

POLYHEDRA, LATTICE STRUCTURES, AND EXTENSIONS OF SEMIGROUPS

KLAUS ALTMANN, ALEXANDRU CONSTANTINESCU, AND MATEJ FILIP

ABSTRACT. For an arbitrary rational polyhedron we consider its decompositions into Minkowski summands and, dual to this, the free extensions of the associated pair of semigroups. Being free for the pair of semigroups is equivalent to flatness for the corresponding algebras. Our main result is phrased in this dual setup: the category of free extensions always contains an initial object, which we describe explicitly. These objects seem to be related to unique liftings in log geometry. Further motivation comes from the deformation theory of the associated toric singularity.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Free pairs of semigroups	3
3. Extending free pairs	7
4. The cone setup	13
5. The discrete setup	17
6. Lifting the η to \mathcal{T}^*	23
7. The universal co-Cartesian extension	28
8. The initial object property	31
9. Minkowski decompositions revisited	43
References	50

1. INTRODUCTION

The present paper deals entirely with objects from discrete mathematics, like semigroups, convex polyhedra and polyhedral cones, and their relations to lattice points. Nevertheless, most of the motivation comes from algebraic deformation theory of affine toric varieties.

1.1. Minkowski sums of polyhedra. A central notion of the present paper is the Minkowski sum of two convex polyhedra A, B in some real vector space $N_{\mathbb{R}} \cong \mathbb{R}^d$. It is simply defined as

$$A + B := \{a + b : a \in A, b \in B\}.$$

It is easy to see that the result is again a convex polyhedron. In analogy to this, the ambient vector space is defined as $A - A := \{a - a' : a, a' \in A\}$. Recall that Minkowski decomposition can be used to

MSC 2010: 14M25; 14B07, 20M10, 52B20; Key words: semigroups, universal extensions, polyhedra, deformation theory, toric singularities.

write every convex polyhedron P as a Minkowski sum of a polytope, i.e. a bounded polyhedron, and a polyhedral cone, namely its tail cone


$$\text{tail}(P) := \{a \in P - P : a + P \subseteq P\}.$$

However, this is exactly the type of situation we will *not* consider. Instead, for all Minkowski sums and decompositions in this paper we will assume that all participating polyhedra share the same tail cone. For example, if this tail cone is 0, then we speak about polytopes. An advantage of this general assumption is that the Minkowski addition allows cancellation, i.e. $A + B = A' + B$ implies $A = A'$.

Starting with a polyhedron P , one might look at all possibilities of splitting P into a Minkowski sum

$$P = P_0 + \dots + P_k.$$

Even if one looks only at the most elementary or extreme decompositions, they are far from being unique. They do rather behave like a non-unique prime factorization. Arguably the most convincing example is the following.



It is well-known that the set of Minkowski summands of scalar multiples of P (see Definition 4.6) carries the structure of a convex, polyhedral cone $C(P)$, i.e. each $\xi \in C(P)$ represents a Minkowski summand P_ξ [Alt97]. For the previous hexagon example, it is the four-dimensional cone over a double tetrahedron. Its vertices, i.e. the fundamental rays of the cone, correspond to the five summands displayed in the figure above.

1.2. Considering families. The concept of studying Minkowski summands of scalar multiples of P can be reformulated into a relative setting. We may look at homomorphisms $p_+ : \tilde{C} \rightarrow C$ of polyhedral cones such that $p_+^{-1}(\xi + \xi') = p_+^{-1}(\xi) + p_+^{-1}(\xi')$ for all $\xi, \xi' \in C$, where the common tail cone of all the fibers $p_+^{-1}(\xi)$ is $p_+^{-1}(0)$. A trivial example of this can be obtained by taking the affine cone over P in $N_{\mathbb{R}} \oplus \mathbb{R}$ (with P embedded in height 1) and considering its natural height function $\text{cone}(P) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Another example is the projection $\tilde{C}(P) \rightarrow C(P)$ with

$$\tilde{C}(P) := \{(\xi, v) : \xi \in C(P), v \in P_\xi\}.$$

The latter is even universal, namely it is the terminal object in the category of all those families around $\text{cone}(P) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, cf. Proposition 4.8. However, while this might just look like an arming of language, the striking point consists of the combination of the following two observations:

(i) One may dualize these notions, looking at injections $p_+^\vee : C^\vee \hookrightarrow \tilde{C}^\vee$. Then, the property of Minkowski linearity translates into an interesting property we call freeness, cf. Proposition 4.4. This property addresses the splitting of \tilde{C}^\vee into a product of C^\vee and a boundary part.

(ii) The advantage of (i) is that it allows porting the whole setup into the category of finitely generated semigroups. Doing so, one can again ask for universal (so, after dualizing, initial) objects of the appropriate categories.

1.3. Extensions of semigroups. We take the observations of Subsection 1.2 as our starting point of the whole paper. We will begin in Sections 2 and 3 from scratch with developing the appropriate notions in the category of semigroups. Then, insisting on finite generation, the general approach naturally splits into two different setups. We have called them the *cone* and the *discrete* setup, and we will focus on them in Sections 4 and 5, respectively. While the cone setup will recover the (duals of the) cones $C(P)$ and $\tilde{C}(P)$, the comparison of both setups will lead to a new vector space $\mathcal{T}(P)$ together with a lattice $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P) \subset \mathcal{T}(P)$, and a rational, polyhedral cone $\mathcal{T}_+(P) \subset \mathcal{T}(P)$ generalizing $C(P)$. Studying their dual level, we obtain a finer structure, i.e. there is a (unique) finitely generated subsemigroup \tilde{T} of the dual Abelian group $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(P)$ fulfilling the universal property (ii) above, i.e. it is the base for a universal free extension.

The existence of a universal object in the discrete setup is our main result. It is formulated in Theorem 8.2, the proof of which occupies the whole of Section 8. It seems to be an interesting question if the existence and structure of initial extensions is linked to results like [Gro11, Proposition 3.38] addressing unique liftings in log geometry; see the remark after Proposition 3.3. Note that unique liftings in log geometry were important for producing smoothings in [FFR19] and [KC19], see also [GS11], [Rud10], [Fel19].

1.4. Involving a lattice structure. Let us return to Subsection 1.1 and let us assume that we have fixed a lattice structure in our ambient \mathbb{R} -vector space. For instance, let us start with a free Abelian group N of rank d , i.e. $N \cong \mathbb{Z}^d$, and take $N_{\mathbb{R}} := N \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R} \cong \mathbb{R}^d$ as our ambient vector space. If P is a lattice polyhedron, i.e. if all vertices belong to N , then it is a natural question to look for all lattice decompositions, i.e. for those Minkowski decompositions such that the summands P_{ν} are lattice polytopes, too. One might expect that those P_{ν} correspond to special points inside the parametrizing cone $C(P)$.

However, in the present paper, we go far beyond lattice polyhedra. Instead, we will deal with arbitrary rational polyhedra, but we study their interaction with the lattice. In particular, lattice decompositions do no longer make sense. Instead, in Section 9.3, we introduce the weaker notion of lattice-friendly decompositions, cf. Definition 9.6. Then, it is our second main result of this paper that the parameters $\xi \in \mathcal{T}_+(P) \cap \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)$ introduced in Subsection 1.3 correspond to exactly those Minkowski summands P_{ξ} occurring in lattice friendly decompositions, cf. Theorem 9.12. Moreover, similarly to the definition of $\tilde{C}(P)$ in Subsection 1.2, we have combined in Theorem 9.5 all Minkowski summands P_{ξ} , lattice friendly or not, into a common polyhedral, so-called tautological cone $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_+(P)$ fibered over $\mathcal{T}_+(P)$. That is, the lattice $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(P)$ occurs twice in this paper – as the ambient space of some universal object \tilde{T} , but also as the right tool to check Minkowski decompositions for the lattice friendly property.

Acknowledgements. The whole project started in 2017 when the first two authors were guests at the University of Genova. We would like to thank for the hospitality and the financial support.

2. FREE PAIRS OF SEMIGROUPS

2.1. Relative boundaries of semigroups within two different setups. Let $T \subseteq S$ be two commutative and cancellative ($a + c = b + c \Rightarrow a = b$) semigroups with identity ($0 + a = a + 0 = a$), satisfying $S \cap (-S) = \{0\}$, i.e. S (and hence T) is pointed. This situation gives rise to the following notion of a relative boundary.

Definition 2.1. The *boundary of S relative to T* is defined as

$$\partial_T S = \{s \in S : (s - T) \cap S = \{s\}\}.$$

This setting comes with a natural addition map $a : \partial_T S \times T \rightarrow S$.

Example 2.2. In the context of numerical semigroups, that is subsemigroups of \mathbb{N} , the so-called Apéry sets are relative boundaries with respect to the subgroups generated by the smallest element.

The following examples illustrate that the relative boundary is almost never a semigroup itself.

Example 2.3. Consider the real cone $S_{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot [-2, 1] + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot [2, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, and the finitely generated semigroup $S = S_{\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathbb{Z}^2$. In the following we consider the boundary of $S_{\mathbb{R}}$ with respect to an internal ray, and boundaries of S relative to different subsemigroups; Figures 3 and 4 show how different embeddings of \mathbb{N} in S give rise to different boundaries (see also Example 2.5 for more details).




FIGURE 1. $T = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot [2, 3] \subseteq S_{\mathbb{R}}$




FIGURE 2. $T = \text{span}_{\mathbb{N}} \{[-1, 1], [1, 1]\} \subseteq S$




FIGURE 3. $T_0 = \text{span}_{\mathbb{N}} \{[0, 1]\} \subseteq S$




FIGURE 4. $T_1 = \text{span}_{\mathbb{N}} \{[1, 1]\} \subseteq S$

$$\text{Blue square} = T \quad \text{Red square} = \partial_T S \quad \text{Green square} = S \setminus (T \cup \partial_T S)$$

There are two quite different classes of semigroups we have in mind. Both are, in their own way, finitely generated.

2.1.1. *The cone setup.* Here we take for $T \subseteq S$ polyhedral cones in some finitely-dimensional real vector space. These gadgets are finitely generated by their fundamental rays as “ $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ -modules”, but not at all finitely generated as semigroups.

Example 2.4. Assume that $T \subseteq S$ is a ray, i.e. $T = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot R$ for some $R \in S \setminus \{0\}$. Then there is unique face $F = F(T) \leq S$ such that R and hence $T \setminus \{0\}$ is contained in the relative interior $\text{int}(F)$. Then $S \setminus \partial_T S = \text{star}(F) := \bigcup_{F \leq G \leq S} \text{int}(G)$. Note that both $\text{int}(S)$ and $\text{int}(F)$ are parts of this set, i.e. $\partial_T S \subseteq \partial S \setminus \text{int}(F)$ with $\partial S := S \setminus \text{int}(S)$ denoting the classical topological boundary. For the special case $R \in \text{int}(S)$, as in Figure 1, we even have that $\partial_T S = \partial S$. In particular, in this situation the relative boundary does not depend on a further specification of R .

2.1.2. *The discrete setup.* Here we suppose that both T and S are finitely generated as semigroups, i.e. as “ \mathbb{N} -modules”. In this case, the so-called Hilbert basis, consisting of all irreducible elements, provides even a minimal, hence canonical, finite generating system. A typical example of this situation is the intersection of a cone setup with an underlying lattice.

Example 2.5. Let $S := \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} \{[-2, 1], [2, 1]\} \cap \mathbb{Z}^2$ as in the three discrete figures of Example 2.3, and in Figure 10, the Hilbert basis of this semigroup is

$$H = \{[-2, 1], [-1, 1], [0, 1], [1, 1], [2, 1]\}.$$

The semigroup S contains the inner “discrete rays” $T_0 = \mathbb{N} \cdot [0, 1]$ and $T_1 = \mathbb{N} \cdot [1, 1]$, and their respective relative boundaries are

$$\partial_{T_0} S = \{[\pm 2b, b] : b \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{[\pm(2b-1), b] : b \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}\}$$

and

$$\partial_{T_1} S = \{[\pm 2b, b] : b \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{[-2b+1, b], [-2b+2, b] : b \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}\}.$$

That is, while both T_0 and T_1 come from the “interior” of S , they lead to different relative, discrete boundaries; see Figures 3 and 4, respectively.

2.2. **Freeness.** We will use the addition map $a : \partial_T S \times T \rightarrow S$ for decomposing elements of the semigroup S . In general, i.e. if we are in the cone setup (2.1.1) or the discrete setup (2.1.2), the existence of those decompositions is not a problem. This is established by the following lemma.

Lemma 2.6. *Assume that we are either in the cone or the discrete setup. Then the canonical addition map $a : \partial_T S \times T \rightarrow S$ is automatically surjective.*

Proof. Let $T = \text{span} \{t_1, \dots, t_k\}$ and $S = \text{span} \{s_1, \dots, s_r\}$, which we consider either as \mathbb{N} -modules, or as $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ -modules. For each $s \in S$ write $s = a_1 s_1 + \dots + a_r s_r$, and for each $i = 1, \dots, k$ write $t_i = b_1 s_1 + \dots + b_r s_r$. By the pointedness assumption, we have that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $a_i < n b_i$, for all i , we get $s - n t \notin S$. So in both setups, there exists a maximal $n^* \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, respectively $\in \mathbb{N}$, with $s - n^* t \in S$. Continuing this process with all generators of T eventually leads to an element $s^* \in S$ which cannot be decreased via T . \square

The injectivity of a is less common, but, as we will see, very powerful. Therefore, we introduce the following key terminology.

Definition 2.7. The semigroups $T \subseteq S$ form a *free pair* (T, S) (or $\iota : T \hookrightarrow S$ is called a free embedding) if the addition map $a : \partial_T S \times T \rightarrow S$ is bijective.

Example 2.8. Let $S := \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}_{>0}} \{[-2, 1], [2, 1]\}$ and $T := \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} \{[-1, 1], [1, 1]\}$. We are thus in the cone setup, and $\partial_T S = \partial S$ as in the situation at the end of Example 2.4. However, the surjective map $a : \partial_T S \times T \rightarrow S$ is not injective. For instance, $[0, 0] + [2, 2] = [2, 1] + [0, 1]$ displays two different decompositions of $[2, 2] \in S$. Applying Proposition 2.11 will make this even more obvious: We obtain $M = \mathbb{R}^2/\mathbb{R}^2 = 0$, hence $q : \partial_T S \rightarrow M$ has no chance to become injective.

Note that literally the same remains true if we intersect everything with the lattice \mathbb{Z}^2 . This yields a non-free example in the discrete setup, too. Alternatively, in Figure 2 above, where we have that $T := \text{span}_{\mathbb{N}} \{[-1, 1], [1, 1]\}$ and $S := \text{span}_{\mathbb{N}} \{[-2, 1], [-1, 1], [0, 1], [1, 1], [2, 1]\}$ we can take for a non-unique decomposition $[0, 0] + [4, 4] = [4, 2] + [0, 2]$.

2.3. The decomposition operators. By definition, free pairs (T, S) allow a unique decomposition of every element $s \in S$ into a sum

$$s = \partial(s) + \lambda(s) \quad \text{with} \quad \partial(s) \in \partial_T S \text{ and } \lambda(s) \in T.$$

In other words, there are retraction maps $\partial : S \rightarrow \partial_T S$ and $\lambda : S \rightarrow T$ with $\partial + \lambda = \text{id}$ satisfying

$$\partial|_{\partial_T S} = \text{id}, \quad \partial|_T = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda|_{\partial_T S} = 0, \quad \lambda|_T = \text{id}.$$

Note that λ is in general not linear, i.e. not a semigroup homomorphism. Moreover, for ∂ , linearity does not even make sense, since the target $\partial_T S$ is not a semigroup. Finally, in the discrete setup, the Hilbert basis H of S hosting a free pair (T, S) splits into two parts, namely

$$H = (H \cap \partial_T S) \sqcup (H \cap T).$$

2.4. Rays yield free pairs. While Example 2.8 has shown that freeness is not always satisfied, there is, nevertheless, a standard situation where this property is guaranteed.

Definition 2.9. In both setups, we call T a ray if it is saturated in the ambient Abelian group $S - S$ and if its canonical poset structure $(t \leq t' : \iff t' - t \in T)$ is a total order.

In the cone setup (2.1.1), this means $T \cong \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$; in the discrete setup (2.1.2), the ray property implies that $T \cong \mathbb{N}$. In both situations, there exists an $R \in S$ such that $T \subseteq S$ consists of all ‘‘allowed’’ multiples of R , i.e. using $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ or \mathbb{N} as coefficients, respectively.

Proposition 2.10. *If T is a ray, then a is injective, i.e. (T, S) is a free pair.*

Proof. Let $b, b' \in \partial_T S$ and $t, t' \in T$ with $b + t = b' + t'$. We may, without loss of generality, assume that $t \geq t'$. Then, the cancellation property implies that $b + (t - t') = b' \in \partial_T S$ with $t - t' \in T$. By definition of the relative boundary, this means that $t - t' = 0$, i.e. $t = t'$ and hence $b = b'$. \square

2.5. Involving the ambient Abelian groups. Since $T \subseteq S$ are both cancellative, we may embed them into their respective linear hulls

$$W := T - T \subseteq S - S =: V.$$

These ambient objects W, V are torsion free Abelian groups. In the cone or in the discrete setup, they are finitely generated \mathbb{R} -, respectively \mathbb{Z} -modules. That is, W and V are finitely dimensional vector spaces or free Abelian groups of finite rank. We denote by $M := V/W$ the quotient (which might have torsion in the discrete setup). This leads to the quotient map

$$q : S \rightarrow \overline{S} \subseteq M \quad \text{with} \quad \overline{S} := (S - T)/(T - T)$$

denoting its image. The usage of the ambient groups and their quotient M yields the following criterion of freeness in terms of the injectivity of $q|_{\partial S}$.

Lemma 2.11. *Let (T, S) be a pair of semigroups such that $a : \partial_T S \times T \rightarrow S$ is surjective. We have:*

- (i) *The restriction $q|_{\partial S} : \partial_T S \rightarrow \overline{S}$ is surjective.*
- (ii) *The map $q|_{\partial S} : \partial_T S \rightarrow M$ is injective if and only if (T, S) is free.*

Proof. (i) The surjectivity of $q|_{\partial S}$ is a direct consequence from the surjectivity of the addition map a .

(ii) The direct implication is obvious. For the converse, assume that (T, S) is free and that $q(b) = q(b')$ for some $b, b' \in \partial_T S$. This implies $b - b' \in T - T$, so there are $t, t' \in T$ with $b + t = b' + t'$. The latter displays two decompositions of the same element into summands from $\partial_T S$ and T . Hence freeness implies $b = b'$. \square

3. EXTENDING FREE PAIRS

3.1. Extending semigroups. Starting with a free pair $T \hookrightarrow S$ we are going to consider all possibilities to put this in relation with other free pairs $\tilde{T} \hookrightarrow \tilde{S}$ having isomorphic boundaries.

Definition 3.1. We call a semigroup homomorphism $\pi : \tilde{S} \rightarrow S$ an *extension* if it has trivial kernel, that is if $\ker \pi = \{\tilde{s} \in \tilde{S} : \pi(\tilde{s}) = 0\} = 0$, which is equivalent¹ to

$$\pi(\tilde{S} \setminus \{0\}) \subseteq S \setminus \{0\}.$$

Let $T \hookrightarrow S$ be a pair of semigroups (not necessary free). A commutative diagram of semigroup maps

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{T} & \hookrightarrow & \tilde{S} \\ \pi_T \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi_S \\ T & \hookrightarrow & S \end{array}$$

is an *extension of the pair (T, S)* if π_S (and thus also π_T) is an extension. An extension is called *co-Cartesian* if the following two conditions are satisfied:

- (i) the addition maps a and \tilde{a} are surjective, and
- (ii) π induces a bijection on the boundaries: $\partial_{\tilde{T}} \tilde{S} \xrightarrow{\sim} \partial_T(S)$.

We will frequently denote both vertical maps simply by π . Note that the above diagram alone immediately implies that $\pi(\tilde{S} \setminus \partial_{\tilde{T}} \tilde{S}) \subseteq S \setminus \partial_T S$. On the other hand, π generally fails to map $\partial_{\tilde{T}} \tilde{S}$ into $\partial_T S$, cf. Example 3.2.2.

Example 3.2. 1. A trivial possibility for extending pairs is to first define $\tilde{S} := S \times F$ with F any semigroup of the scenario in question. However, the plain projection $\text{pr}_S : S \times F \rightarrow S$ does not meet our requirements, because its kernel equals F . This can be corrected by choosing any semigroup map $\ell : F \rightarrow S$ with trivial kernel and defining $\pi_\ell := \text{pr}_S + \ell$, i.e. $\pi_\ell(s, f) := s + \ell(f)$. Using this notation, the forbidden plain projection corresponds to the forbidden $\ell = 0$. To obtain an extension of the pair, take $\ell : F \rightarrow T \subseteq S$ with $\ker \ell = 0$, and define $\tilde{T} := T \times F$. Note that $\partial_{T \times F}(S \times F) = \partial_T(S) \times \{0\}$. Hence the freeness property of (T, S) is equivalent to the similar one for (\tilde{T}, \tilde{S}) .

¹Note that for semigroup homomorphisms, having a trivial kernel does not imply injectivity.

2. We consider an example in the cone setup (2.1.1). To be able to draw what is going on, we intersect both cones \tilde{S} and S with affine hyperplanes – displaying convex polytopes (the origin of the cones being behind the screen):




FIGURE 5. π does not always map boundary to boundary.

Extending the formula of Example 2.4, we obtain that, in the cone setup,

$$S \setminus \partial_T S = \bigcup_{\substack{R \in T \\ R \neq 0}} (S \setminus \partial_R S) = \bigcup_{\substack{R \in T \\ R \neq 0}} \left(\bigcup_{\substack{R \in G \\ G \leq S}} \text{int}(G) \right) = \bigcup_{\substack{G \leq S \\ G \cap T \neq 0}} \text{int}(G).$$

In particular, in Figure 5, we have that $\pi^{-1}(T) = \tilde{T}$, but $\partial_{\tilde{T}} \tilde{S}$ does not map to $\partial_T S$.

3.2. **Keeping it free.** The main point of the present subsection is to keep track of the freeness property along extensions of pairs. The next result shows two important consequences of a diagram being co-Cartesian, and that if the vertical maps are surjective, each of these consequences are also sufficient. Let the following diagram define an extension of the free pair (T, S)

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \tilde{T} & \hookrightarrow & \partial_{\tilde{T}}(\tilde{S}) \times \tilde{T} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{a}} & \tilde{S} \\ \pi_T \downarrow & & & & \downarrow \pi_S \\ T & \hookrightarrow & \partial_T(S) \times T & \xrightarrow{a} & S \end{array}$$

with the addition map \tilde{a} surjective. Denote by $\tilde{M} := (\tilde{S} - \tilde{S})/(\tilde{T} - \tilde{T})$ and by $M := (S - S)/(T - T)$. Consider the following three conditions.

(C1) The extension is co-Cartesian.

(C2) The pair (\tilde{T}, \tilde{S}) is free and $\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{M} \rightarrow M$ is an isomorphism.

(C3) For all $\tilde{s}_1, \tilde{s}_2 \in \tilde{S}$ with $\pi(\tilde{s}_1) = \pi(\tilde{s}_2)$, there exist $\tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_2 \in \tilde{T}$ such that $\tilde{s}_1 - \tilde{t}_1 = \tilde{s}_2 - \tilde{t}_2 \in \tilde{S}$.

Proposition 3.3. (i) *In the above situation we have the following logical relations:*

$$(C1) \xrightarrow{\iff} (C2) \xrightarrow{\iff} (C3)$$

(ii) *If the maps π_S and π_T are surjective, then*

$$(C3) \implies (C1),$$

thus the three conditions are equivalent in this case.

Proof. **(C1)⇒(C2)** *The decomposability of $(\widetilde{T}, \widetilde{S})$.* Assume that $\widetilde{b}_1 + \widetilde{t}_1 = \widetilde{b}_2 + \widetilde{t}_2$, with $\widetilde{b}_i \in \partial_{\widetilde{T}}\widetilde{S}$ and $\widetilde{t}_i \in \widetilde{T}$. Applying π we obtain

$$\pi(\widetilde{b}_1) + \pi(\widetilde{t}_1) = \pi(\widetilde{b}_2) + \pi(\widetilde{t}_2).$$

By **(C1)** we have $\pi(\widetilde{b}_1), \pi(\widetilde{b}_2) \in \partial_T S$, and the diagram condition implies $\pi(\widetilde{t}_1), \pi(\widetilde{t}_2) \in T$. So, by the decomposability of (T, S) , that $\pi(\widetilde{b}_1) = \pi(\widetilde{b}_2)$. Again by **(C1)** we obtain $\widetilde{b}_1 = \widetilde{b}_2$, and thus $\widetilde{t}_1 = \widetilde{t}_2$, so the decomposition is unique.

