

# The Varchenko Matrix for Dehyperplane Arrangement

Hery Randriamaro \*

November 2, 2021

## Abstract

This article computes the Varchenko determinant of dehyperplane arrangements which are generalizations of pseudohyperplane arrangements. But unlike those latter, they are defined on a real manifold, and it is not always possible to obtain a central dehyperplane arrangement by coning. This article also studies the solution space of a linear system defined from a dehyperplane arrangement. That equation system was first introduced by Aguiar and Mahajan for central hyperplane arrangements.

*Keywords:* Dehyperplane Arrangement, Varchenko Determinant, Linear System

*MSC Number:* 05B20, 06A11, 15A15, 52C35

## 1 Introduction

For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathcal{R}_n$  be the category of nonempty real open contractible  $n$ -dimensional manifolds. A dehyperplane in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$  is a set  $H \subseteq T$  such that  $H \in \mathcal{R}_{n-1}$  and  $H$  cuts  $T$  into two elements of  $\mathcal{R}_n$ . For a dehyperplane  $H$  in  $T$ , denote by  $H^+, H^-$  both elements of  $\mathcal{R}_n$  such that  $H^+ \sqcup H \sqcup H^- = T$  and  $\overline{H^+} \cap \overline{H^-} = H$ . Consider a finite set  $\mathcal{A}$  of dehyperplanes in  $T$ . A flat of  $\mathcal{A}$  is a nonempty intersection of dehyperplanes in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Denote by  $L_{\mathcal{A}}$  the set formed by the flats of  $\mathcal{A}$ , the intersection of element in  $\emptyset$  being  $T$ . It is a meet semilattice with partial order  $\leq$  defined, for  $X, Y \in L_{\mathcal{A}}$ , by  $X \leq Y \iff Y \subseteq X$ . The set  $\mathcal{A}$  is a dehyperplane arrangement in  $T$  if, for every  $H \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $X \in L_{\mathcal{A}}$  such that  $H \cap X \neq \emptyset$ , we have

- either  $H \leq X$ ,
- or  $\exists i \in [n] : H \cap X \in \mathcal{R}_{i-1}, H^+ \cap X \in \mathcal{R}_i, H^- \cap X \in \mathcal{R}_i$ .

Letting  $H^0 := H$  for a dehyperplane  $H$ , a face of  $\mathcal{A}$  is a nonempty subset  $F \subseteq T$  having the form  $F = \bigcap_{H \in \mathcal{A}} H^{\epsilon_H(F)}$  with  $\epsilon_H(F) \in \{+, 0, -\}$ . Denote  $F_{\mathcal{A}}$  the set formed by the faces of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

It is a poset with partial order  $\preceq$  defined, for  $F, G \in F_{\mathcal{A}}$ , by

$$F \preceq G \iff \forall H \in \mathcal{A} : \epsilon_H(F) \in \{0, \epsilon_H(G)\}.$$

---

\*This research was funded by my mother  
 Lot II B 32 bis Faravohitra, 101 Antananarivo, Madagascar  
 e-mail: [hery.randriamaro@outlook.com](mailto:hery.randriamaro@outlook.com)

The sign sequence of a face  $F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}$  is  $\epsilon_{\mathcal{A}}(F) := (\epsilon_H(F))_{H \in \mathcal{A}}$ . A chamber of  $\mathcal{A}$  is a face whose sign sequence contains no 0. Denote the set formed by the chambers of  $\mathcal{A}$  by  $C_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

The dehyperplane arrangements were recently introduced, and their  $f$ -polynomial computed [12]. As mentioned at the end of that article, we think that it is possible to provide a generalization of the topological representation theorem by using dehyperplane arrangements. In other words, we believe that every conditional oriented matroid is poset isomorphic to  $F_{\mathcal{A}}$  for some dehyperplane arrangement  $F_{\mathcal{A}}$ . The former was introduced by Bandelt et al. [2], and is a common generalization of oriented matroids and lopsided sets.

**Definition 1.1.** Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a subset of a dehyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$ . An **apartment** of  $\mathcal{A}$  is a chamber of  $\mathcal{K}$ . Denote the set formed by the apartments of  $\mathcal{A}$  by  $K_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

The sets formed by the faces and the chambers in an apartment  $K \in K_{\mathcal{A}}$  are respectively

$$F_{\mathcal{A}}^K := \{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \mid F \subseteq K\} \quad \text{and} \quad C_{\mathcal{A}}^K := C_{\mathcal{A}} \cap F_{\mathcal{A}}^K.$$

For  $H \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\varepsilon \in \{+, -\}$ , assign a variable  $q_H^\varepsilon$  to every open spaces  $H^\varepsilon$ . We work with the polynomial ring  $R_{\mathcal{A}} := \mathbb{Z}[q_H^\varepsilon \mid \varepsilon \in \{+, -\}, H \in \mathcal{A}]$ . For  $C, D \in C_{\mathcal{A}}$ , the set of formed by the open spaces containing  $C$  but not  $D$  is  $\mathcal{H}(C, D) := \{H^{\varepsilon_H(C)} \mid H \in \mathcal{A}, \varepsilon_H(C) = -\varepsilon_H(D)\}$ . Define an extension  $v : C_{\mathcal{A}} \times C_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow R_{\mathcal{A}}$  to dehyperplane arrangements of the distance function of Aguiar and Mahajan [1, § 8.1] by

$$v(C, C) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad v(C, D) = \prod_{H \in \mathcal{H}(C, D)} q_H^\varepsilon \quad \text{if } C \neq D.$$

**Definition 1.2.** The **Varchenko matrix** for an apartment  $K$  of a dehyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$  is  $V_{\mathcal{A}}^K := |v(D, C)|_{C, D \in C_{\mathcal{A}}^K}$ .

For a dehyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $T$ , we just write  $V_{\mathcal{A}}$  for  $V_{\mathcal{A}}^T$ . That matrix was originally defined for hyperplane arrangements in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and with the restriction  $q_H^+ = q_H^-$  by Varchenko [15, § 1]. But it already appeared earlier in the implicit form of a symmetric matrix for a Verma module over a  $\mathbb{C}$ -algebra [14, § 1]. It plays a key role to prove the realizability of variant models of quon algebras like the multiparametric quon algebra [11, Proposition 2.1] in quantum statistics. Moreover, algebraic structures of the Varchenko matrix have been studied over time. Gao and Zhang computed its diagonal form [5, Theorem 2] for hyperplane arrangements in semigeneral position with the same restriction. Then, for  $q_H^+ = q_H^- = q$ , Denham and Hanlon studied its Smith normal form [3, Theorem 3.3], and Hanlon and Stanley computed the nullspace of the Varchenko matrix of braid arrangements [7, Theorem 3.3].

**Definition 1.3.** The **centralization** of a dehyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$  to a face  $F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \setminus C_{\mathcal{A}}$  is the dehyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}_F := \{H \in \mathcal{A} \mid F \subseteq H\}$  in  $T$ . The **weight** and **multiplicity** of  $F$  are respectively the monomial and integer

$$b_F := \prod_{H \in \mathcal{A}_F} q_H^+ q_H^- \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_F := \frac{\#\{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}} \mid \overline{C} \cap H = F\}}{2},$$

where  $H \in \mathcal{A}_F$ , and we will see at the end of Section 4 that  $\beta_F$  is independent of  $H$ .

