordinate x . Then $\partial_x \cdot \delta_I = \delta_0 - \delta_1$, $x \cdot \delta_0 = 0$, and $(x - 1) \cdot \delta_1 = 0$. It follows that δ_I is annihilated by the operator $x(x - 1)\partial_x$.

Definition 2.5. For a polyhedral cell complex $K = \bigcup \sigma$, we define the *characteristic module* of K to be the D_X -module

$$M_K := D_X \cdot \{\delta_\sigma | \sigma \subset K\},$$

generated by the characteristic distributions of all the cells of K .

Remark 2.6. We note that the support (in \mathbb{C}^m) of a generator δ_σ of M_K is equal to the affine closure H_σ . This is different from the support of δ_σ considered as a distribution (on \mathbb{R}^m), and is due to the fact that the module is defined by the differential equations the distribution δ_σ satisfies, which do not uniquely determine δ_σ ; there are other distributional solutions, but they are all supported on H_σ . In the remainder, the *support of δ_σ* will always mean the support of the generator δ_σ .

2.1. The skeleton filtration. This module has a natural filtration by the dimension of the support of the generators:

Definition 2.7 (The skeleton filtration). Let $F^i M_K := D_X \cdot \{\delta_\sigma | \sigma \subset K, \dim(\sigma) \leq i\}$, this is a submodule of M_K . These submodules form a filtration

$$F^0 M_K \subset F^1 M_K \subset \cdots \subset F^{m-1} M_K \subset F^m M_K = M_K$$

which we call the *skeleton filtration*.

Proposition 2.8. Let $i : H_\sigma \hookrightarrow X$ be the inclusion map. The filtration quotients $Q_k := F^k M_K / F^{k-1} M_K$ are semisimple, with summands isomorphic to the direct image under the inclusion $i_+^0 \mathbb{C}[H_\sigma]$, one for each k -cell $\sigma \subset K$.

Remark 2.9. See [7],[1, V] for definitions of the direct image functor i_+ ; this is a functor between the corresponding derived categories, and we will denote by i_+^0 the restriction to the zeroth cohomology object. When i is a closed embedding as here, these are equivalent, and we also have the celebrated theorem of Kashiwara ([6]), which we will use several times in the rest of the paper.

Theorem 2.10. Let $i : V \hookrightarrow W$ be a closed immersion of schemes. Then the functor i_+ is an equivalence between the category of coherent D_V -modules and the category of coherent D_W -modules with support on V .

Kashiwara's theorem is very useful, among other things it allows us to assume we are in maximal dimension when we need to. See [7, IV] or [3] for elegant expositions of the proof.

Proof of 2.8. It is clear that Q_k is generated by the (classes of the) k -cells, namely $Q_k = \sum D_X \cdot \overline{\delta_\sigma}$. We must show two things: that $D_X \cdot \overline{\delta_\sigma}$ is of the given form, and that the sum is direct.

We may assume by choosing coordinates appropriately that H_σ is the affine flat $x_{k+1} - p_{k+1} = \cdots = x_m - p_m = 0$. From the standard relations given in Proposition 2.3, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_j \overline{\delta_\sigma} &= 0, & j \leq k \\ (x_j - p_j) \overline{\delta_\sigma} &= 0, & j > k. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, we have $\partial_v \cdot \delta_\sigma = \sum_j \langle v | n_j \rangle \delta_{\sigma_j}$ for v parallel to H_σ , and in the quotient the right-hand side disappears, so we are left with $\partial_v \overline{\delta_\sigma} = 0$.

The existence of these relations implies that there is a surjective map

$$i_+^0 \mathbb{C}[H_\sigma] \rightarrow D_X \cdot \overline{\delta_\sigma}$$

and as the first module is simple by Kashiwara's Theorem (2.10), this is an isomorphism unless $D_X \cdot \overline{\delta_\sigma}$ is the zero module. It is not, as $\overline{\delta_\sigma} = 0$ would imply that δ_σ is some linear combination of distributions with support on lower-dimensional cells, which cannot be true as their supports have different dimension. Directness of the sum follows easily. \square

Corollary 2.11. *The modules $D_X \cdot \delta_{H_\sigma}$ and $D_X \cdot \overline{\delta_\sigma}$ are isomorphic, and also simple.*

Remark 2.12. This implies that we can write $D_X \cdot \overline{\delta_\sigma}$ as $\mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_k, \partial_{k+1}, \dots, \partial_m]$ for suitable coordinates x_i , where $k = \dim(\sigma)$. Suppose the coordinates are chosen so that $H_\sigma = \{x_{k+1} = p_{k+1}, \dots, x_m = p_m\}$, then for $i \leq k$, ∂_i acts by $\partial_i \cdot x_i = 1$, and for $i > k$, x_i acts by $x_i \cdot \partial_i = p_i \partial_i - 1$.

Because we now have a composition series for M_K with regular holonomic quotients, and regular holonomicity is preserved under extensions, we deduce the following:

Corollary 2.13. *M_K is regular holonomic.*

Proposition 2.14. *M_K is the quotient of the free module generated by the cells of K , by the submodule generated by the standard relations given in Proposition 2.3. Letting c be the number of cells in K , this submodule is generated by a total of $m \cdot c$ relations, and hence there is a canonical presentation*

$$D_X^{m \cdot c} \rightarrow D_X^c \twoheadrightarrow M_K,$$

where the last map is given by $\sum_{\sigma \subset K} p_\sigma \cdot g_\sigma \mapsto \sum_{\sigma \subset K} p_\sigma \delta_\sigma$, and $D_X^c = \bigoplus D_X \cdot g_\sigma$ is the free module generated by the cells of K .

Proof. Let us first define the maps properly. We label the generators of D_X^c by the cells of K — so that D_X^c is freely generated by generators g_σ , for all the $\sigma \subset K$ — and let the map $D_X^c \rightarrow M_K$ be given by $g_\sigma \mapsto \delta_\sigma$.

For each cell $\sigma \subset K$, the standard relations of type (i) and (ii) form vector spaces of dimension $\dim(H_\sigma)$ and $m - \dim(\sigma)$ respectively, so for each σ there are m linearly independent (over \mathbb{C}) relations that generate all. Each can be written as a D_X -linear combination $P^\sigma(\delta_\sigma, \dots, \delta_{\sigma_k}) = 0$.