The group isomorphism. Since the addition maps are surjective, every element of M and of \widetilde{M} can be represented by a corresponding boundary element. So the surjectivity of the restriction to the boundary implies the surjectivity of the map $\overline{\pi} : \widetilde{M} \rightarrow M$. By Lemma 2.11, we have $q|_{\partial S} : \partial_T S \xrightarrow{\sim} \overline{S} \subseteq M$ on both levels, \widetilde{M} and M . Hence $\overline{\pi} : \widetilde{M} \rightarrow M$ is an isomorphism on the images of \widetilde{S} and S in \widetilde{M} and M , respectively. Since these images generate the two groups, we are done.

(C2)⇒(C3) Let $\widetilde{s}_1, \widetilde{s}_2 \in \widetilde{S}$ with $\pi(\widetilde{s}_1) = \pi(\widetilde{s}_2)$ in S , hence in M . Then the second part of **(C2)**, i.e. the fact that $\overline{\pi}$ is an isomorphism, implies that \widetilde{s}_1 and \widetilde{s}_2 become equal in \widetilde{M} , i.e. $\widetilde{q}(\widetilde{s}_1) = \widetilde{q}(\widetilde{s}_2)$. Now, we consider the unique decompositions

$$\widetilde{s}_1 = \widetilde{s}'_1 + \widetilde{t}_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{s}_2 = \widetilde{s}'_2 + \widetilde{t}_2 \quad \text{within} \quad \partial_{\widetilde{T}}(\widetilde{S}) \times \widetilde{T}.$$

We still have $\widetilde{q}(\widetilde{s}'_1) = \widetilde{q}(\widetilde{s}'_2)$, but now we can use the decomposability of $(\widetilde{T}, \widetilde{S})$ in the way provided by Lemma 2.11, namely as the injectivity of $\widetilde{q} : \partial_{\widetilde{T}}\widetilde{S} \rightarrow \widetilde{M}$. This implies $\widetilde{s}'_1 = \widetilde{s}'_2 =: \widetilde{s}'$, hence $\widetilde{s}_1 - \widetilde{t}_1 = \widetilde{s}_2 - \widetilde{t}_2 = \widetilde{s}' \in \widetilde{S}$.

(C2)⇏(C1) Take the following extension with surjective addition maps:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \langle 2, 3 \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{N} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \langle 1 \rangle = \mathbb{N} \end{array}$$

with the second vertical map being the canonical inclusion. The two pairs on the rows are free, and even the first projection is surjective. Also, the groups \widetilde{M} and M are both isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} , and π_S induces the identity as isomorphism. However, the restriction to the boundary is a strict inclusion.

(C3)⇏(C2) Take the following extension with surjective addition maps:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2 \end{array}$$

with both maps $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2$ given by $t \mapsto (t, t)$. Even if the two pairs are free and the groups M and \widetilde{M} are isomorphic to \mathbb{R} , the map induced by the vertical one is the zero map, so not an isomorphism.

(C3)⇒(C1) if π_S is surjective. *The restriction $\pi_{\partial(\widetilde{S})}$ is well defined.* Let $\widetilde{b} \in \partial_{\widetilde{T}}(\widetilde{S})$ and $b = \pi(\widetilde{b})$. Then b admits a unique decomposition into $s + t \in \partial_T(S) \times T$ and, by surjectivity, we may lift both

summands to $\tilde{s} \in \tilde{S}$ and $\tilde{t} \in \tilde{T}$, respectively. Thus, \tilde{b} and $\tilde{s} + \tilde{t}$ have the same image under π , and (C3) implies the existence of $\tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_2 \in \tilde{T}$ with

$$\tilde{b} - \tilde{t}_1 = \tilde{s} + \tilde{t} - \tilde{t}_2 \in \tilde{S}.$$

The hypothesis $\tilde{b} \in \partial_{\tilde{T}}(\tilde{S})$ enforces $\tilde{t}_1 = 0$. Hence $\tilde{b} = \tilde{s} + \tilde{t} - \tilde{t}_2$. After applying π , this means

$$b = \pi(\tilde{b}) = \pi(\tilde{s}) + \pi(\tilde{t}) - \pi(\tilde{t}_2) = s + t - \pi(\tilde{t}_2).$$

Comparing with our original equation $b = s + t$, this implies $\pi(\tilde{t}_2) = 0$, i.e. $\tilde{t}_2 \in \ker \pi_T = \{0\}$. Hence $\tilde{s} + \tilde{t} = \tilde{b} \in \partial_{\tilde{T}}(\tilde{S})$ which again enforces $\tilde{t} = 0$. Finally, we apply π to the equation $\tilde{b} = \tilde{s}$, leading to $b = s \in \partial_T(S)$.

Injectivity. Let $\tilde{b}_1, \tilde{b}_2 \in \partial_{\tilde{T}}(\tilde{S})$ with $\pi(\tilde{b}_1) = \pi(\tilde{b}_2)$. By (C3) we obtain elements $\tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_2 \in \tilde{T}$ with

$$\tilde{b}_1 - \tilde{t}_1 = \tilde{b}_2 - \tilde{t}_2 \in \tilde{S}.$$

Again, the defining property of $\partial_{\tilde{T}}(\tilde{S})$ implies $\tilde{t}_1 = \tilde{t}_2 = 0$.

Surjectivity. Let $b \in \partial_T(S)$. By the surjectivity of π_S , this may be lifted to an element $\tilde{b} = \tilde{s} + \tilde{t} \in \partial_{\tilde{T}}(\tilde{S}) + \tilde{T}$. Applying π yields $b = s + t \in \partial_T(S) + T$, thus $\pi(\tilde{t}) = t = 0$. Again we conclude that $\tilde{t} \in \ker \pi_T = \{0\}$. \square

Note that the property (C3) is called the integrality of the embedding $\tilde{T} \hookrightarrow \tilde{S}$ in [Gro11, Remark 3.25]. There and in [Kat89, Proposition 4.1], this notion is related to the flatness among the associated semigroup algebras.

Example 3.4. 1. It could have been that both (T, S) and (\tilde{T}, \tilde{S}) are free, but the diagram is not co-Cartesian. For example take $\tilde{T} = T = S = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $\tilde{S} = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2$ containing \tilde{T} as the ray $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot (1, 1)$ with $\pi = \frac{1}{2}(1, 1)$. By Proposition 2.10 we know that (T, S) and (\tilde{T}, \tilde{S}) are free but $\bar{\pi} : \tilde{M} \rightarrow M$ is not an isomorphism, i.e. even (C2) fails.

2. Any co-Cartesian diagram is automatically Cartesian, i.e. it follows that $\tilde{T} = \pi_S^{-1}(T) \subseteq \tilde{S}$. However, as it can be seen in Example 3.2, 2., this condition does not suffice.

3.3. Boundary independence. The goal of Section 7 is to construct a universal co-Cartesian extension for any free pair. To this aim, we have to identify the essential structures and concepts that a co-Cartesian extension has to preserve. The first is the concept of independence. This is defined for tuples of elements in the boundary. The second is a family of special elements in the smaller semigroup $(T, \text{respectively } \tilde{T})$ which can be defined in terms of the boundary, and has to be compatible with the bijection on the boundary.

Definition 3.5. Let (T, S) be a free pair of semigroups. A collection of r (not necessarily distinct) boundary elements $b_1, \dots, b_r \in \partial_T S$ is called *boundary independent* if their sum is still in the boundary, that is if

$$b_1 + \dots + b_r = \partial(b_1 + \dots + b_r).$$

In contrast, such a collection is called *boundary dependent*, if it is not boundary independent, and *minimally dependent* if it is dependent and every proper subset is independent.

Let (T, S) be a free pair, and (\tilde{T}, \tilde{S}) be a co-Cartesian extension of it. We thus have an induced bijection $\pi_{\partial}^{-1} : \partial_T(S) \xrightarrow{\sim} \partial_{\tilde{T}}(\tilde{S})$, and for every $b \in \partial_T S$ we simply denote

$$\tilde{b} := \pi_{\partial}^{-1}(b).$$

Let us denote the retractions upstairs by $\tilde{\partial} : \tilde{S} \rightarrow \partial_{\tilde{T}}\tilde{S}$ and $\tilde{\lambda} : \tilde{S} \rightarrow \tilde{T}$ respectively.

Proposition 3.6. *For any co-Cartesian extension $\pi : (\tilde{T}, \tilde{S}) \rightarrow (T, S)$ and for any (not necessarily distinct) elements $b_1, \dots, b_r \in \partial_T S$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\partial}(\tilde{b}_1 + \dots + \tilde{b}_r) &= \pi_{\partial}^{-1}(\partial(b_1 + \dots + b_r)) \\ \pi_T(\tilde{\lambda}(\tilde{b}_1 + \dots + \tilde{b}_r)) &= \lambda(b_1 + \dots + b_r) \\ \tilde{b}_1, \dots, \tilde{b}_r \text{ are boundary independent} &\iff b_1, \dots, b_r \text{ are boundary independent.} \end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$\pi_{\partial}^{-1}(b_1) + \dots + \pi_{\partial}^{-1}(b_r) - \pi_{\partial}^{-1}(\partial(b_1 + \dots + b_r)) \in \tilde{T}.$$

Furthermore, if we choose $\tilde{s}_1, \dots, \tilde{s}_r \in \tilde{S}$ and denote by $s_i := \pi(\tilde{s}_i)$, then the first two relations above still hold.

Proof. From $\pi(\tilde{b}_1 + \dots + \tilde{b}_r) = b_1 + \dots + b_r$, using the unique boundary decompositions we get

$$\pi_{\partial}(\tilde{\partial}(\tilde{b}_1 + \dots + \tilde{b}_r)) + \pi_T(\tilde{\lambda}(\tilde{b}_1 + \dots + \tilde{b}_r)) = \partial(b_1 + \dots + b_r) + \lambda(b_1 + \dots + b_r).$$

By the uniqueness of the decomposition, by the bijectivity of π_{∂} and by $\ker \pi_T = 0$, we conclude. \square

3.4. The category of free extensions of a pair. Assume that (T, S) is a free pair. Then the co-Cartesian extensions $\pi : (\tilde{T}, \tilde{S}) \rightarrow (T, S)$ form a category $\mathcal{E}_{(T,S)}$ where the morphisms are defined in the obvious way. Moreover, we have the following construction imitating base change from algebraic geometry and equipping $\mathcal{E}_{(T,S)}$ with the structure of being fibered in groupoids.

Proposition 3.7. *Assume that $(\tilde{T}, \tilde{S}) \in \mathcal{E}_{(T,S)}$ and that $\pi'_T : \tilde{T}' \rightarrow T$ is another extension of T . Then, for any semigroup homomorphism $f : \tilde{T} \rightarrow \tilde{T}'$ over T , there is a unique extension $\pi'_S : \tilde{S}' \rightarrow S$ such that $\pi' = (\pi'_T, \pi'_S) : (\tilde{T}', \tilde{S}') \rightarrow (T, S)$ belongs to $\mathcal{E}_{(T,S)}$ and that f extends to a morphism $(\tilde{T}, \tilde{S}) \rightarrow (\tilde{T}', \tilde{S}')$ in this category.*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & \forall f & & & & \\ & \curvearrowright & & \curvearrowright & & \curvearrowright & \\ \tilde{T} & \longrightarrow & \tilde{S} & \longrightarrow & \tilde{T}' & \longrightarrow & \tilde{S}' \\ & \searrow & & \searrow & & \searrow & \\ & & T & \longrightarrow & S & & \end{array}$$

Proof. It suffices to prove that the canonical map $\partial_{\tilde{T}}\tilde{S} \times \tilde{T}' \rightarrow \tilde{S} \oplus_{\tilde{T}} \tilde{T}'$ is a bijection where the latter denotes the push-out $\tilde{S} \oplus_{\tilde{T}} \tilde{T}' := (\tilde{S} \times \tilde{T}') / \sim$ defined by modding out the equivalence relation

$$(\tilde{s}_1, \tilde{t}'_1) \sim (\tilde{s}_2, \tilde{t}'_2) : \iff \exists \tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_2 \in \tilde{T} : \tilde{s}_1 + \tilde{t}_2 = \tilde{s}_2 + \tilde{t}_1 \text{ and } \tilde{t}'_1 + f(\tilde{t}_1) = \tilde{t}'_2 + f(\tilde{t}_2).$$

However, it is straightforward to check that the assignment $(\tilde{s}, \tilde{t}') \mapsto (\partial\tilde{s}, f(\lambda\tilde{s}) + \tilde{t}')$ yields a correctly defined inverse map $\tilde{S} \oplus_{\tilde{T}} \tilde{T}' \rightarrow \partial_{\tilde{T}}\tilde{S} \times \tilde{T}'$. \square

3.5. **Initial objects in $\mathcal{E}_{(T,S)}$.** The main result of this paper is the following.

Theorem 3.8. *Let us assume that we are in the discrete setup, cf. Section 2.1.2. The category of co-Cartesian extensions of (T, S) contains an initial object.*

We will provide a very explicit construction of this universal object in the discrete setup. We start analysing first the cone setup in Section 4, where we get a terminal object, cf. Proposition 4.8. Just to get an impression of what this initial object may look like we provide the following example.

Example 3.9. Let us return to Example 2.5 and Figure 3, i.e. $S = \langle [-2, 1], [-1, 1], [0, 1], [1, 1], [2, 1] \rangle$ with $T = \mathbb{N} \cdot R$ and $R = [0, 1]$. In Example 5.4 this semigroup will be understood starting from the 1-dimensional polytope $P = [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}] \subset \mathbb{R}$; the link between these two approaches is that the polyhedral cone σ over $P \times \{1\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is dual to $S_{\mathbb{R}} = \sigma^\vee$ from Example 2.3 which contains S as the set of lattice points. Anyway, in algebraic geometry, this setup gives rise to the toric singularity $X = \text{TV}(\sigma) \subseteq \mathbb{A}_k^5$ which can, alternatively, be understood as the vanishing set of the six minors encoded by the condition

$$\text{rank} \begin{pmatrix} z_{-2} & z_{-1} & z_0 & z_1 \\ z_{-1} & z_0 & z_1 & z_2 \end{pmatrix} \leq 1.$$

The elements $[k, 1] \in S$ can be recovered as the multidegrees of the variables z_i . In [ACF20] we discuss the deformation theory of those toric singularities. In this context, the present example became famous in the last century, because Pinkham has detected that the deformation space of X admits two different components. In [ACF20] we will recall that this corresponds to two different lattice friendly decompositions of P as we will meet them here in Section 9, cf. Example 9.10. Finally, it comes full circle by the fact that these two decompositions correspond to the following two co-Cartesian extensions of (T, S) , which we represent in Figures 6 and 7 only through the generators. The blue points correspond to T and \tilde{T} , respectively. The semigroups are recovered from the pictures by taking the cone over the convex hull. Figure 10 in Example 5.4 depicts this explicitly for S .




FIGURE 6. The Artin component




FIGURE 7. The qG component

Now, by Theorem 3.8, we know that both extensions can be merged to a common one. This leads to a 4-dimensional semigroup, i.e. to a semigroup filling a 4-dimensional polyhedral cone where its 3-dimensional crosscut is depicted in Figure 9; see Example 6.12 for the detailed calculations. Note that this establishes a remarkable difference to the algebro-geometric setup: There, the two deformation components cannot be dominated by a higher-dimensional joint deformation. In Figure 8 we represent the core of this merger, by drawing only the generators of the semigroups: on the left the generators of the subsemigroups, and on the right, those of the semigroups. The colors in this figure deviate from the




FIGURE 8. The generators of the semigroups, and the way they fit together.

convention established in Figure 1: we have drawn in gray the generators of given semigroups and in orange those of the initial object.

In Figure 9 we return to the colors used throughout the paper, and depict the convex bodies which define the 2-, 3-, and 4-dimensional semigroups involved.




FIGURE 9. The full picture: Artin- and qG-components as projections of the initial object.

4. THE CONE SETUP

4.1. Dualizing the cone setup. In the present section, we deal exclusively with the situation introduced in (2.1.1). The main result is the construction of a terminal object in a certain category (Proposition 4.8). This proposition is a much easier to prove analog of Theorem 3.8. One of the striking features of the cone setup is that it allows dualization of both the cones T and S and their ambient vector spaces $V := S - S = \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{S\}$ and $W := T - T = \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{T\}$, respectively. In particular, considering $\iota : W \hookrightarrow V$ with $\iota(T) \subseteq S$, there is a dual linear map

$$p : V^* \rightarrow W^* \quad \text{with} \quad p(S^\vee) \subseteq T^\vee.$$

While p is always surjective on the level of vector spaces, the surjectivity of its restriction $p_+ : S^\vee \rightarrow T^\vee$ to the level of semigroups is equivalent to the property $S \cap W = T$. This is, however, automatically fulfilled for free pairs, cf. Definition 2.7.

Lemma 4.1. *If (T, S) is free, then $S \cap \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{T\} = T$.*

Proof. If $t_1 - t_2 \in S$ (with $t_i \in T$), then this element can be decomposed into $t_1 - t_2 = b + t$ with $b \in \partial_T(S)$ and $t \in T$. Hence $0 + t_1 = b + (t + t_2)$, but this displays two decompositions within $S = \partial_T(S) + T$. Thus, $0 = b$, and this means $t_1 - t_2 = 0 + t \in T$. \square

4.2. A dual characterization of freeness. In the cone setup, freeness can be characterized by the following enhancement of the surjectivity of $p_+ : S^\vee \rightarrow T^\vee$.

Proposition 4.2. *The pair (T, S) is free if and only if $p_+ : S^\vee \rightarrow T^\vee$ is surjective and maps faces onto faces.*

Proof. For each $s \in S$ we define $T_s := (s + \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{T\}) \cap S$. Note that, for every $s' \in T_s$, one has $T_s = T_{s'}$. It is a polyhedron in (a translate of) $\text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{T\}$ with tail cone T , i.e. its normal fan $\mathcal{N}(T_s)$ has T^\vee as its support, cf. Subsection 4.4 for reviewing these notions. Now, the freeness of the pair (T, S) is equivalent to the fact that the polyhedra T_s are cones, i.e. that their normal fans $\mathcal{N}(T_s)$ equal the face fan of their supporting cone T^\vee . That is, for each $s \in S$ the normal cone $\mathcal{N}(s, T_s)$ has to be a face of T^\vee . On the other hand, these normal cones equal

$$\mathcal{N}(s, T_s) = \{\varphi : \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{T\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \varphi(s) \leq \varphi(T_s)\}$$

where the description requires choosing some lift of $\varphi \in W^*$ along the surjection $p : V^* \rightarrow W^*$. Hence, these normal cones are the images under p of the faces

$$\text{face}(S^\vee, s) := S^\vee \cap s^\perp = \{\varphi \in S^\vee : \varphi(s) = 0\}.$$

Finally, since these faces are running, with $s \in S$, through all faces $F \leq S^\vee$, we get exactly the characterization claimed in the proposition. \square

4.3. Freeness and Minkowski linearity. We have already seen that it was important to distinguish between the map $p : V^* \rightarrow W^*$ on the level of vector spaces and its restriction $p_+ : S^\vee \rightarrow T^\vee$. This is particularly relevant when we deal with fibers. For an element $\xi \in T^\vee$ we will call

$$p_+^{-1}(\xi) := p^{-1}(\xi) \cap S^\vee$$

the positive fiber of ξ (under p).

Definition 4.3. We call the pair (T, S) *Minkowski linear* if $p_+ : S^\vee \rightarrow T^\vee$ is surjective, and if for each $\xi, \xi' \in T^\vee$ we have $p_+^{-1}(\xi) + p_+^{-1}(\xi') = p_+^{-1}(\xi + \xi')$.

Note that the inclusion “ \subseteq ” as well as equality on the level of vector spaces, i.e. replacing p_+ by p , is always satisfied. However, the linearity among the positive fibers becomes equivalent to freeness.

Proposition 4.4. *The pair (T, S) is free if and only if it is Minkowski linear.*

Proof. Let us visualize the present situation. Denoting $\overline{S} := q(S) \subseteq V/W$, we obtain the exact sequence

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & W & \longrightarrow & V & \xrightarrow{q} & V/W & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\ & & T_s & \longrightarrow & S \supseteq \partial_T S & \longrightarrow & \overline{S} \ni q(s) & & \end{array}$$

where, for an element $s \in S$, the positive fiber $q_+^{-1}(q(s))$ is just another way of writing T_s from the proof of Proposition 4.2. In particular, for a fixed s , the linearity of the function

$$\Phi_s : \varphi \mapsto \min \langle q_+^{-1}(q(s)), \varphi \rangle$$

is equivalent to the fact that T_s is a shifted copy of T . Hence, the linearity of Φ_s for all $s \in S$ is equivalent to the freeness of the pair (T, S) . On the other hand, the dual picture is

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longleftarrow & W^* & \xleftarrow{p} & V^* & \longleftarrow & W^\perp & \longleftarrow & 0 \\ & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\ & & \xi \in T^\vee & \xleftarrow{p^+} & S^\vee & \longleftarrow & p_+^{-1}(\xi) & & \end{array}$$

Writing $\xi = \pi(\varphi)$ and $\xi' = \pi(\varphi')$, the linearity of

$$\Psi_s : \varphi \mapsto \min \langle s, p_+^{-1}(p(\varphi)) \rangle$$

means that the polyhedra $\pi_+^{-1}(\xi + \xi')$ and $\pi_+^{-1}(\xi) + \pi_+^{-1}(\xi')$ provide the same values after applying $\min \langle s, \bullet \rangle$ for all $s \in S$. i.e., that both polyhedra coincide. That is, the linearity of Ψ_s for all $s \in S$ is equivalent to the Minkowski linearity of the pair (T, S) .

Finally, starting with two elements $s \in S$ and $\varphi \in S^\vee$, we obtain from the proof of [AH03, Proposition 8.5] the equality

$$\min \langle q_+^{-1}(q(s)), p_+^{-1}(p(\varphi)) \rangle = 0,$$

or the equivalent version

$$\Phi_s(\varphi) + \Psi_s(\varphi) = \min \langle q_+^{-1}(q(s)), \varphi \rangle + \min \langle s, p_+^{-1}(p(\varphi)) \rangle = \langle s, \varphi \rangle.$$

It follows that the linearity of Φ_s is equivalent to the linearity of Ψ_s . \square

4.4. The cone of Minkowski summands. Let us assume that (T, S) is free, meaning that the map $p_+ : S^\vee \rightarrow T^\vee$ is Minkowski linear and, in particular, surjective. We fix a ray in the interior of the cone $T^\vee \subseteq W^*$, that is we fix a linear map $e : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \hookrightarrow T^\vee$ such that $e(1) \in \text{int } T^\vee$. The preimage $P := p_+^{-1}(e(1)) \subseteq S^\vee$ can be understood, well-defined up to some shift, as a polyhedron in $W^\perp =: N_{\mathbb{R}}$. Consequently, the preimage of the whole ray $e^*(S^\vee) := p_+^{-1}(e(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}))$ equals $\sigma := \text{cone}(P)$.

Remark 4.5. In Sections 2 and 3 we had originally denoted $M = (S - S)/(T - T)$. This fits perfectly well for the discrete setup: M is then a finitely generated Abelian group, and in Subsection 3.5 we had denoted by $M_{\mathbb{R}} := M \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$ the associated vector space. However, in the cone setup, $(S - S)/(T - T) = V/W$ is already an \mathbb{R} -vector space, and it seems appropriate to denote it by $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ instead of M . The same applies for the dual gadgets N and $N_{\mathbb{R}}$, i.e. in particular W^\perp becomes $N_{\mathbb{R}}$.

The tail cone $\text{tail}(P) = \{a \in N_{\mathbb{R}} : a + P \subseteq P\}$ equals $\ker(p_+) = S^\vee \cap N_{\mathbb{R}} = \overline{S}^\vee$, and, more general, this is the common tail cone of all other positive fibers $p_+^{-1}(\xi)$. In particular, \overline{S} is the common support of their normal fans $\mathcal{N}(p_+^{-1}(\xi))$.

Definition 4.6. A (convex) polyhedron Q with $\text{tail}(Q) = \text{tail}(P)$ is called a *Minkowski summand* of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot P$ if there is another polyhedron Q' and a scalar $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $Q + Q' = \lambda \cdot P$.