We can now state the first main result of this article.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a dehyperplane arrangement in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$ , and  $K \in K_{\mathcal{A}}$ . Then,*

$$\det V_{\mathcal{A}}^K = \prod_{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^K \setminus C_{\mathcal{A}}^K} (1 - b_F)^{\beta_F}.$$

It is the Varchenko determinant of the dehyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$  for the apartment  $K$ .

**Corollary 1.5.** *For a dehyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$ , we have*

$$\det V_{\mathcal{A}} = \prod_{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \setminus C_{\mathcal{A}}} (1 - b_F)^{\beta_F}.$$

The Varchenko determinant has known several investigations over time. The original computing was that of Varchenko for hyperplane arrangements with the restriction  $q_H^+ = q_H^-$  [15, Theorem 1.1]. Still with that restriction, Gente computed that determinant for cone of hyperplane arrangements [6, Theorem 4.5]. Then, Aguiar and Mahajan computed that determinant for central hyperplane arrangements [1, Theorem 8.11] and their cones [1, Theorem 8.12] using the distance function  $v$ . Two recent results are the Varchenko determinant for oriented matroids with  $q_H^+ = q_H^-$  computed by Hochstättler and Welker [8, Theorem 1], and that for pseudohyperplane arrangements we computed [13, Theorem 1.5]. The topological representation theorem links both results as it states that every oriented matroid is poset isomorphic to  $F_{\mathcal{A}}$  for some central pseudohyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$  [4, Theorem 3.5, Corollary 3.13]. Besides, as mentioned at the end of their article, the referee suggested Hochstättler and Welker conditional oriented matroids as possible direction to generalize [8, Theorem 1]. If a generalized topological representation theorem linking conditional oriented matroids with dehyperplane arrangements is proved, then Corollary 1.5 would be the generalization proposed by that referee. Furthermore, all those cited Varchenko determinants have a common point: it suffices to investigate central hyperplane or pseudohyperplane arrangements to obtain the Varchenko determinant of arbitrary ones by using the coning described in [13, § 4]. That is not the case for dehyperplane arrangements. The following example shows one for which the Varchenko determinant cannot be computed by coning.

*Example 1.* Consider the dehyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}_{ex} = \{P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4\}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  represented in Figure 1. Assigning the variable  $q_i^+$  resp.  $q_i^-$  to the set  $P_i^+$  resp.  $P_i^-$  where  $i \in [4]$ , we get

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & q_1^+ q_2^- & q_1^+ q_3^- & q_1^+ q_4^- & q_1^+ \\ q_1^- q_2^+ & 1 & q_2^+ q_3^- & q_2^+ q_4^- & q_2^+ \\ q_1^- q_3^+ & q_2^- q_3^+ & 1 & q_3^+ q_4^- & q_3^+ \\ q_1^- q_4^+ & q_2^- q_4^+ & q_3^- q_4^+ & 1 & q_4^+ \\ q_1^- & q_2^- & q_3^- & q_4^- & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \prod_{i \in [4]} (1 - q_i^+ q_i^-).$$

We know that the restriction  $\mathcal{A}^X := \{H \cap X \in L_{\mathcal{A}} \mid H \in \mathcal{A}, X \not\subseteq H, H \cap X \neq \emptyset\}$  of a dehyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$  on a flat  $X \in L_{\mathcal{A}}$  is a dehyperplane arrangement in  $X \in \mathcal{R}_{\dim X}$  [12, Lemma 2.2]. The support of a face  $F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}$  is the subset  $s(F) := \{H \in \mathcal{A} \mid \epsilon_H(F) = 0\}$  of  $\mathcal{A}$ . The sets formed by the faces and the chambers of  $\mathcal{A}^X$  are respectively

$$F_{\mathcal{A}^X} := \{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \mid s(F) \subseteq X\} \quad \text{and} \quad C_{\mathcal{A}^X} := \{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \mid s(F) = X\}.$$

For  $C, D \in C_{\mathcal{A}^X}$ , let  $\mathcal{H}(C, D) := \{H^{\epsilon_H(C)} \mid H \in \mathcal{A}, H \cap X \in \mathcal{A}^X, \epsilon_H(C) = -\epsilon_H(D)\}$ . Define  $v^X : C_{\mathcal{A}^X} \times C_{\mathcal{A}^X} \rightarrow R_{\mathcal{A}}$  by  $v^X(C, C) = 1$  and  $v^X(C, D) = \prod_{H \in \mathcal{H}(C, D)} q_H^{\epsilon_H}$  if  $C \neq D$ .




Figure 1: The Dehyperplane Arrangement  $\mathcal{A}_{ex}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$

We will see in Section 2 that  $F_{\mathcal{A}}$  forms a semigroup together with the binary operation defined as follows: If  $F, G \in F_{\mathcal{A}}$ , then  $FG$  is the face in  $F_{\mathcal{A}}$  such that, for every  $H \in \mathcal{A}$ ,

$$\epsilon_H(FG) := \begin{cases} \epsilon_H(F) & \text{if } \epsilon_H(F) \neq 0, \\ \epsilon_H(G) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Extend the distance functions  $v^X$  to  $\mathbf{v} : F_{\mathcal{A}} \times F_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow R_{\mathcal{A}}$ , for  $F, G \in F_{\mathcal{A}}$ , by

$$\mathbf{v}(F, G) := v^{s(FG)}(FG, GF).$$

The set formed by the minimal elements of  $F_{\mathcal{A}}$  is  $\min F_{\mathcal{A}} := \{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \mid \nexists G \in F_{\mathcal{A}} : G \prec F\}$ . Assign a variable  $x_F$  to each face  $F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

**Definition 1.6.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a dehyperplane arrangement in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$ . The **Aguiar-Mahajan system** for  $\mathcal{A}$  is the linear equation system

$$\sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ GF=G}} x_F \mathbf{v}(F, G) = 0 \quad \text{indexed by } G \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \min F_{\mathcal{A}}.$$

That system was introduced, and solved by Aguiar and Mahajan for central hyperplane arrangements [1, Theorem 8.19]. A dehyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $T$  is said central if  $\bigcap_{H \in \mathcal{A}} H \neq \emptyset$ . In that case, we will see in Lemma 3.1 that, for every  $F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}$ , there exists  $\tilde{F} \in F_{\mathcal{A}}$  such that  $\epsilon_{\mathcal{A}}(F) = -\epsilon_{\mathcal{A}}(\tilde{F})$ . Here is the second main result of this article.

**Theorem 1.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a dehyperplane arrangement in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$ . The solution space dimension of the Aguiar-Mahajan system of  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $\#\min F_{\mathcal{A}}$ . In the particular case that  $\mathcal{A}$  is central,*

then  $\min F_{\mathcal{A}} = \{O\}$ , and starting with an arbitrary value of  $x_O$ , there is a unique solution which can be computed recursively with the formula

$$x_G = \frac{-1}{1 - \mathbf{v}(G, \tilde{G}) \mathbf{v}(\tilde{G}, G)} \sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ F \prec \tilde{G}}} (x_F + (-1)^{\text{rk} G} x_{\tilde{F}} \mathbf{v}(\tilde{G}, G)).$$

This article is structured as follows: We prove in Section 2 that  $F_{\mathcal{A}}$  forms a semigroup together with the binary operation defined above. Then, we extend Witt identities to dehyperplane arrangements in Section 3. Those extensions are used at the end to compute  $\det V_{\mathcal{A}}^K$  in Section 4, and to prove Theorem 1.7 in Section 5.

