

# On matroid modularity and the coefficients of the inverse Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomial of a matroid

Lorenzo Vecchi

December 24, 2024

## Abstract

Following the work of Gao and Xie in [2], we state some properties of the inverse Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomial of a matroid. We also give a full characterization of the structure of modular matroids.

## 1 Introduction

Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials for matroids were firstly introduced in 2016 by Elias, Proudfoot and Wakefield in [4], in analogy with the classical Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials for Coxeter groups ([10]). While the classical version gives rise to a very broad class of polynomials (every polynomial with non-negative integer coefficients and constant term equal to 1 is the Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomial of some Coxeter group [6]), the matroidal Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials have a very rigid structure: Braden et al. proved in [1] that their coefficients are always non-negative, and it is conjectured that they form a log-concave sequence with no internal zeros. In 2020, Gao and Xie introduced in [2] the analogue of the inverse Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomial for a matroid, employing the general framework of Kazhdan-Lusztig-Stanley theory. These polynomials were also proven to have non-negative coefficients in [1], and they are conjectured as well to be log-concave with no internal zeros. Our work aims to develop new results for the polynomials  $P_M(t)$  and  $Q_M(t)$  in a purely combinatorial way, giving interpretations of their coefficients directly on the lattice of flats of  $M$ : in Theorem 3.3 we give an explicit definition of the coefficient of degree 1 of  $Q_M(t)$ . The rest of the paper is mainly aimed to study the following Conjecture found in [3].

**Conjecture 1.1.** *Every connected regular matroid is non-degenerate.*

Here degeneracy means that the polynomial  $P_M(t)$  does not have maximal degree. First of all we are able to link the degeneracy of a matroid  $M$  to its inverse polynomial  $Q_M(t)$  (Theorem 3.4); then, with a lattice-theoretic approach we discover clear structure theorems for the class of modular matroids (Theorem 3.8 and 3.15). These results let us exclude modular matroids and matroids with rank lower than 4 among the possible counterexamples of Conjecture 1.1.

**Acknowledgements.** The author is very grateful to Luca Moci, Michele D’Adderio, Simone Billi and Aleksandr Dzhugan for the thoughtful discussions and the helpful comments.

## 2 Background and notation

We begin our work by setting all the notation needed in the rest of the paper. Many invariants defined on matroids can actually be calculated by working on their family of flats, which form a lattice by inclusion. This is why we are going to employ an order-theoretic approach, which also let us not worry about the regularity of the matroids we study. To start, we recall the definition of a geometric lattice.

**Definition 2.1.** A lattice  $\mathcal{L}$  is said to be atomic if each non-minimal element can be obtained as a join of its atoms. It is semimodular if it has a rank function  $\rho$  such that

$$\rho(F) + \rho(G) \geq \rho(F \vee G) + \rho(F \wedge G),$$

for all  $F, G \in \mathcal{L}$ . If  $\mathcal{L}$  is atomic and semimodular it is said to be geometric.

We are also interested in the underlying matroidal structure of  $\mathcal{L}$ . It is a theorem by Birkhoff [12] that every geometric lattice arises as a lattice of flats of a matroid. If  $M$  is a matroid with lattice of flats isomorphic to  $\mathcal{L}$  we will write  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(M)$ , omitting the  $M$  if the matroid is clear from the context. In this sense, we will also say that  $\mathcal{L}$  is a matroid.

Unless otherwise stated, we will always work with simple matroids of rank  $r$ . Given a simple matroid  $M$  we denote with  $E$  its ground set (which is equal to the set of atoms of  $\mathcal{L}$ ), and  $\chi_M(t)$  its characteristic polynomial. Moreover, we call  $[\emptyset, F] \subset \mathcal{L}$  the restriction of  $M$  to  $F$ , denoted with  $M_F$ , and we call  $[F, E] \subset \mathcal{L}$  the contraction of  $M$  by  $F$  denoted by  $M^F$ .

The uniform matroid of rank  $k$  on a ground set  $|E| = n$  will be denoted with  $U_{k,n}$ . The Boolean matroid, corresponding to the Boolean lattice, will be denoted with  $B_n$ .