We now let D_X^r be freely generated by generators r_{P^σ} , one for each generating standard relation, and define the map $D_X^r \rightarrow D_X^c$ by $r_{P^\sigma} \mapsto P^\sigma(g_\sigma, \dots, g_{\sigma_k})$.

The skeleton filtration on M_K induces filtrations on D_X^c and D_X^r , in both cases by dimension of σ : $F^i D_X^c$ and $F^i D_X^r$ are generated, respectively, by those g_σ and r_{P^σ} with $\dim(\sigma) \leq i$. Both maps respect the filtration, so passing to the associated graded modules we see that $gr(D_X^r) \rightarrow gr(D_X^c) \twoheadrightarrow gr(M_K)$ is a direct sum of sequences $D_X^m \xrightarrow{\alpha_\sigma} D_X \rightarrow D_X \cdot \overline{\delta_\sigma}$, one for each cell σ , where α_σ is the map given by $r_{P^\sigma} \mapsto P^\sigma(g_\sigma, 0, \dots, 0)$. Only exactness in the middle is non-obvious. Choosing coordinates such that H_σ is given by $x_{k+1} = \dots = x_m = 0$, so that $D_X \cdot \overline{\delta_\sigma} \simeq \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_k, \partial_{k+1}, \dots, \partial_m]$ as in 2.12, we see that the cokernel

of α_σ is $D_X/(\sum_{i \leq k} D_X \cdot \partial_i + \sum_{i > k} D_X \cdot x_i)$, and this is clearly isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_k, \partial_{k+1}, \dots, \partial_m] \simeq D_X \cdot \overline{\delta_\sigma}$. \square

Using the canonical presentation, it is easy to show the following facts.

Corollary 2.15. *If $K \subset L$ is a subcomplex, closed in L , then M_K is a submodule of M_L . If K_1 and K_2 are glued along a subcomplex F , we have $M_{K_1 \cup_F K_2} \simeq M_{K_1} \oplus_{M_F} M_{K_2}$.*

Theorem 2.16. *Recall that $\widehat{\sigma}$ denotes the cell complex consisting of a polytope σ and all its faces. Assume for all faces α, β of σ that if $H_\alpha \subset H_\beta$, then α is a face of β . Then $M_{\widehat{\sigma}} \simeq D_X \cdot \delta_\sigma \simeq D_X / \text{Ann}_{D_X}(\delta_\sigma)$.*

Proof. The claim is true if for any k -face τ we can find a $P \in D_X$ such that $P \cdot \delta_\sigma = \delta_\tau$, and it suffices by repeated application to assume τ is a facet. Let now A be the set of 1-faces α of σ not lying in $H(\tau)$, that is, α is not a face of τ . For each $\alpha \in A$, let ∂_α be a directional derivative along α . As each face β of σ not in $H(\tau)$ is parallel to some α , by 2.3 the action of ∂_α reduces δ_β to a sum of terms with support on the facets of β , specifically those facets not having α as a face. Consider now $(\prod_{\alpha \in A} \partial_\alpha) \cdot \delta_\sigma$, this will by the previous observation and the assumption on supports be equal to a sum of point distributions δ_p for points $p \notin H(\tau)$, generators δ_γ for γ a face of τ , and δ_τ , each with coefficient some polynomial $P_p(\partial), P_\gamma(\partial)$ in the variables ∂_i . We make the claim that the degree of $P_\tau(\partial) = \prod_{\alpha \in A} \partial_\alpha$ is strictly larger than the degree of any other $P_p(\partial), P_\gamma(\partial)$. The reason is that because terms involving δ_p, δ_γ are obtained by applying ∂_α to some δ_β with β parallel to α , and as we have the standard relation $\partial_\alpha \delta_\beta = \sum_j c_j \delta_{\beta_j}$ (where β_j are the faces of β not parallel to α , and c_j are constants), the polynomial coefficients of the δ_{β_j} have lower degree than the coefficient polynomial of δ_β . As δ_τ is by assumption not parallel to any α , there are no standard relations reducing $\partial_\alpha \delta_\tau$ to a sum of δ_γ 's, and so the coefficient of δ_τ retains the maximal degree.

So, $(\prod_{\alpha \in A} \partial_\alpha) \cdot \delta_\sigma = (\prod_{\alpha \in A} \partial_\alpha) \cdot \delta_\tau + \sum_p P_p(\partial) \delta_p + \sum_{\gamma \subset \tau} P_\gamma(\partial) \delta_\gamma$ with $\deg(P_p)$ and $\deg(P_\gamma)$ both strictly less than $\deg(\prod_{\alpha \in A} \partial_\alpha) = |A|$. Now, $H(\tau)$ is a hyperplane, and we may assume its defining equation is $x_m = 0$. Each $p = (p_1, \dots, p_m)$ occurring here lies in a hyperplane $x_m = p_m$, so acting on $(\prod_{\alpha \in A} \partial_\alpha) \cdot \delta_\tau + \sum_p P_p(\partial) \delta_p + \sum_{\gamma \subset \tau} P_\gamma(\partial) \delta_\gamma$ by $(x_m - p_m)^{|A|}$ kills $P_p(\partial) \delta_p$ (as $\deg(P_p) < |A|$), and moreover (as we are multiplying with a polynomial in the x_i variables) clearly does not increase the degree of any other coefficient $P_*(\partial)$ in the sum (as these are polynomials in the ∂_i variables). In this way, kill off the sum $\sum_p P_p(\partial) \delta_p$, and we are left with $C \cdot (\prod_{\alpha \in A} \partial_\alpha) \cdot \delta_\tau + \sum_{\gamma \subset \tau} P_\gamma(\partial) \delta_\gamma$ (where C is some constant), and acting on this by $x_m^{|A|}$ we kill the sum $\sum_{\gamma \subset \tau} P_\gamma(\partial) \delta_\gamma$, and the term $C \cdot (\prod_{\alpha \in A} \partial_\alpha) \cdot \delta_\tau$ is reduced to some constant times δ_τ . \square

2.2. De Rham cohomology of M_K .

Definition 2.17. The *de Rham complex* $DR_X(M)$ of a left D_X -module M is the complex $\Omega_X^\bullet \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[X]} M[m]$, with differential $d(\omega \otimes m) = d\omega \otimes m + \sum_i dx_i \wedge \omega \otimes \partial_i m$.