It is well-known fact that Q is a Minkowski summand of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot P$ if and only if the normal fan $\mathcal{N}(P)$ is a refinement, i.e. a subdivision of $\mathcal{N}(Q)$. Exactly this property applies to all positive fibers $Q = p_+^{-1}(\xi)$. For interior points $\xi \in \text{int } T^\vee$, we even have $\mathcal{N}(p_+^{-1}(\xi)) = \mathcal{N}(P)$. In [Alt97] we have constructed a linear surjective map of polyhedral cones

$$p_C : \tilde{C}(P) \twoheadrightarrow C(P)$$

where the elements $\xi \in C(P)$ of the target parametrize the set of (translation classes of) Minkowski summands P_ξ of P . The summands P_ξ are encoded via the associated dilation factors $t_{ij}(\xi) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ of the bounded edges $d_{ij} = v^j - v^i$ connecting the vertices $v^i, v^j \in P$. For instance $t_{ij}(\xi) = 1$ for all i, j leads to $\underline{1} \in C(P)$ with $P_{\underline{1}} = P$. In general, the parameters $t_{ij}(\xi)$ are supposed to meet the closing conditions $\sum_i t_{i,i+1}(\xi) \cdot d_{i,i+1} = 0$ along the oriented boundaries of all 2-dimensional, compact faces of P . The source cone of p_C is the ‘‘universal Minkowski summand’’; it is defined as

$$\tilde{C}(P) := \{(\xi, w) : \xi \in C(P), w \in P_\xi\}, \quad \text{i.e. } p_C^{-1}(\xi) = \{\xi\} \times P_\xi.$$

While the Minkowski summands are only well-defined up to translation, one can make the previous definition precise by fixing a vertex $v_* \in P$ and placing all associated vertices $(v_*)_\xi \in P_\xi$ in the origin. In general, every vertex $v \in P$ provides a linear section $v : C(P) \hookrightarrow \tilde{C}(P)$ of p_C sending $\xi \mapsto v_\xi$. The formula $v_\xi^j - v_\xi^i = t_{ij}(\xi) \cdot (v^j - v^i)$ summarizes the situation.

Remark 4.7. (i) The special element $\underline{1} \in C(P)$, representing P itself, provides a linear embedding $e_C : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \hookrightarrow C(P)$. As in the beginning of this subsection, the fiber product, i.e. the preimage of this ray $p_C^{-1}(e_C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}))$ equals $\sigma = \text{cone}(P)$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{cone}(P) & \longrightarrow & \tilde{C}(P) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow p_C \\ \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} & \xhookrightarrow{e_C} & C(P) \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{cone}(P_0 * \dots * P_k) & \longrightarrow & \tilde{C}(P) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow p_C \\ \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{k+1} & \longrightarrow & C(P) \end{array}$$

(ii) If $P = P_0 + \dots + P_k$ is a Minkowski decomposition of P , then the summands induce elements $[P_0], \dots, [P_k] \in C(P)$, and thus a linear map $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{k+1} \rightarrow C(P)$ sending the i -th unit vector $e^i \mapsto [P_i]$. The fiber product becomes equal to the cone over the so-called *Cayley product* $P_0 * \dots * P_k$.

4.5. A terminal object in the cone setup. This subsection is the dual of the cone setup variant of Subsection 3.5. Let P be a rational, convex polyhedron in some \mathbb{R} -vector space $N_{\mathbb{R}}$; for instance, it could arise from the situation in Subsection 4.4. Taking the height induces a natural map $R : \text{cone}(P) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Then the pairs (p_+, e) consisting of a surjective homomorphism of polyhedral cones $p_+ : \tilde{C} \twoheadrightarrow C$ and an embedding $e : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \hookrightarrow C$ form a *category* \mathcal{F}_P . The embedding e gives thus an element $e(1) \in C$, such that

(i) for $\xi, \xi' \in C$ one has $p_+^{-1}(\xi) + p_+^{-1}(\xi') = p_+^{-1}(\xi + \xi')$ and

(ii) $R : \text{cone}(P) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is obtained from $p_+ : \tilde{C} \twoheadrightarrow C$ via base change $e : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \hookrightarrow C$, that is $\text{cone}(P) = \tilde{C} \times_C \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$

The two examples $[R : \text{cone}(P) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \ni 1]$ and $[p_C : \tilde{C}(P) \twoheadrightarrow C(P) \ni \underline{1}]$ yield two objects in \mathcal{F}_P . Moreover, if P arises from Subsection 4.4, then also $[p_+ : S^\vee \twoheadrightarrow T^\vee \ni e(1)]$ becomes an object in \mathcal{F}_P .

By Proposition 4.4, \mathcal{F}_P equals the opposite category $\mathcal{E}_P^{\text{opp}}$ of the cone setup variant of $\mathcal{E}_P = \mathcal{E}_{(T,S)}$ from

Subsection 3.5. Amplifying this comparison, the (dual) analog to Proposition 3.7 is just base change. Moreover, it is clear that $[R, 1] \in \mathcal{F}_P$ is an initial object. However, the true analog to Theorem 3.8 (restricted to this setting) is the existence of a terminal object in \mathcal{F}_P .

Proposition 4.8. *The pair $[p_C, \underline{1}]$ is a terminal object in \mathcal{F}_P . That is, for any $[p_+ : \tilde{C} \rightarrow C \ni e(1)]$ in the category \mathcal{F}_P , there is a unique linear $e' : C \rightarrow C(P)$ such that p_+ is induced from p_C via e'*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & \text{cone}(P) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \tilde{C} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \tilde{C}(P) \\
 & & \downarrow R & & \downarrow p_+ & & \downarrow p_C \\
 \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} & \xrightarrow{\quad e \quad} & C & \xrightarrow{\quad e' \quad} & C(P) & & \\
 & & \text{e}_C & \xrightarrow{\quad} & & &
 \end{array}$$

and $e_C(1) = \underline{1} = (e' \circ e)(1)$. Moreover, the map $\tilde{C} \rightarrow \tilde{C}(P)$ is supposed to induce the identity map $\text{id}_P : p_+^{-1}(e(1)) \rightarrow P_{\underline{1}}$ on the two distinguished fibers.

Proof. Let $\xi \in C$. Then, since we have that $e(1)$ is an interior point of C , there is an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\xi' := e(n) - \xi \in C$. That is, by Minkowski linearity, the decomposition $e(n) = \xi + \xi'$ within C provides a Minkowski decomposition $n \cdot P = p_+^{-1}(\xi) + p_+^{-1}(\xi')$, i.e. $p_+^{-1}(\xi)$ is a Minkowski summand of a scalar multiple of P . Now, since the points of $C(P)$ are in a one-to-one correspondence to the Minkowski summands of scalar multiples of P , the polyhedron $p_+^{-1}(\xi)$ corresponds to a unique $e'(\xi) \in C(P)$. This establishes the map e' . It is clearly additive, and one easily checks the remaining properties. \square

5. THE DISCRETE SETUP

5.1. The pair of semigroups associated to a polyhedron. Let N be a lattice of rank d , that is a finitely generated free Abelian group $N \simeq \mathbb{Z}^d$, and let $M = \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(N, \mathbb{Z})$ be the dual lattice. We denote the ambient real vector spaces by $N_{\mathbb{R}} := N \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R} \simeq \mathbb{R}^d$, respectively by $M_{\mathbb{R}} := M \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$. Let $P \subset N_{\mathbb{R}}$ be a rational polyhedron, which means that P is the intersection of finitely many halfspaces defined by linear inequalities with rational coefficients. Recall from Subsection 1.1 that polyhedra are not necessarily bounded, but we will assume that they have at least one vertex. Then, they split into a Minkowski sum

$$P = P^c + \text{tail}(P)$$

where P^c is the (bounded) convex hull of the vertices of P , and $\text{tail}(P)$ is a pointed polyhedral cone. We associate a cone to the polyhedron P by embedding it in the hyperplane of height one of $N_{\mathbb{R}} \oplus \mathbb{R}$, and taking the (closure of) the cone over it:

$$\sigma := \text{cone}(P) \subseteq N_{\mathbb{R}} \oplus \mathbb{R}.$$

The dual cone will be denoted by $\sigma^\vee = \text{cone}(P)^\vee \subseteq M_{\mathbb{R}} \oplus \mathbb{R}$. We call R the canonical projection $N_{\mathbb{R}} \oplus \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Alternatively, we can understand this map as the element $R = [0, 1] \in M \oplus \mathbb{Z}$, which defines a ray $R : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \hookrightarrow \sigma^\vee$. Note that the intersections $\sigma \cap R^\perp =: \sigma \cap [R = 0]$ and $\sigma \cap [R = 1]$ recover $\text{tail}(P)$ and P , respectively. The pair of discrete semigroups associated to P is given by

$$(5.1) \quad T := \mathbb{N}, \quad S := \text{cone}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)^\vee := \text{cone}(P)^\vee \cap (M \oplus \mathbb{Z}), \quad \text{and} \quad R : T \hookrightarrow S.$$

By Proposition 2.10, this forms a free pair. One goal of this work is to construct explicitly the universal co-Cartesian extension of $T \hookrightarrow S$ (cf. Theorem 8.2). The inspiration for the constructions to come was

the knowledge of the space of infinitesimal deformations T^1 of the toric singularity $\mathrm{TV}(\sigma) = \mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{C}[S]$ in the multidegree $-R \in M$.

5.2. The structure of σ^\vee . We want to understand the relative boundaries of both σ^\vee and $\sigma^\vee \cap (M \oplus \mathbb{Z})$, with respect to the rays given by R . To this aim we introduce the following.

Definition 5.1. For every linear form $c \in \mathrm{tail}(P)^\vee \subseteq M_{\mathbb{R}}$ define

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(c) &:= -\min_{v \in P} \langle v, c \rangle \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c) &:= \lceil \eta(c) \rceil \in \mathbb{Z}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\lceil \eta \rceil$ denotes the ceiling, i.e. the least integer not smaller than the real number η . It is easy to see that the set $f_c := \{v \in P : -\langle v, c \rangle = \eta(c)\}$ is a face and contains at least one vertex. We choose and fix one such vertex and denote it by $v(c)$. So we have

$$\eta(c) = -\langle v(c), c \rangle \leq \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c).$$

The reason for not taking any $c \in M_{\mathbb{R}}$ is that we want c to be bounded below on P . Obviously, when P is compact, $\mathrm{tail}(P)^\vee = M_{\mathbb{R}}$.

Notation 5.2. We denote the set of all vertices of P by $\mathrm{Vert}(P)$. We will need to distinguish between lattice and non-lattice vertices, and for this use the notation

$$\mathrm{Vert}_{\in \mathbb{Z}}(P) := \mathrm{Vert}(P) \cap N \quad \mathrm{Vert}_{\notin \mathbb{Z}}(P) := \mathrm{Vert}(P) \setminus \mathrm{Vert}_{\in \mathbb{Z}}(P).$$

Moreover, for real numbers $z \in \mathbb{R}$ we will use the following notation:

$$(5.2) \quad \{z\} := \lceil z \rceil - z.$$

For $c \in \mathrm{tail}(P)^\vee \cap M$ and $v(c) \in \mathrm{Vert}_{\in \mathbb{Z}}(P)$ we have $\eta(c) = \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)$. If $\eta(c) \notin \mathbb{Z}$, then the integer $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)$ equals the value of $-\langle \bullet, c \rangle$ at some point sitting on a moving affine c -hyperplane *before* it reaches our polyhedron P .

Remark 5.3. (i) If $0 \in P$, then $\eta(c) \geq 0$.

(ii) The elements $[c, \eta(c)]$ form the relative boundary $\partial_{(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} R)} \sigma^\vee \subseteq \partial \sigma^\vee$ (the inclusion is strict if the tail cone is not trivial). This implies

$$\sigma^\vee = \{[c, \eta(c)] : c \in \mathrm{tail}(P)^\vee\} + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot [\underline{0}, 1].$$

(iii) The semigroup $S := \sigma^\vee \cap (M \oplus \mathbb{Z})$ is generated by the Hilbert basis of σ^\vee , which has the form

$$\{[c_1, \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1)], \dots, [c_k, \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_k)], [\underline{0}, 1]\},$$

with uniquely determined elements $c_i \in \mathrm{tail}(P)^\vee \cap M$. We will use the font “ c ” only for the Hilbert basis elements.

(iv) We defined $T := \mathbb{N}$ and embedded it in S by $1 \mapsto [\underline{0}, 1]$. For $c \in \mathrm{tail}(P)^\vee \cap M$, the elements $[c, \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)]$ are always in $\partial_T S$, but not in $\partial_{(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} R)} \sigma^\vee$ whenever $\eta(c) \notin \mathbb{Z}$. Note that the latter implies that $v(c)$ does not belong to the lattice, i.e. that $v(c) \in \mathrm{Vert}_{\notin \mathbb{Z}}(P)$.

Example 5.4. Let $P = \text{conv}(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Then $\sigma \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ is spanned by the rays $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot (-1, 2)$ and $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot (1, 2)$. The dual σ^\vee is spanned by $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot [-2, 1]$ and $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot [2, 1]$, see Figure 10 continuing the story of Figure 3 and of Example 3.9. We obtain:

c	...	-2	-1	0	1	2	...
$v(c)$...	v_2	v_2	v_2 or v_1	v_1	v_1	...
$\eta(c)$...	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	...
$\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)$...	1	1	0	1	1	...




FIGURE 10. The cone and the semigroups for the 1-dimensional $P = [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}] \subset \mathbb{R}$.

5.3. The ambient space of the universal extension. In this section we will define $\mathcal{T}(P)$. The two subgroups which will later give the initial object live in the dual spaces of $\mathcal{T}(P)$ and $N_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathcal{T}(P)$, respectively.

Notation 5.5. The set of compact edges of P is $\text{Edge}^c(P) = \{d_1, \dots, d_r\}$. We write $d = [v^i, v^j]$ for the edge connecting v^i and v^j and we write $[v^i, v^j]$ for the half-open edge. We will abuse notation and denote oriented edges also by $d := v^j - v^i \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$; in the few ambiguous situations we will use words to specify which of the two d refers to. We also use the convention that round brackets denote vectors: $(1, 2, 3) \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$, square brackets denote linear forms $[4, 5, 6] \in M_{\mathbb{R}}$, and pointed brackets denote the standard perfect pairing: $\langle (1, 2, 3), [4, 5, 6] \rangle = 32 \in \mathbb{R}$. We will also fix

$$r = |\text{Edge}^c(P)| \quad m = |\text{Vert}(P)|.$$

The \mathbb{R} -vector space $\mathcal{T}(P)$ will be a subspace of $\mathbb{R}^r \oplus \mathbb{R}^m$. In order to describe its equations we need to introduce the following notions.

Definition 5.6. For every compact two-dimensional face F of P let $\varepsilon_F : \text{Edge}^c(P) \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ be one of the two functions satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_F(d) \in \{-1, 1\} &\iff d \subseteq F \\ \{\varepsilon_F(d) \cdot d : d \subseteq F\} &\text{ forms an oriented cycle along } \partial F. \end{aligned}$$

The last property implies (but is not equivalent to)

$$\sum_{d \in \text{Edge}^c(P)} \varepsilon_F(d) \cdot d = 0.$$

Definition 5.7. (i) To each half open edge $d = [v, w)$ of P we associate the positive integer

$$g = g(d) := \min\{g \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} : \text{the affine line through } gv \text{ and } gw \text{ contains lattice points}\}.$$

(ii) We call $d = [v, w)$ a *short half open edge* if

$$|\{g \cdot [v, w) \cap N\}| \leq g - 1.$$

If this is the case, then it follows that $v \notin N$. Finally, we call d a *short edge* if both $[v, w)$ and $(w, v]$ are short half open edges.

Remark 5.8. If at least one of the half open edges $[v, w)$ or $(w, v]$ is short, then $\ell(w - v) < 1$, where ℓ denotes the lattice length². While the property $\ell(w - v) < 1$ is responsible for the name “short”, $\ell < 1$ alone does not suffice for shortness. For example $d = [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{3}] \subset \mathbb{R}$ has lattice length $\ell = \frac{5}{6} < 1$, but still, neither of the two half open edges is short.

Definition 5.9. For each compact edge $d_i = [v^j, v^k]$ of P we introduce a parameter which we denote by t_{d_i} , t_i , or t_{jk} ³. We then collect all of these in a vector $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^r$ and define the linear subspace

$$C^{\text{lin}}(P) := \{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^r : \sum_{d \subset F} \varepsilon_F(d) t_d \cdot d = 0 \text{ for all compact 2-faces } F \text{ of } P\}.$$

The intersection $C^{\text{lin}}(P) \cap R_{\geq 0}^r$ parametrizes the Minkowski summands of positive multiples of P .

Definition 5.10. For each vertex $v = v^i \in \text{Vert}(P)$ we introduce a parameter which we denote by s_v or s_i . We then define

$$\mathcal{T}(P) := \{(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) \in C^{\text{lin}}(P) \oplus \mathbb{R}^m : \begin{array}{ll} s_i = 0 & \text{if } v^i \in N, \\ s_i = s_j & \text{if } [v^i, v^j] \in \text{Edge}^c(P) \text{ with } [v^i, v^j] \cap N = \emptyset, \text{ and} \\ s_i = t_{ij} & \text{if } [v^i, v^j] \text{ is a half open short edge} \end{array}\}.$$

Note that the vector space $\mathcal{T}(P)$ contains a distinguished element $(\underline{1}; \underline{1}, \underline{0}) = [P]$ which is defined by $s_i := 0$ for $v^i \in N$ and $s_j := 1$ and $t_{ij} := 1$ for all remaining coordinates, cf. Remark 9.11. In the upcoming sections we will often deal with the dual vector space $\mathcal{T}^*(P)$. Then, its elements $s_i, t_{ij} \in \mathcal{T}^*(P)$ form a generating set of this space. We could easily omit the elements $s_i = 0$ for $v^i \in N$. However, while they are just zero, their existence will simplify some formulae.

5.4. Relation to algebraic geometry. In Example 3.9 we have already mentioned that our theory of extensions of semigroups has strong links to deformation theory in algebraic geometry, cf. [ACF20] for addressing this in detail. Nevertheless, we would like to mention here that for a singularity X there is the vector space T_X^1 of so-called infinitesimal deformations. In case of a toric singularity, it is M -graded, and we denote by $T_X^1(-R)$ the contribution in multidegree $-R$.

Proposition 5.11. For $X = \mathbb{T}\mathbb{V}(\text{cone}(P))$ we obtain that $T_X^1(-R) = (\mathcal{T}(P) \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C}) / \mathbb{C} \cdot (\underline{1}; \underline{1}, \underline{0})$.

Proof. Essentially, this corresponds to Theorem 2.5 in [Alt00]. One has just to check that the equations called G_{jk} in [Alt00, (2.6)] coincide with those in the definition of the \mathbb{R} -vector space $\mathcal{T}(P)$. \square

Example 5.12. 1. The mother of all examples is $P = [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}] \subset \mathbb{R}$ from Example 3.9. Here we have only one edge $d = P$ with $g_P = 1$. The interval has length one, and it contains exactly one lattice point, i.e. $|\{P \cap N\}| = 1$. In particular, it gives rise to two non-short half open edges.

² defined as the homogeneous function on $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that any primitive element of N has lattice length one.

³ always choosing the most convenient one in the given context.

2. The interval $P = [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{3}] \subset \mathbb{R}$ has lattice length $\ell = \frac{5}{6} < 1$, but still, neither of the two half open edges is short.

3. Since the interval $P = [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}]$ does not contain any lattice points, but the affine line through P does, we obtain that $g = 1$, and both half open edges are short.

4. Take $P := \text{conv} \{(-\frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{2}), (\frac{2}{3}, \frac{1}{2})\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. Here we need to multiply with $g = 2$ to produce lattice points on the affine line. The resulting interval $gP = [-\frac{1}{3}, \frac{4}{3}]$ has length $\frac{5}{3} < 2$ and $|\{gP \cap N\}| = 2$. That is, neither of the half open edges are short.

5. At last, we consider $P := \text{conv} \{(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}), (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2})\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. We still have $g = 2$ and this leads to the interval $gP = [-1, \frac{2}{3}]$. In particular, one of the half open edges is short, the opposite one is not.

5.5. **Understanding** $\mathcal{T}_+^\vee(P)$. By definition we have $\mathcal{T}(P) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^r \oplus \mathbb{R}^m$, which allows us to define

$$\mathcal{T}_+(P) := \mathcal{T}(P) \cap (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^r \oplus \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m).$$

For the construction of the universal object from Section 7 positivity does not play an important role. However, positivity will be crucial for the correspondence with lattice-friendly Minkowski decompositions in Section 9. While positivity of the t -coordinates has a clear meaning, the necessity of positive s -coordinates becomes apparent in Example 9.14.

We will denote the dual of \mathbb{R}^{r+m} by the same symbol⁴: \mathbb{R}^{r+m} . Since $\mathcal{T}(P) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{r+m}$, we have a canonical projection $\mathbb{R}^{r+m} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}^*(P)$ yielding elements $t_{ij}, s_v \in \mathcal{T}^*(P)$ and the equality

$$(5.3) \quad \mathcal{T}^*(P) = \mathbb{R}^{r+m} / \mathcal{T}(P)^\perp.$$

According to Definition 5.10, the subspace $\mathcal{T}(P)^\perp \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{r+m}$ is generated by the following four types of elements:

$$(5.4) \quad \chi(F) := \sum_{d \subset F} \varepsilon_F(d) t_d \cdot d \quad \text{for all}^5 \text{ compact 2-faces } F \text{ of } P,$$

$$(5.5) \quad s_i \quad \text{for all } v^i \in N.$$

$$(5.6) \quad s_i - s_j \quad \text{for all } [v^i, v^j] \in \text{Edge}^c(P) \text{ with } [v^i, v^j] \cap N = \emptyset, \text{ and}$$

$$(5.7) \quad t_{ij} - s_i \quad \text{for all short edges } [v^i, v^j].$$

The relations $\chi(F)$ enable us to encode Minkowski summands via edge dilation, cf. Subsection 4.4 and Definition 5.9. Their importance for the extensions of semigroups, however, becomes apparent in the proof of Proposition 6.15. From Equation (5.3) we get that the dual cone of $\mathcal{T}_+(P)$ is

$$\mathcal{T}_+^\vee(P) = \text{Image}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{r+m} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}^*(P)) = \frac{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{r+m} + \mathcal{T}(P)^\perp}{\mathcal{T}(P)^\perp}.$$

5.6. **The lattice structure in $\mathcal{T}(P)$.** We start by defining a subgroup of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P) \subset \mathcal{T}(P)$, and then prove that this is a lattice. In the case in which P is a lattice polytope with primitive edges, this lattice is simply $\mathbb{Z}^r \cap C^{\text{lin}}(P)$, cf. Example 5.17.

⁴i.e. we will not add a star here.

⁵actually, these elements are in $\mathcal{T}(P)^\perp \otimes N_{\mathbb{R}}$ and need to be evaluated by some $c \in M_{\mathbb{R}}$.

Definition 5.13. Define the subgroup $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P) \subset \mathcal{T}(P)$ by

$$(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P) \quad : \iff \begin{cases} s_i \in \mathbb{Z} & , \forall v^i \in \text{Vert}(P), \text{ and} \\ (t_{ij} - s_i)v^i - (t_{ij} - s_j)v^j \in N & , \forall [v^i, v^j] \in \text{Edge}^c(P). \end{cases}$$

Clearly $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)$ is a subgroup of $\mathcal{T}(P)$, thus it is Abelian and torsion-free.

Lemma 5.14. *The subgroup $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)$ is a free Abelian group satisfying*

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R} = \mathcal{T}(P).$$

Proof. We first show that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)$ is a discrete subgroup, i.e. that $0 \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)$ is an isolated point. If $(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)$ has sufficiently small coordinates, then the integrality of s_i implies that $s_i = 0$. For the resulting $(\mathbf{t}, 0)$ we thus get

$$t_{ij}(v^i - v^j) \in N.$$

As we have finitely many compact edges, and as N is a lattice, thus not divisible, it follows that sufficiently small t_{ij} are forced to be zero as well.

Every rational element of $\mathcal{T}(P)$ admits an integral multiple contained in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)$. Together with the discrete property, this implies that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)$ is an Abelian group satisfying

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R} = \mathcal{T}(P).$$

□

The dual lattice is by definition

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(P) = \{f \in \mathcal{T}^*(P) : f(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)) \subseteq \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

Thus, the dual lattice $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(P)$ is generated by

$$\{s_v : v \in \text{Vert}(P)\} \cup \{L_{ij}(c) : c \in \text{tail}(P)^\vee \cap M\}.$$

We will regard all the t_{ij}, s_i, s_j as coordinate functions, that is as elements of $\mathcal{T}^*(P)$. The two conditions of Definition 5.13 can be thus rephrased as

$$\begin{aligned} s_i &\in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(P), \\ L_{ij} &:= (t_{ij} - s_i) \otimes v^i - (t_{ij} - s_j) \otimes v^j \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(P) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} N. \end{aligned}$$

We will often group the summands as: $L_{ij} = t_{ij} \otimes (v^i - v^j) + s_j \otimes v^j - s_i \otimes v^i$.