## 2 A Face Semigroup for Dehyperplane Arrangement

We prove that  $F_{\mathcal{A}}$  forms a semigroup with the operation  $FG$  for  $F, G \in F_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

**Proposition 2.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a dehyperplane arrangement in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$ , and  $F, G \in F_{\mathcal{A}}$ . Then, there exists a unique face  $E \in F_{\mathcal{A}}$  such that*

$$\forall H \in \mathcal{A} : \epsilon_H(E) = \begin{cases} \epsilon_H(F) & \text{if } \epsilon_H(F) \neq 0, \\ \epsilon_H(G) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

*Proof.* Consider the subset  $\mathcal{K} = \{H \in \mathcal{A} \mid \epsilon_H(F) \neq 0\}$ , and the apartment  $K = \bigcap_{H \in \mathcal{K}} H^{\epsilon_H(F)}$ .

If  $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{A}$ , then  $E = F$ . Otherwise, we have  $F \subsetneq K$ , therefore for every  $L \in F_{\mathcal{A}_F}$ ,  $L \cap K \neq \emptyset$ . Note that the set  $\bigcap_{H \in \mathcal{A}_F} H^{\epsilon_H(G)}$  is nonempty since it contains  $G$ . As that set is a face of  $\mathcal{A}_F$ ,

we consequently obtain  $E = K \cap \bigcap_{H \in \mathcal{A}_F} H^{\epsilon_H(G)}$ . □

**Corollary 2.2.** *Given a dehyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$ , the set  $F_{\mathcal{A}}$  forms a semigroup together with the binary operation defined by: If  $F, G \in F_{\mathcal{A}}$ , then  $FG$  is the face in  $F_{\mathcal{A}}$  such that, for every  $H \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\epsilon_H(FG) := \begin{cases} \epsilon_H(F) & \text{if } \epsilon_H(F) \neq 0, \\ \epsilon_H(G) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ .*

*Proof.* It remains to prove the associativity of the binary operation. Let  $E, F, G \in F_{\mathcal{A}}$ , and  $H \in \mathcal{A}$ . Then,  $\epsilon_H((EF)G) = \begin{cases} \epsilon_H(E) & \text{if } \epsilon_H(E) \neq 0, \\ \epsilon_H(F) & \text{if } \epsilon_H(E) = 0 \text{ and } \epsilon_H(F) \neq 0, \\ \epsilon_H(G) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} = \epsilon_H(E(FG))$ . □

It is known that, if  $\mathcal{A}$  is a central hyperplane arrangement, then  $F_{\mathcal{A}}$  together with that binary operation is the Tits monoid [1, § 1.4.2]. Besides, if the generalized topological representation theorem stated in the introduction is proved, one could immediately conclude Corollary 2.2 from the fact that a conditional oriented matroid is a semigroup [9, Proposition 2.12].

### 3 Witt Identities on Dehyperplane Arrangement

We extend Witt identities to dehyperplane arrangements. They will be used later to compute  $\det V_{\mathcal{A}}^K$ , and to investigate the Aguiar-Mahajan system.

**Lemma 3.1.** *If  $\mathcal{A}$  is a central dehyperplane arrangement in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$ , then*

$$\forall F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}, \exists \tilde{F} \in F_{\mathcal{A}} : \forall H \in \mathcal{A} : \epsilon_H(\tilde{F}) = -\epsilon_H(F).$$

*Proof.* Let  $F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \setminus C_{\mathcal{A}}$ , and define a path  $p : [0, 1] \rightarrow \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{A}_F} H$  as follows:  $p$  starts at a point  $p(0) \in F$ , crosses all the hyperplanes  $H \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_F$ , and ends at the  $p(1)$  after those crossings. Then,  $\tilde{F}$  is the face of  $\mathcal{A}$  containing  $p(1)$ . Now, considering a chamber  $C \in C_{\mathcal{A}}$ ,  $\tilde{C}$  is the chamber of  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\partial \tilde{C} = \bigsqcup_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \setminus C_{\mathcal{A}} \\ F \not\subseteq \partial C}} \tilde{F}$ .  $\square$

**Definition 3.2.** A **nested face** of a dehyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$  is a pair  $(F, G)$  of faces in  $F_{\mathcal{A}}$  such that  $F \prec G$ .

For a nested face  $(F, G)$  of  $\mathcal{A}$ , let  $F_{\mathcal{A}}^{(F, G)}$  be the set of faces  $\{L \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \mid F \preceq L \preceq G\}$ .

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a dehyperplane arrangement in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$ ,  $D \in C_{\mathcal{A}}$ , and  $(A, D)$  a nested face of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then,  $C_{\mathcal{A}}$  has a chamber  $\tilde{D}_A$  whose sign sequence is defined by*

$$\forall H \in \mathcal{A} : \epsilon_H(\tilde{D}_A) = \begin{cases} -\epsilon_H(D) & \text{if } \epsilon_H(A) = 0, \\ \epsilon_H(A) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* Consider the apartment  $K = \bigcap_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{A} \\ \epsilon_H(A) \neq 0}} H^{\epsilon_H(A)}$ . We have  $C_{\mathcal{A}}^K = \{C \cap K \mid C \in C_{\mathcal{A}}\}$ . It

is clear that  $D \in C_{\mathcal{A}}^K$ . Moreover, we know from Lemma 3.1 that  $C_{\mathcal{A}}^K$  has a chamber  $\tilde{D}_A$  such that, for every  $H \in \mathcal{A}_A$ ,  $\epsilon_H(\tilde{D}_A) = -\epsilon_H(D)$ , which is consequently the sought chamber.  $\square$

**Definition 3.4.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a dehyperplane arrangement in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$ , and define the integer  $c_{\mathcal{A}} := \min \{\dim F \mid F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}\}$ . The **rank** of a face  $F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}$  is  $\text{rk } F := \dim F - c_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

For a dehyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $T$  and  $D \in C_{\mathcal{A}}$ , denote by  $F_{\mathcal{A}}^{n-1, D}$  the set of faces  $\{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \mid F \preceq D, \dim F = n - 1\}$ . Besides, let  $\chi$  be the function Euler characteristic of the structure of a topological space.

**Proposition 3.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a dehyperplane arrangement in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$ ,  $D \in C_{\mathcal{A}}$ , and  $(A, D)$  a nested face of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then,*

$$\sum_{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^{(A, D)}} (-1)^{\text{rk } F} \sum_{\substack{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}} \\ FC=D}} x_C = (-1)^{\text{rk } D} \sum_{\substack{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}} \\ AC=\tilde{D}_A}} x_C.$$

*Proof.* The proof is the extension of [10, Proposition 4.2] to dehyperplane arrangements. We have

$$\sum_{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^{(A, D)}} (-1)^{\text{rk } F} \sum_{\substack{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}} \\ FC=D}} x_C = \sum_{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}}} \left( \sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^{(A, D)} \\ FC=D}} (-1)^{\text{rk } F} \right) x_C.$$

- If  $\epsilon_{\mathcal{A}_A}(C) = \epsilon_{\mathcal{A}_A}(\tilde{D}_A)$ , then  $\sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^{(A,D)} \\ FC=D}} (-1)^{\text{rk } F} = (-1)^{\text{rk } D}$ .