Theorem 2.18. *The de Rham complex $DR_X(M_K)$ of M_K is quasi-isomorphic to the Borel-Moore homology chain complex $C_\bullet^{BM}(K, \mathbb{C})$.*

Proof. We observe that the differential in the de Rham complex respects the skeleton filtration, and because each filtration quotient Q_k has support only of dimension k , the associated spectral sequence collapses on the E_1 page, with $E_1^{pq} = H_{dR}^{p+q}(Q_{-p}) \simeq \mathbb{C}^{a_k}$ if $(p, q) = (0, -k)$ and zero otherwise, to a single row

$$\mathbb{C}^{a_m} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{a_{m-1}} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{a_0},$$

where a_k is the number of cells $\sigma \subset K$ with $\dim(\sigma) = k$ and \mathbb{C}^{a_k} is the vector space with generators $\omega_\sigma \otimes \delta_\sigma := dx_{k+1} \wedge \dots \wedge dx_m \otimes \overline{\delta_\sigma}$ (in coordinates such that H_σ is parallel to $x_1 = \dots = x_k = 0$) for each such σ . It suffices to check a single generator (assuming suitable coordinates).

$$\begin{aligned} d(\omega_\sigma \otimes \overline{\delta_\sigma}) &= \sum_{i=1}^k dx_i \wedge \omega_\sigma \otimes \partial_i \overline{\delta_\sigma} \\ &= - \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_j \langle e_i | n_j \rangle dx_i \wedge \omega_\sigma \otimes \overline{\delta_{\sigma_j}} \\ &= - \sum_j \langle \sum_{i=1}^k e_i | n_j \rangle dx_i \wedge \omega_\sigma \otimes \overline{\delta_{\sigma_j}} \\ &= - \sum_j d(\sum_{i=1}^k e_i | n_j) x_i \wedge \omega_\sigma \otimes \overline{\delta_{\sigma_j}} \\ &= - \sum_j d(n_j) \wedge \omega_\sigma \otimes \overline{\delta_{\sigma_j}} \\ &= - \sum_j \omega_{\sigma_j} \otimes \overline{\delta_{\sigma_j}} \end{aligned}$$

We see that the generator corresponding to δ_σ is sent to the sum of the generators corresponding to the boundary cells δ_{σ_j} . Note that each generator $[\sigma]$ has closed support; d thus corresponds to the boundary maps for chains of *closed support*, i.e. the Borel-Moore homology boundary map, and we are done.

Quasi-isomorphism follows from the observation that the map $C_{\bullet}^{BM} \rightarrow DR_X(M_K)$ sending a homology class $[\sigma]$ to its corresponding generator $\omega_\sigma \otimes \delta_\sigma$ is an injective chain map which by the above is the identity on (co)homology. \square

Remark 2.19. The modules M_K generate by taking extensions a subcategory of the category of regular holonomic D_X -modules, and it follows from the existence of the skeleton filtration that this category is equal to the category of regular holonomic D_X -modules admitting a composition series with quotients each isomorphic to $i_+^0 \mathcal{O}_H$ for some affine flat H . The assignment $K \mapsto M_K$ is a functor into this category from the category of polyhedral cell complexes and cellular maps, this functor is faithful and preserves finite limits and colimits. Moreover, 2.18 gives us a commutative diagram of functors:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K & \xrightarrow{\quad} & M_K \\ & \searrow & \swarrow \\ C_{\bullet}^{BM} & & DR(M_K) \end{array}$$

3. ANNIHILATOR IDEALS FOR δ_σ

Recall that the polyhedral cell complex consisting of a single polytope σ and all its faces, is denoted by $\widehat{\sigma}$. In this section, we apply our constructions to produce some tools that enable computation of the annihilator ideal $\text{Ann}_{D_X}(\delta_\sigma)$ for any polytope σ . By application of Kashiwara's theorem we may assume σ is of maximal dimension.

Proposition 3.1. *For each vertex p of σ , let C_p be the cone at p spanned by the faces intersecting p . Then $\text{Ann}_{D_X}(\delta_\sigma) = \bigcap_p \text{Ann}_{D_X}(\delta_{C_p})$.*

Proof. Let M_p be the quotient of $M_{\widehat{\sigma}}$ given by dividing away the submodule generated by all δ_τ for cells τ not intersecting p . In geometric terms, M_p is isomorphic to the module associated to the cone C_p spanned by the faces intersecting p , and $\overline{\delta_\sigma} = \delta_{C_p}$. The map $M_{\widehat{\sigma}} \rightarrow \bigoplus_p M_p$ given by $\delta_\sigma \mapsto \sum_p \overline{\delta_\sigma}$ is an injection, because no cell except σ is common to all the C_p ; hence we have equality between the annihilator ideals $\text{Ann}_{D_X}(\delta_\sigma) = \text{Ann}_{D_X}(\sum_p \overline{\delta_\sigma})$. The latter is equal to the intersection $\bigcap_p \text{Ann}_{D_X}(\delta_{C_p})$. \square

This reduces the problem to computing the annihilator ideals of the cones on the vertices of σ , which by translation is equivalent to cones at the origin. Before we give the general method, we can observe that in the special case of a simple cone we have the following nice geometric description:

Proposition 3.2. *Let C be the positive orthant in \mathbb{R}^n . The annihilator ideal of δ_C is the ideal $\sum_i \langle x_i \partial_i \rangle$.*