We denote with  $w_k$  and  $W_k$ , respectively, the Whitney numbers of first and second kind. We recall that  $\chi_M(t) = \sum_{k=0}^r w_k t^{r-k}$  and that  $W_k$  is the number of rank- $k$  flats in the matroid. See [5] and [9] for exact definitions on matroids and geometric lattices.

The notion of modularity in a lattice can be stated in several different ways, but we collect in the following proposition the different characterizations we will need for our results.

**Proposition 2.2.** *For a lattice  $\mathcal{L}$  the following statements are equivalent*

- i)  $\mathcal{L}$  is modular,
- ii)  $\mathcal{L}$  has a rank function  $\rho$  such that  $\rho(F) + \rho(G) = \rho(F \vee G) + \rho(F \wedge G)$  for any two elements  $F$  and  $G$ ,
- iii) (Diamond isomorphism Theorem) For every  $F$  and  $G$  in  $\mathcal{L}$  the intervals

$$[F \wedge G, F] \cong [G, F \vee G]$$

are isomorphic.

If, moreover,  $\mathcal{L}$  is geometric, then *i*) is also equivalent to

$$iv) W_1 = W_{r-1},$$

*v*) The dual lattice  $\mathcal{L}^* = (\mathcal{L}, \geq)$  is geometric.

Condition *iv*) is the Hyperplane Theorem and can be found for example in [9], Chapter 8. Regarding condition *v*), geometric lattices are always dually atomic ([8]), hence what one has left to prove is the semimodularity of  $\mathcal{L}^*$ . Moreover, the Top-Heavy Conjecture, proved in [1], implies that

**Corollary 2.3.** *If  $\mathcal{L}$  is geometric and modular its sequence of Whitney numbers of the second kind is symmetric, i.e. for all  $k$*

$$W_k = W_{r-k}.$$

Theorem 2.2 in [4] and Theorem 1.2 in [2] give us the definition of the Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomial and the inverse Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomial of a matroid, which we will now recall.

**Theorem 2.4.** *There is a unique way to assign to each matroid  $M$  two polynomials  $P_M(t), Q_M(t) \in \mathbb{Z}[t]$  such that*

*i*) If  $r = 0$ , then  $P_M(t) = 1$ .

*ii*) If  $r > 0$ , then  $\deg P_M(t) < \frac{1}{2} \text{rk } M$ .

*iii*) For every matroid  $M$  we have

$$t^r P_M(t^{-1}) = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{L}(M)} \chi_{M_F}(t) P_{M^F}(t).$$

*i')* If  $r = 0$ , then  $Q_M(t) = 1$ .

*ii')* If  $r > 0$ , then  $\deg Q_M(t) < \frac{1}{2} \text{rk } M$ .

*iii')* For every matroid  $M$  we have

$$t^r \cdot (-1)^r Q_M(t^{-1}) = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{L}(M)} (-1)^{\text{rk } M_F} Q_{M^F}(t) \cdot t^{\text{rk } M^F} \chi_{M^F}(t^{-1}).$$

**Remark 2.5.** These polynomials also arise in the more general framework of Kazhdan-Lusztig-Stanley theory. We call  $f$  the unique function that satisfies

$$\bar{f} = \chi * f,$$

where  $\bar{f}$  is the involution  $\bar{f}(t) = t^r f(t^{-1})$  and  $*$  denotes the convolution in the incidence algebra of  $\mathcal{L}$ . Then  $f$  is called the right Kazhdan-Lusztig-Stanley function associated to  $\chi$ . In this setting then one has that

$$P_M(t) = (f)_{\emptyset, E}(t).$$

Then, the polynomial  $Q_M(t)$  can be found to be equal to

$$Q_M(t) = (-1)^r (f^{-1})_{\emptyset, E}(t),$$

where  $f^{-1}$  is the inverse of  $f$  in the incidence algebra of  $\mathcal{L}$ . This justifies the name "inverse polynomial" for  $Q_M(t)$ , since it arises as the inverse of  $P_M(t)$  with respect to the convolution product. In particular, this means that

$$\sum_{F \in \mathcal{L}(M)} P_{M_F}(-1)^{\text{rk } M^F} Q_{M^F} = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{L}(M)} P_{M^F}(-1)^{\text{rk } M^F} Q_{M^F} = 0.$$