Remark 5.15. The elements L_{ij} , together with $s_i \otimes N$, generate $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)^* \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} N$.

Note that $t_{ji} = t_{ij}$, but $L_{ji} = -L_{ij}$. For any oriented compact edge $d = [v^i, v^j]$ we will write L_d or $L_{v^i v^j}$ instead of L_{ij} when it is more convenient to do so. Finally, let us point out that the distinguished element $(\underline{1}; \underline{1}, \underline{0}) =: [P]$ belongs to the lattice.

Notation 5.16. As we are dealing with the tensor product of two linear forms, one on $\mathcal{T}(P)$ and one on M , it makes sense to apply L_{ij} to both types of elements separately. We will denote as consistently as possible the elements of $\mathcal{T}(P)$ by ξ and those of M by c . Therefore, we will use the same notation when we apply L_{ij} to either of them:

$$\begin{aligned} L_{ij}(\xi) &:= t_{ij}(\xi) \cdot (v^i - v^j) + s_j(\xi) \cdot v^j - s_i(\xi) \cdot v^i \in N_{\mathbb{R}}, \text{ for } \xi \in \mathcal{T}(P), \\ L_{ij}(c) &:= \langle v^i - v^j, c \rangle \cdot t_{ij} + \langle v^j, c \rangle \cdot s_j - \langle v^i, c \rangle \cdot s_i \in \mathcal{T}^*(P), \text{ for } c \in M. \end{aligned}$$

Example 5.17. 1. If $P = [v, w] \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a rational line segment, then we denote by $d(P) := w - v$ the length of P and by $\{v\} := \lceil v \rceil - v$ and $\{w\} := \lceil w \rceil - w$ the discrepancies for P to have integral limits. Then, besides $s_v, s_w \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(P)$, this lattice is characterized by the incidence

$$d(P) \cdot t - \{v\} \cdot s_v + \{w\} \cdot s_w \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(P)$$

which has a straightforward geometric interpretation. Indeed, this follows from

$$\begin{aligned} L_{d(P)} &= -d(P) \cdot t + w \cdot s_w - v \cdot s_v \\ &= -d(P) \cdot t - \{w\} \cdot s_w + \{v\} \cdot s_v + (w + \{w\}) \cdot s_w - (v + \{v\}) \cdot s_v, \end{aligned}$$

because the last two coefficients, $w + \{w\}$ and $-v - \{v\}$, are integers.

2. Whenever P is a lattice polyhedron with primitive compact edges, then $\mathcal{T}(P) = C^{\text{lin}}(P)$, and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P) = C_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{lin}}(P)$ is determined by the integrality of all t_{ij} .

In Section 6 we will lift $\eta(c)$ and $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)$ along the map $\pi : \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(P) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ (or its rational version), where $t_{ij} \mapsto 1$ for all edges and $s_v \mapsto 1$ if $v \notin N$. This gives the vertical maps in the following diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(P) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} N & \xrightarrow{\langle \bullet, c \rangle} & \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(P) \\ \pi := \pi \otimes \text{id}_N \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi \\ N & \xrightarrow{\langle \bullet, c \rangle} & \mathbb{Z} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} L_{ij} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & L_{ij}(c) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ (\delta^{\mathbb{Z}} v^i - \delta^{\mathbb{Z}} v^j) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \langle \delta^{\mathbb{Z}} v^i - \delta^{\mathbb{Z}} v^j, c \rangle \end{array}$$

In the previous diagram we have used the symbol

$$\delta^{\mathbb{Z}} v := \begin{cases} v & \text{if } v \in N \\ 0 & \text{if } v \in N_{\mathbb{R}} \setminus N. \end{cases}$$

In particular, $L_{ij} \in \ker(\pi)$ if $v^i, v^j \in \text{Vert}_{\neq \mathbb{Z}}(P)$.

6. LIFTING THE η TO \mathcal{T}^*

In this section we define liftings $[c, \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)] \leftarrow [c, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)]$ in the finite dimensional \mathbb{R} -vector space $\mathcal{T}^*(P)$ from Section 5.3. The main idea behind constructing the universal extension is to use these liftings of the relative boundary and define \tilde{T} using the relations among them: $\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, \dots, c_{\ell})$ (cf. Definition 6.10). Then \tilde{S} will be the sum of the lifted boundary with \tilde{T} .

6.1. Lifting the boundary. We start by fixing a *reference vertex* $v_* \in \text{Vert}(P)$.

Convention 6.1. Whenever $v_* \in P$ belongs to the lattice, we will set $v_* = 0$.

As the c in $[c, \eta(c)]$ will be unchanged when lifting, we will only focus on the η part. Let us state Definition 5.1 of $\eta(c)$ from a different point of view. For $c \in \text{tail}(P)^\vee$ we choose a path $v_* = v^0, v^1, \dots, v^k = v(c)$ along the compact edges of P . Then

$$\begin{aligned} -\eta(c) &= \langle v(c), c \rangle \\ &= \langle v_*, c \rangle + \langle v(c) - v_*, c \rangle \\ &= \langle v_*, c \rangle + \sum_{j=1}^k \langle v^j - v^{j-1}, c \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

In complete analogy to this we define now the lifting $\tilde{\eta}(c)$ of $\eta(c)$.

Definition 6.2. For every $c \in \text{tail}(P)^\vee$, we define $\tilde{\eta}(c) \in \mathcal{T}^*(P)$ as

$$\tilde{\eta}(c) := -\langle v_*, c \rangle \cdot s_{v_*} - \sum_{j=1}^k \langle v^j - v^{j-1}, c \rangle \cdot t_{j-1,j}.$$

Lemma 6.3. *The definition of $\tilde{\eta}(c) \in \mathcal{T}^*(P)$ depends neither on the choice of the vertex $v(c)$, nor on the choice of the path connecting v_* and $v(c)$.*

Proof. The independence on the choice of the path follows by the usual argument, namely by the presence of the closing relations, i.e. the elements $\chi(F)$ providing $\langle \chi(F), c \rangle \in \mathcal{T}(P)^\perp$ mentioned in Subsection 5.5.

For the independence on $v(c)$, let us choose another candidate $v'(c)$. Then $\langle v'(c), c \rangle = \langle v(c), c \rangle$, and we may connect both vertices by a path within the level face $f_c = \{v \in P : \langle v, c \rangle = \langle v(c), c \rangle\}$, i.e. via edges $d \in c^\perp$. Thus, the two paths connecting v_* with $v(c)$ or $v'(c)$, respectively, can be chosen to differ only by those edges. In particular, they produce the same result after being paired with c . \square

Note that $\tilde{\eta}(c)$ is always a lifting of $\eta(c)$ via the map π due to our Convention 6.1, i.e. it holds that

$$\pi(\tilde{\eta}(c)) = \eta(c).$$

Remark 6.4. Sending a certain point of P to 0 means to shift the polyhedron by some vector w . This implies $\tilde{\eta}(c)_{P-w} = \tilde{\eta}(c)_P + \langle w, c \rangle \cdot s_{v_*}$. In particular, if $v_* \in N$, then shifting by $-v_*$ to meet our convention does not change $\tilde{\eta}(c)$.

For integrality issues it is important to express $\tilde{\eta}(c)$ in terms of the integral $L_{ij} \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)^* \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} N$.

Lemma 6.5. *For every $c \in \text{tail}(P)^\vee \cap M$ and any path $v_* = v^0, v^1, \dots, v^k = v(c)$ along the compact edges of P we have*

$$\tilde{\eta}(c) = \eta(c) \cdot s_{v(c)} + \sum_{j=1}^k L_{j-1,j}(c).$$

Proof. We use the chosen path $v_* = v^0, v^1, \dots, v^k = v(c)$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -\tilde{\eta}(c) &= \langle v^0, c \rangle \cdot s_0 + \sum_{j=1}^k \langle v^j - v^{j-1}, c \rangle \cdot t_{j-1,j} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\langle v^j - v^{j-1}, c \rangle \cdot t_{j-1,j} - \langle v^j, c \rangle \cdot s_j + \langle v^{j-1}, c \rangle \cdot s_{j-1} \right) + \langle v^k, c \rangle \cdot s_k \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k L_{j,j-1}(c) + \langle v(c), c \rangle \cdot s_{v(c)}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Corollary 6.6. *For every $c \in \text{tail}(P)^\vee \cap M$ we have $\tilde{\eta}(c) \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(P)$ if and only if $\eta(c) \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof. Since $\pi : \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(P) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ maps $\tilde{\eta}(c)$ to $\eta(c)$, we obtain the first implication. The converse is a direct consequence of Lemma 6.5 and the integrality of L_{ij} . \square

For $c \in \text{tail}(P)^\vee \cap M$, we recall $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c) = \lceil \eta(c) \rceil \in \mathbb{Z}$ from Definition 5.1. Thus, Lemma 6.5 suggests the following possibility to lift this definition via π .

Definition 6.7. For every $c \in \text{tail}(P)^\vee \cap M$ we define $\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c) \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(P)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c) &:= \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c) \cdot s_{v(c)} + \sum_{j=1}^k L_{j-1,j}(c) \\ &= \tilde{\eta}(c) + (\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c) - \eta(c)) \cdot s_{v(c)} \\ &= \tilde{\eta}(c) + \{\eta(c)\} \cdot s_{v(c)}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 6.8. (i) By Convention 6.1 we have $\pi(\tilde{\eta}(c)) = \eta(c)$. We also have

$$\pi(\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)) = \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c).$$

(ii) The pair $[c, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)]$ is a quite natural lifting of $[c, \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)]$ from $M \times \mathbb{N}$ to $M \times \mathcal{T}^*(P)$. However, even when asking for some positivity, it might be not the only lifting – see [AK13, 3.7] for an example.

Lemma 6.9. *The definition of $\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)$ does not depend on the choice of the vertex $v(c)$.*

Proof. As we did in the proof of Lemma 6.3, we may connect $v(c)$ and $v'(c)$ by edges $d = [v^i, v^j]$ contained in the face $f_c := \{p \in P : \langle p, c \rangle = \min \langle P, c \rangle\}$. If the shared coefficient of our two heroes $s_{v(c)}$ and $s_{v'(c)}$ matters at all, that is, if $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c) - \eta(c) \neq 0$, then $\eta(c) \notin \mathbb{Z}$, i.e. the face f_c contains no lattice points. That is, any edge $d = [v^i, v^j]$ on the path between $v(c)$ and $v'(c)$ satisfies the property $[v^i, v^j] \cap N = \emptyset$. This property occurs in Definition 5.10, and implies $s_i = s_j$ as elements of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(P) \subseteq \mathcal{T}^*(P)$. Altogether, it means that $s_{v(c)} = s_{v'(c)}$. \square

6.2. Relations. Having defined $\eta(c)$ as a minimum and $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c) = \lceil \eta(c) \rceil$ (Definition 5.1), we get $\lceil \eta(c_1) \rceil + \dots + \lceil \eta(c_\ell) \rceil \geq \lceil \eta(c_1) + \dots + \eta(c_\ell) \rceil \geq \lceil \eta(c_1 + \dots + c_\ell) \rceil$ for any sequence c_1, \dots, c_ℓ of not necessarily distinct elements of $\text{tail}(P)^\vee \cap M$. This implies:

$$(6.1) \quad \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1) + \dots + \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_\ell) \geq \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1 + \dots + c_\ell).$$

Definition 6.10. Let $\ell \geq 2$. For each sequence $c_1, \dots, c_\ell \in \text{tail}(P)^\vee \cap M$ of not necessarily distinct elements, and for each of the symbols $\eta, \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}, \tilde{\eta}$, or $\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}$, which we represent bellow by a \diamond , we define

$$\diamond(c_1, \dots, c_\ell) := \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \diamond(c_i) - \diamond\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} c_i\right)$$

A sequence c_1, \dots, c_ℓ is called \diamond -independent if $\diamond(c_1, \dots, c_\ell) = 0$. We use the convention that every sequence of length one is independent as well⁶.

This definition does not depend on the order of the c_i , just on the multiset.

Remark 6.11. (i) Convention 6.1 and Remark 6.11 extend to:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(\tilde{\eta}(c_1, \dots, c_\ell)) &= \eta(c_1, \dots, c_\ell) \\ \pi(\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, \dots, c_\ell)) &= \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, \dots, c_\ell). \end{aligned}$$

(ii) The fact that $\eta(c_1, \dots, c_\ell) \geq 0$ is a trivial consequence of $\eta(c)$ being defined as some minimum. However, for the integral variant $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, \dots, c_\ell)$ one should keep in mind that this does *not* need to be the roundup of $\eta(c_1, \dots, c_\ell)$; even the inequality $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2) \geq \eta(c_1, c_2)$ might fail. Nevertheless, the non-negativity of $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, \dots, c_\ell)$ is given by Equation (6.1), so $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, \dots, c_\ell) \in \mathbb{N}$.

(iii) For every $\diamond \in \{\eta, \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}, \tilde{\eta}, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}\}$, for every $c_1, \dots, c_\ell \in \text{tail}(P)^\vee \cap M$ with $\ell \geq 2$, and for every $i = 2, \dots, \ell - 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \diamond(c_1, \dots, c_\ell) &= \diamond(c_1) + \dots + \diamond(c_i) - \diamond(c_1 + \dots + c_i) + \\ &\quad + \diamond(c_1 + \dots + c_i) + \diamond(c_{i+1}) + \dots + \diamond(c_\ell) - \diamond(c_1 + \dots + c_\ell) \\ &= \diamond(c_1, \dots, c_i) + \diamond(c_1 + \dots + c_i, c_{i+1}, \dots, c_\ell). \end{aligned}$$

⁶This make sense, as the definition of $\diamond(c_1, \dots, c_\ell)$ would give zero for $\ell = 1$. However, due to the overlap in notation for $\ell = 1$, we define $\diamond(c_1, \dots, c_\ell)$ only for $\ell \geq 2$.

(iv) In particular, the above recursive formula gives us the semigroup equality

$$\text{span}_{\mathbb{N}} \{ \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, \dots, c_\ell) : \forall \ell \geq 2 \} = \text{span}_{\mathbb{N}} \{ \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2) \},$$

where the c_i run through all possible elements of $\text{tail}(P)^\vee \cap M$.

Example 6.12. Let us continue Example 5.4. Denoting the variables associated to the two non-lattice vertices $-\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ by s_1 and s_2 , respectively, and denoting by t the variable referring to the one and only edge $d = P$, we obtain the following values:

c	$\eta(c)$	$\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)$	$\tilde{\eta}(c)$	$\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)$
-2	1	1	$-s_1 + 2t$	$-s_1 + 2t$
-1	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	$-\frac{1}{2}s_1 + t$	$\frac{1}{2}(s_2 - s_1) + t$
0	0	0	0	0
1	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	$\frac{1}{2}s_1$	s_1
2	1	1	s_1	s_1

Turning to the values for $\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2)$, this leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(1, 1) &= s_1 & \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(-1, -1) &= s_2 \\ \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(-1, 1) &= t + \frac{1}{2}(s_1 + s_2) & \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(-2, 2) &= 2t \\ \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(-1, 2) &= \frac{1}{2}(s_2 - s_1) + t & \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(-2, 1) &= \frac{1}{2}(s_1 - s_2) + t \end{aligned}$$

Our main goal in this section is to prove that the notions of $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -independence and $\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -independence from Definition 6.10 are equivalent (Proposition 6.15).

Lemma 6.13. *The property of $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -independence is bequeathed to subsequences and to partitioning. Moreover, the latter is also true for the property of being “minimally $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -dependent”.*

Proof. The first part follows from the equation (6.1) and Remark 6.11 (iii). If $\ell \geq 3$ and c_1, \dots, c_ℓ is minimally dependent, then $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, \dots, c_\ell) > 0$ and $\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2) = 0$, so $(c_1 + c_2), c_3, \dots, c_\ell$ is dependent too. The minimality of this property is clear. \square

The next lemma will not be directly applied later on. Its proof however can be seen as a warm up in which some notation is fixed for the proof the main result in this section.

Lemma 6.14. *Let $c_1, c_2 \in \text{tail}(P)^\vee \cap M$. If $\eta(c_1, c_2) = 0$, then $\tilde{\eta}(c_1, c_2) = 0$.*

Proof. If d_1^1, \dots, d_k^1 and d_1^2, \dots, d_l^2 are the oriented edges forming paths leading from $v(c_1 + c_2)$ to $v(c_1)$ and $v(c_2)$ with $\langle d_i^1, c_1 \rangle, \langle d_j^2, c_2 \rangle \leq 0$, respectively, we obtain

$$(6.2) \quad \tilde{\eta}(c_1, c_2) = - \sum_{i=1}^k \langle d_i^1, c_1 \rangle \cdot t_{d_i^1} - \sum_{j=1}^l \langle d_j^2, c_2 \rangle \cdot t_{d_j^2}$$

showing non-negative coefficients. This implies that the edges d_i^1 and d_j^2 have to be contained in c_1^\perp and c_2^\perp , respectively, because

$$\pi(\tilde{\eta}(c_1, c_2)) = - \sum_{i=1}^k \langle d_i^1, c_1 \rangle - \sum_{j=1}^l \langle d_j^2, c_2 \rangle = \eta(c_1, c_2) = 0.$$

Thus, $\langle v(c_1), c_1 \rangle = \langle v(c_1 + c_2), c_1 \rangle$ and $\langle v(c_2), c_2 \rangle = \langle v(c_1 + c_2), c_2 \rangle$. This means that we could have chosen, i.e. that we can assume now, that $v(c_1) = v(c_1 + c_2) = v(c_2)$, which implies $\tilde{\eta}(c_1, c_2) = 0$. \square

In the next proof, the generators of $\mathcal{T}(P)^\perp$ described in (5.4-5.7) play a crucial role.

Proposition 6.15. *Being $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -independent is equivalent to being $\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -independent.*

Proof. By Remark 6.11 $\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -independence implies $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -independence. For the other direction we use induction on the length ℓ of the sequence c_1, \dots, c_ℓ . The case $\ell = 1$ is trivial. The essential step is $\ell = 2$.

So let $c_1, c_2 \in \text{tail}(P)^\vee \cap M$ with $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2) = 0$. Note first that we have

$$\{\eta(c)\} = \lceil \eta(c) \rceil - \eta(c) = \lceil -\langle v(c), c \rangle \rceil - (-\langle v(c), c \rangle) = \langle v(c), c \rangle - \lfloor \langle v(c), c \rangle \rfloor.$$

Combining the above relation with the definition of $\tilde{\eta}$ and with the formula (6.2) for $\tilde{\eta}(c_1, c_2)$ we obtain:

$$\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2) = \tilde{\eta}(c_1, c_2) + \{\eta(c_1)\} \cdot s_{v(c_1)} + \{\eta(c_2)\} \cdot s_{v(c_2)} - \{\eta(c_1 + c_2)\} \cdot s_{v(c_1 + c_2)}$$

$$(6.3) \quad = -\sum_{i=1}^k \langle d_i^1, c_1 \rangle \cdot t_{d_i^1} + (\langle v(c_1), c_1 \rangle - \lfloor \langle v(c_1), c_1 \rangle \rfloor) \cdot s_{v(c_1)}$$

$$(6.4) \quad -\sum_{j=1}^l \langle d_j^2, c_2 \rangle \cdot t_{d_j^2} + (\langle v(c_2), c_2 \rangle - \lfloor \langle v(c_2), c_2 \rangle \rfloor) \cdot s_{v(c_2)} \\ - (\langle v(c_1 + c_2), c_1 + c_2 \rangle - \lfloor \langle v(c_1 + c_2), c_1 + c_2 \rangle \rfloor) \cdot s_{v(c_1 + c_2)}$$

where the d_i^1 and d_j^2 are just as in the proof of Lemma 6.14. Our goal is to show that, assuming $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -independence, all the edges above are short. The proof is analogous for both paths, so we focus only on d_1^1, \dots, d_k^1 , and label the vertices with $v(c_1 + c_2) = v^0, \dots, v^k = v(c_1)$. From $\langle d_i^1, c_1 \rangle = \langle v^i - v^{i-1}, c_1 \rangle \leq 0$ we get that $\langle v^i, c_1 \rangle \leq \langle v^{i-1}, c_1 \rangle$. Via a suitable choice of $v(c_1)$, we can even insist on strict inequalities:

$$\langle v^i, c_1 \rangle < \langle v^{i-1}, c_1 \rangle.$$

So the vanishing of $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2)$, which is obtained from $\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2)$ by sending $t_{\bullet, \bullet}, s_{\bullet} \mapsto 1$, means that all the coefficients in rows (6.3) and (6.4) added up cancel with the single negative coefficient: that of $s_{v(c_1 + c_2)}$, which is contained in the half-open real interval $[0, 1)$. In particular, the sum of all coefficients of $t_{\bullet, \bullet}$ and s_{\bullet} below is positive and strictly less than 1:

$$S_1 := -\sum_{i=1}^k \langle v^i - v^{i-1}, c_1 \rangle \cdot t_{i-1, i} + (\langle v(c_1), c_1 \rangle - \lfloor \langle v(c_1), c_1 \rangle \rfloor) \cdot s_{v(c_1)}.$$

We would like to express the coefficient of $s_{v(c_1)}$ in a similar way as the coefficients of $t_{i-1, i}$. For this, we choose a c_1 -integral point ⁷ $v^{k+1} \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that

$$\langle v^{k+1}, c_1 \rangle = \lfloor \langle v(c_1), c_1 \rangle \rfloor \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Note that integral points $v \in N$ are always c_1 -integral, but the opposite is far from being true. Moreover, note that, unless $\eta(c_1) \in \mathbb{Z}$, the new point v^{k+1} cannot be contained in the polyhedron P . On the other hand, if $\eta(c_1) \in \mathbb{Z}$, then we may and will choose $v^{k+1} := v^k$. Anyway, the $s_{v(c_1)}$ -coefficient of S_1 becomes $\langle v^k - v^{k+1}, c_1 \rangle$, and we obtain

$$\pi(S_1) = -\sum_{i=1}^k \langle v^i - v^{i-1}, c_1 \rangle + \langle v^k - v^{k+1}, c_1 \rangle = \langle v^0, c_1 \rangle - \langle v^{k+1}, c_1 \rangle < 1.$$

We want to deduce that

$$(6.5) \quad s_{v(c_1 + c_2)} = t_{0,1} = s_{v^1} = t_{1,2} = \dots = s_{v^{k-1}} = t_{k-1,k} = s_{v(c_1)} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{T}^*(P)$$

⁷meaning that $\langle v^{k+1}, c_1 \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}$

where the last $s_{v(c_1)} = s_{v^k}$ has to be omitted if $\eta(c_1) \in \mathbb{Z}$. These equalities (together with those for the analogous c_2 -summand) obviously imply that

$$\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2) = \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2) \cdot s_{v(c_1+c_2)} = 0.$$

To obtain (6.5) we show that for $i = 1, \dots, k$ the edges $[v^{i-1}, v^i]$ are short edges, cf. Definition 5.7. Actually, if $\eta(c_1) \in \mathbb{Z}$, then only the one half open $[v^{k-1}, v^k]$ is needed to be short for the last segment. Assume that this fails for one of them. Then we have

$$|[gv^{i-1}, gv^i] \cap N| \geq g \quad \text{or} \quad |(gv^{i-1}, gv^i] \cap N| \geq g,$$

where $g \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ denotes the smallest number such that the line connecting gv^{i-1} and gv^i contains lattice points. In the first case, this implies that there are at least $(g+1)$ c_1 -integral points along our path from gv^{i-1} to gv^{k+1} , hence, more than ever, from gv^0 to gv^{k+1} . In the second case, we obtain the same, unless $i = k$ and $v^k = v^{k+1}$ – however this exactly means that we speak about the half open interval $(v^{k-1}, v^k]$ in the situation where $\eta(c_1) \in \mathbb{Z}$, which was excluded before.