Proof. (i): It is clear that $\sum_i \langle x_i \partial_i \rangle \subset \text{Ann}_{D_X}(\delta_C)$, and any $P \in \text{Ann}(\delta_C)$ can be written as $P = \sum_{I \subset \{1, \dots, n\}} c_I x_I^{\alpha_I} \partial_I^{\beta_I}$ (modulo $\sum_i \langle x_i \partial_i \rangle$), here I^c denotes the complement of I , and $x_j^{\alpha_j} := \prod_{j \in J} x_j^{\alpha_j}$ etc. Observe that the standard relations imply $\text{supp}(x_I^{\alpha_I} \partial_I^{\beta_I} \cdot \delta_C) = \text{supp}(\partial_I^{\beta_I} \cdot \delta_C) = C \cap \{x_I = 0\}$, so for $P \cdot \delta_C$ to be zero, every c_I must be zero, and P must belong to $\sum_i \langle x_i \partial_i \rangle$. \square

Example 3.3. The standard 2-simplex in \mathbb{R}^2 has vertices at $(0, 0)$, $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$; in coordinates (x, y) the annihilator ideals of the respective cones are $\langle x \partial_x, y \partial_y \rangle$, $\langle (x + y - 1) \partial_x, y(\partial_x - \partial_y) \rangle$ and $\langle (x + y - 1) \partial_y, x(\partial_x - \partial_y) \rangle$. Using e.g. the `Dmodules` package of the `Macaulay2` computer algebra suite, we compute that the annihilator ideal is equal to $\langle x(x + y - 1) \partial_x, y(x + y - 1) \partial_y \rangle$.

For non-simple cones there is no neat geometric argument, but there is a general algebraic method that combines the standard relations 2.3 with the algebraic Fourier transform. Recall that the algebraic Fourier transform is the automorphism of D_X given by $x_i \mapsto \partial_i, \partial_i \mapsto -x_i$. Twisting M_σ with this automorphism gives the module generated by the Laplace transform $L\delta_\sigma$ of δ_σ , and in the case where σ is a cone at the origin, the Laplace transform is a rational function. Algorithms exist for computing the annihilator ideal of a rational function (see [8] and [9]), so by computing the annihilator ideal of $L\delta_\sigma$ and taking its Fourier transform, we recover the annihilator ideal of δ_σ . Expressing $L\delta_\sigma$ as a rational function can be done by a variable elimination on the standard relations, as described below.

Algorithm 3.4. Computes the annihilator ideal of a cone σ at the origin.

Input: the Fourier transforms of the standard relations in M_σ of type (i) (these are equations of the form $v\mu_\sigma = -\sum\langle v|n_i\rangle\mu_{\sigma_i}$, see 2.3, where we denote by μ_τ the transform of δ_τ).

Output: the annihilator ideal of δ_σ .

- (1) Considering all the μ_{σ_i} 's as formal variables, eliminate from the transformed equations all the μ_{σ_i} except for μ_σ itself; this expresses μ_σ as a rational function in the original variables x_i .
- (2) Compute the annihilator ideal of this rational function.
- (3) Take the Fourier transform of this ideal.

Example 3.5. Let σ be the cone in \mathbb{R}^3 with rays $(1, 0, 0)$, $(0, 1, 0)$, $(0, 0, 1)$ and $(-1, -1, -1)$ (connected in that order). The Laplace transform of δ_σ is $L\delta_\sigma = \frac{x+z}{xyz(x+y+z)}$. The annihilator ideal of $L\delta_\sigma$ is generated by the elements $x\partial_x + y\partial_y + z\partial_z + 3$, $z\partial_y\partial_z - z\partial_z^2 + \partial_y - 2\partial_z$, $yz(\partial_y^2 - \partial_z^2) + 2z\partial_y - 2y\partial_z - 2z\partial_z - 2$, $yz\partial_x(\partial_y - \partial_z) + z(\partial_x - \partial_z) - y\partial_y - 2$ and $yz(x+z)(\partial_y - \partial_z) - xy + xz + z^2$. Its Fourier transform is the annihilator ideal of δ_σ , and is generated by $x\partial_x + y\partial_y + z\partial_z$, $(y-z)z\partial_z$, $(y^2 - z^2)\partial_y\partial_z + 2z\partial_z$, $(y-z)x\partial_y\partial_z + (y-x)\partial_y + z\partial_z$ and $(z-y)(\partial_x + \partial_z)\partial_y\partial_z + 2\partial_y\partial_z$.

4. DIRECT IMAGES AND B -SPLINES

We consider the projection map $\pi : \mathbb{R}^m = \mathbb{R}^s \times \mathbb{R}^{m-s} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^s$ given by projecting on the first s coordinates, and its complexification $\pi : \mathbb{C}^m = \mathbb{C}^s \times \mathbb{C}^{m-s} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^s$. For convenience we denote as before $X = \mathbb{C}^m$, and also $Y = \mathbb{C}^s$, $Z = \mathbb{C}^{m-s}$, and use coordinates (y, z) on X . The direct image functor from D_X -modules to D_Y -modules is given by

$$\pi_+ M := DR_{X/Y}(M),$$

see [7],[1, V, VI] for details. In considering the direct image of M_K , we will focus in particular on the zeroth-level part

$$(4.1) \quad \pi_+^0 M_K \simeq M_K / \sum_j \partial_{z_j} M_K.$$

Some useful notation:

Definition 4.1. For a cell $\sigma \subset K$, let $v(\sigma) := \dim(\sigma) - \dim(\pi(\sigma))$ (which is the same as the dimension of a generic fiber $\pi^{-1}(x) \cap K$ for a point $x \in \text{int}(\pi(\sigma))$). We call $v(\sigma)$ the *fiber dimension* of σ . In particular, if $\dim(\sigma) = \dim(X) = m$, then $v(\sigma) = m - s$.

We also extend this notation to the whole complex, and let $v(K) := \dim(K) - \dim(\pi(K))$. Note that a complex K can contain cells σ with $v(\sigma) > v(K)$.