**Remark 2.6.** To ease some of the computations, we will also use this version of condition *iii'*,

$$Q_M(t) = (-1)^r \sum_{F \in \mathcal{L}(M)} (-1)^{\text{rk } F} t^{\text{rk } F} Q_{M^F}(t^{-1}) \cdot \chi_{M^F}(t).$$

### 3 New results

We will denote the coefficient of  $t^j$  in a polynomial  $p(t)$  as  $[t^j]p(t)$ .

It is observed in Proposition 2.4 in [2] that

**Proposition 3.1.**

$$[t^0]Q_M(t) = |[t^0]\chi_M(t)| = |w_r|.$$

Our next goal is to compute the coefficient of  $t$  in the same fashion of Proposition 2.12 in [4]. To do that we recall the definition of the doubly-indexed Whitney numbers.

**Definition 3.2.** For all natural numbers  $i$  and  $j$ , let

$$w_{i,j} := \sum_{\text{rk } F=i, \text{rk } G=j} \mu(F, G) \quad \text{and} \quad W_{i,j} := \sum_{\text{rk } F=i, \text{rk } G=j} \zeta(F, G),$$

where  $\mu$  is the Moebius function of  $\mathcal{L}(M)$  and  $\zeta$  is its inverse in the incidence algebra of  $\mathcal{L}(M)$ . If  $i$  is set to 0, we recover the Whitney numbers of first and second kind.

**Theorem 3.3.** For every matroid  $M$ ,

$$[t]Q_M(t) = |w_{1,r}| - |w_{0,r-1}|.$$

*Proof.* We just need to compute the coefficient of  $t$  in the right-hand side of the equation in Remark 2.6. First of all we notice that flats with rank greater than or equal to 2 will give no contribution to the coefficient of  $t$  because the terms of  $Q_{M^F}(t^{-1})$  have degrees ranging in  $(-\frac{\text{rk } F}{2}, 0]$ , which means that the lowest term of

$$t^{\text{rk } F} Q_{M^F}(t^{-1}) \chi_{M^F}(t)$$

has degree strictly greater than 1. If we consider  $F = \emptyset$ , then the corresponding term in the sum is reduced to

$$(-1)^{\text{rk } M} \chi_M(t),$$

since  $Q_{M_\emptyset}(t) = Q_\emptyset(t) \equiv 1$ . Then we get a contribution for the coefficient of  $t$  of  $(-1)^{\text{rk } M} [t]\chi_M(t)$ . The sign of  $[t]\chi_M(t)$  is opposite to the parity of  $\text{rk } M$ , which means that

$$(-1)^{\text{rk } M} [t]\chi_M(t) = -|[t]\chi_M(t)|.$$

Let us now consider a rank-1 flat,  $i \subset E$ . Combining  $ii'$ ) and 3.1 we get that  $Q_{M_i}(t) = Q_{B_1}(t) \equiv 1$ , thus its corresponding term in the sum is

$$(-1)^{\text{rk } M-1} t \chi_{M/i}(t).$$

This means that each of these terms gives a contribution to the coefficient of  $t$  of  $(-1)^{\text{rk } M-1} [t^0] \chi_{M/i}(t)$ , which, for the same reason as before, is equal to  $|[t^0] \chi_{M/i}(t)|$ . Putting everything together tells us that

$$[t] Q_M(t) = \left| \sum_{i \in E} [t^0] \chi_{M/i}(t) \right| - |[t] \chi_M(t)|.$$

A straightforward substitution using the definition of  $\chi_M(t)$  gives us the desired result.  $\square$

Investigating Conjecture 1.1 one quickly understands that the degeneracy of a matroid  $M$  is linked to the coefficient of  $t^{\lfloor \frac{r-1}{2} \rfloor}$  in  $P_M(t)$ , that is, the matroid  $M$  is degenerate if and only if

$$\left[ t^{\lfloor \frac{r-1}{2} \rfloor} \right] P_M(t) = 0.$$

The following Theorem describes how degeneracy is linked to  $Q_M(t)$ .