Anyway, we do always get

$$|[gv^0, gv^{k+1}] \cap N| \geq g + 1,$$

hence, we obtain

$$g \cdot \pi(S_1) = \langle gv^0, c_1 \rangle - \langle gv^{k+1}, c_1 \rangle \geq g,$$

a contradiction. This concludes the proof for $\ell = 2$. The inductive step follows from Lemma 6.13 and Remark 6.11 (iii). \square

6.3. Liftings and relations of the Hilbert basis. In the last part of this section we will prepare the proof of the finite generation of the semigroup of all relations $\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, \dots, c_\ell)$ given in Proposition 7.7. To this aim, let $\{[c_1, \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1)], \dots, [c_k, \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_k)], [0, 1]\}$ be the Hilbert basis of $\sigma^\vee \cap (M \oplus \mathbb{Z})$ (cf. Subsection 5.2, Remark 5.3). Multisets supported on $\{c_1, \dots, c_k\}$ correspond to elements of \mathbb{N}^k via the multiplicities of occurrence of each element: $m_1, \dots, m_k \in \mathbb{N}$. We denote them by $\{c_1^{m_1}, \dots, c_k^{m_k}\}$. So we may speak of $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -dependent elements $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k$ via this correspondence, and write

$$\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbf{m}) := \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1^{m_1}, \dots, c_k^{m_k}), \quad \forall \mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{N}^k.$$

Lemma 6.16. *The number of minimally $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -dependent elements of \mathbb{N}^k finite.*

Proof. By Lemma 6.13, the set of dependent sequences supported on c_1, \dots, c_k is in order-preserving correspondence with a subset of \mathbb{N}^k representing a monomial ideal $\text{Dep}_{\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}[t_1, \dots, t_k]$. So the above statement follows from Dickson's Lemma. \square

7. THE UNIVERSAL CO-CARTESIAN EXTENSION

The inspiration for the following definition comes from Proposition 3.3, which defines co-Cartesian extensions by isomorphic relative boundaries, and Remark 5.3 which describes the relative boundary of our given object $(\mathbb{N}, \text{cone}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)^\vee)$, where $\text{cone}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)^\vee := \text{cone}(P)^\vee \cap (M \oplus \mathbb{Z})$. Denote by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(P) := M \oplus \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(P).$$

Definition 7.1. For any rational polyhedron $P \subseteq N_{\mathbb{R}}$, define the semigroups $\tilde{T}, \tilde{S} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(P)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{T} &= \text{span}_{\mathbb{N}} \{ [0, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2)] : c_1, c_2 \in \text{tail}(P)^{\vee} \cap M \}, \\ \tilde{S} &= \tilde{T} + \text{span}_{\mathbb{N}} \{ [c, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)] : c \in \text{tail}(P)^{\vee} \cap M \}.\end{aligned}$$

By Remark 6.11 (iv) we have

$$\tilde{T} = \text{span}_{\mathbb{N}} \{ [0, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, \dots, c_{\ell})] : \forall \ell \geq 2 \text{ and } \forall c_1, \dots, c_{\ell} \in \text{tail}(P)^{\vee} \cap M \}.$$

Further on, in Proposition 7.7, we will see that we could have chosen, in the latter version of defining \tilde{T} , only those c which appear in a Hilbert Basis of $\text{cone}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)^{\vee}$.

7.1. Belonging to the category. In this section we will check that the semigroups $\tilde{T} \subset \tilde{S}$ form a co-Cartesian extension of $(\mathbb{N}, \text{cone}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)^{\vee})$.

Proposition 7.2. *It holds that*

$$\partial_{\tilde{T}} \tilde{S} = \{ [c, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)] \mid c \in \text{tail}(P)^{\vee} \cap M \}.$$

Proof. The main consequence of Proposition 6.15 is that $\ker \pi_T = 0$, from which it follows that $[c, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)] \in \partial_{\tilde{T}} \tilde{S}$. The other inclusion is obvious. \square

Remark 7.3. Since $[c, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)]$ are natural (but not the only) liftings of $[c, \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)] \in \partial_{\mathbb{N}} \text{cone}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)^{\vee}$, it is quite natural to put these elements in \tilde{S} . Independently of the shape of \tilde{T} , the required triviality of the kernel of $\pi|_{\tilde{T}} : \tilde{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ (cf. Definition 3.1) implies that $[c, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)] \in \partial_{\tilde{T}} \tilde{S}$. By the defining property of the relative boundary, it follows that

$$[0, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2)] = [c_1, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1)] + [c_2, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_2)] - [c_1 + c_2, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1 + c_2)]$$

has to be contained in \tilde{T} . Thus, the Definition 7.1 was quite inevitable. At least, it was the minimal choice.

Proposition 6.15 is also crucial to prove the following.

Proposition 7.4. *For every rational polyhedron P , the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{T} & \hookrightarrow & \tilde{S} \\ \pi_T \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi_S \\ \mathbb{N} & \hookrightarrow & \text{cone}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)^{\vee} \end{array}$$

with vertical maps induced by $t_{\bullet, \bullet}, s_v \mapsto 1$ for $v \notin N$ and $s_v \mapsto 0$ for $v \in N$, is a co-Cartesian extension. This means that the addition maps are surjective, π_S induces a bijection on the boundaries, and $\ker \pi_T = \ker \pi_S = 0$.

Proof. The addition map downstairs is surjective because the pair is free. The addition map upstairs is by Proposition 7.2 surjective. The restriction of π_S to the boundary maps $[c, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)] \mapsto [c, \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)]$, which is obviously bijective.

We have that $\pi_T([0, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2)]) = 0 \iff \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2) = 0$, which by Proposition 6.15 is equivalent to $\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2) = 0$. Since every element $\tilde{s} \in \tilde{S}$ can be written as $\tilde{s} = [c, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)] + \tilde{t}$ for some elements $c \in \text{tail}(P)^{\vee} \cap M$ and $\tilde{t} \in \tilde{T}$, we have that $\pi(\tilde{s}) = 0$ implies $c = 0$ and $\pi(\tilde{t}) = 0$, which implies $\tilde{s} = 0$ because $\ker \pi_T = 0$. \square

7.2. The s and multiples of t are in \tilde{T} . The next result shows that the special elements s_i and some multiples of the t_{ij} are always in \tilde{T} .

Proposition 7.5. *For every $v^i \in \text{Vert}_{\neq \mathbb{Z}}(P)$ there exist some $c_1^i, c_2^i \in \text{cone}(P)^\vee \cap M$ such that $\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1^i, c_2^i) = s_i$, where $s_i = s_{v^i}$ is the corresponding coordinate. Furthermore, we can also find for each t_{ij} a positive integer $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a_{ij}t_{ij} \in \tilde{T}$.*

Proof. Let $v^i \in \text{Vert}_{\neq \mathbb{Z}}(P)$. Clearly there exists a c such that $v(c) = v^i$ and $\eta(c) \notin \mathbb{Z}$. We may assume that

$$\eta(c) = z + q \text{ with } z \in \mathbb{Z}, q \in \mathbb{Q} \text{ and } 0 < q \leq \frac{1}{2} :$$

otherwise we replace c by kc with k being a positive integer such that $\eta(kc) + 1 - \lceil \eta(kc) \rceil \leq \frac{1}{2}$. This brings us to

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c, c) &= \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)s_i + \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)s_i - \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(2c)s_i \\ &= (z+1)s_i + (z+1)s_i - \lceil 2z+2q \rceil s_i \\ &= s_i. \end{aligned}$$

For the second part, we look at one edge $[v^i, v^j]$. We can choose c_1, c_2 such that $v(c_1) = v^i, v(c_2) = v^j$ and furthermore such that $\langle v^j, c_2 \rangle < \langle v^i, c_2 \rangle$ and that $v(c_1 + c_2) = v(c_1)$. Finally, we can assume that all the brackets are integers. By Definition 6.2 we then have

$$\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2) = (\langle v^i, c_2 \rangle - \langle v^j, c_2 \rangle) t_{ij}$$

and by our assumptions the coefficient of t_{ij} is a positive integer. \square

7.3. Finite generation. A consequence of Proposition 6.15 is that lifting the Hilbert basis elements

$$[c_1, \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1)], \dots, [c_k, \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_k)]$$

we obtain generators of \tilde{S} as a “ \tilde{T} -module”:

Corollary 7.6. *The following equality holds: $\tilde{S} = \tilde{T} + \text{span}_{\mathbb{N}} \{[c_1, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1)], \dots, [c_k, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_k)]\}$.*

Proof. Let $c \in \text{tail}(P)^\vee \cap M$. Our goal is to prove that $[c, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)] \in \text{span}_{\mathbb{N}} \{[c_i, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_i)] : i = 1 \dots k\}$. By Remark 5.3 $[c, \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)] \in \partial_{\mathbb{N}} \text{cone}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)^\vee$, that is $[c, \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)] \in \text{span}_{\mathbb{N}} \{[c_i, \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_i)] : i = 1 \dots k\}$. So there exists an $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -independent sequence consisting of c_i s which adds up to c , and we conclude by Proposition 6.15. \square

Proposition 7.7. *The semigroup \tilde{T} is finitely generated. A finite set of generators is given by the minimally dependent sequences supported on c_1, \dots, c_k , yielding $\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbf{m})$ for certain $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{N}^k$.*

Proof. We start by claiming that for any sequence c_1, \dots, c_ℓ of elements from $\text{tail}(P)^\vee \cap M$, there exists an $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{N}^k$ such that, with the notation introduced in 6.3, we have

$$(7.1) \quad \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, \dots, c_\ell) = \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbf{m}).$$

Indeed, for every c_i we have

$$[c_i, \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_i)] = \sum_{j=1}^k m_{ij} [c_j, \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_j)] = [\sum_{j=1}^k m_{ij} c_j, \sum_{j=1}^k m_{ij} \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_j)],$$

so we can choose $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{m}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{m}_\ell \in \mathbb{N}^k$:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, \dots, c_\ell) &= \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1) + \cdots + \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_\ell) - \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1 + \cdots + c_\ell) \\ &= \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\sum_{j=1}^k m_{1j} \mathbf{c}_j) + \cdots + \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\sum_{j=1}^k m_{\ell,j} \mathbf{c}_j) - \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\sum_{i=1}^\ell \sum_{j=1}^k m_{ij} \mathbf{c}_j) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k m_{1j} \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbf{c}_j) + \cdots + \sum_{j=1}^k m_{\ell,j} \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbf{c}_j) - \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\sum_{i=1}^\ell \sum_{j=1}^k m_{ij} \mathbf{c}_j) \\ &= \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbf{m}), \end{aligned}$$

so (7.1) holds. Furthermore, all the \mathbf{m}_i are independent, but their sum \mathbf{m} is independent if and only if c_1, \dots, c_ℓ are independent.

Next we claim that for every sequence $c_1, \dots, c_\ell \in \text{tail}(P)^\vee \cap M$ we can even express $\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, \dots, c_\ell)$ using a combination of $\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\bullet)$ with minimally dependent arguments from \mathbb{N}^k . From this second claim, we can immediately conclude. To prove this claim we use double induction: first with respect to $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, \dots, c_\ell) \in \mathbb{N}$, and, inside each induction step we use induction on $\deg(\mathbf{m}) = \sum m_{ij}$. The key of the proof is Remark 6.11 (iii) adapted to \mathbb{N}^k : if $\mathbf{m}' \leq \mathbf{m}$ component-wise, then

$$(7.2) \quad \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbf{m}) = \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbf{m}') + \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\sum_{i=1}^k m'_i \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{c}_1^{m_1-m'_1}, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k^{m_k-m'_k}).$$

The case $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, \dots, c_\ell) = 1$. If $\deg(\mathbf{m}) = 2$ we are trivially done. Otherwise, assume \mathbf{m} is not minimally dependent and choose $\mathbf{m}' < \mathbf{m}$ which is also dependent. By (7.2) we have $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbf{m}) = \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbf{m}') = 1$ so $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(\sum_{i=1}^k m'_i \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{c}_1^{m_1-m'_1}, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k^{m_k-m'_k}) = 0$. By Proposition 6.15 and (7.2) it follows that $\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbf{m}) = \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbf{m}')$, with $\deg(\mathbf{m}') < \deg(\mathbf{m})$, so we conclude by induction on $\deg(\mathbf{m})$.

The inductive step follows very similarly from (7.2). □

Question 7.8. Now, where we know that \tilde{T} is a finitely generated semigroup, it might be interesting to ask for the polyhedral cone generated by \tilde{T} . What are its fundamental rays, and how do its facets look like? This will be answered partially in [ACF20]. In that paper we will use different techniques which will provide a new description of the generators of \tilde{T} as well as another proof of Proposition 7.7.

8. THE INITIAL OBJECT PROPERTY

In Proposition 7.4 we showed that (\tilde{T}, \tilde{S}) belongs to the category of co-Cartesian extensions of the pair $\mathbb{N} \hookrightarrow \text{cone}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)^\vee$. For this, we have utilized the fact that (\tilde{T}, \tilde{S}) is “small enough”, i.e. that the elements of the space $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(P)$ satisfy sufficiently many relations, e.g. the short edge relation, which lead us to Proposition 6.15. This was then crucial to Propositions 7.4 and 7.7. We are now going to show that (\tilde{T}, \tilde{S}) it is an initial object in this category, so, in a sense, we care about the opposite: We have to show that all these relations within (\tilde{T}, \tilde{S}) (or $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(P)$) are not arbitrarily but implicitly part of the structure of every other co-Cartesian extension. This will allow us to construct a unique map from (\tilde{T}, \tilde{S}) to any other co-Cartesian extension.

Notation 8.1. In contrast to Section 5 we no longer use (T, S) to denote the starting pair $(\mathbb{N}, \text{cone}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)^\vee)$. Instead, we assume that (T, S) is an arbitrary co-Cartesian extension of $(\mathbb{N}, \text{cone}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)^\vee)$.

Our goal in this section is to define compatible maps $\ell_T : \tilde{T} \rightarrow T$ and $\ell_S : \tilde{S} \rightarrow S$ and prove the following theorem.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & \ell_T & & \ell_S \\
 & & \curvearrowright & & \curvearrowleft \\
 \tilde{T} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \tilde{S} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & T & \xrightarrow{\quad} & S \\
 & \searrow & \swarrow & \swarrow & \searrow & \swarrow & \\
 & & \mathbb{N} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \text{cone}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)^{\vee} & &
 \end{array}$$

Theorem 8.2. *The pair (\tilde{T}, \tilde{S}) is an initial object in the category of co-Cartesian extensions of the pair $(\mathbb{N}, \text{cone}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)^{\vee})$. Down to earth, this means that, for any given (T, S) inducing a diagram as above, there exists a unique pair (ℓ_T, ℓ_S) of compatible maps $\ell_T : \tilde{T} \rightarrow T$ and $\ell_S : \tilde{S} \rightarrow S$.*

The proof of this theorem will be done in the following subsections filling the rest of Section 8.

8.1. Uniqueness. The fact that both $(\pi_{\tilde{T}}, \pi_{\tilde{S}})$ and (π_T, π_S) are co-Cartesian extensions implies that we have vertical isomorphisms $\pi_{\tilde{\partial}} := \pi_{\tilde{S}}|_{\partial_{\tilde{T}}(\tilde{S})}$ and $\pi_{\partial} := \pi_S|_{\partial_T(S)}$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \partial_{\tilde{T}}(\tilde{S}) & \xrightarrow{\quad \ell_{\partial} \quad} & \partial_T(S) \\
 \searrow \pi_{\tilde{\partial}} \sim & \xrightarrow{\quad (\sim) \quad} & \swarrow \sim \pi_{\partial} \\
 & \partial_{\mathbb{N}}(\text{cone}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)^{\vee}) &
 \end{array}$$

In particular, we are allowed and forced to set

$$\ell_{\partial} = \pi_{\partial}^{-1} \circ \pi_{\tilde{\partial}}$$

which will become the unique restriction to $\partial_{\tilde{T}}(\tilde{S})$ of any possible $\ell_S : \tilde{S} \rightarrow S$. Moreover, it follows that, like $\pi_{\tilde{\partial}}$ and π_{∂} , the map ℓ_{∂} is bijective too.

Notation 8.3. In this section c, c_i will always denote elements from the semigroup $\text{tail}(P)^{\vee} \cap M$. For every c we write

$$\begin{aligned}
 \ell_{\partial}(c) &:= \ell_{\partial}([c, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)]) = \pi_{\partial}^{-1}([c, \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)]), \\
 \ell_{\partial}(c_1, c_2) &:= \ell_{\partial}(c_1) + \ell_{\partial}(c_2) - \ell_{\partial}(c_1 + c_2) \in T - T.
 \end{aligned}$$

So we can also regard ℓ_{∂} as a map $\ell_{\partial} : \text{tail}(P)^{\vee} \cap M \rightarrow \partial_T(S)$.

Recall that from Remark 5.3 and as a consequence of Proposition 7.4 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \partial_{\mathbb{N}}(\text{cone}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)^{\vee}) &= \{[c, \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)] : c \in \text{tail}(P)^{\vee} \cap M\} \quad \text{and} \\
 \partial_{\tilde{T}}(\tilde{S}) &= \{[c, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)] : c \in \text{tail}(P)^{\vee} \cap M\},
 \end{aligned}$$

with $\pi_{\tilde{\partial}} : [c, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)] \mapsto [c, \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)]$. So \tilde{T} is generated by a combination of elements from the boundary:

$$[0, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2)] = [c_1, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1)] + [c_2, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_2)] - [c_1 + c_2, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1 + c_2)].$$

Thus, since ℓ_S is supposed to equal the unique ℓ_{∂} on the summands on the right hand side, it is uniquely determined too.

8.2. Defining the maps. There is thus not much choice in defining the maps ℓ : on the boundary it has to be $\ell_\partial = \pi_{\tilde{\partial}}^{-1} \circ \pi_{\tilde{\partial}}$ and $\ell_{\tilde{T}}$ it has to satisfy

$$\ell_{\tilde{T}}([0, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2)]) = \ell_\partial([c_1, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1)]) + \ell_\partial([c_2, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_2)]) - \ell_\partial([c_1 + c_2, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1 + c_2)]).$$

We can then define

$$\ell_{\tilde{S}}(\tilde{s}) := \ell_\partial(\tilde{\partial}(\tilde{s})) + \ell_{\tilde{T}}(\tilde{\lambda}(\tilde{s})).$$

We first have to check that the maps land where they are supposed to. For ℓ_∂ this holds by definition. For $\ell_{\tilde{T}}$ this follows directly from Proposition 3.6. Furthermore, by the same proposition, the map ℓ_∂ is as linear as it may be:

Proposition 8.4. *For all c_1, c_2 we have $\ell_{\tilde{T}}([0, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2)]) \in T$. Moreover, c_1, \dots, c_r are $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -independent if and only if $\ell_\partial(c_1), \dots, \ell_\partial(c_r)$ are boundary independent.*

Remark 8.5. If $\ell_{\tilde{T}}$ is a well-defined semigroup homomorphism, then so is $\ell_{\tilde{S}}$. Being well-defined follows from the uniqueness of the decomposition $\tilde{s} = \tilde{\partial}(\tilde{s}) + \tilde{\lambda}(\tilde{s})$. The fact that $\ell_{\tilde{S}}(\tilde{s}_1 + \tilde{s}_2) = \ell_{\tilde{S}}(\tilde{s}_1) + \ell_{\tilde{S}}(\tilde{s}_2)$ is a consequence of Proposition 3.6 combined with the easy remark that for any freepair (\tilde{T}, \tilde{S}) and any $s_1, s_2 \in \tilde{S}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial(s_1 + s_2) &= \partial(\partial(s_1) + \partial(s_2)), \quad \text{and} \\ \lambda(s_1 + s_2) &= \lambda(s_1) + \lambda(s_2) + \lambda(\partial(s_1) + \partial(s_2)). \end{aligned}$$

The hard part is to show that $\ell_{\tilde{T}}$ is well-defined i.e. that it depends only on the element $\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2)$ but not on the individual c_1, c_2 . This will be a consequence of Lemma 8.12. So, for most of the remainder of this section we will work towards this goal. We will use the s and t coordinates introduced in Section 5.3 and prove that there are corresponding elements in T as well, and then show that these corresponding elements satisfy the relations from Definitions 5.9 and 5.10. The idea is to recover ℓ_T from a linear map $\mathcal{T}^*(P) \rightarrow (T - T) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$. So the elements s_v and t_{ij} are important because they generate $\mathcal{T}^*(P)$, and because the relations (such as those arising from the short edges) are formulated in terms of the elements s_v and t_{ij} . This is the rough idea of the next sections.

8.3. Recovering the s -parameters. Recall from Definition 6.2 that the elements $\tilde{\eta}(c)$ depend linearly on c whenever the vertex $v(c)$ is not changing. That means that, fixing some vertex v of P , the map

$$\tilde{\eta}(\bullet) : \mathcal{N}(v, P) \subseteq \text{tail}(P)^\vee \rightarrow \mathcal{T}^*(P)$$

is a linear on the normal cone $\mathcal{N}(v, P) \subseteq \text{tail}(P)^\vee \subseteq M_{\mathbb{R}}$; it defines some element $\tilde{\eta}_v \in N_{\mathbb{R}} \otimes \mathcal{T}^*(P)$. Let us denote simplify further the notation introduced in (5.2) by setting

$$\{c\} := \{\eta(c)\} = \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c) - \eta(c) \in [0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}.$$

Then Definition 6.2 turns into $\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c) = \tilde{\eta}(c) + \{c\} \cdot s_{v(c)} \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(P)$, and, via π , this element maps to $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c) = \eta(c) + \{c\} \in \mathbb{Z}$. In Proposition 7.5 we have used elements c with $\{c\} \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ to represent $s_{v(c)} = \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c, c)$. This generalizes to the fact that

$$\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2) = \begin{cases} s_v & \text{if } \{c_1\} + \{c_2\} \geq 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } \{c_1\} + \{c_2\} < 1. \end{cases}$$

whenever $c_i \in \mathcal{N}(v, P) \cap M$, i.e. whenever v can be chosen as $v(c_i)$ ($i = 1, 2$). Now, the first step into the direction of establishing the map ℓ is that this independence on the special choice of elements $c_i \in \mathcal{N}(v, P)$ remains true in S .

Proposition 8.6. (i) Assume that $v \in P$ is a vertex. Then there is an element $\ell_s(v) \in S$ such that for all $c_1, c_2 \in \mathcal{N}(v, P) \cap M$ we have

$$\ell(c_1, c_2) = \begin{cases} \ell_s(v) & \text{if } \{c_1\} + \{c_2\} \geq 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } \{c_1\} + \{c_2\} < 1. \end{cases}$$

(ii) If $c \in \mathcal{N}(v, P)^\vee \cap M$ with $n \in \mathbb{N}$ being the smallest positive integer such that $n \cdot \{c\} \geq 1$, e.g. if $\{c\} = 1/n$, then we obtain $\ell_s(v) = n \cdot \ell_\partial(c) - \ell_\partial(nc)$.

Proof. (i) *Step 1.* We check first that $\ell(c_1, c_2) = 0$ whenever $\{c_1\} + \{c_2\} < 1$. This inequality is equivalent to the equality

$$\{c_1\} + \{c_2\} = \{c_1 + c_2\},$$

i.e. it yields

$$\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1) + \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_2) = \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1 + c_2).$$

Hence, $\ell(c_1, c_2) = 0$ follows from Proposition 8.4. Note that the assumption of the just proven claim is trivially fulfilled if, $\{c_1\} = 0$, i.e. if $\eta(c_1)$ is an integer. We will use this in the next step.

Step 2. Assume that $c, c' \in \mathcal{N}(v, P) \cap M$ such that $\{c\} = 1/n$ and that $\{c'\} = (n - k)/n$ for some not necessarily coprime natural numbers $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, n - 1\}$. Then

$$\ell(c', k \cdot c) = n \cdot \ell_\partial(c) - \ell_\partial(nc) = \ell(a \cdot c, b \cdot c) \text{ for all } a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \text{ with } a + b = n.$$

Step 1 immediately implies the second equality. To check the first one, we have to show that

$$\ell_\partial(c') + \ell_\partial(kc) - \ell_\partial(c' + kc) = n \cdot \ell_\partial(c) - \ell_\partial(nc).$$

Since Step 1 yields $\ell_\partial(kc) = k \cdot \ell_\partial(c)$, this reduces to the claim

$$\ell_\partial(c') + \ell_\partial(nc) = (n - k) \cdot \ell_\partial(c) + \ell_\partial(c' + kc).$$

However, since $\{nc\} = \{c' + kc\} = 0$, the expression ℓ_∂ is linear on both sides, i.e. both sides are equal to $\ell_\partial(c' + nc)$.