Proposition 4.2 (Standard relations for $\pi_+^0 M_K$). *Let σ be a cell in K of top dimension (i.e. $\dim(\sigma) = \dim(X) = m$), with facets σ_i with outward unit normals n_i , and let $\pi : X = Y \times Z \rightarrow Y$ be the projection on the first s coordinates. Denote the class of δ_σ in the direct image $\pi_+^0 M_K$ by $\overline{\delta_\sigma}$. Then the following relations hold:*

- (i) $\partial_{\pi(z)} \overline{\delta_\sigma} = -\sum_i \langle \pi(z) | n_i \rangle \overline{\delta_{\sigma_i}}$, for any point z in H_σ (where we let $\partial_{\pi(z)} := \sum_i \langle e_i | \pi(z) \rangle \partial_i$),
- (ii) $\sum_i \langle v | n_i \rangle \overline{\delta_{\sigma_i}} = 0$, for any $v \in \ker(\pi)$, and
- (iii) $v(\sigma) \overline{\delta_\sigma} = \sum_i (d_i - \sum_{j \leq s} \langle e_j | n_i \rangle x_j) \cdot \overline{\delta_{\sigma_i}}$, where $\sum_j \langle e_j | n_i \rangle x_j - d_i = 0$ is the defining equation of H_{σ_i} .
- (iv) $p(x) \cdot \overline{\delta_\sigma} = 0$ for any $p(x) \in I(H_{\pi(\sigma)})$.

Proof. For $j \leq s$, the action of ∂_j is unchanged in the quotient (4.1), which implies (i). For $j > s$, $\partial_j \delta_\sigma$ is zero in the quotient (4.1): $0 = \partial_j \delta_\sigma = \sum_i \langle e_j | n_i \rangle \overline{\delta_{\sigma_i}}$ and since $\ker(\pi) = \langle e_j | j > s \rangle$, we get (ii).

The affine spans H_{σ_i} of the boundary cells σ_i are defined by equations $\langle x | n_i \rangle = d_i$ for some constants d_i . Now $\sum_{j>s} \partial_j x_j \overline{\delta_\sigma} = 0$, because $\sum \partial_j x_j$ is in the ideal $\sum_{j>s} \partial_j D_X$. We then get $0 = \sum_{j>s} \partial_j x_j \overline{\delta_\sigma} = \sum_{j>s} (1 + x_j \partial_j) \overline{\delta_\sigma}$, or (using $v(\sigma) = m - s$)

$$\left((m - s) + \sum_{j>s} x_j \partial_j \right) \overline{\delta_\sigma} = \left(v(\sigma) + \sum_{j>s} x_j \partial_j \right) \overline{\delta_\sigma} = 0.$$

Let us expand this:

$$\begin{aligned} v(\sigma) \overline{\delta_\sigma} &= - \sum_{j>s} x_j \partial_j \overline{\delta_\sigma} \\ &= \sum_{j>s} x_j \sum_i \langle e_j | n_i \rangle \overline{\delta_{\sigma_i}} \\ &= \sum_i \left(\sum_{j>s} \langle e_j | n_i \rangle x_j \right) \overline{\delta_{\sigma_i}} \\ &= \sum_i (d_i - \langle e_1 | n_i \rangle x_1 - \cdots - \langle e_s | n_i \rangle x_s) \overline{\delta_{\sigma_i}} \\ &= \sum_i (d_i - \sum_{j \leq s} \langle e_j | n_i \rangle x_j) \overline{\delta_{\sigma_i}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second-to-last equality uses the standard relation $(\sum_j \langle e_j | n_i \rangle x_j - d_i) \delta_{\sigma_i} = 0$; and we have (iii). The claim (iv) is of course obvious, it follows by definition that $\text{supp}(\overline{\delta_\sigma}) = \pi(\text{supp}(\delta_\sigma)) = \pi(H_\sigma) = H_{\pi(\sigma)}$. \square

The corresponding result for general cells not of top dimension follows from an application of Kashiwara's Theorem.

Definition 4.3. Let $F_{\leq i}^\pi := D_X \cdot \{\delta_\sigma | \sigma \subset K, \dim(\pi(\sigma)) \leq i\}$. These submodules form a filtration on M_K , which we call the π -skeleton filtration. We denote the filtration quotients by Q_i^π . Let $F_{\leq i}^{\pi'} := D_Y \cdot \{\overline{\delta_\sigma} | \sigma \subset K, \dim(\pi(\sigma)) \leq i\}$. These are submodules of $\pi_+^0 M_K$, and form a filtration which we call the skeleton filtration on $\pi_+^0 M_K$. We denote the filtration quotients by $Q_i^{\pi'}$.

Definition 4.4. Let $K_i, K_{\leq i}$ denote the subcomplexes of K given by respectively $K_i := \bigcup_{\dim(\pi(\sigma))=i} \sigma$ and $K_{\leq i} := \bigcup_{\dim(\pi(\sigma)) \leq i} \sigma$. Note that $K_{\leq i}$ is closed in K , and so clearly $F_{\leq i}^\pi \simeq M_{K_{\leq i}}$.

Proposition 4.5. $F_{\leq i}^{\pi'} \simeq \pi_+^0 F_{\leq i}^\pi$, and $Q_i^{\pi'} \simeq \pi_+^0 Q_i^\pi$.

Proof. The second claim follows from the first. There is a surjective map $\theta : \pi_+^0 F_{\leq k}^\pi \rightarrow F_{\leq k}^{\pi'}$ given by $\overline{\delta_\sigma} \mapsto \delta_\sigma$ sending the class of δ_σ in $\pi_+^0 F_{\leq k}^\pi$ to the class of δ_σ in $\pi_+^0 M_K$. If we let $\iota : F_{\leq k}^{\pi'} \hookrightarrow \pi_+^0 M_K$ and $i : F_{\leq k}^\pi \hookrightarrow M_K$ be the inclusions of submodules, and $\widehat{i} : \pi_+^0 F_{\leq k}^\pi \rightarrow \pi_+^0 M_K$ the map induced by i in the direct image, we have $\widehat{i} = \iota \circ \theta$, so if we can show that \widehat{i} is injective, θ is an isomorphism.