Denote by  $F_{\mathcal{A}}^{A,n}$  the set of faces  $\{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \mid A \preceq F\} = \{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \mid \epsilon_{\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_A}(F) = \epsilon_{\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_A}(A)\}$ . Let  $f : F_{\mathcal{A}}^{A,n} \rightarrow F_{\mathcal{A}_A}$  be the bijection such that, if  $F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^{A,n}$ , then  $f(F)$  is the face of  $\mathcal{A}_A$  having the property

$$\forall H \in \mathcal{A}_A : \epsilon_H(f(F)) = \epsilon_H(F).$$

- If  $\epsilon_{\mathcal{A}_A}(C) = \epsilon_{\mathcal{A}_A}(D)$ , then

$$\sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^{(A,D)} \\ FC=D}} (-1)^{\text{rk } F} = (-1)^{-c_A} \sum_{F \in f(F_{\mathcal{A}}^{(A,D)})} (-1)^{\dim F} = (-1)^{-c_A} \chi(\overline{f(D)}) = 0.$$

- The case  $\epsilon_{\mathcal{A}_A}(C) \notin \{\epsilon_{\mathcal{A}_A}(D), \epsilon_{\mathcal{A}_A}(\tilde{D}_A)\}$  remains. Assume  $\epsilon_H(D) = +$  for  $H \in \mathcal{A}_A$ , and define the dehyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}_A(C) := \{H \in \mathcal{A}_A \mid \epsilon_H(C) = -\}$ . If  $\#\mathcal{A}_A(C) > 1$  and  $E \in F_{\mathcal{A}_A}(C)$ , then

$$\forall F \in F_{\mathcal{A}_A(C)}^{n-1,E}, \exists F' \in F_{\mathcal{A}_A(C)}^{n-1,E} \setminus \{F\} : \text{int}(\overline{F} \cap \overline{F'}) \in \mathcal{R}_{n-2}.$$

We obtain,

$$\sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^{(A,D)} \\ FC=D}} (-1)^{\text{rk } F} = \sum_{\substack{F \in f(F_{\mathcal{A}}^{(A,D)}) \\ \forall H \in \mathcal{A}_A(C) : \epsilon_H(F) = +}} (-1)^{\text{rk } F} = (-1)^{-c_A} \chi(\overline{f(D)} \setminus \bigcup_{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}_A(C)}^{n-1,f(D)}} \overline{F}) = 0.$$

So  $\sum_{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^{(A,D)}} (-1)^{\text{rk } F} \sum_{\substack{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}} \\ FC=D}} x_C = (-1)^{\text{rk } D} \sum_{\substack{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}} \\ \epsilon_{\mathcal{A}_A}(C) = \epsilon_{\mathcal{A}_A}(\tilde{D}_A)}} x_C = (-1)^{\text{rk } D} \sum_{\substack{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}} \\ AC=\tilde{D}_A}} x_C. \quad \square$

**Corollary 3.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a dehyperplane arrangement in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$ ,  $G \in F_{\mathcal{A}}$ , and  $(A, G)$  a nested face of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then,*

$$\sum_{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^{(A,G)}} (-1)^{\text{rk } F} \sum_{\substack{L \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ FL \preceq G}} x_L = (-1)^{\text{rk } G} \sum_{\substack{L \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ AL = \tilde{G}_A}} x_L, \quad (1)$$

$$\sum_{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^{(A,G)}} (-1)^{\text{rk } F} \sum_{\substack{L \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ FL = G}} x_L = (-1)^{\text{rk } G} \sum_{\substack{L \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ AL \preceq \tilde{G}_A}} x_L. \quad (2)$$

*Proof.* We have  $\sum_{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^{(A,G)}} (-1)^{\text{rk } F} \sum_{\substack{L \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ FL \preceq G}} x_L = \sum_{L \in F_{\mathcal{A}}} \left( \sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^{(A,G)} \\ FL \preceq G}} (-1)^{\text{rk } F} \right) x_L$ . As the condition

$FL \leq G$  is equivalent to  $FLG = G$ , using Proposition 3.5 with  $D = G$  and  $C = LG$ , we get

$$\sum_{L \in F_{\mathcal{A}}} \left( \sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^{(A,G)} \\ FL \preceq G}} (-1)^{\text{rk } F} \right) x_L = (-1)^{\text{rk } G} \sum_{\substack{L \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ ALG = \tilde{G}_A}} x_L = (-1)^{\text{rk } G} \sum_{\substack{L \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ AL = \tilde{G}_A}} x_L.$$

Similarly,  $\sum_{F \in F_A^{(A,G)}} (-1)^{\text{rk } F} \sum_{\substack{L \in F_A \\ FL=G}} x_L = \sum_{L \in F_A} \left( \sum_{\substack{F \in F_A^{(A,G)} \\ FL=G}} (-1)^{\text{rk } F} \right) x_L$ . As the condition  $FL = G$

is equivalent to  $FL\tilde{G}_A = \tilde{G}_A$  for every  $A \in \{F \in \min F_A \mid F \preceq G\}$ . Using Proposition 3.5 with  $D = G$  and  $C = L\tilde{G}_A$ , we get

$$\sum_{L \in F_A} \left( \sum_{\substack{F \in F_A^{(A,G)} \\ FL=G}} (-1)^{\text{rk } F} \right) x_L = (-1)^{\text{rk } G} \sum_{\substack{L \in F_A \\ AL\tilde{G}_A = \tilde{G}_A}} x_L = (-1)^{\text{rk } G} \sum_{\substack{L \in F_A \\ AL \preceq \tilde{G}_A}} x_L.$$

□

Denote by  $\check{C}_A$  the set formed by the bounded chambers of a dehyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$ . And the set of faces composing the closure of a chamber  $D \in C_A$  is  $F_{\overline{D}} := \{F \in F_A \mid F \preceq D\}$ .

**Proposition 3.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a dehyperplane arrangement in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$ , and assume  $\check{C}_A \neq \emptyset$ . Then,*

$$\forall D \in \check{C}_A : \sum_{F \in F_{\overline{D}}} (-1)^{\text{rk } F} \sum_{\substack{C \in C_A \\ FC=D}} x_C = (-1)^{c_A} x_D.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\{F_i\}_{i \in I} \subsetneq F_A^{n-1, D}$  such that, if  $\#I > 1$ , then

$$\forall i \in I, \exists j \in I \setminus \{i\} : \dim \overline{F_i} \cap \overline{F_j} = n - 2.$$

We will use  $\chi\left(\overline{D} \setminus \bigcup_{i \in I} \overline{F_i}\right) = \chi(\overline{D}) - \chi\left(\bigcup_{i \in I} \overline{F_i}\right) = 0$  to prove Proposition 3.7. Consider now

$$\sum_{F \in F_{\overline{D}}} (-1)^{\text{rk } F} \sum_{\substack{C \in C_A \\ FC=D}} x_C = \sum_{C \in C_A} \left( \sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\overline{D}} \\ FC=D}} (-1)^{\text{rk } F} \right) x_C.$$

If  $C \neq D$ , define the dehyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}_{C,D} := \{H \in \mathcal{A} \mid \epsilon_H(C) \neq \epsilon_H(D)\}$ . Remark that if  $\#\mathcal{A}_{C,D} > 1$ , then

$$\forall H \in \mathcal{A}_{C,D}, \exists H' \in \mathcal{A}_{C,D} \setminus \{H\} : \dim \overline{H} \cap \overline{H'} = n - 2.$$

We obtain

$$\sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\overline{D}} \\ FC=D}} (-1)^{\text{rk } F} = (-1)^{c_A} \sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\overline{D}} \\ \forall H \in \mathcal{A}_{C,D}: \epsilon_H(F) \neq 0}} (-1)^{\dim F} = (-1)^{c_A} \chi\left(\overline{D} \setminus \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{A}_{C,D}} \overline{D} \cap H\right) = 0.$$

If  $C = D$ , then  $\sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\overline{D}} \\ FC=D}} (-1)^{\text{rk } F} = (-1)^{c_A} \chi(\overline{D}) = (-1)^{c_A}$ . □

## 4 Proof of Theorem 1.4

We compute  $\det V_A^K$ , and justify the definition of a face multiplicity.