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let  $M$  be a matroid of rank  $r \neq 2$ . Then*

$$\left[ t^{\lfloor \frac{r-1}{2} \rfloor} \right] P_M(t) = \left[ t^{\lfloor \frac{r-1}{2} \rfloor} \right] Q_M(t),$$

that is, the coefficients of the highest possible degree coincide (possibly equal to zero).

*Proof.* In the case of  $r = 2k + 1$  this becomes a special case of Corollary 8.8 in [7]. We know that

$$\sum_F P_{M_F}(t) (-1)^{\text{rk } M_F} Q_{M_F}(t) = 0.$$

If  $F = \emptyset$  or  $F = E$  we get, respectively,  $P_M(t)$  and  $(-1)^{2k+1} Q_M(t) = -Q_M(t)$ . Let us show that no other term in the sum has degree  $k$ . If  $\emptyset \neq F \neq E$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \deg P_{M_F} Q_{M_F} &= \deg P_{M_F} + \deg Q_{M_F} \leq \left\lfloor \frac{\text{rk } F - 1}{2} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{r - \text{rk } F - 1}{2} \right\rfloor \\ &< \frac{r}{2} - 1 = k - \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$0 = [t^k] 0 = [t^k] (P_M(t) - Q_M(t)) = [t^k] P_M(t) - [t^k] Q_M(t).$$

In general, we prove it by induction on  $r = 2k$ , supposing the statement holds for every matroid of rank lower than  $r$ . Write

$$P_M(t) = - \sum_{F \neq \emptyset} (-1)^{\text{rk } M_F} Q_{M_F}(t) P_{M_F}(t)$$

and

$$Q_M(t) = - \sum_{F \neq \emptyset} (-1)^{\text{rk } M_F} P_{M_F}(t) Q_{M_F}(t).$$

Therefore,

$$[t^{k-1}]P_M(t) = - \sum_{F \neq \emptyset} (-1)^{\text{rk } M_F} [t^{k-1}]Q_{M_F}(t) P_{M_F}(t)$$

and similarly for  $[t^{k-1}]Q_M(t)$ . We know that  $\deg Q_{M_F} \leq \lfloor \frac{\text{rk } F - 1}{2} \rfloor$  and  $\deg P_{M_F} \leq \lfloor k - \frac{\text{rk } F + 1}{2} \rfloor$ , which means that

$$[t^{k-1}]Q_{M_F}(t)P_{M_F}(t) = \left[ t^{\lfloor \frac{\text{rk } F - 1}{2} \rfloor} \right] Q_{M_F}(t) \left[ t^{\lfloor k - \frac{\text{rk } F + 1}{2} \rfloor} \right] P_{M_F}(t).$$

Hence, by induction hypothesis, we get that

$$[t^{k-1}]Q_{M_F}(t)P_{M_F}(t) = [t^{k-1}]P_{M_F}(t)Q_{M_F}(t),$$

which, substituted back in the formula for  $[t^{k-1}]P_M(t)$  and  $[t^{k-1}]Q_M(t)$ , completes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 3.5.** The only rank for which Proposition 3.4 is not true is  $r = 2$ , because the maximal degree is 0 but Proposition 3.1 gives infinite counterexamples since  $[t^0]\chi_{U_{2,n}}(t) = n - 1$ . More specifically, the only rank-2 matroid for which the statement holds is the Boolean matroid  $B_2$ .

**Corollary 3.6.** *A matroid  $M$  is non-degenerate if and only if  $Q_M(t)$  has degree  $\lfloor \frac{r-1}{2} \rfloor$ .*

We now continue by investigating the behaviour of modular matroids with respect to their Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials. Proposition 2.14 in [4] gives the following condition on  $P_M(t)$  regarding the modularity of  $\mathcal{L}(M)$ .

**Proposition 3.7.** *The following conditions are equivalent*

- i)  $P_M(t) = 1$ ,
- ii)  $[t]P_M(t) = 0$ ,
- iii)  $\mathcal{L}(M)$  is modular.