Consider now the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
F_{\leq k}^\pi & \xrightarrow{q_k} & \pi_+^0 F_{\leq k}^\pi \\
\downarrow i & & \downarrow \widehat{i} \\
M_K & \xrightarrow{q} & \pi_+^0 M_K \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\text{cok}(i) & \xrightarrow{\overline{q}} & \text{cok}(\widehat{i})
\end{array}$$

where $q : M_K \rightarrow M_K / \sum \partial_z M_K \simeq \pi_+^0 M_K$ (and similar for q_k) is the quotient map from (4.1), and $\overline{q} : \text{cok}(i) \rightarrow \text{cok}(\widehat{i})$ is the map induced by q . Considering this diagram as a double complex, the associated spectral sequence gives us that $\ker(\widehat{i}) = 0$ and we are done. \square

Theorem 4.6. *The cohomology modules $h^i(DR_{X/Y} Q_k^\pi)$ of $DR_{X/Y} Q_k^\pi$ are semisimple D_Y -modules, with summands isomorphic to $D_Y \cdot \overline{\delta_{\pi(\sigma)}}$ for $\sigma \in K_k$. The number of such summands for $h^i(DR_{X/Y} Q_k^\pi)$ is equal to $\dim H_{i+k}^{BM}(K_k, \mathbb{C})$.*

Proof. We recall our convention that $X = Y \times Z$, with π the projection on Y . We will (begin to) compute the relative de Rham complex by means of a skeleton filtration (as in 2.7 with the obvious alterations) on Q_k^π . We can express each skeleton filtration quotient summand $D_X \cdot \overline{\delta_\sigma}$ as a module $\mathbb{C}[y_1, \dots, \partial_{y_s}, z_1, \dots, \partial_{z_{m-s}}]$ by choosing suitable coordinates, in the following manner. We choose the y_i such that

$$D_Y \cdot \overline{\delta_{\pi(\sigma)}} \simeq \mathbb{C}[y_1, \dots, y_{\dim(\pi(\sigma))}, \partial_{y_{\dim(\pi(\sigma))+1}}, \dots, \partial_{y_s}]$$

in the same way as in 2.12. Similarly, we choose the z_j such that for a generic fiber $F := \pi^{-1}(p) \cap H_\sigma$ (where $p \in \text{int}(\pi(\sigma))$ is some point), we have, also as in 2.12, that

$$D_Z \cdot \overline{\delta_F} \simeq \mathbb{C}[z_1, \dots, z_{v(\sigma)}, \partial_{z_{v(\sigma)-1}}, \dots, \partial_{z_{m-s}}].$$

This isomorphism of course depends on which point p we choose, but the coordinates do not. In particular we have $\partial_{z_j} \overline{\delta_\sigma} = 0$ for $j \leq v(\sigma)$.

The relative de Rham complex $DR_{X/Y}(D_X \cdot \overline{\delta_\sigma})$ is now of the form

$$\Omega_{X/Y}^\bullet \otimes \mathbb{C}[y_1, \dots, y_{\dim(\pi(\sigma))}, \partial_{y_{\dim(\pi(\sigma))+1}}, \dots, \partial_{y_s}, z_1, \dots, z_{v(\sigma)}, \partial_{z_{v(\sigma)-1}}, \dots, \partial_{z_{m-s}}],$$

and since the differential $d_Z = \sum_j dz_j \otimes \partial_{z_j}$ commutes with the Y variables, this becomes

$$\mathbb{C}[y_1, \dots, \partial_{y_s}] \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} (\Omega_Z^\bullet \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[Z]} \mathbb{C}[z_1, \dots, \partial_{z_{m-s}}]).$$

As in 2.18 we have

$$\Omega_Z^\bullet \otimes \mathbb{C}[z_1, \dots, z_{v(\sigma)}, \partial_{z_{v(\sigma)-1}}, \dots, \partial_{z_{m-s}}] \simeq C_\bullet^{BM}(\pi^{-1}(p) \cap \widehat{\sigma}).$$

The cohomology is now computed via the spectral sequence associated to the skeleton filtration on Q_k^π , which begins with $E_0^{pq} = \Omega_{X/Y}^{m-s+p+q} \otimes Q_{-p}$, and collapses on the E_1 page to a single row

$$\bigoplus_{v(\sigma)=m-s-k} D_Y \cdot \overline{\delta_{\pi(\sigma)}} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \bigoplus_{v(\sigma)=0} D_Y \cdot \omega_\sigma \otimes \overline{\delta_{\pi(\sigma)}}$$

(we let $\omega_\sigma = dz_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dz_{v(\sigma)}$, in the coordinates suiting each σ as above).

We can now show that the cohomology modules must be direct sums of simple modules: as the differential d_Z commutes with D_Y , its action is determined by the action on the generators $\omega_{\pi(\sigma)}\overline{\delta_{\pi(\sigma)}}$, and so taking cohomology only involves identification of generators. This implies that the cohomology modules are of the form $\sum D_Y \cdot \omega_{\pi(\sigma)}\overline{\delta_{\pi(\sigma)}}$, and one gets a (non-canonical) direct sum decomposition by choosing some generating set. We recall from 2.11 that each summand $D_Y \cdot \omega_{\pi(\sigma)}\overline{\delta_{\pi(\sigma)}}$ is simple.

We want to relate this to the homology of K_k . We recall from 2.18 that the de Rham differential d_X corresponds to the topological boundary map, because for a generator $\omega_\sigma \otimes \delta_\sigma$ we had

$$d(\omega_\sigma \otimes \delta_\sigma) = - \sum_{\sigma_i \subset \partial\sigma} \omega_{\sigma_i} \otimes \delta_{\sigma_i}.$$

Now, in the relative de Rham complex we have the relative differential d_Z acting on generators $\omega_\sigma \otimes \delta_\sigma$, and this also behaves like the topological boundary map, the same computation as in 2.18 works, and we get

$$d_Z(\omega_\sigma \otimes \delta_\sigma) = - \sum_{\sigma_i \subset \partial\sigma} \omega_{\sigma_i} \otimes \delta_{\sigma_i}$$

We see that the correspondence of the de Rham differential to the topological boundary map holds, except for one subtlety: those cells $\sigma_i \subset \partial\sigma$ such that H_{σ_i} is contained in a translate of $\ker(\pi)$ do not appear in the final sum. These are precisely those cells in the boundary of σ that have image of dimension strictly lower than $\dim(\pi(\sigma))$. Thus, if we restrict our attention to the subcomplex K_k , where these cells are removed, the correspondence to the topological boundary map remains. Just as we had $d[\sigma] = d(\omega_\sigma \otimes \delta_\sigma) = - \sum \omega_{\sigma_i} \otimes \delta_{\sigma_i} = [\partial\sigma]$, we have now $d_Z(\omega_\sigma \otimes \delta_\sigma) = - \sum \omega_{\sigma_i} \otimes \delta_{\sigma_i}$, the only difference is instead of constant coefficients we now have D_Y -coefficients.