**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a dehyperplane arrangement in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$ ,  $C, D \in C_{\mathcal{A}}$ , and  $F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}$  such that  $F \preceq C$ . Then,*

$$v(C, D) = v(C, FD) v(FD, D).$$

*Proof.* We know that  $FD$  is a chamber in  $C_{\mathcal{A}}^K = \{E \cap K \mid E \in C_{\mathcal{A}_F}\}$  with  $K = \bigcap_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{A} \\ \epsilon_H(F) \neq 0}} H^{\epsilon_H(F)}$ .

- If  $FD = C$ , then  $\mathcal{H}(C, FD) \sqcup \mathcal{H}(FD, D) = \mathcal{H}(C, C) \sqcup \mathcal{H}(C, D) = \mathcal{H}(C, D)$ .
- Else,  $\mathcal{H}(C, FD) \sqcup \mathcal{H}(FD, D)$  is equal to

$$\{P^{\epsilon_P(C)} \mid P \in \mathcal{A}_F, \epsilon_P(C) \neq \epsilon_P(FD)\} \sqcup \{Q^{\epsilon_Q(FD)} \mid Q \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_F, \epsilon_Q(FD) \neq \epsilon_Q(D)\}$$

which is  $\mathcal{H}(C, D)$  since  $\epsilon_Q(FD) = \epsilon_Q(C)$  for every  $Q \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_F$ . □

For a dehyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $T$ ,  $M_{\mathcal{A}} := \left\{ \sum_{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}}} x_C C \mid x_C \in R_{\mathcal{A}} \right\}$  is the module of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}$ -linear combinations of chambers in  $C_{\mathcal{A}}$ . Let  $\{C^*\}_{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}}}$  be the dual basis of the basis  $C_{\mathcal{A}}$  of  $M_{\mathcal{A}}$ . Define the linear map  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}} : M_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow M_{\mathcal{A}}^*$ , for  $D \in C_{\mathcal{A}}$ , by  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(D) := \sum_{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}}} v(D, C) C^*$ .

For a nested face  $(A, D)$  with  $D \in C_{\mathcal{A}}$ , let  $m(A, D) := \sum_{\substack{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}} \\ AC=D}} v(D, C) C^* \in M_{\mathcal{A}}^*$ .

Define the extension ring  $B_{\mathcal{A}} := \left\{ \frac{p}{\prod_{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \setminus C_{\mathcal{A}}} (1 - b_F)^{k_F}} \mid p \in R_{\mathcal{A}}, k_F \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$  of  $R_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

**Proposition 4.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a dehyperplane arrangement in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$ ,  $D \in C_{\mathcal{A}}$ , and  $(A, D)$  a nested face of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then,*

$$m(A, D) = \sum_{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}}} x_C \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(C) \quad \text{with } x_C \in B_{\mathcal{A}}.$$

*Proof.* The proof is inspired from the backward induction in the proof of [1, Proposition 8.13]. We obviously have  $m(D, D) = \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(D)$ . Then, Proposition 3.5 applied to  $x_C = v(D, C) C^*$  in addition to Lemma 4.1 yield

$$\sum_{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^{(A, D)}} (-1)^{\text{rk } F} m(F, D) = (-1)^{\text{rk } D} \sum_{\substack{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}} \\ AC=\tilde{D}_A}} v(D, C) C^* = (-1)^{\text{rk } D} v(D, \tilde{D}_A) m(A, \tilde{D}_A).$$

Hence,  $m(A, D) - (-1)^{\text{rk } D - \text{rk } A} v(D, \tilde{D}_A) m(A, \tilde{D}_A) = \sum_{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^{(A, D)} \setminus \{A\}} (-1)^{\text{rk } F - \text{rk } A + 1} m(F, D)$ .

By induction hypothesis, for every  $C \in C_{\mathcal{A}}$ , there exists  $a_C \in B_{\mathcal{A}}$ , such that

$$\sum_{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^{(A, D)} \setminus \{A\}} (-1)^{\text{rk } F - \text{rk } A + 1} m(F, D) = \sum_{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}}} a_C \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(C).$$

Since  $A \preceq \tilde{D}_A$  and  $(\tilde{D}_A)_A = D$ , replacing  $D$  with  $A\tilde{D}$ , there exists also  $e_C \in B_A$  for every  $C \in C_A$  such that  $m(A, \tilde{D}_A) - (-1)^{\text{rk } \tilde{D}_A - \text{rk } A} v(\tilde{D}_A, D) m(A, D) = \sum_{C \in C_A} e_C \gamma_A(C)$ . Therefore,

$$m(A, D) = \sum_{C \in C_A} \frac{a_C + (-1)^{\text{rk } D - \text{rk } A} v(D, \tilde{D}_A) e_C}{1 - b_A} \gamma_A(C).$$

□

A bounded chamber  $C$  of a dehyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$  is locally bounded in  $K$  if  $\partial C \not\subseteq K$ . Denote by  $\check{C}_A^K$  the set formed by the chambers of  $\mathcal{A}$  which are locally bounded in  $K$ .

**Definition 4.3.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a dehyperplane arrangement in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$ ,  $K \in K_A$ , and  $D$  a chamber in  $C_A^K \setminus \check{C}_A^K$ . The **local bounding** of  $D$  to a locally bounded chamber  $D'$  in  $K$  consists on inserting a minimal number of dehyperplanes  $H_1, \dots, H_k$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  such that

- $\mathcal{A}' = \mathcal{A} \sqcup \{H_i\}_{i \in [k]}$  is a dehyperplane arrangement in  $T$ , and obviously  $K \in K_{\mathcal{A}'}$ ,
- $H_i$  divides  $D$  into two chambers  $D_i, D'_i$  such that  $D_i \not\subseteq H_i^+$  and  $\chi(\overline{D'_i} \cap K) = 0$ ,
- if  $L = \bigcap_{i \in [k]} H_i^+$  and  $C_{\mathcal{A}'}^K(L) := \{C \cap L \mid C \in C_{\mathcal{A}}^K\}$ , there is a bijection  $g_K : C_{\mathcal{A}'}^K(L) \rightarrow C_A^K$  such that, for every  $C \in C_{\mathcal{A}'}^K(L)$ , we have  $\epsilon_{\mathcal{A}}(C) = \epsilon_{\mathcal{A}'}(g_K(C))$ ,
- $D' = \bigcap_{i \in [k]} D_i$  is the chamber of  $\mathcal{A}'$  such that  $\epsilon_{\mathcal{A}}(D') = \epsilon_{\mathcal{A}}(D)$  and  $\check{C}_{\mathcal{A}'}^K = \check{C}_A^K \sqcup \{D'\}$ .

*Example 2.* Consider the dehyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}_{ex}$  of Figure 1. In Figure 2, we have a bounding of the chamber  $- + + +$  with the dehyperplanes  $Q_1, Q_2$ , and a bounding of the chamber  $+ + + +$  with the dehyperplanes  $Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, Q_4$ .