In a sense then, modular matroids are the most degenerate ones and it should be clear by now why we are interested in studying them with regards to Conjecture 1.1. Let now  $\mathcal{L}$  be a geometric lattice and  $(\mathcal{L}^*, \leq^*) = (\mathcal{L}, \geq)$  its dual lattice. We want to prove a stronger result for modularity, which will then give both necessary and sufficient conditions on  $P_M(t)$  and  $Q_M(t)$ .

**Theorem 3.8.** *A geometric lattice  $\mathcal{L}$  is modular if and only if  $\chi_{\mathcal{L}} = \chi_{\mathcal{L}^*}$ .*

The proof of Theorem 3.8 requires the following Lemmas.

**Lemma 3.9.** *If  $\mathcal{L}$  is a combinatorial geometry, then there exists an injective correspondence between the set of atoms and the set of hyperplanes  $\mathcal{H}$*

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi : E &\rightarrow \mathcal{H} \\ i &\mapsto H_i \end{aligned}$$

such that  $i \notin H_i$ .

*Proof.* First of all we recall that  $|E| = W_1 \leq W_{r-1} = |\mathcal{H}|$ . We also observe that if  $i$  is a coloop there is only one possible choice, i.e.  $H_i = E \setminus i$ . By induction on  $n = W_1$ , if  $n = 1$ , then  $\mathcal{L} = B_1$  where the statement is trivial. If  $n = 2$  then  $\mathcal{L} = B_2$ , and  $\varphi$  swaps the two atoms. Suppose now we were able to assign  $H_1, \dots, H_{n-1}$ . Then, we just need to find  $H_n$  among the remaining unassigned ones (which exist by the previous remark on cardinality). If no hyperplane satisfies the property, since no atom belongs to every hyperplane there must exist another  $H_i$  (minimal with respect to the usual order on  $E$ ) that does not contain  $n$ . Now we have to find a new image for  $i$ : if we can find it among the unassigned hyperplanes we are done, otherwise we keep swapping places with the other  $H_j$ 's. The process has to end because none of the unassigned hyperplanes can contain all the atoms (that would imply that  $H = E$ ).  $\square$

**Remark 3.10.** The following statements are easy to check:

- i) If  $\mathcal{L}$  is modular,  $\varphi$  is a bijection.
- ii) If  $\mathcal{L} = B_n$ ,  $\varphi$  is unique.

**Lemma 3.11.** *If  $\mathcal{L}$  is modular,*

$$\mu(i, E) = \mu(\emptyset, H_i).$$


*Proof.* Since  $i \wedge H_i = \emptyset$  and  $i \vee H_i = E$ , by the Diamond isomorphism Theorem

$$[\emptyset, H_i] \cong [i, E],$$

hence valuations of the Moebius functions on the respective intervals coincide.  $\square$

Let us give some concrete examples of how the Lemmas work.

**Example 3.12.** Consider the following geometric lattice,




This is clearly not modular, since  $W_2 = 6 > 5 = W_1$ . However, we can still find a map  $\varphi$  assigning to each atom the first suitable hyperplane in lexicographic order. The ordered set of images is then  $(23, 13, 14, 125, 24)$ . Diamond isomorphism Theorem fails, (and Lemma 3.11 holds), since for example,  $[1, 12345] \cong U_{2,3}$  but  $[\emptyset, 23] \cong B_2$ . The characteristic polynomials of  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{L}^*$  are, respectively,

$$\chi_{\mathcal{L}}(t) = t^3 - 5t^2 + 8t - 4,$$

$$\chi_{\mathcal{L}^*}(t) = t^3 - 6t^2 + 9t - 4.$$

**Example 3.13.** Consider the following geometric lattice, where we omitted to draw the internal covering relations for more clarity.



If we set  $H_1 = 24567$  and  $H_2 = 14567$  (the first available in lexicographic order), we have no choice available for  $H_3$ . However, we can swap  $H_1$  to  $34567$  and set  $H_3 = 24567$ . This algorithm gives us the following ordered images  $(34567, 14567, 24567, 1235, 1234, 1237, 1236)$  and it is pretty straightforward to check that for each  $i$ ,  $M/i \cong M_{H_i}$ .