Step 3. Assume that $\{c_1\} + \{c_2\} \geq 1$; in particular, that both summands are positive. For the present Step 3 we suppose that we have found an element $c \in \mathcal{N}(v, P) \cap M$ such that it satisfies the assumption made in Step 2 with respect to both $c' := c_1, c_2$. That is, $\{c\} = 1/n$ and $\{c_i\} = (n - k_i)/n$ with $k_i \in \{1, \dots, n - 1\}$ for $i = 1, 2$. This leads to the equalities

$$\ell_\partial(c_i) + k_i \cdot \ell_\partial(c) - \ell_\partial(c_i + k_i \cdot c) = \ell(c_1, k_i \cdot c) = n \cdot \ell_\partial(c) - \ell_\partial(nc),$$

hence

$$\ell_\partial(c_i) = \ell_\partial(c_i + k_i \cdot c) + (n - k_i) \cdot \ell_\partial(c) - \ell_\partial(nc).$$

Alternatively, we could also take $c' := c_1 + c_2$ instead of the single c_i . Since $k_1 + k_2 < n$, we have to replace the coefficients k_i by $(k_1 + k_2)$. This leads to

$$\ell_\partial(c_1 + c_2) = \ell_\partial(c_1 + c_2 + (k_1 + k_2) \cdot c) + (n - k_1 - k_2) \cdot \ell_\partial(c) - \ell_\partial(nc).$$

Using these equations, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(c_1, c_2) &= \ell_\partial(c_1) + \ell_\partial(c_2) - \ell_\partial(c_1 + c_2) \\ &= \ell_\partial(c_1 + k_1 \cdot c) + \ell_\partial(c_2 + k_2 \cdot c) - \ell_\partial(c_1 + c_2 + (k_1 + k_2) \cdot c) \\ &\quad + n \cdot \ell_\partial(c) - \ell_\partial(nc). \end{aligned}$$

The arguments of the first two summands have the property that $\{\bullet\} = 0$, i.e. $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(\bullet) = \eta(\bullet)$. In particular, since ℓ_{∂} is linear in this case, their sum cancels with the third summand. Altogether this yields

$$\ell(c_1, c_2) = n \cdot \ell_{\partial}(c) - \ell_{\partial}(nc).$$

Step 4. Since v is a rational vertex of P , we know that the denominators of all $\eta(c)$ and hence that of all fractional parts $\{c\}$ with $c \in \mathcal{N}(v, P) \cap M$ are bounded. If n is the maximal denominator among them, then we can find a special $c \in \mathcal{N}(v, P) \cap M$ with $\{c\} = 1/n$. We will fix this element and set

$$\ell_s(v) := n \cdot \ell_{\partial}(c) - \ell_{\partial}(nc).$$

And now we can apply Step 3 for any given $c_1, c_2 \in \mathcal{N}(v, P) \cap M$ and our fixed c .

(ii) This is a direct consequence of the first part of the proposition and of Proposition 8.4. \square

Remark 8.7. The meaning of the elements $\ell_s(v)$ is that ℓ_T will map s_v onto $\ell_s(v)$. Hence the existence of $\ell_s(v)$ is, on the one hand, a necessary condition for the existence of ℓ_T , but, on the other, it will also help to prove it.

8.4. Recovering the s -equations (5.6) for lattice-disjoint edges. In Definition 5.10 we had imposed the equations $s_i = s_j$ on the vector space $\mathcal{T}(P)$ for compact edges $d = [v^i, v^j]$ with $[v^i, v^j] \cap N = \emptyset$. These impose the equality $s_i = s_j \in \mathcal{T}^*(P)$. Hence, for the well-definition of the map $\ell_T : \tilde{T} \rightarrow T$, we have to check that this leads to the equality $\ell_s(v^i) = \ell_s(v^j)$ inside T too.

Recall from Definition 5.7 that $g_d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ is minimal such that the affine line $\overline{g_d \cdot d}$ spanned by $g_d \cdot d$ contains lattice points. If $g_d = 1$, then we may choose some $w \in \overline{d} \cap N$, and for any integral

$$c \in \mathcal{N}(d, P) = \mathcal{N}(v^i, P) \cap \mathcal{N}(v^j, P)$$

we obtain that

$$\eta(c) = -\langle v^i, c \rangle = -\langle v^j, c \rangle = -\langle w, c \rangle \in \mathbb{Z},$$

i.e. that $\{c\} = 0$. That means that those c do not qualify to determine neither $\ell_s(v^i)$, nor $\ell_s(v^j)$ via Proposition 8.6(ii). While this is bad news, the point is that the reverse implication works as well: Assume that $g_d \geq 2$. Considering the projection

$$N_{\mathbb{R}} \twoheadrightarrow N_{\mathbb{R}}/\mathbb{R}(v^j - v^i) =: \overline{N_{\mathbb{R}}}$$

the polyhedron P maps to a polyhedron \overline{P} , and the edge d becomes a vertex \overline{d} of \overline{P} . Within the dual setup, the injection $\overline{M_{\mathbb{R}}} \hookrightarrow M_{\mathbb{R}}$ sends $\mathcal{N}(\overline{d}, \overline{P})$ isomorphically to $\mathcal{N}(d, P)$. The assumption $g_d \geq 2$ means that \overline{d} is not a lattice point in $\overline{N_{\mathbb{R}}}$. In particular, there are integral $c \in \mathcal{N}(\overline{d}, \overline{P}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{N}(d, P)$ such that $\langle \overline{d}, c \rangle \notin \mathbb{Z}$. However, this number equals $\langle v^i, c \rangle = \langle v^j, c \rangle = -\eta(c)$. As a direct consequence, we obtain the following.

Proposition 8.8. *If $d = [v^i, v^j]$ is an edge with $g_d \geq 2$, then $\ell_s(v^i) = \ell_s(v^j)$ inside T .*

Proof. Using the element $c \in \mathcal{N}(d, P) \cap M$ with $\{c\} \neq 0$ constructed right before the proposition, we denote by $n \geq 2$ the smallest positive integer such that $n \cdot \{c\} \geq 1$. Then, (ii) of Proposition 8.6 implies that $\ell_s(v^i) = n \cdot \ell_{\partial}(c) - \ell_{\partial}(nc) = \ell_s(v^j)$. \square

The task mentioned at the beginning of the present subsection is not fulfilled yet – it remains to show that $\ell_s(v^i) = \ell_s(v^j)$ for the lattice-disjoint edges $d = [v^i, v^j]$ with $g_d = 1$. While we have already indicated that the method of the proof of Proposition 8.8 does not work here, we are saved by the fact

that, supposed that $g_d = 1$ and $v^i, v^j \notin N$, the property $d \cap N = \emptyset$ is equivalent to d being a short edge (see Definition 5.7). Thus, we can and will postpone this case until we have studied the elements $\ell(t_{ij})$ where t_{ij} is the dilation parameter.

8.5. Recovering the t -parameters. In Subsection 8.3 we have utilized the fact that $\tilde{\eta}(\bullet)$ is linear on the normal cones $\mathcal{N}(v, P)$ for vertices $v \in P$. In the present subsection, however, we start with an edge $d = [v^1, v^2]$ leading to the normal cones

$$\mathcal{N}(d, P) = \mathcal{N}(v^1, P) \cap \mathcal{N}(v^2, P).$$

Here, we have to pay attention that the function $\tilde{\eta}(\bullet)$ is linear on each individual $\mathcal{N}(v^i, P)$, but not on their union. In particular, the function $c \mapsto \{c\}$ ceases to be linear (even mod \mathbb{Z}) when crossing the boundaries of normal cones.

Definition 8.9. We call an element $c \in \text{tail}(P)^\vee$ super integral if it belongs to M and has integral values on all (rational, but not necessarily integral) vertices of P . In particular, super integral elements c satisfy $\eta(c) \in \mathbb{Z}$, hence $\{c\} = 0$. This notion is additive, i.e. the set of super integral elements form a sublattice $M_{\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{Z}} \subseteq M$.

Now, assume that $c_i \in \mathcal{N}(v^i, P)$ ($i = 1, 2$) are super integral such that $c_1 + c_2 \in \mathcal{N}(v^1, P) \cup \mathcal{N}(v^2, P)$. Note that the latter condition is automatic if $\mathcal{N}(v^1, P) \cup \mathcal{N}(v^2, P)$ is convex. Denoting $d := v^2 - v^1$, this implies that $\langle d, c_1 \rangle, \langle -d, c_2 \rangle \geq 0$. In Proposition 7.5, we have related the element $\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2)$ to the edge parameter $t = t_{12}$. The exact statement generalizes to the fact that

$$\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2) = \min\{\langle d, c_1 \rangle, \langle -d, c_2 \rangle\} \cdot t.$$

Now, the next towards establishing the map ℓ is that this special dependence on the choice of elements $c_i \in \mathcal{N}(v^i, P)$ remains true in T .

Proposition 8.10. *There is an element $\ell_t(d) \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0} \cdot T$ such that for all super integral $c_i \in \mathcal{N}(v^i, P)$ ($i = 1, 2$) with $c_1 + c_2 \in \mathcal{N}(v^1, P) \cup \mathcal{N}(v^2, P)$ we have $\ell(c_1, c_2) = \min\{\langle d, c_1 \rangle, \langle -d, c_2 \rangle\} \cdot \ell_t(d)$.*

Proof. We may assume that $\langle d, c_1 \rangle \geq \langle -d, c_2 \rangle$ (≥ 0). In this case, the claim turns into the equation $\ell(c_1, c_2) = \langle -d, c_2 \rangle \cdot \ell_t(d)$.

Step 1: Show that $\ell(c_1, c_2)$ does indeed not depend on c_1 , provided that it does not leave the range $\mathcal{N}(v^1, P) \cap [\langle d, \bullet \rangle \geq \langle -d, c_2 \rangle]$. If c'_1 is another candidate, then we obtain

$$\ell(c_1, c_2) - \ell(c'_1, c_2) = \ell_{\partial}(c_1) - \ell_{\partial}(c_1 + c_2) - \ell_{\partial}(c'_1) + \ell_{\partial}(c'_1 + c_2).$$

Hence, as our goal is $\ell(c_1, c_2) = \ell(c'_1, c_2)$, we have to show that

$$\ell_{\partial}(c_1) + \ell_{\partial}(c'_1 + c_2) = \ell_{\partial}(c'_1) + \ell_{\partial}(c_1 + c_2).$$

The inequalities $\langle d, c_1 \rangle, \langle d, c'_1 \rangle \geq \langle -d, c_2 \rangle$ imply that both $c_1 + c_2$ and $c'_1 + c_2$ belong to $\mathcal{N}(v^1, P)$, i.e. to the same normal cone which already contains c_1 and c'_1 . In particular, since c_1, c'_1 are super integral, Proposition 8.4 shows that the map ℓ_{∂} behaves linearly on both sums, i.e. adding up to $\ell_{\partial}(c_1 + c'_1 + c_2)$ in both cases.

Step 2: Fix a super integral $c_1 \in \mathcal{N}(v^1, P)$ and show that $\ell(c_1, \bullet)$ is an additive function on

$$B(c_1) := \{c_2 \in \mathcal{N}(v^2, P) : c_1 + c_2 \in \mathcal{N}(v^1, P) \text{ and } \langle v^j, c_2 \rangle \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ for } j = 1, 2\}.$$

Note that $B(c_1)$ is not a cone. However, if $c_2, c'_2 \in B(c_1)$ with $c_2 + c'_2 \in B(c_1)$, then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(c_1, c_2 + c'_2) - \ell(c_1, c_2) - \ell(c_1, c'_2) &= \ell_{\partial}(c_1) + \ell_{\partial}(c_2 + c'_2) - \ell_{\partial}(c_1 + c_2 + c'_2) - \ell_{\partial}(c_1) - \\ &\quad - \ell_{\partial}(c_2) + \ell_{\partial}(c_1 + c_2) - \ell_{\partial}(c_1) - \ell_{\partial}(c'_2) + \ell_{\partial}(c_1 + c'_2) \\ &= \ell_{\partial}(c_1 + c_2) + \ell_{\partial}(c_1 + c'_2) + \ell_{\partial}(c_2 + c'_2) - \\ &\quad - \ell_{\partial}(c_1) - \ell_{\partial}(c_2) - \ell_{\partial}(c'_2) - \ell_{\partial}(c_1 + c_2 + c'_2). \end{aligned}$$

Since $c_2, c'_2 \in \mathcal{N}(v^2, P)$ are super integral, we know that $\ell_{\partial}(c_2) + \ell_{\partial}(c'_2) = \ell_{\partial}(c_2 + c'_2)$. This transforms the previous expression into

$$\ell(c_1, c_2 + c'_2) - \ell(c_1, c_2) - \ell(c_1, c'_2) = \ell_{\partial}(c_1 + c_2) + \ell_{\partial}(c_1 + c'_2) - \ell_{\partial}(c_1) - \ell_{\partial}(c_1 + c_2 + c'_2),$$

and the additivity claim that we want to prove for $\ell(c_1, \bullet)$ is equivalent to the equality

$$\ell_{\partial}(c_1 + c_2) + \ell_{\partial}(c_1 + c'_2) = \ell_{\partial}(c_1) + \ell_{\partial}(c_1 + c_2 + c'_2).$$

The integrality of $\langle v^1, c_1 + c_2 \rangle$ (and similarly for c'_2) implies that the left hand side equals the compact expression $\ell_{\partial}(2c_1 + c_2 + c'_2)$. The same argument applies for the right hand side, yielding the same value.

Step 3: Define the map $\psi : \{c_2 \in \mathcal{N}(v^2, P) \cap M : \langle v^i, c_2 \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}, i = 1, 2\} \longrightarrow T$ as

$$\psi(c_2) := \ell(c_1, c_2)$$

under use of any $c_1 \in \mathcal{N}(v^1, P) \cap M$ with $\langle v^i, c_1 \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}$ ($i = 1, 2$) and $c_1 + c_2 \in \mathcal{N}(v^1, P)$, i.e. such that $c_2 \in B(c_1)$ from Step 2.

While it is obvious that those elements c_1 exist, it is a consequence of Step 1 that the definition of $\psi(c_2)$ does not depend on their choice. Moreover, for any $c_2, c'_2 \in \mathcal{N}(v^2, P) \cap M$ with $\langle v^i, c_2 \rangle, \langle v^i, c'_2 \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}$ ($i = 1, 2$), we can find an element c_1 such that $c_2, c'_2, c_2 + c'_2 \in B(c_1)$. Hence, it follows from Step 2, that ψ is an additive function.

By definition, it is clear that $d \leq 0$ on $\mathcal{N}(v^2, P)$, and we may restrict ψ to the d -face

$$\mathcal{N}(v^2, P) \cap (d)^{\perp} = \mathcal{N}(d, P) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(v^1, P).$$

That means that both arguments from $\psi(c_2) = \ell(c_1, c_2)$ become super integral elements of $\mathcal{N}(v^1, P)$, i.e. they satisfy the linearity relation $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1) + \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_2) = \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1 + c_2)$. Thus, Proposition 8.4 implies that $\ell(c_1, c_2) = 0$ on $(d)^{\perp}$. It follows that ψ extends to a linear map

$$\mathcal{N}(v^2, P)/(d)^{\perp} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0} \cdot T,$$

i.e. it is of the form $\psi(c_2) = \langle -d, c_2 \rangle \cdot \ell_t(d)$ for some element $\ell_t(d) \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0} \cdot T$. \square

8.6. Recovering the s/t -equations (5.7) for short edges. Note that the vector $d = v^2 - v^1$ spans the 1-dimensional \mathbb{Q} -vector space associated to the edge $d = [v^1, v^2]$. While the affine line spanned by d might lack lattice points (i.e. $g_d \geq 2$ from Definition 5.7), the intersection $(\mathbb{Q} \cdot d) \cap N$ can be identified with \mathbb{Z} . It is dual to $M/(d)^{\perp} = \mathbb{Z}$. Choose a representative $c_+ \in M$ lifting 1. Note that, in the case of $g_d \geq 2$, the choice might indeed matter, cf. Subsubsection 8.6.3.

We fix an element $w \in \text{int } \mathcal{N}(d, P)$, meaning that $\langle w, v^1 \rangle = \langle w, v^2 \rangle$ is strictly less than the value of w on all other vertices of P . We will, additionally, assume that it is super integral $w \in M_{\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{Z}}$, meaning that

it has integral values on all, even on the non-integral, vertices of P . This allows us to choose and fix an $A \gg 0$ leading to elements

$$c_1 := c_+ + A \cdot w \in \mathcal{N}(v^1, P) \quad \text{and} \quad c_2 := -c_+ + A \cdot w \in \mathcal{N}(v^2, P).$$

In particular,

$$c_0 := c_1 + c_2 = 2A \cdot w \in \mathcal{N}(d, P).$$

In contrast to w , the values of c_+ on v^1, v^2 might be non-integral. Let $n \in g_d \cdot \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ such that

$$n \cdot \langle M, v^i \rangle \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (i = 1, 2).$$

The idea is now to frequently make use of Proposition 8.4 stating that any linearity from $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}$ transfers directly to ℓ_{∂} . On the other hand, when looking for linearity instances of $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}$, having w (or an integral multiple) as one argument does always help: First, since w is contained in $\mathcal{N}(d, P)$, the function η acts linear into both regions $\mathcal{N}(v^1, P)$ and $\mathcal{N}(v^2, P)$. Second, the integrality assumption for w implies $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(w) = \eta(w)$.

8.6.1. *The first recursion formula.* For any $h \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ we consider the differences

$$\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(hc_1, c_1) = \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(hc_1) + \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1) - \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}((h+1) \cdot c_1) \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since both arguments sit in the same normal cone, i.e. η behaves linear, we know $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(hc_1, c_1) \in \{0, 1\}$.

Case 1: $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(hc_1, c_1) = 0$. Then Proposition 8.4 implies $\ell_{\partial}(hc_1) + \ell_{\partial}(c_1) = \ell_{\partial}((h+1) \cdot c_1)$.

Case 2: $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(hc_1, c_1) = 1$. Now, Proposition 8.6 says that

$$\ell(hc_1, c_1) = \ell_{\partial}(hc_1) + \ell_{\partial}(c_1) - \ell_{\partial}((h+1) \cdot c_1) = \ell_s(v^1).$$

Hence, we can express

$$\ell_{\partial}((h+1) \cdot c_1) = \ell_{\partial}(hc_1) + \ell_{\partial}(c_1) - \begin{cases} 0 & \text{in Case 1} \\ \ell_s(v^1) & \text{in Case 2.} \end{cases}$$

Assume that, for $h = 0, \dots, n-1$, the Cases 1 and 2 occur $(n-k)$ and k times, respectively. Then, since $\ell_{\partial}(0 \cdot c_1) = 0$, these recursion formulae add up to $\ell_{\partial}(nc_1) = n \cdot \ell_{\partial}(c_1) - k \cdot \ell_s(v^1)$. Analogously, utilizing the corresponding k_2 replacing $k_1 := k$, we obtain the same formula for $\ell_s(v^2)$. Hence,

$$n \cdot \ell_{\partial}(c_i) - \ell_{\partial}(nc_i) = k_i \cdot \ell_s(v^i) \quad (i = 1, 2).$$

Finally, we use Proposition 8.10. Note that c_1, c_2 do not meet the assumptions, but nc_1, nc_2 do. Hence

$$\ell(nc_1, nc_2) = \ell_{\partial}(nc_1) + \ell_{\partial}(nc_2) - \ell_{\partial}(nc_0) = \langle d, nc_1 \rangle \cdot \ell_t(d).$$

8.6.2. *The relation between ℓ_{∂} - and $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -equations.* Recall from Subsection 8.1 that we have an additive map π_{∂} sending $\ell_{\partial}(c) \mapsto [c, \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)]$. Followed by the projection to \mathbb{Z} , this becomes $\ell_{\partial}(c) \mapsto \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)$. That means that all equations among the $\ell_{\partial}(c) \in S$ we obtained so far (or in the upcoming text) induce the same equations among the integers $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)$. Actually it is the point of claims as treated in Subsubsection 8.6.1 to deal with the reverse direction, i.e. lifting certain $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -relations to ℓ_{∂} -relations.

Nevertheless, when transferring relations, via $\text{pr}_{\mathbb{Z}} \circ \pi_{\partial}$, from the elements $\ell_{\partial}(c)$ to the integers $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)$, then by Proposition 8.6 and Proposition 8.10 we obtain that $\ell_s(v), \ell_t(d) \mapsto 1$, provided that $v \notin N$. This fits well with the facts $s_v, t_e \mapsto 1$ under π (cf. Section 5.3). In particular, the equations of Subsubsection 8.6.1 imply that

$$k_i = n \cdot \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_i) - \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(nc_i) = n \cdot (\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_i) - \eta(c_i))$$

and

$$\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(nc_1) + \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(nc_2) - \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(nc_0) = \langle e, nc_1 \rangle = \langle -e, nc_2 \rangle.$$

Note that $k_i \geq 1$ if and only if $\eta(c_i) = -\langle v^i, c_i \rangle \notin \mathbb{Z}$, i.e. exactly when $v^i \notin N$. In the case of $v^i \in N$, i.e. if the parameter s_i is set to 0, then we proceed with $\ell_s(v^i)$ in the very same way.

8.6.3. A property of short edges. Here we will show that, whenever d is a short edge, then there is a choice of c_+ (lifting $1 \in M/e^\perp$) such that the associated special elements c_i lead to $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2) = 1$, i.e. we obtain $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1) + \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_2) = \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_0) + 1$. The special choice of c_+ does only matter for $g = g_d \geq 2$.

Fix an element $p \in \frac{1}{g} \cdot N$ of the affine line \bar{d} containing the edge d . That means that $d - p \subseteq \mathbb{Q} \cdot d$, inducing a lattice structure on \bar{d} with p becoming the origin. Now, the striking point is that we may and will choose p such that $\langle c_+, p \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}$. Note that a different choice of the lifting $c_+ \in M$ of $1 \in M/(d)^\perp$ at the beginning of the present Subsection 8.6 leads to a different p .

Now we can write $v^i = p + v_0^i$ with $v_0^i \in \mathbb{Q} \cdot d$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then, we obtain $\eta(c_i) = -\langle c_i, p + v_0^i \rangle$ and $\eta(c_1 + c_2) = -\langle c_1 + c_2, p + v_0^{1 \wedge 2} \rangle$. Since $\langle c_+, p \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}$, we obtain that $\langle c_i, p \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}$ as well, hence

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2) &= \lceil -\langle c_1, p + v_0^1 \rangle \rceil + \lceil -\langle c_2, p + v_0^2 \rangle \rceil - \lceil -\langle c_1 + c_2, p + v_0^{1 \wedge 2} \rangle \rceil \\ &= \lceil -\langle c_1, v_0^1 \rangle \rceil + \lceil -\langle c_2, v_0^2 \rangle \rceil - \lceil -\langle c_1 + c_2, v_0^{1 \wedge 2} \rangle \rceil \\ &= \lceil -\langle c_+, v_0^1 \rangle \rceil + \lceil -\langle -c_+, v_0^2 \rangle \rceil \\ &= \lceil \langle c_+, v_0^2 \rangle \rceil - \lfloor \langle c_+, v_0^1 \rangle \rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

If we identify $(\mathbb{Q} \cdot d) \cap N$ with \mathbb{Z} , thus also $\mathbb{Q} \cdot d$ with \mathbb{Q} , then c_+ becomes 1 again, so

$$\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2) = \lceil v_0^2 \rceil - \lfloor v_0^1 \rfloor.$$

Hence, our claim $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2) = 1$ is equivalent to the lack of interior lattice points in d (which we identified with $d - p$). This is clearly satisfied for short edges with $g_d = 1$, but we have to take a closer look at the case of $g_d \geq 2$.

Assume that $g_d \geq 2$. Then, the shortness still implies the lack of interior lattice points on $d - p$, provided that $p \in (\frac{1}{g} \cdot N) \cap \bar{d}$ is chosen as close as possible to d . Thus, it remains to check that any desirable choice of p can be realized by a suitable choice of c_+ . For this, we start by choosing coordinates $N \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $d \cdot \mathbb{Q}$ becomes the first coordinate axis $\mathbb{Q} \times \underline{0}^{d-1} = \{(\bullet, \underline{0})\}$. The dual picture is $\mathbb{Z}^d \xrightarrow{\sim} M$ with $(d)^\perp = 0 \times \mathbb{Q}^{d-1} = \{(0, \bullet)\}$. So, the affine line \bar{d} equals $\mathbb{Q} \times \{(\frac{k_2}{g}, \dots, \frac{k_d}{g})\} = \{(\bullet, \frac{k_2}{g}, \dots, \frac{k_d}{g})\}$ with $k_2, \dots, k_d \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\gcd(k_2, \dots, k_d, g) = 1$. Thus, if $p = (\frac{p_1}{g}, \frac{k_2}{g}, \dots, \frac{k_d}{g})$, there are coefficients $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$\frac{p_1}{g} \equiv \sum_{i=2}^d \lambda_i \cdot \frac{k_i}{g} \pmod{\mathbb{Z}}.$$

Then $c_+ := (1, -\lambda_2, \dots, -\lambda_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d = M$ is a suitable initial choice allowing to take this special point p as an origin afterwards.