Figure 2: Bounding of the Chambers  $- + + +$  and  $+ + + +$  of  $\mathcal{A}_{ex}$

Let  $B_{\mathcal{A}}^K$  be the subring  $\left\{ \frac{p}{\prod_{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^K \setminus C_{\mathcal{A}}^K} (1 - b_F)^{k_F}} \mid p \in R_{\mathcal{A}}, k_F \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$  of  $B_{\mathcal{A}}$ , and  $M_{\mathcal{A}}^K$  the sub-module  $\left\{ \sum_{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}}^K} x_C C \mid x_C \in R_{\mathcal{A}} \right\}$  of  $M_{\mathcal{A}}$  for an apartment  $K$  of a dehyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$ .

Moreover, define the linear map  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}^K : M_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow M_{\mathcal{A}}^*$ , for  $D \in C_{\mathcal{A}}^K$ , by  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}^K(D) := \sum_{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}}^K} v(D, C) C^*$ ,

and for a nested face  $(A, D)$  with  $A \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^K$ , let  $m_K(A, D) := \sum_{\substack{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}}^K \\ AC=D}} v(D, C) C^* \in M_{\mathcal{A}}^*$ .

**Theorem 4.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a dehyperplane arrangement in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$ ,  $K \in K_{\mathcal{A}}$ , and  $D \in C_{\mathcal{A}}^K$ . Then,*

$$D^* = \sum_{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}}^K} x_C \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}^K(C) \quad \text{with } x_C \in B_{\mathcal{A}}^K.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be the subset containing the dehyperplanes  $H \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\dim H \cap \overline{K} = n - 1$ . Setting  $q_H^+ = q_H^- = 0$  for every  $H \in \mathcal{K}$ , we get  $v(D, C) = 0$  whenever one of  $C$  or  $D$  is a chamber in  $C_{\mathcal{A}}^K$  but the other not. Then if  $D \in C_{\mathcal{A}}^K$ ,

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(D) = \sum_{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}}^K} v(D, C) C^* = \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}^K(D) \quad \text{and} \quad m(A, D) = \sum_{\substack{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}}^K \\ AC=D}} v(D, C) C^* = m_K(A, D).$$

Suppose that  $D \in \check{C}_{\mathcal{A}}^K$ . Applying  $x_C = v(D, C) C^*$  to Proposition 3.7, we obtain

$$\sum_{F \in F_{\overline{D}}} (-1)^{\text{rk } F} m_K(F, D) = (-1)^{c_{\mathcal{A}}} D^*.$$

From Proposition 4.2, we conclude that  $D^* = \sum_{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}}} x_C \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}^K(C)$  with  $x_C \in B_{\mathcal{A}}^K$ .

Suppose now that  $D \in C_{\mathcal{A}}^K \setminus \check{C}_{\mathcal{A}}^K$ . Consider the dehyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}' = \mathcal{A} \sqcup \{H_i\}_{i \in [k]}$  obtained from the local bounding of  $D$  to  $D'$ , the apartment  $L = \bigcap_{i \in [k]} H_i^+$ , and the bijection

$g_K : C_{\mathcal{A}'}^K(L) \rightarrow C_{\mathcal{A}}^K$  with  $\epsilon_{\mathcal{A}}(C) = \epsilon_{\mathcal{A}}(g_K(C))$ . As  $D' \in \check{C}_{\mathcal{A}'}^K$ , then  $D'^* = \sum_{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}'}^K} x_C \gamma_{\mathcal{A}'}^K(C)$

where  $x_C \in B_{\mathcal{A}'}^K$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} D'^* &= \sum_{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}'}^K(L)} x_C \gamma_{\mathcal{A}'}^K(C) + \sum_{C' \in C_{\mathcal{A}'}^K \setminus C_{\mathcal{A}'}^K(L)} x_{C'} \gamma_{\mathcal{A}'}^K(C') \\ D'^* - \sum_{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}'}^K(L)} x_C \gamma_{\mathcal{A}'}^K(C) &= \sum_{C' \in C_{\mathcal{A}'}^K \setminus C_{\mathcal{A}'}^K(L)} x_{C'} \gamma_{\mathcal{A}'}^K(C'). \end{aligned}$$

Setting  $q_{H_i}^+ = q_{H_i}^- = 0$  for  $i \in [k]$ , we get on one side

$$D'^* - \sum_{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}'}^K(L)} x_C \gamma_{\mathcal{A}'}^K(C) \in \left\{ \sum_{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}'}^K(L)} x_{C^*} C^* \mid x_{C^*} \in B_{\mathcal{A}}^K \right\},$$

and  $\sum_{C' \in C_{\mathcal{A}'}^K \setminus C_{\mathcal{A}'}^K(L)} x_{C'} \gamma_{\mathcal{A}'}^K(C') \in \left\{ \sum_{C' \in C_{\mathcal{A}'}^K \setminus C_{\mathcal{A}'}^K(L)} x_{C'} C' \mid x_{C'} \in B_{\mathcal{A}}^K \right\}$  on the other side.

The only possibility is  $D'^* - \sum_{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}'}^K(L)} x_C \gamma_{\mathcal{A}'}^K(C) = \sum_{C' \in C_{\mathcal{A}'}^K \setminus C_{\mathcal{A}'}^K(L)} x_{C'} \gamma_{\mathcal{A}'}^K(C') = 0$ . Finally,

replacing  $C$  by  $g_K(C)$  for every  $C \in C_{\mathcal{A}'}^K(L)$ , we conclude that  $D^* = \sum_{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}}^K} x_C \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}^K(C)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 4.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  a dehyperplane arrangement in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$ , and  $K \in K_{\mathcal{A}}$ . To every face  $F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^K \setminus C_{\mathcal{A}}^K$  can be associated a nonnegative integer  $l_F$  such that*

$$\det V_{\mathcal{A}}^K = \prod_{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^K \setminus C_{\mathcal{A}}^K} (1 - b_F)^{l_F}.$$

*Proof.* We extend the proof of [10, Proposition 5.4] to apartment of dehyperplane arrangements, namely, we first note that  $V_{\mathcal{A}}^K$  is the matrix representation of  $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}^K$ . Then, we know from Theorem 4.4 that  $(\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}^K)^{-1}(D^*) = \sum_{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}}^K} x_C C$  with  $x_C \in B_{\mathcal{A}}^K$  for  $D \in C_{\mathcal{A}}^K$ . Hence, each

entry of  $(V_{\mathcal{A}}^K)^{-1}$  is an element of  $B_{\mathcal{A}}^K$ . Since  $(V_{\mathcal{A}}^K)^{-1} = \frac{\text{adj}(V_{\mathcal{A}}^K)}{\det V_{\mathcal{A}}^K}$ , the determinant of  $V_{\mathcal{A}}^K$  has

then the form  $k \prod_{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^K \setminus C_{\mathcal{A}}^K} (1 - b_F)^{l_F}$  with  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . As the constant term of  $\det V_{\mathcal{A}}^K$  is 1, we deduce that  $k = 1$ .  $\square$

For  $F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $H \in \mathcal{A}_F$ , define the integer  $\beta_F^H := \frac{\#\{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}} \mid \overline{C} \cap H = F\}}{2}$ . The following proof not only proves Theorem 1.4, but also shows that, for any hyperplane in  $\mathcal{A}_F$ ,  $\beta_F^H$  is the same, which justifies the definition of the multiplicity.