We are now ready to prove Theorem 3.8.

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\mathcal{L}$  is modular. For  $r = 1, 2$  the statement is trivially true. For a generic  $r$ , fix a  $\varphi$  as in Lemma 3.9. We claim that there is a unique bijection

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi : \mathcal{L} &\rightarrow \mathcal{L}, \\ F &\mapsto G \end{aligned}$$

where if  $F = \bigvee_j i_j$  is of rank  $k$ , then  $G = \bigwedge_j H_j$  is of rank  $r - k$ . Then, since  $F \wedge G = \emptyset$  and  $F \vee G = E$ , we conclude as in Lemma 3.11 that

$$\mu(\emptyset, F) = \mu(G, E) = \mu^*(E, G),$$

where the last equality holds since any sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}$  is still modular of a strictly lower rank. Then by summing on the correct flats we get the desired equality  $w_k = w_k^*$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $\mathcal{L}$  is not modular. Then,  $W_1 \neq W_{r-1}$ , but  $w_1 = -W_1$  and  $w_1^* = -W_{r-1}$ , so the coefficients of  $t^{r-1}$  are different in  $\chi_{\mathcal{L}}$  and  $\chi_{\mathcal{L}^*}$ .  $\square$

**Example 3.14.** Building on Example 3.13,

$$\varphi(123) = H_1 \wedge H_2 \wedge H_3 = 4567$$

and

$$\varphi(14) = H_1 \wedge H_4 = 35.$$

It turns out that modularity in matroids give very strict constraints regarding the structure of their lattice of flats.

**Theorem 3.15.** *A matroid  $M$  is modular if and only if it can be written as a sum of a Boolean matroid and rank-2 uniform matroids*

$$M = B_n \oplus \bigoplus_k U_{2, n_k}.$$



*Proof.* Such a sum is clearly modular since  $\rho$  is additive under the operation of direct sum and flats of a direct sum are disjoint unions of flats in the different components of  $M$ . Let us consider a modular matroid and prove this decomposition by induction on the rank  $r$ . If  $r = 1$ , then  $M = B_1$ . If  $r = 2$ , then  $M = U_{2,n}$  (where, in particular  $M = B_2$  for  $n = 2$ ). For a general  $r$ , consider a hyperplane  $H$ . Since a sublattice of a modular lattice is still modular, we can write

$$M_H = B_{n_1} \oplus \bigoplus_{k_1} U_{2,n_{k_1}},$$

where we want to stress that a coloop in  $M_H$  is not necessarily a coloop in  $M$ . Since every flat  $F$  has a complement  $G$  whose rank is necessarily  $r - \text{rk } F$  ([11]), we know that a complement for  $H$  is an atom  $i$  not belonging to  $H$ . If  $i$  is unique, it must be a coloop, hence the result by induction.

Otherwise, we can consider  $M$  without coloops,  $i_1$  and  $i_2$  two distinguished complements of  $H$  and set  $F = i_1 \vee i_2$ . We observe that  $F$  is a rank-2 flat that intersects  $H$ , because otherwise it would be a complement of  $H$  with an incorrect rank. For the same reason, every other atom not in  $H$  should belong to  $F$ . Using the modular equality for the ranks we observe that  $\rho(F \wedge H) = 1$  hence we can set  $F \wedge H = j$ . Clearly,  $F$  is connected and it contains at least three elements ( $i_1$ ,  $i_2$  and  $j$ ), thus it is of the form  $F = U_{2,n_F}$ .