8.6.4. The second recursion formula. Here we assume that d is a short edge and use Subsection 8.6.3. We will first show that

$$\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(hc_1, c_1) = 1 - \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}((h+1)c_1, c_2)$$

for all $h \in \mathbb{Z}$ (both positive and negative). This can be seen as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(hc_1) + \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1) - \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}((h+1) \cdot c_1) &= \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(hc_1) + \left(\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_0) + 1 - \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_2) \right) - \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}((h+1) \cdot c_1) \\ &= 1 + \left(\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(hc_1) + \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_0) \right) - \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_2) - \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}((h+1) \cdot c_1) \\ &= 1 + \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(hc_1 + c_0) - \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_2) - \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}((h+1) \cdot c_1). \end{aligned}$$

Let us recall Case 2 from Subsection 8.6.1. We had assumed $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(hc_1, c_1) = 1$, occurs for $(k_1 = k)$ values of $h \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$. Using our new relation, this implies $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}((h+1)c_1, c_2) = 0$. Hence, Proposition 8.4 implies that $\ell_{\partial}((h+1)c_1) + \ell_{\partial}(c_2) = \ell_{\partial}(hc_1 + c_0)$. So, if $k_1 \geq 1$, i.e. if Case 2 occurs, then we can express

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_s(v^1) &= \ell_{\partial}(hc_1) + \ell_{\partial}(c_1) - \ell_{\partial}((h+1) \cdot c_1) \\ &= \ell_{\partial}(hc_1) + \ell_{\partial}(c_1) + \ell_{\partial}(c_2) - \ell_{\partial}(hc_1 + c_0) \\ &= \ell_{\partial}(hc_1) + \ell_{\partial}(c_1) + \ell_{\partial}(c_2) - \ell_{\partial}(hc_1) - \ell_{\partial}(c_0) \\ &= \ell_{\partial}(c_1) + \ell_{\partial}(c_2) - \ell_{\partial}(c_0). \end{aligned}$$

In Subsubsection 8.6.2 we have seen that $k_i \geq 1$ if and only if $v^i \notin N$. In particular, we obtain for these cases

$$\ell_s := \ell_s(v^i) = \ell_{\partial}(c_1) + \ell_{\partial}(c_2) - \ell_{\partial}(c_0).$$

If both $v^1, v^2 \notin N$, then this already shows that $\ell_s(v^1) = \ell_s(v^2)$. Anyway, it remains to compare ℓ_s with $\ell_t(d)$. At the end of Subsubsection 8.6.1 we already got

$$\langle d, nc_1 \rangle \cdot \ell_t(d) = \ell_{\partial}(nc_1) + \ell_{\partial}(nc_2) - \ell_{\partial}(nc_0),$$

which is in the same spirit as the formula before. Applying π as explained in Subsubsection 8.6.2 and $\eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2) = 1$ from Subsubsection 8.6.3, this yields

$$\begin{aligned} \langle e, nc_1 \rangle &= \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(nc_1) + \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(nc_2) - \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(nc_0) \\ &= n \cdot \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1) - k_1 + n \cdot \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_2) - k_2 - n \cdot \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_0) \\ &= n - (k_1 + k_2). \end{aligned}$$

Adding up the two equations from Subsubsection 8.6.1: $n \cdot \ell_{\partial}(c_i) - \ell_{\partial}(nc_i) = k_i \cdot \ell_s(v^i)$, for $i = 1, 2$, we obtain

$$n \cdot (\ell_{\partial}(c_1) + \ell_{\partial}(c_2)) - (\ell_{\partial}(nc_1) + \ell_{\partial}(nc_2)) = (k_1 + k_2) \cdot \ell_s.$$

Note that this is even correct if one of the vertices v^i belongs to N , i.e. if $k_i = 0$. Now, we replace $\ell_{\partial}(c_1) + \ell_{\partial}(c_2)$ by $\ell_{\partial}(c_0) + \ell_s$ and $\ell_{\partial}(nc_1) + \ell_{\partial}(nc_2)$ by $\ell_{\partial}(nc_0) + (n - k_1 - k_2) \cdot \ell_t(d)$. We obtain

$$n \cdot (\ell_{\partial}(c_0) + \ell_s) - (\ell_{\partial}(nc_0) + (n - k_1 - k_2) \cdot \ell_t(d)) = (k_1 + k_2) \cdot \ell_s.$$

Reordering, this yields

$$(n - k_1 - k_2) \cdot \ell_t(d) = (n - k_1 - k_2) \cdot \ell_s,$$

and it remains to check that $n - (k_1 + k_2) \neq 0$. However, since we have seen before that

$$n - (k_1 + k_2) = \langle e, nc_1 \rangle = \langle -e, nc_2 \rangle,$$

the vanishing of $n - (k_1 + k_2)$ would imply $v^2 - v^1 = \langle e, 1 \rangle = \langle e, c_+ \rangle = \langle e, c_1 \rangle = 0$, which leads to a contradiction.

8.7. Recovering the closing conditions along 2-faces. In Subsection 8.5 we have looked at adjacent vertices $v, v' \in P$. If their oriented connecting edge is $d = v' - v$, then we may choose sufficiently integral $c \in \mathcal{N}(v, P)$, $c' \in \mathcal{N}(v', P)$ in M with $\langle d, c + c' \rangle = 0$, i.e. with $\langle d, c \rangle = -\langle d, c' \rangle > 0$, and $c + c' \in \mathcal{N}(d, P) = \mathcal{N}(v, P) \cap \mathcal{N}(v', P)$ leading to $\ell(c, c') = \langle d, c \rangle \cdot \ell_t(d)$ by Proposition 8.10. For the whole subsection we could keep the assumption of being “sufficiently integral” for all relevant elements from M – namely, we could entirely work within the super integral sublattice $M_{\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{Z}} \subseteq M$. Instead, we replace $\ell_{\partial}(c)$ by the following stabilized version:

$$\ell^{\text{st}}(c) := \frac{1}{A} \cdot \ell_{\partial}(A \cdot c) \quad \text{for } A \in \mathbb{N} \text{ with } A \gg 0.$$

In accordance to this, we replace $\ell(c, c') = \ell_{\partial}(c) + \ell_{\partial}(c') - \ell_{\partial}(c + c')$ by the stabilized version too: $\ell^{\text{st}}(c, c') := \ell^{\text{st}}(c) + \ell^{\text{st}}(c') - \ell^{\text{st}}(c + c')$. It extends the validity of the above formula for $\ell_t(d)$ to non-integral arguments.

Now we consider a compact 2-dimensional face $F \leq P$. Assume that its vertices and oriented edges are $v^i \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $d_i = v^{i+1} - v^i$ ($i \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$), respectively. Then, the cones $\mathcal{N}(F, P) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(d_i, P) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(v^i, P)$ are part of the inner normal fan $\mathcal{N}(P)$. Projecting them down to the 2-dimensional vector space $M_{\mathbb{R}}/F^{\perp} =: F^*$ (dual to the vector space $F - F$ accompanying the affine space spanned by F) yields a 2-dimensional complete fan $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_F$ within F^* . We denote the image cones by

$$0 = \overline{\mathcal{N}}(F, P) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{N}}(d_i, P) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{N}}(v^i, P) \subseteq F^*.$$

The cones $\overline{\mathcal{N}}(d_i, P)$ form the rays, and their linear hull is $(d_i)^{\perp}/F^{\perp}$. The two-dimensional cones $\overline{\mathcal{N}}(v^i, P)$ are spanned by the rays $\overline{\mathcal{N}}(d^{i-1}, P)$ and $\overline{\mathcal{N}}(d_i, P)$.




FIGURE 11. The normal fan of a 2-face with four edges.

Proposition 8.11. *Corresponding to (5.4), in $T \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} N_{\mathbb{R}}$ we have the equation $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}} \ell_t(d_i) \otimes d_i = 0$.*

Proof. We choose elements $a_i \in \text{int } \mathcal{N}(d_i, P)$ mapping to points \bar{a}_i on the rays $\overline{\mathcal{N}}(d_i, P)$. Since $d_i \subseteq F - F$, we know that $\langle d_i, F^{\perp} \rangle = 0$, i.e. we may write $\langle d_i, a_j \rangle = \langle d_i, \bar{a}_j \rangle$. This yields

$$\langle d_i, \bar{a}_{i-1} \rangle > 0, \quad \langle d_i, \bar{a}_i \rangle = 0, \quad \langle d_i, \bar{a}_{i+1} \rangle < 0.$$

For a fixed $i \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ and some $A \gg 0$ we will use

$$c := \frac{1}{\langle d_i, \bar{a}_{i-1} \rangle} \cdot a_{i-1} + A \cdot a_i \quad \text{and} \quad c' := \frac{-1}{\langle d_i, \bar{a}_{i+1} \rangle} \cdot a_{i+1} + A \cdot a_i$$

for which we have $\langle d_i, c' \rangle = -\langle d_i, c \rangle$. Hence, we obtain that $c + c' \in d_i^\perp$ and, if A is large enough, even $c + c' \in \mathcal{N}(d_i, P)$. Thus, with $v := v^i$, $v' := v^{i+1}$, and $d = d_i$ we are exactly in the situation of the begin of this subsection. That is,

$$\ell_t(d_i) = \ell^{\text{st}}(c) + \ell^{\text{st}}(c') - \ell^{\text{st}}(c + c').$$

This equation remains valid if we alter $\ell^{\text{st}}(c)$ by a function that is linear in c . Thus, we may and will assume that ℓ^{st} vanishes on $\mathcal{N}(F, P)$. This implies that ℓ^{st} descends to a well-defined function $\ell^{\text{st}} : F^* \rightarrow (S - S) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$. It is linear on the cones of $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_F$, and we still have

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_t(d_i) &= \ell^{\text{st}}(\bar{c}) + \ell^{\text{st}}(\bar{c}') - \ell^{\text{st}}(\bar{c} + \bar{c}') \\ &= \ell^{\text{st}}\left(\frac{1}{\langle d_i, \bar{a}_{i-1} \rangle} \cdot \bar{a}_{i-1} + A \cdot \bar{a}_i\right) + \ell^{\text{st}}\left(\frac{-1}{\langle d_i, \bar{a}_{i+1} \rangle} \cdot \bar{a}_{i+1} + A \cdot \bar{a}_i\right) \\ &\quad - \ell^{\text{st}}\left(\frac{1}{\langle d_i, \bar{a}_{i-1} \rangle} \cdot \bar{a}_{i-1} - \frac{1}{\langle d_i, \bar{a}_{i+1} \rangle} \cdot \bar{a}_{i+1} + 2A \cdot \bar{a}_i\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\langle d_i, \bar{a}_{i-1} \rangle} \ell^{\text{st}}(\bar{a}_{i-1}) + A \ell^{\text{st}}(\bar{a}_i) - \frac{1}{\langle d_i, \bar{a}_{i+1} \rangle} \ell^{\text{st}}(\bar{a}_{i+1}) + A \ell^{\text{st}}(\bar{a}_i) - (\beta_i + 2A) \ell^{\text{st}}(\bar{a}_i) \\ &= \frac{1}{\langle d_i, \bar{a}_{i-1} \rangle} \ell^{\text{st}}(\bar{a}_{i-1}) - \frac{1}{\langle d_i, \bar{a}_{i+1} \rangle} \ell^{\text{st}}(\bar{a}_{i+1}) - \beta_i \ell^{\text{st}}(\bar{a}_i) \end{aligned}$$

where $\beta_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is defined by the equality

$$\frac{1}{\langle d_i, \bar{a}_{i-1} \rangle} \cdot \bar{a}_{i-1} - \frac{1}{\langle d_i, \bar{a}_{i+1} \rangle} \cdot \bar{a}_{i+1} - \beta_i \cdot \bar{a}_i = 0.$$

Now, we consider

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i \ell_t(d_i) \otimes d_i &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}} \left(\frac{1}{\langle d_i, \bar{a}_{i-1} \rangle} \ell^{\text{st}}(\bar{a}_{i-1}) - \frac{1}{\langle d_i, \bar{a}_{i+1} \rangle} \ell^{\text{st}}(\bar{a}_{i+1}) - \beta_i \ell^{\text{st}}(\bar{a}_i) \right) \otimes d_i \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}} \ell^{\text{st}}(\bar{a}_i) \otimes \left(\frac{1}{\langle d_{i+1}, \bar{a}_i \rangle} d_{i+1} - \frac{1}{\langle d_{i-1}, \bar{a}_i \rangle} d_{i-1} - \beta_i d_i \right) \end{aligned}$$

and check that all of the second factors vanish. This will be done in the following quick and dirty way via choosing coordinates, i.e. fixing some isomorphism $(F - F) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{R}^2$ which determines a dual isomorphism $\mathbb{R}^2 \xrightarrow{\sim} F^*$ too. While the vectors $d_i \in (F - F) = \mathbb{R}^2$ are given by the choice of $F \leq P$, we have some freedom in choosing the $\bar{a}_i \in F^* = \mathbb{R}^2$ – one has just to ensure that $\bar{a}_i \perp d_i$ and that they have the right orientation. This can be obtained by

$$\bar{a}_i := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot d_i.$$

Doing so, the \bar{a}_i satisfy the same linear relations as the d_i do. i.e. we obtain that

$$\frac{1}{\langle d_i, \bar{a}_{i-1} \rangle} \cdot d_{i-1} - \frac{1}{\langle d_i, \bar{a}_{i+1} \rangle} \cdot d_{i+1} - \beta_i \cdot d_i = 0.$$

Thus, the claim follows from the equalities $\langle d_{i-1}, \bar{a}_i \rangle = -\langle d_i, \bar{a}_{i-1} \rangle$ for all indices $i \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ and our special choices of $\bar{a}_i \in \mathbb{R}^2$. \square

8.8. Concluding the proof of the existence of ℓ . One might think that we are already done with the construction of the map ℓ – but it requires the following, seemingly paranoid conclusion of the proof. What do we have so far? First, we have well-defined elements $\ell_{\partial}(c) \in \partial_T(S)$ which have to become the images of $[c, \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c)] \in \partial_{\tilde{T}}(\tilde{S})$. Second, we have constructed the following elements:

(i) If $v \in P$ is a vertex, then there is a well-defined $\ell_s(v) \in T$ planned to become the image $\ell(s_v)$, cf. Proposition 8.6 in Subsection 8.3.

(ii) For each compact edge $d \leq P$ there is a well-defined $\ell_t(d) \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0} \cdot T$ planned to become the image $\ell(t_d)$, cf. Proposition 8.10 in Subsection 8.5.

In the Subsections 8.4, 8.6, and 8.7 we have shown that the new elements $\ell_s(v)$ and $\ell_t(d)$ satisfy the same linear relations as the original elements s_v and t_d . This gives rise to a well-defined linear map

$$\varphi : \mathcal{T}^*(P) = (\tilde{T} - \tilde{T}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow (T - T) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$$

with $\varphi(s_v) = \ell_s(v)$ and $\varphi(t_d) = \ell_t(d)$.

Lemma 8.12. *For $c_1, c_2 \in \text{tail}(P)^\vee \cap M$ we have $\varphi(\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2)) = \ell(c_1, c_2)$.*

Proof. Step 1. First, by Proposition 8.6 and the preceding remarks in Subsection 8.3, the claim of the lemma follows for those pairs (c_1, c_2) where c_1, c_2 are contained in a common normal cone $\mathcal{N}(v, P)$ for some vertex $v \in P$. Second, by Proposition 8.10 and the preceding remarks in Subsection 8.5 the claim of the lemma does also follow for super integral $c_1, c_2 \in M_{\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{Z}}$ being contained in two adjacent normal cones $\mathcal{N}(v^1, P)$ and $\mathcal{N}(v^2, P)$, respectively. (That is, v^1 and v^2 have to be connected by an edge, and one has to suppose that $c_1 + c_2$ belongs to the union of these normal cones).

Step 2. If $c \in M$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then we know from Subsection 8.3 that $n \cdot \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c) - \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(nc) = (n \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c) - \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(nc)) \cdot s_{v(c)}$ and $n \cdot \ell_{\partial}(c) - \ell_{\partial}(nc) = (n \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(c) - \eta_{\mathbb{Z}}(nc)) \cdot \ell_s(v(c))$. Hence, for $c_1, c_2 \in M$ we obtain that $n \cdot \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2) - \tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(nc_1, nc_2)$ maps, via φ , to $n \cdot \ell(c_1, c_2) - \ell(nc_1, nc_2)$. Consequently, the fact that $\varphi(\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(c_1, c_2)) = \ell(c_1, c_2)$ is equivalent to $\varphi(\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(nc_1, nc_2)) = \ell(nc_1, nc_2)$. This means that it remains to show the claim for super integral (but not necessarily from adjacent cones) $c_1, c_2 \in M_{\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{Z}}$.

Step 3. We are going to use the inhomogeneous description of group cohomology, cf. [Ser79, VII.3]. Both $\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\bullet, \bullet)$ and $\ell(\bullet, \bullet)$ are 2-coboundaries. Hence, the map $b : M_{\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{Z}} \times M_{\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow (T - T) \cdot \mathbb{Q}$ defined as

$$b(\bullet, \bullet) := \varphi(\tilde{\eta}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\bullet, \bullet)) - \ell(\bullet, \bullet)$$

is still a 2-cocyle for $H^\bullet(M_{\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{Z}}, (T - T) \cdot \mathbb{Q})$. Since $(T - T) \cdot \mathbb{Q}$ is a divisible group, hence an injective \mathbb{Z} -module, we know that $H^2(M_{\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{Z}}, (T - T) \cdot \mathbb{Q}) = 0$. Thus, b is a 2-coboundary, i.e. there is a map

$$b_{\partial} : M_{\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow (T - T) \cdot \mathbb{Q} \quad \text{with} \quad b(c_1, c_2) = b_{\partial}(c_1) + b_{\partial}(c_2) - b_{\partial}(c_1 + c_2).$$

From Step 1 we know that b_{∂} is linear on the full-dimensional normal cones $\mathcal{N}(v, P)$ or even on the union of adjacent ones $\mathcal{N}(v^1, P)$ and $\mathcal{N}(v^2, P)$ – provided that $c_1 + c_2$ belongs to this union. But this means that b_{∂} is globally linear, i.e. $b = 0$. \square

So $\ell_T : \tilde{T} \rightarrow T$ is a well-defined linear map, and we conclude the existence part of Theorem 8.2 by Remark 8.5.

9. MINKOWSKI DECOMPOSITIONS REVISITED

9.1. Review of the case of lattice polytopes with primitive edges. In [Alt97] we had treated a special case of the scenario described in Subsection 5.1. There it was assumed that P is a lattice polytope with primitive edges, i.e. the edges did not contain any lattice points other than the vertices. In algebro-geometric terms this means that $X = \text{TV}(\text{cone}(P)) = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[S]$ is Gorenstein and it is smooth in codimension two. Let us summarize the main results from [Alt97] for this special case.

(i) If $P = P_0 + \dots + P_k$ is Minkowski decomposition, then this corresponds to a decomposition $\underline{1} = \xi_0 + \dots + \xi_k$ within the cone $C(P)$. The summands P_ν are lattice polytopes if and only if the

corresponding ξ_ν belong to the lattice $C_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{lin}}(P)$ within the vector space $C^{\text{lin}}(P) := C(P) - C(P)$. This lattice is defined by the integrality of all coordinates $t_{ij}(\xi)$.

(ii) Since the coordinates t_{ij} are supposed to be non-negative on $C(P)$, they become elements of the dual cone $t_{ij} \in C(P)^\vee$. The subsemigroup generated by these elements provides the base of the initial object from Theorem 8.2. That is, the present special case of a discrete setup shows tight parallels to the cone setup displayed in Proposition 4.8.

(iii) Translated to the framework of algebraic geometry, lattice decompositions of P as in (i) correspond to components of the versal deformation of $X = \mathbb{T}\mathbb{V}(\text{cone}(P))$ in degree $-R$. The complexification of the vector space $C^{\text{lin}}(P)/\underline{1} \cdot \mathbb{R}$ equals the space of infinitesimal deformations $T_X^1(-R)$ of X in degree $-R$. Finally, the subsemigroup $\text{span}_{\mathbb{N}}\{t_{ij}\} \subseteq C(P)^\vee$ of (ii) encodes the versal deformation itself, which is a much finer information than just its linear ambient space $T_X^1(-R)$.

Remark 9.1. In the Gorenstein case, i.e. when P was a lattice polytope, then the smoothness of X in codimension two could be easily expressed by the primitivity of its lattice edges. In [AK13] we already got rid of the Gorenstein assumption, but we heavily depended on the assumption of smoothness in codimension two. In the non-Gorenstein case, this condition can be still be expressed in the combinatorial language. It says that, for each bounded edge $[v^i, v^j]$ of $P \subseteq N_{\mathbb{R}}$, the polyhedral cone generated from $(v^i, 1), (v^j, 1) \in N_{\mathbb{R}} \oplus \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is \mathbb{Z} -linearly (!) isomorphic to the ordinary upper orthant $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2$.

Now, returning to the general discrete setup established in Subsection (5.1) and taking the points (i)-(iii) above as a guideline, we no longer assume that P is bounded, i.e. P may have a non-trivial tail cone. More important, however, is that we do not require P to be a lattice polyhedron anymore, nor do we ask for any further restrictions (on the edges or anything else).

Example 9.2. Let us return to Example 3.9. In this case we have $C^{\text{lin}}(P) = \mathbb{R}$, which shows that (9.1) (iii) is no longer valid in this case. Moreover, neither the lattice $C_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{lin}}(P)$, nor lattice decompositions $P = P_0 + \dots + P_k$ from Subsection 9.1 (i) make any sense here. So these notions need to be replaced: $C_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{lin}}(P)$ by $\mathcal{T}_{+\mathbb{Z}}$ and lattice decompositions by lattice *friendly* decompositions (cf. Section 9.3).

9.2. The universal Minkowski summand. We start by fixing a *reference vertex* $v_* \in \text{Vert}(P)$, and recall from Subsection 5.3 that

$$\mathcal{T}_+(P) := \mathcal{T}(P) \cap (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^r \oplus \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m).$$

For $\xi = (t, s) \in \mathcal{T}_+(P)$ we construct P_ξ by defining a map $\psi_{v_*}(\xi) : \text{Vert}(P) \rightarrow N_{\mathbb{R}}$. For the reference vertex we set

$$\psi_{v_*}(\xi, v_*) := s_{v_*}(\xi) \cdot v_*.$$

Note that this definition implies that $\psi_{v_*}(\xi, v_*) = 0$ if $v_* \in N$. For every other $v \in \text{Vert}(P)$, choose a path $v_* = v^0, v^1, \dots, v^k = v$ along the compact edges of P . Denoting $d_i := v^i - v^{i-1}$, we define

$$\psi_{v_*}(\xi, v) = \psi_{v_*}(\xi, v_*) + \sum_{i=1}^k t_i(\xi) \cdot d_i.$$

It is a direct consequence of the closing conditions in the definition of $C^{\text{lin}}(P)$ and hence of $\mathcal{T}(P)$ in Subsection 5.3 that $\psi_{v_*}(\xi, v)$ does not depend on the special choice of the path, cf. (9.2.1). Now, we obtain the Minkowski summand associated to $\xi \in \mathcal{T}_+(P)$ as

$$P_\xi := \psi_{v_*}(\xi, P) := \text{conv}\{\psi_{v_*}(\xi, v) : v \in \text{Vert}(P)\} + \text{tail}(P).$$

Note that one can avoid the usage of the s -variables when there exists a lattice vertex in P to be chosen as v_* . However, even then the s -coordinates will play an important role in (9.2.2). Similarly to Subsection 4.4 we proceed with the following.

Definition 9.3. We define the *universal Minkowski summand* or the *tautological cone* as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_+^{v_*}(P) := \{(\xi, w) : \xi \in \mathcal{T}_+(P), w \in \psi_{v_*}(\xi, P)\} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_+(P) \times N_{\mathbb{R}}.$$

It comes with the natural projection $p_+ : \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_+^{v_*}(P) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_+(P)$ onto the first factor.

Now we check that, up to consistent lattice-translations in N , the previous definitions are independent of all choices, i.e. that we may indeed call our Minkowski summands P_ξ and denote the tautological cone by $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_+(P)$. In more detail, if $\xi \in \mathcal{T}_+(P) \cap \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)$, then the following (9.2.1) and (9.2.2) will imply that, for all v_*, v'_* , the polyhedron $\psi_{v_*}(\xi, P)$ is obtained from $\psi_{v'_*}(\xi, P)$ via a lattice isomorphism linearly depending on ξ .

9.2.1. *Independence on the path along the edges.* This is a direct consequence of the closure conditions along the compact 2-faces $F \leq P$ which define $C^{\text{lin}}(P)$ or $\mathcal{T}(P)$, cf. Definition 5.10. Here we are literally in the same situation as in [Alt97].