*Proof.* From Proposition 4.5, we have  $\det V_{\mathcal{A}}^K = \prod_{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^K \setminus C_{\mathcal{A}}^K} (1 - b_F)^{l_F}$ . Take a face  $E \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^K \setminus C_{\mathcal{A}}^K$ :

there exists an apartment  $L \in K_{\mathcal{A}}$  such that  $E \subseteq L \subseteq K$ ,  $\bigcap_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{A} \\ H \cap L \neq \emptyset}} H = E$ , and

$$\det V_{\mathcal{A}}^L = \prod_{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^L \setminus C_{\mathcal{A}}^L} (1 - b_F)^{l_F}.$$

Setting  $h_H^+ = h_H^- = 0$  for every  $H \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_E$ , we see that, for every  $F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^L \setminus C_{\mathcal{A}}^L$ ,  $l_F = l'_F$ . We prove by backward induction on the dimension of  $E$  that

$$\forall H, H' \in \mathcal{A}_E : \beta_E^H = \beta_E^{H'} = \beta_E \quad \text{and} \quad \det V_{\mathcal{A}}^L = \prod_{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^L \setminus C_{\mathcal{A}}^L} (1 - b_F)^{\beta_F}.$$

Remark that  $\beta_F^H = \frac{\#\{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}}^L \mid \overline{C} \cap H = F\}}{2}$ . It is clear that, if  $\dim E = n - 1$ , then  $\beta_E = 1$  and  $\det V_{\mathcal{A}}^L = 1 - b_E$ . If  $\dim E < n - 1$ , by induction hypothesis,

$$\det V_{\mathcal{A}}^L = (1 - b_E)^{l_E} \prod_{F \in (F_{\mathcal{A}}^L \setminus C_{\mathcal{A}}^L) \setminus \{E\}} (1 - b_F)^{\beta_F}.$$

Note that the leading monomial in  $\det V_{\mathcal{A}}^L$  is  $(-1)^{\frac{\#C_{\mathcal{A}}^L}{2}} \prod_{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}}^L} \mathbf{v}(C, \tilde{C}_E) = (-1)^{\frac{\#C_{\mathcal{A}}^L}{2}} \prod_{H \in \mathcal{A}_E} h_H^+ h_H^-$ .

Comparing the exponent of  $h_H^+ h_H^-$ , we get  $l_E = \frac{\#C_{\mathcal{A}}^L}{2} - \sum_{\substack{F \in (F_{\mathcal{A}}^L \setminus C_{\mathcal{A}}^L) \setminus \{E\} \\ F \subseteq \tilde{H}}} \beta_F^H = \beta_E^H$ .  $\square$

## 5 Proof of Theorem 1.7

We determine the solution space dimension of the Aguiar-Mahajan system, and solve that latter for central dehyperplane arrangements.

The Varchenko matrix of  $\mathcal{A}^X$  is  $V_{\mathcal{A}^X} := |\mathbf{v}(D, C)|_{C, D \in C_{\mathcal{A}^X}}$ . The centralization to a face  $F \in F_{\mathcal{A}^X} \setminus C_{\mathcal{A}^X}$  is the dehyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}_F^X := \{H \in \mathcal{A}^X \mid F \subseteq H\}$  in  $X$ . The weight and multiplicity of  $F$  in  $X$  are respectively the monomial and integer

$$b_F^X := \prod_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{A} \\ H \cap X \in \mathcal{A}_F^X}} q_H^+ q_H^- \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_F^X := \frac{\#\{C \in C_{\mathcal{A}^X} \mid \bar{C} \cap P = F\}}{2},$$

where  $P \in \mathcal{A}_F^X$ , and  $\beta_F^X$  is independent of  $P$  like the multiplicity of a dehyperplane in  $\mathcal{A}$ .

**Corollary 5.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a dehyperplane arrangement in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$ , and  $X \in L_{\mathcal{A}}$ . Then,*

$$\det V_{\mathcal{A}^X} = \prod_{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}^X} \setminus C_{\mathcal{A}^X}} (1 - b_F^X)^{\beta_F^X}.$$

*Proof.* It is Corollary 1.5 but for the dehyperplane arrangement  $\mathcal{A}^X$ .  $\square$

Define the assembly of Varchenko matrices  $S_{\mathcal{A}} := (s_{F,G})_{F,G \in F_{\mathcal{A}}}$  by

$$s_{F,G} := \begin{cases} \mathbf{v}(F, G) & \text{if } GF = G, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

**Proposition 5.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a dehyperplane arrangement in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$ . Then,*

$$\det S_{\mathcal{A}} = \prod_{X \in L_{\mathcal{A}}} \prod_{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}^X} \setminus C_{\mathcal{A}^X}} (1 - b_F^X)^{\beta_F^X}.$$

*Proof.* We basically take up the argument in [1, § 8.4.5] in a dehyperplane arrangement context. Write  $S_{\mathcal{A}}$  as a block matrix indexed by flats, with the  $(X, Y)$ -block consisting of the entries  $s_{F,G}$  such that  $s(F) = X$  and  $s(G) = Y$ . Moreover, order the flats so that row  $X$  appears above row  $Y$  if  $X < Y$ . That block matrix is lower triangular with the diagonal block  $(X, X)$ -block being  $V_{\mathcal{A}^X}$ . Hence,  $\det S_{\mathcal{A}} = \prod_{X \in L_{\mathcal{A}}} \det V_{\mathcal{A}^X}$ , and it remains to

apply Corollary 5.1.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a dehyperplane arrangement in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$ , and  $F, G, L \in F_{\mathcal{A}}$  such that  $FG \preceq L$ . Then,*

$$\mathbf{v}(F, G) = \mathbf{v}(L, G) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{v}(G, F) = \mathbf{v}(G, L).$$

*Proof.* For  $F, G \in F_{\mathcal{A}}$ , define the set  $d(F, G) := \{H \in \mathcal{A} \mid \epsilon_H(F) \neq 0, \epsilon_H(G) = 0\}$ . We have  $\mathbf{v}(F, G) = \mathbf{v}(FG, GF) = \mathbf{v}(L, GFL)$ . Moreover,  $FG \preceq L$  also implies  $\epsilon_{d(F, G)}(F) = \epsilon_{d(F, G)}(L)$ . Then,  $\mathbf{v}(L, GFL) = \mathbf{v}(L, GL) = \mathbf{v}(L, G)$ .