Let us now show that  $j$  must be a coloop in  $M_H$ . If that were not the case, there would exist a component  $U_{2,n_j}$  of  $H$  such that  $j \in U_{2,n_j} \subseteq H$ ; however, that implies that  $U_{2,n_j} \vee F$  is a sublattice with  $(n_j - 1)(n_F - 1) + 2$  hyperplanes and  $n_j + n_F - 1$  atoms, which is not modular for  $n_j \neq 2$ . Moreover,  $M_H$  should have at most one coloop, in fact, suppose  $M_H = B_{n_1}$ ,  $n_1 \geq 2$ ; if  $G$  is the join of the atoms of  $H$  that do not belong to  $F$ , then  $G = B_{n_1-1}$  and  $\text{rho}(G) = r - 2 = n_1 - 1$ . Hence,  $G$  is a complement for  $F$  and is made of coloops of  $M$ . If instead all atoms of  $H$  belong to  $F \wedge H$ , then they were not coloops of  $M_H$  in the first place. Since we established that  $j$  is the unique coloop in  $H$ , we have already shown that  $F \vee j$  is of the form  $U_{2,n_F}$ , hence the result.  $\square$

**Example 3.16.** Consider Example 3.13. First of all, no hyperplane has exactly one complement. If we take the hyperplane  $H = 1234$ ,  $M_H$  is modular and can be decomposed as  $U_{2,3} \oplus B_1$ , where 4 is the unique coloop. If  $F = 5 \vee 6 = 4567$ , we can see that it contains both the unique coloop of  $M_H$  and the other complement of  $H$ , which is 7. This implies that  $M = U_{2,3} \oplus U_{2,4}$ . On the contrary, in Example 3.12 if we take  $H = 345 \cong U_{2,3}$  and  $F = 1 \vee 2 = 125 \cong U_{2,3}$ , since  $5 = F \wedge H$  is not a coloop in  $M_H$  we obtain that the number of hyperplanes of  $M = F \vee H$  is  $(3 - 1)(3 - 1) + 2 = 6$ , while its atoms are only 5.

**Corollary 3.17.** *For every matroid  $M$  with lattice of flats  $\mathcal{L}$  the following statement are equivalent:*

- $M$  is modular,
- $\chi_{\mathcal{L}} = \chi_{\mathcal{L}^*}$ ,
- $W_k = W_{r-k}$  for every  $k$ ,
- $P_M(t) = 1$ ,
- $Q_M(t) = w_r$ .

Theorem 3.15 also gives some partial answers regarding Conjecture 1.1. The most-tempting path in the search of a counterexample would be finding a connected modular matroid of rank greater than 3. However this path is not accessible since all the connected components in 3.15 have rank at most 2. We also see that connection in matroids of rank greater than 2 implies non-modularity. Hence, such a counterexample, if existing, must be a non-modular matroid of rank at least 5.

## References

- [1] T. Braden, J. Huh, J. Matherne, N. Proudfoot, B. Wang, Singular Hodge theory for combinatorial geometries. 2020. arXiv:2010.06088.
- [2] A. Gao, M. Xie, The inverse Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomial of a matroid. 2020. arXiv:2007.15349.
- [3] K. Gedeon, N. Proudfoot, B. Young. Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials of matroids: a survey of results and conjectures. 2017. *Sém. Lothar. Combin.*, 78B: Article 80.
- [4] B. Elias, N. Proudfoot, M. Wakefield, The Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomial of a matroid. 2016. *Advances in Mathematics* Volume 299, 20 August 2016, Pages 36-70.
- [5] J. Oxley, *Matroid Theory*. 2011. Oxford University Press. New York, USA.
- [6] P. Polo, Construction of arbitrary Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials in symmetric groups. 1999. *Represent. Theory* 3, 90-104 (electronic).
- [7] R. Stanley, Subdivisions and Local h-vectors. 1992. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, Oct. 1992, Vol.5, N0 4, pp. 805-851.
- [8] M. Stern, Dually atomistic lattices. 1991. *Discrete Mathematics*, Volume 93, Issue 1, Pages 97-100.
- [9] N. White, *Combinatorial Geometries*. 1987. *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [10] D. Kazhdan, G. Lusztig, Representations of Coxeter groups and Hecke algebras. 1979. *Invent. Math.*, 53(2): 165-184.
- [11] R. Stanley, Modular elements of geometric lattices. 1971. *Algebra Univ.* 1, 214-217.
- [12] G. Birkhoff, Abstract linear dependences in lattices. 1935. *Amer. J.Math* 57, 800-804.