We observe that the cells in K_k all have $\dim(\sigma) = k + v(\sigma)$, and accordingly the generators of $h^i(DR_{X/Y}Q_k^\pi)$ correspond to cells with $\dim(\sigma) = k + i$. This gives us that the number of summands in $h^i(DR_{X/Y}Q_k^\pi)$ is equal to the dimension of the homology group $H_{k+i}^{BM}(K_k, \mathbb{C})$, and one can choose as generators any set of $\overline{dz_{J_\sigma}} \otimes \overline{\delta_\sigma}$'s such that the associated homology classes $[\sigma]$ generate $H_{k+i}^{BM}(K_k, \mathbb{C})$. \square

Remark 4.7. Using 4.6 we can compute the skeleton filtration quotients of each level of the direct image π_+M_K , by running the appropriate spectral sequence. To recover π_+M_K from the filtration quotients, it is enough to find the extension with the correct de Rham cohomology, as each isomorphism class of extensions has different cohomology.

In the same way as 2.14 we can show the following:

Proposition 4.8. *There is a canonical presentation*

$$(D_Y)^r \rightarrow (D_Y)^c \twoheadrightarrow \pi_+^0 M_K$$

where c is the number of cells in K , and r is equal to $(\dim(Y)+1) \cdot c + \sum_{\sigma \subset K} (v(\sigma) - \delta_{0,v(\sigma)})$ (here, $\delta_{0,v(\sigma)}$ is the Kronecker delta function).

4.1. Distributional direct images and B -splines.

Definition 4.9. The *distributional direct image* of δ_σ is defined by

$$\pi_*\delta_\sigma := [\phi \mapsto \int_\sigma \phi \circ \pi \, dx]$$

for a test function ϕ on \mathbb{R}^s . This is the distribution form of the well-known *multivariate B -spline*

$$\sigma_\pi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det(\pi \cdot \pi^t)}} \text{vol}(\pi^{-1}(x) \cap \sigma),$$

(where we by abuse of notation write π for the matrix associated to π). Using this we can also express $\pi_*\delta_\sigma$ as the distribution

$$\phi \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^s} \phi(x) \sigma_\pi(x) dx$$

(see e.g. [5, chapter 7] for details).

De Concini and Procesi in [5] investigate some of the properties of the module $D_Y \cdot \pi_*\delta_K$, when π is a projection, in the special cases when K is a box or a cone. In light of what we have done so far, we might say that for general K , the module generated by all the $\pi_*\delta_\sigma$ is the more natural object, so let us investigate it closer.

Definition 4.10. We let $S_K := W \cdot \{\pi_*\delta_\sigma \mid \sigma \subset K\}$.

There are similar standard relations as for $\pi_+^0 M_K$:

Theorem 4.11 (De Boor - Höllig, [4]). *Let σ be a polyhedral body in \mathbb{R}^m , with facets σ_i , and corresponding outward unit normals n_i , and let π be the projection on the first s coordinates. Assume also that the fibers $\pi^{-1}(x) \cap K$ are compact. Then the following hold:*

- (i) $\partial_{\pi(z)} \pi_*\delta_\sigma = -\sum_i \langle \pi(z) | n_i \rangle \pi_*\delta_{\sigma_i}$, for any $z \in \mathbb{R}^m$,
- (ii) $\sum_i \langle v | n_i \rangle \pi_*\delta_{\sigma_i} = 0$, for $v \in \mathbb{R}^m$ orthogonal to \mathbb{R}^s , and
- (iii) $v(\sigma) \pi_*\delta_\sigma = \sum_i \langle k_i - x | n_i \rangle \pi_*\delta_{\sigma_i}$, where k_i is an arbitrary point of σ_i and $x \in \mathbb{R}^s$.

Remark 4.12. As with the previous case, suitable restrictions of π to H_σ with appropriate coordinate changes give the corresponding results for general σ .

We observe that the standard relations for $\pi_*\delta_\sigma$ (4.11) are essentially identical to the standard relations for $\pi_+^0 M_K$ (4.2), and we can make the analogous constructions of skeleton filtration and canonical presentation, and achieve the analogous results (we omit tedious repetition of the arguments).

There is only one difference between the modules $\pi_+^0 M_K$ and S_K defined by these standard relations: 4.11(ii) and 4.2(ii) both essentially say that $\partial_v \delta_\sigma = 0$ for $v \in \ker(\pi)$, which means a certain linear combination of the boundary cells δ_{σ_i} is zero. The important observation is that 4.11(ii) applies even if the σ in question is *not* in K , while 4.2(ii) does not. The reason is obvious: the $\pi_*\delta_\sigma$, being concrete distributions, do not care what module they sit in, while the abstract generators $\overline{\delta_\sigma}$ are not so lucky. We thus get extra relations in $\pi_+^0 M_K$ whenever there are “missing” cells.

To formalise this we recall a definition from general topology (see also [2] for a further introduction):

Definition 4.13. We say that a cell σ in K has a *free facet* τ if τ is a facet of σ , and is not a facet of any other cell in K ; we say that (σ, τ) is a *free pair*. If we remove σ and τ from K , we obtain another cell complex L which we call an *elementary collapse* of K , and K is an *elementary expansion* of L . A complex L obtained from K by a sequence of elementary collapses is called a *collapse* of K , and we say that K is an *expansion* of L . Two complexes related by a sequence of collapses and expansions are said to be *elementarily equivalent*.

Let us modify this slightly to suit our purposes:

Definition 4.14. If (σ, τ) is a free pair of K and $v(\sigma) = v(\tau) + 1$, we say that (σ, τ) is a *$v(\sigma)$ -free pair* of K (with respect to π). The concepts of $v(\sigma)$ -(elementary) collapse and $v(\sigma)$ -elementary equivalence are defined analogously (with all involved elementary collapses and extensions being the removal or addition of a $v(\sigma)$ -free pair).