Similarly,  $\mathbf{v}(G, F) = \mathbf{v}(GF, FG) = \mathbf{v}(GFL, L) = \mathbf{v}(GL, L) = \mathbf{v}(G, L)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a dehyperplane arrangement in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$ , and  $F, G, L \in F_{\mathcal{A}}$  such that  $G \preceq L$ . Then,*

$$\mathbf{v}(F, L) = \mathbf{v}(F, GF) \mathbf{v}(GF, L).$$

*Proof.* For  $F, G \in F_{\mathcal{A}}$ , define the set  $e(F, G) := \{H \in \mathcal{A} \mid \epsilon_H(F) \neq 0, \epsilon_H(G) \neq 0\}$ . On one side,  $\mathbf{v}(F, GF) = \mathbf{v}(FG, GF)$  and

$$\mathcal{H}(FG, GF) = \{H^{\epsilon_H(F)} \mid H \in e(F, G), \epsilon_H(F) \neq \epsilon_H(G)\}.$$

On the other side,  $\mathbf{v}(GF, L) = \mathbf{v}(GFL, LF)$  and

$$\mathcal{H}(GFL, LF) = \{H^{\epsilon_H(F)} \mid H \in e(F, L) \setminus e(F, G), \epsilon_H(F) \neq \epsilon_H(L)\}.$$

Hence,  $\mathcal{H}(FG, GF) \sqcup \mathcal{H}(GFL, LF) = \mathcal{H}(FL, LF)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a dehyperplane arrangement in  $T \in \mathcal{R}_n$ . The solution space of the Aguiar-Mahajan system of  $\mathcal{A}$  coincides with that of the linear equation system*

$$\sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ LF=G}} x_F \mathbf{v}(F, G) = 0 \quad \text{indexed by } L, G \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \min F_{\mathcal{A}} \quad \text{with } L \preceq G.$$

*Proof.* Note that the Aguiar-Mahajan system is smaller than that of Lemma 5.5. So we need to show that any solution of the former also solves the latter. The proof is inspired from the backward induction of the proof of [1, Lemma 8.18]. It is clear that the solutions coincide if  $L = G$ . Let  $A \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \min F_{\mathcal{A}}$  with  $A \preceq G$ , and start with Equation 2 by replacing  $x_F$  with  $x_F \mathbf{v}(F, G)$ . By induction,  $\sum_{L \in F_{\mathcal{A}}^{(A, G)}} (-1)^{\text{rk } L} \sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ LF=G}} x_F \mathbf{v}(F, G) = (-1)^{\text{rk } A} \sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ AF=G}} x_F \mathbf{v}(F, G)$ , thus

$$\begin{aligned} (-1)^{\text{rk } A} \sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ AF=G}} x_F \mathbf{v}(F, G) &= (-1)^{\text{rk } G} \sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ AF \preceq \tilde{G}_A}} x_F \mathbf{v}(F, G) \\ &= (-1)^{\text{rk } G} \sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ AF=\tilde{G}_A}} x_F \mathbf{v}(F, G) \quad \text{as } s(AF) = s(G) = s(\tilde{G}_A) \\ &= (-1)^{\text{rk } G} \sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ AF=\tilde{G}_A}} x_F \mathbf{v}(F, AF) \mathbf{v}(AF, G) \quad \text{using Lemma 5.4} \\ &= (-1)^{\text{rk } G} \mathbf{v}(\tilde{G}_A, G) \sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ AF=\tilde{G}_A}} x_F \mathbf{v}(F, \tilde{G}_A) \quad \text{using Lemma 5.3.} \end{aligned}$$

Interchanging the roles of  $G$  and  $\tilde{G}_A$  yields a similar identity. Combining both ones, we obtain

$$(1 - \mathbf{v}(G, \tilde{G}_A) \mathbf{v}(\tilde{G}_A, G)) \sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ AF=G}} x_F \mathbf{v}(F, G) = 0.$$

$\square$

We can finally proceed to the proof of Theorem 1.7.

*Proof.* To the Aguiar-Mahajan system add the equations

$$x_F = \alpha_F \quad \text{for } F \in \min F_{\mathcal{A}}, \alpha_F \in R_{\mathcal{A}},$$

where  $\alpha_F$  is fixed but arbitrary. The matrix of that linear system is the assembly  $S_{\mathcal{A}}$ . We know from Proposition 5.2 that  $\det S_{\mathcal{A}}$  is invertible in  $B_{\mathcal{A}}$ , so that system has a unique solution. Hence, the solution space dimension of the Aguiar-Mahajan system of  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $\#\min F_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

Now assume  $\mathcal{A}$  is central. Lemma 5.5 allows to consider the linear system  $\sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ LF=G}} x_F \mathbf{v}(F, G) = 0$

to solve the Aguiar-Mahajan system. We successively have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ LF=G}} x_F \mathbf{v}(F, G) &= 0 \\ \sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ LF=N \\ N \prec G}} x_F \mathbf{v}(F, N) &= 0 \\ \sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ LF \prec G}} x_F \mathbf{v}(F, G) &= 0 \quad \text{using Lemma 5.3.} \end{aligned}$$

Applying Equation 1 with  $x_F$  replaced by  $x_F \mathbf{v}(F, G)$  and  $A$  by  $O$ , we obtain

$$\sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ F \prec \tilde{G}}} x_F + x_G = (-1)^{\text{rk } G} x_{\tilde{G}} \mathbf{v}(\tilde{G}, G).$$

Interchanging the roles of  $G$  and  $\tilde{G}$  yields  $\sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ F \prec \tilde{G}}} x_F + x_{\tilde{G}} = (-1)^{\text{rk } G} x_G \mathbf{v}(G, \tilde{G})$ . Thus,

$$x_G = - \sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ F \prec \tilde{G}}} x_F + x_G \mathbf{v}(G, \tilde{G}) \mathbf{v}(\tilde{G}, G) - (-1)^{\text{rk } G} \mathbf{v}(\tilde{G}, G) \sum_{\substack{F \in F_{\mathcal{A}} \\ F \prec \tilde{G}}} x_F.$$

□

## References

- [1] M. Aguiar, S. Mahajan, *Topics in Hyperplane Arrangements*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs 226, 2017.
- [2] H.-J. Bandelt, V. Chepoi, K. Knauer, *COMs: Complexes of Oriented Matroids*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A (156) (2018), 195–237.
- [3] G. Denham, P. Hanlon, *Some Algebraic Properties of the Schechtman-Varchenko Bilinear Forms*, New Perspectives in Geometric Combinatorics, MSRI Publications 38, 1999.
- [4] P. Deshpande, *On Arrangements of Pseudohyperplanes*, Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. Math. Sci. (126) 3 (2016), 399–420.

- [5] Y. Gao, Y. Zhang, *Diagonal Form of the Varchenko Matrices*, J. Algebraic Combin. (48) (2018), 351–368.
- [6] R. Gente, *The Varchenko Matrix for Cones*, PhD Thesis, Philipps-Universität Marburg, 2013.
- [7] P. Hanlon, R. Stanley, *A  $q$ -Deformation of a Trivial Symmetric Group Action*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. (350) 11 (1998), 4445–4459.
- [8] W. Hochstättler, V. Welker, *The Varchenko Determinant for Oriented Matroids*, Math. Z. (293) 3-4 (2019), 1415–1430.
- [9] S. Margolis, F. Saliola, B. Steinberg, *Cell Complexes, Poset Topology and the Representation Theory of Algebras arising in Algebraic Combinatorics and Discrete Geometry*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. to appear.
- [10] H. Randriamaro, *The Varchenko Determinant for Apartments*, Results Math. (75) 3 (2020) 86.
- [11] H. Randriamaro, *A Multiparametric Quon Algebra*, Bull. Iranian Math. Soc. (2020), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41980-020-00414-5>.
- [12] H. Randriamaro, *Face Counting of Dehyperplane Arrangements*, arXiv: 2003.02241.
- [13] H. Randriamaro, *The Varchenko Determinant of Pseudohyperplane Arrangements*, arXiv: 2003.01970.
- [14] V. Schechtman, A. Varchenko, *Quantum Groups and Homology of Local Systems*, Algebraic Geometry and Analytic Geometry, Springer, 1990.
- [15] A. Varchenko, *Bilinear Form of Real Configuration of Hyperplanes*, Adv. Math. (97) 1 (1993), 110–144.