9.2.2. *Independence on the reference vertex.* Assume that v_* and v'_* are two different vertices of P which are connected by an (oriented) edge $d = v'_* - v_*$. Recall from Definition 5.13 that this situation gives rise to an element $L_d \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)^* \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} N$. Again, we have to compare the Minkowski summands with respect to the same vertex, say v_* :

$$\psi_{v'_*}(\xi, v_*) - \psi_{v_*}(\xi, v_*) = s_{v'_*}(\xi) \cdot v'_* - t_d(\xi) \cdot (v'_* - v_*) - s_{v_*}(\xi) \cdot v_*$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{v'_*}(v_*) - \psi_{v_*}(v_*) &= s_{v'_*} \otimes v'_* - t_d \otimes (v'_* - v_*) - s_{v_*} \otimes v_* \\ &= (t_d - s_{v_*}) \otimes v_* - (t_d - s_{v'_*}) \otimes v'_* = L_d \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(P) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} N. \end{aligned}$$

That is the two tautological cones differ via translation by an integral, linear section of p .

Convention 9.4. Unless P has at least one lattice vertex, we cannot assume that the reference vertex v_* is 0. Nevertheless, we will write $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_+(P)$ for $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_+^{v_*}(P)$ and keep in mind the dependence on v_* via⁸ the shift by the p -section $\psi_{v'_*} - \psi_{v_*} = L_{v_*v'_*}$ and via $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_+^{v'_*0}(P) = \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_+^{v_*0}(P) + L_{v_*v'_*}$.

Theorem 9.5. *The universal Minkowski summand $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_+(P)$ is a convex, polyhedral cone.*

Proof. This follows because $\xi(v_*) := \psi(\xi, v_*)$ and hence $v_\xi = \xi(v) := \psi(\xi, v)$ depend, for every vertex $v \in P$, linearly on ξ . \square

⁸This is not true literally. It maps $(\xi, w) \mapsto (\xi, w + L_{v_*v'_*})$.

9.3. Lattice friendly Minkowski decompositions. In the situation of Subsection 9.1 (i), each decomposition of a lattice polytope P into a sum of lattice polytopes $P = P_0 + \dots + P_k$ was encoding a component of the versal deformation. Independently on this interpretation, the lattice condition for the summands P_i was a discrete requirement reducing the number of admissible decompositions drastically; in particular, it becomes finite. In the general setup, however, i.e. when P is no longer a lattice polytope, then lattice decompositions cannot exist at all. Inspired by [Alt00, (3.2)], we nevertheless save this concept by defining the following weaker version.

Definition 9.6. A Minkowski decomposition $P = P_0 + \dots + P_k$ is called *lattice friendly* if all summands share the same tail cone, and if, for every $c \in \text{tail}(P)^\vee \cap M$, there is an index $\mu = \mu(c)$ such that all $\text{face}(P_i, c) \leq P_i$ with $i \in \{0, \dots, k\} \setminus \{\mu\}$ contain lattice points.

Recall that $\text{face}(P_i, c) := \{a \in P_i : \langle c, a \rangle = \min \langle c, P_i \rangle\}$ is the face of P_i where c attains its minimum. It suffices to check the condition of the previous definition for generic $c \in \text{tail}(P)^\vee \cap M$, i.e. for those where $\text{face}(P, c)$ is a vertex of P . Since

$$\text{face}(P, c) = \text{face}(P_0, c) + \dots + \text{face}(P_k, c),$$

this implies that $\text{face}(P_i, c) \leq P_i$ are vertices, too. Hence, in this generic case, the above definition asks for

$$\text{face}(P_0, c), \dots, \text{face}(P_k, c) \in N$$

to be lattice vertices – with at most one exception, namely for $\text{face}(P_\mu, c)$. This means that

- (i) any failure $\text{face}(P, c) \notin N$ stems from one single summand $\text{face}(P_\mu, c) \notin N$ where μ depends on the choice of the generic c , i.e. on the choice of the vertex $\text{face}(P, c)$, and
- (ii) if $\text{face}(P, c) \in N$, then all summands $\text{face}(P_i, c)$ are lattice vertices, without any exception.

In particular, if P were a lattice polyhedron as in Subsection 9.1 (i), then being lattice friendly just means being a lattice decomposition, i.e. all summands P_i must be lattice polyhedra with $\text{tail}(P_i) = \text{tail}(P)$.

9.4. The Kodaira-Spencer map. Assume that $P = P_0 + \dots + P_k$ is any Minkowski decomposition with $\text{tail}(P_i) = \text{tail}(P)$. For each vertex $w = \text{face}(P, c)$ of P we will denote the corresponding vertex $\text{face}(P_i, c)$ by $w(P_i) = w_i \in P_i$. Note that it depends on w alone, i.e. not on the special choice of $c \in \text{tail}(P)^\vee$. Actually, the associated normal cones, i.e. the regions of those c providing the desired vertex, satisfy $\mathcal{N}(w, P) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(w_i, P_i)$ and

$$\mathcal{N}(w, P) = \mathcal{N}(w_0, P_0) \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{N}(w_k, P_k).$$

In accordance with Notation 5.5 we write $\text{Vert}(P) = \{v^1, \dots, v^m\}$ and $\text{Edge}^c(P) := \{d_1, \dots, d_r\}$, which gives rise to the \mathbb{R} -vector space $\mathbb{R}^r \oplus \mathbb{R}^m$ with coordinates (\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) . We will define an evaluation $\rho : \{0, \dots, k\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^r \oplus \mathbb{R}^m$ of the Minkowski summands.

Definition 9.7. Let Q with $\text{tail}(Q) = \text{tail}(P)$ be a Minkowski summand of P . The *Kodaira-Spencer* evaluation $\rho(Q) = (t(Q), s(Q)) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^r \oplus \mathbb{R}^m$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} t_d(Q) &:= (\text{the dilation factor of the edge } d \text{ inside } Q) \in [0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R} \\ s_v(Q) &:= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } v(Q) \in N \\ 1 & \text{if } v(Q) \notin N \end{cases} \quad \text{for any vertex } v \in P. \end{aligned}$$

Recall from Subsection 4.4 that the dilation factor means the non-negative scalar transforming an edge of P into the associated edge of Q , i.e. satisfying $v^j(Q) - v^i(Q) = t_{ij}(Q) \cdot (v^j - v^i)$ for vertices $v^i, v^j \in P$. Note that the values collected in $s(Q) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ do heavily depend on the position of Q , i.e. in general, they do change after shifting Q along a vector from $N_{\mathbb{R}} \setminus N$. In particular, the Kodaira-Spencer map ρ is, in general, neither Minkowski-additive, nor is its image contained in the subspace $\mathcal{T}(P) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^r \oplus \mathbb{R}^m$ from Definition 5.10. Nevertheless, we have $\rho(P) = (\underline{1}; \underline{1}, \underline{0}) = [P] \in \mathcal{T}(P)$ and $\rho(0) = \underline{0}$.

Example 9.8. Take $P = [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}]$ from Example 5.12.3. and decompose it as

$$P_0 + P_1 = [0, \frac{1}{4}] + [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}].$$

Using the coordinates $(t; s_1, s_2)$ of \mathbb{R}^3 , the Kodaira-Spencer map yields

$$\rho(P) = (1; 1, 1), \quad \rho(P_0) = (1; 0, 1), \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(P_1) = (0; 1, 1).$$

While this is clearly not additive, both summands $\rho(P_i)$ do also miss $\mathcal{T}(P)$: Since both half open edges induced from P are short, the equations for $\rho(P_i)$ involve $s_1 = t = s_2$, which is not satisfied.

9.5. The Kodaira-Spencer map for lattice friendly decompositions. While the Kodaira-Spencer map $\rho = (t, s)$ behaves rather wildly for general Minkowski decompositions, it turns out to be the right tool to reflect lattice friendly decompositions.

Theorem 9.9. *Let $P = P_0 + \dots + P_k$ be a Minkowski decomposition with $\text{tail}(P_i) = \text{tail}(P)$. Then this decomposition is lattice friendly if and only if*

$$\rho(P) = (\underline{1}; \underline{1}, \underline{0}) = \rho(P_0) + \dots + \rho(P_k),$$

and this is a decomposition inside $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)$, i.e. for all summands we have $\rho(P_i) \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P) \subset \mathbb{R}^r \oplus \mathbb{R}^m$.

Proof. (\Leftarrow) For each vertex $w \in P$, we obtain a decomposition $s_w(P) = s_w(P_0) + \dots + s_w(P_k)$ inside \mathbb{N} . Since $s_w(P) \in \{0, 1\}$, this means that there is at most one index $\mu = \mu(w)$ such that $s_w(P_\mu) = 1$. All remaining summands vanish, and this translates directly into the condition of Definition 9.6.

(\Rightarrow) Assume that the decomposition $P = P_0 + \dots + P_k$ is lattice friendly.

Step 1. Since there is never a problem with the dilation factors, let us focus on the s -parameters. If $w \in P$ is a vertex, then there is at most one index $\mu = \mu(w)$ such that $s_w(P_\mu) \neq 0$. Moreover, we know that

$$s_w(P_\mu) = 1 \iff s_w(P_\mu) \neq 0 \implies w \notin N \iff s_w(P) \neq 0 \iff s_w(P) = 1.$$

This shows the formula $\rho(P) = \sum_{i=0}^k \rho(P_i)$. Moreover, the integrality of the $s_w(P_i)$ is clear, too.

Step 2. Assume that $[v, w] \leq P$ is a compact edge with $[v, w] \cap N = \emptyset$. We may choose an element $c \in \text{tail}(P)^\vee \cap M$ such that $[v, w] = \text{face}(P, c)$. Since

$$\text{face}(P, c) = \text{face}(P_0, c) + \dots + \text{face}(P_k, c),$$

there is at least one summand $\text{face}(P_\mu, c)$ lacking lattice points, too. In particular, $v(P_\mu), w(P_\mu) \notin N$, and since the decomposition of P is lattice friendly, P_μ is the only summand with $v(P_\mu) \notin N$ or $w(P_\mu) \notin N$. Hence

$$s_v(P_\mu) = 1 = s_w(P_\mu) \quad \text{and} \quad s_v(P_i) = 0 = s_w(P_i) \quad \text{for } i \neq \mu.$$

That is, the equation $s_v = s_w$ from the definition of $\mathcal{T}(P)$ is satisfied for all Minkowski summands.

Step 3. Assume that $[v, w]$ is a short half open edge of P . We are supposed to check the equality $s_v = t := t_{vw}$ for all Minkowski summands. Since $v \notin N$, we know that $s_v(P) = 1$, i.e. there is exactly one index $\mu = \mu(v)$ such that $s_v(P_\mu) = 1$. Since this means $s_v(P_i) = 0$ for $i \neq \mu$, it remains to show that $t(P_i) = 0$ for these indices; the equality $t(P_\mu) = 1$ follows then automatically. If we had $t(P_i) > 0$, then the equality

$$w(P_i) - v(P_i) = t(P_i) \cdot (w - v) \neq 0.$$

would imply that $w(P_i) \neq v(P_i)$. On the other hand, both vertices $w(P_i)$ and $v(P_i)$ are lattice points. While this is clear for $v(P_i)$, we have to provide an extra argument for $w(P_i)$: If $w \in N$, then it is clear; if $w \notin N$, then it follows from the shortness of $[v, w]$ that $[v, w] \cap N = \emptyset$. Hence, we can use the equation $s_v = s_w$ obtained in Step 2. Now, since we know that $w(P_i), v(P_i) \in N$ do not coincide, we get a lower bound for the lattice lengths

$$\ell(w - v) \geq \ell(w(P_i) - v(P_i)) \geq 1,$$

which, by Remark 5.8, is not possible for short half open edges.

Step 4. So far, we have seen that $\rho(P_i) \in \mathcal{T}(P)$. To show that $\rho(P_i)$ is integral, i.e. that $\rho(P_i) \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)$, we are supposed to check, for all $i = 0, \dots, k$, that

$$L_{vw}(P_i) = t(P_i) \cdot (v - w) - s_v(P_i) \cdot v + s_w(P_i) \cdot w \in N.$$

For this, we rewrite

$$L_{vw}(P_i) = (v(P_i) - s_v(P_i) \cdot v) - (w(P_i) - s_w(P_i) \cdot w)$$

and analyse the membership of N for both summands separately. If $v \in N$, then $v(P_i) \in N$ and $s_v(P_i) = 0$, hence

$$v(P_i) - s_v(P_i) \cdot v \in N.$$

If $v \notin N$, then we denote by $\mu = \mu(v)$ the unique index with $v(P_\mu) \notin N$, and the previous argument survives for $i \neq \mu$. On the other hand, since $s_v(P_\mu) = 1$,

$$v(P_\mu) - s_v(P_\mu) \cdot v = v(P_\mu) - v = -\sum_{i \neq \mu} v(P_i) \in N.$$

The proof for the w -summand is the same, with a possibly different index $\mu = \mu(w)$. \square

Example 9.10. Let us continue our main example. The interval $P = [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}] \subset \mathbb{R}$ allows two non-trivial, lattice friendly decompositions, namely

$$[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}] = [-\frac{1}{2}, 0] + [0, \frac{1}{2}] = [-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}] + [0, 1].$$

Applying the Kodaira-Spencer map ρ , this decomposition looks like

$$(1, 1, 1) = (\frac{1}{2}, 1, 0) + (\frac{1}{2}, 0, 1) = (0, 1, 1) + (1, 0, 0) \text{ inside } \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P).$$

According to Subsection 9.7, we can understand these two decompositions, for $i = 1, 2$, as two linear maps $\rho_i : \mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)$; the dual maps $\rho_i^* : \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(P) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2$ are given by the matrices

$$\left(\begin{array}{ccc} \frac{1}{2} & 1 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 1 \end{array} \right), \quad \left(\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right).$$

The integrality of the target can be checked when ρ_i^* are applied to the generators of \tilde{T} :

$$s_1, \quad s_2, \quad A = t + \frac{1}{2}s_1 - \frac{1}{2}s_2, \quad B = t + \frac{1}{2}s_2 - \frac{1}{2}s_1.$$

Then, ρ_i^* yield two integral (2×4) -matrices mapping from $\mathbb{Z}s_1 \oplus \mathbb{Z}s_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}A \oplus \mathbb{Z}B$ to \mathbb{Z}^2 :

$$\rho_1^* = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho_2^* = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

9.6. Lattice friendly decompositions and the map ψ . In Subsection 9.2 we have defined for every $\xi \in \mathcal{T}_+(P)$ an associated Minkowski summand $P_\xi = \psi(\xi, P)$. While this construction depends on the choice of a reference vertex v_* , we have seen in (9.2.2) that, for integral $\xi \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)$, this dependence involves only lattice translations. Furthermore, ψ is linear in ξ , i.e. for $\xi, \xi' \in \mathcal{T}_+(P)$ we have

$$P_\xi + P_{\xi'} = P_{\xi + \xi'}.$$

Remark 9.11. We do not always have the equality $\psi_{v_*}((\underline{1}; \underline{1}, \underline{0}), P) = P$, but we can be very precise about this:

$$P_{(\underline{1}; \underline{1}, \underline{0})} \neq P \iff v_* \in N \setminus \{0\}.$$

This issue can again be solved by a lattice translation of P . Hence, in accordance with Convention 9.4, we can and will assume that v_* is chosen such that $P_{(\underline{1}; \underline{1}, \underline{0})} = P$.

In Theorem 9.9 we have seen how the Kodaira-Spencer map ρ can detect whether a Minkowski decomposition is lattice friendly or not. The next result shows how the map $\psi(\bullet, P) = P_\bullet$ fits into this relation.

Theorem 9.12. *Let $\xi_0, \dots, \xi_k \in \mathcal{T}_+(P)$ with $\xi_0 + \dots + \xi_k = (\underline{1}; \underline{1}, \underline{0})$. Then, the following three conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) $\xi_0, \dots, \xi_k \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)$,
- (ii) for each vertex $w \in P$ and index $i \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ we have

$$w(P_i) \notin N \iff w \notin N \text{ and } s_w(P_{\xi_i}) = 1, \text{ and}$$

- (iii) the decomposition $P_{\xi_0} + \dots + P_{\xi_k} = P$ is lattice friendly with $\rho(P_{\xi_i}) = \xi_i$ for $i = 0, \dots, k$.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii): Let $v \in P$ be a vertex and choose a path $v_* = v^0, v^1, \dots, v^k = v$ along the compact edges of P . Denoting $d_i := v^i - v^{i-1}$, we know from Subsection 9.2 that for each $\xi \in \mathcal{T}_+(P)$

$$\psi_{v_*}(\xi, v) = s_{v_*}(\xi) \cdot v_* + \sum_{i=1}^k t_i(\xi) \cdot d_i = \sum_{i=1}^k L_{i, i-1}(\xi) + s_v(\xi) \cdot v.$$

As $\xi \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)$ implies $L_{i, i-1}(\xi) \in N$ for every i , the equivalence in (ii) becomes evident.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii): Since $P_{(\underline{1}; \underline{1}, \underline{0})} = P$, we obtain a Minkowski decomposition $P_{\xi_0} + \dots + P_{\xi_k} = P$. To check that it is lattice friendly, it suffices to check that for every vertex $w \in P$ we have at most one index $\mu \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ with $w(\xi_\mu) \notin N$. However, this follows directly from $s_w(\xi \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}) \in \mathbb{N}$, from $\xi_0 + \dots + \xi_k = (\underline{1}; \underline{1}, \underline{0})$, hence from $s_w(\xi_0) + \dots + s_w(\xi_k) = 1$ and (ii).

Finally, the t -coordinates of $\rho(P_\xi)$ and ξ are equal by definition. For the equality of the s -coordinates we use again $\xi_0 + \dots + \xi_k = (\underline{1}; \underline{1}, \underline{0})$ and (ii) in a straightforward manner.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i): This follows from the direction (\Rightarrow) in Theorem 9.9. □

Remark 9.13. (i) On the one hand, since there are many non-lattice choices for ξ which produce the same polyhedron P_ξ , we cannot expect that ξ can be recovered from P_ξ . In particular, the equality $\rho(P_\xi) = \xi$ cannot be true in general. Hence, it is not possible to erase the phrase “with $\rho(P_\xi) = \xi$ ” from (iii) of the previous theorem.

(ii) On the other hand, every lattice shift of a Minkowski summand produces the same value of ρ . So we cannot expect to obtain $Q = P_{\rho(Q)}$ in general, either.

(iii) Despite the negative claims above, we can consider the following two sets:

$$A := \{\text{polyhedra } Q \subseteq N_{\mathbb{R}} \text{ with } \text{tail}(Q) = \text{tail}(P) \text{ such that there is a polyhedron } Q' \text{ providing a lattice friendly decomposition } P = Q + Q'\} \quad \text{and}$$

$$B := \{\xi \in \mathcal{T}_+(P) \cap \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P) : (\underline{1}; \underline{1}, \underline{0}) - \xi \in \mathcal{T}_+(P)\}.$$

Then, dividing out integral translations, it follows from the theorems 9.9 and 9.12 that the two maps $\rho : A/N \rightarrow B$ and $\psi : B \rightarrow A/N$ are mutually inverse.

Example 9.14. While the construction $\xi \mapsto P_{\xi}$ from Subsection 9.2 does not make use of the non-negativity of s in $\xi = (t, s)$, the assumption $\xi \in \mathcal{T}_+(P)$ becomes really important for Theorem 9.12. To illustrate this, take $P = [-\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{4}]$ with $v_1 = -\frac{1}{3}$ and $v_2 = \frac{1}{4}$. So this is not a short edge (none of the two half-open edges is), and the lattice conditions for $\xi = (t, s_1, s_2)$ are

$$s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{7}{12}t - \frac{1}{3}s_1 - \frac{1}{4}s_2 \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Choose $v_* = v_1$ and consider

$$\xi = (\frac{1}{7}, 1, -1), \quad \xi' = (\frac{6}{7}, 0, 2).$$

We see that $\xi, \xi' \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)$ with $\xi + \xi' = (1, 1, 1)$, but that

$$P_{\xi} = [-\frac{1}{3}, -\frac{1}{4}] \quad \text{and} \quad P_{\xi'} = [0, \frac{1}{2}],$$

provides a non-lattice-friendly Minkowski decomposition of P .

9.7. The Kodaira-Spencer map revisited. In Definition 9.6 we have introduced the notion of lattice friendly decomposition $P = P_0 + \dots + P_k$. In [Alt00, (3.2)], this notion was used to construct a k -parameter family, i.e. a deformation $\tilde{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_k^k$ of the associated toric singularity X . Its total space was built from the Cayley product mentioned in Remark 4.7.(ii). Actually, similarly to $X = \mathbb{T}\mathbb{V}(\sigma)$, one defines it as $\tilde{X} = \mathbb{T}\mathbb{V}(\tilde{\sigma})$ with $\tilde{\sigma} := \text{cone}(P_0 * \dots * P_k)$.

In [Alt00, (3.3)+(3.4)] it was shown that the Kodaira-Spencer map of this construction is exactly the map ρ we have defined in Subsection 9.4 – this is why we have called it like this even in the purely discrete, i.e. non-algebraic setup. In [ACF20, Proposition 4.3] we will connect the notion of a free pair to flatness, from which it follows that the corresponding inclusion $\mathbb{N}^{k+1} \hookrightarrow \tilde{\sigma}^{\vee} \cap (M \oplus \mathbb{N}^{k+1})$ is a co-Cartesian extension of $\mathbb{N} \hookrightarrow \sigma^{\vee} \cap (M \oplus \mathbb{N})$. In particular, denoting by (\tilde{T}, \tilde{S}) the initial extension from Theorem 8.2, then this is induced from a semigroup homomorphism $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(P) \supseteq \tilde{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^{k+1}$. The dual map $\mathbb{Z}^{k+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P)$ equals ρ , and the fact that its target is $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P) \subset \mathcal{T}(P)$ illustrates Theorem 9.9.

REFERENCES

- [ACF20] Klaus Altmann, Alexandru Constantinescu, and Matej Filip, *Versality in toric geometry*, to appear soon, 2020.
- [AH03] Klaus Altmann and Jürgen Hausen, *Polyhedral divisors and algebraic torus actions, extended version*, arXiv:math/0306285v1, 2003.
- [AK13] Klaus Altmann and Lars Kastner, *Negative deformations of toric singularities that are smooth in codimension two*, Deformations of surface singularities, Bolyai Soc. Math. Stud., vol. 23, János Bolyai Math. Soc., Budapest, 2013, pp. 13–55. MR 3203574
- [Alt97] Klaus Altmann, *The versal deformation of an isolated toric Gorenstein singularity*, Invent. Math. **128** (1997), no. 3, 443–479. MR 1452429

- [Alt00] ———, *One parameter families containing three-dimensional toric-Gorenstein singularities*, Explicit birational geometry of 3-folds, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 281, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2000, pp. 21–50. MR MR1798979 (2001j:14006)
- [Fel19] Simon Felten, *Log smooth deformation theory via Gerstenhaber algebras*, 2019, arXiv:1908.11235.
- [FFR19] Simon Felten, Matej Filip, and Helge Ruddat, *Smoothing toroidal crossing spaces*, 2019, arXiv:1908.11235.
- [Gro11] Mark Gross, *Tropical geometry and mirror symmetry.*, vol. 114, Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 2011 (English).
- [GS11] Mark Gross and Bernd Siebert, *From real affine geometry to complex geometry*, Ann. of Math. (2011), 1301–1428.
- [Kat89] Kazuya Kato, *Logarithmic structures of Fontaine-Illusie.*, Algebraic analysis, geometry, and number theory: proceedings of the JAMI inaugural conference, held at Baltimore, MD, USA, May 16-19, 1988, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989, pp. 191–224 (English).
- [KC19] Z. N. Ma K. Chan, N. C. Leung, *Geometry of the Maurer-Cartan equation near degenerate Calabi-Yau varieties*, 2019, arXiv:1902.11174.
- [Rud10] Helge Ruddat, *Log Hodge groups on a toric Calabi-Yau degeneration*, Mirror Symmetry and Tropical Geometry, Contemporary Mathematics, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, no. 527, 2010, pp. 113–164.
- [Ser79] Jean-Pierre Serre, *Local fields. Translated from the French by Marvin Jay Greenberg.*, vol. 67, Springer, New York, NY, 1979 (English).

INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, FU BERLIN, ARNIMALLE 3, D-14195 BERLIN, GERMANY
E-mail address: altmann@math.fu-berlin.de

INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, FU BERLIN, ARNIMALLE 3, D-14195 BERLIN, GERMANY
E-mail address: aconstant@zedat.fu-berlin.de

LABORATORY OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF LJUBLJANA, TRŽAIŠKA CESTA 25, SI-1000 LJUBLJANA, SLOVENIA
E-mail address: matej.filip@fe.uni-lj.si