Theorem 4.15. *There is a canonical surjective map $\pi_+^0 M_K \rightarrow S_K$ given by $\overline{\delta_\sigma} \mapsto \pi_* \delta_\sigma$. If K is 1-elementarily equivalent to a complex K' with connected fibers $\pi^{-1}(x) \cap K'$, then the canonical map is an isomorphism.*

Proof. Surjectivity follows directly from the above observations about the standard relations. It remains to show two things: that 1-elementary collapses do not change the isomorphism class of $\pi_+^0 M_K$; and that if K has connected fibers under π , then $\pi_+^0 M_K$ is isomorphic to S_K .

The standard relation 4.2(iii) expresses each $\overline{\delta_\sigma}$ with $v(\sigma) > 0$ in terms of those of its facets $\overline{\delta_{\sigma_i}}$ with $v(\sigma_i) < v(\sigma)$ (the coefficients of the remaining facets are zero). By repeated application, this implies that $\pi_+^0 M_K$ is generated by those $\overline{\delta_\sigma}$ for which $v(\sigma) = 0$, with relations among them determined by cells with $v(\sigma) = 1$ (given by 4.2(ii)) and cells with $v(\sigma) = 0$ (given by 4.2(i)). (The analogous statement for S_K follows in the same manner.) It follows that if we add or remove cells from K to produce another complex K' , we get isomorphic direct image modules if the addition or removal of cells preserves these relations. The claim is thus that 1-elementary collapses and expansions preserves the standard relations.

It suffices to check this for a complex $\widehat{\sigma}$ with $v(\sigma) = 1$. The standard relation 4.2(ii) essentially says that $\partial_v \delta_\sigma = 0$ for any $v \in \ker(\pi)$ parallel to H_σ , which means a certain linear combination of those boundary cells δ_τ with $v(\tau) = 0$ is zero, and we can thus write any one of them as a sum of the others, which then generate $\pi_+^0 M_{\widehat{\sigma}}$. So, in $\pi_+^0 M_{\widehat{\sigma}}$, any single one of the generators $\overline{\delta_\tau}$ (with τ a free facet of σ) is redundant, and it follows that $\pi_+^0 M_{\widehat{\sigma}} \simeq \pi_+^0 M_{\widehat{\sigma} \setminus (\sigma, \tau)}$, and further that 1-elementary equivalent cell complexes give isomorphic direct image modules.

For the second claim, if K has connected fibers, all the cells with $v(\tau) = 0$ are connected by cells with $v(\sigma) = 1$, and so adding any more cells with $v(\sigma) = 1$ can not introduce any extra relations between the generators; the ‘extra’ relations in S_K are already there. \square

Even when 4.15 fails, we can at least express $\pi_+^0 M_K$ as an extension, using the geometry of K and π to recover the kernel of the map $\pi_+^0 M_K \twoheadrightarrow S_K$. We illustrate by a simple example:

Example 4.16. Let $\pi : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ be the projection $(x, y, z) \mapsto (x, y)$, and let K be the unit box $[0, 1]^3$ with the interior and any two ‘vertical’ facets removed. It

is easy to see that K is not 1-elementarily equivalent to a complex with connected fibers, as neither of the missing facets form a free pair with the interior of the box, because of the remaining missing facet.

Letting *top* and *bottom* denote the top and bottom facets (in the z direction), we see that the kernel of the map $\pi_+^0 M_K \twoheadrightarrow S_K$ is generated by $\overline{\delta_{top}} - \overline{\delta_{bottom}}$ (considered as a submodule of $\pi_+^0 M_K$). This submodule is isomorphic to the module generated by $\delta_{\pi(K)}$ (and in this case actually isomorphic to S_K , though this is not the general case), in other words we have the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow M_{\pi(K)} \rightarrow \pi_+^0 M_K \rightarrow S_K \rightarrow 0$.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to my advisor Rikard Bøgvad, for all the usual reasons; I would also like to thank Rolf Källström and Jan-Erik Björk for helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Borel, P.-P. Grivel, B. Kaup, A. Haefliger, B. Malgrange, and F. Ehlers, *Algebraic D-modules*, Perspectives in Mathematics, vol. 2, Academic Press Inc., Boston, MA, 1987.
- [2] Marshall M. Cohen, *A course in simple-homotopy theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1973, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 10.
- [3] S. C. Coutinho, *A primer of algebraic D-modules*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts, vol. 33, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [4] Carl de Boor and Klaus Höllig, *Recurrence relations for multivariate B-splines*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **85** (1982), no. 3, 397–400.
- [5] Corrado De Concini and Claudio Procesi, *Topics in hyperplane arrangements, polytopes and box-splines*, Universitext, Springer, New York, 2011.
- [6] Masaki Kashiwara, *Algebraic study of systems of partial differential equations*, Mém. Soc. Math. France (N.S.) (1995), no. 63, xiv+72.
- [7] Bernard Malgrange, *De Rham complex and direct images of \mathcal{D} -modules*, Éléments de la théorie des systèmes différentiels. Images directes et constructibilité (Nice, 1990), Travaux en Cours, vol. 46, Hermann, Paris, 1993, pp. 1–13.
- [8] Toshinori Oaku and Nobuki Takayama, *Algorithms for D-modules—restriction, tensor product, localization, and local cohomology groups*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **156** (2001), no. 2-3, 267–308.
- [9] Toshinori Oaku, Nobuki Takayama, and Uli Walther, *A localization algorithm for D-modules*, J. Symbolic Comput. **29** (2000), no. 4-5, 721–728, Symbolic computation in algebra, analysis, and geometry (Berkeley, CA, 1998).
- [10] Frédéric Pham, *Singularités des systèmes différentiels de Gauss-Manin*, Progress in Mathematics, vol. 2, Birkhäuser Boston, Mass., 1979, With contributions by Lo Kam Chan, Philippe Maisonobe and Jean-Étienne Rombaldi.

KETIL TVEITEN, MATEMATISKA INSTITUTIONEN, STOCKHOLMS UNIVERSITET, 106 91 STOCKHOLM.

E-mail address: ktveiten@math.su.se