

ON NEARLY GORENSTEIN AFFINE SEMIGROUPS

RAHELEH JAFARI, FRANCESCO STRAZZANTI, AND SANTIAGO ZARZUELA ARMENGOU

ABSTRACT. We describe the canonical module of a simplicial affine semigroup ring $\mathbb{K}[S]$ and its trace ideal. As a consequence, we characterize when $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is nearly Gorenstein in terms of arithmetic properties of the semigroup S . Then, we find some bounds for the Cohen-Macaulay type of $\mathbb{K}[S]$ when it is nearly Gorenstein. In particular, if it has codimension at most three, we prove that the Cohen-Macaulay type is at most three and this bound is sharp.

INTRODUCTION

The notion of nearly Gorenstein ring appeared several times in literature as a generalization of Gorenstein rings, even if this name was introduced later in [11], see for instance [4, 13, 21]. Indeed, only in 2019, with the work of Herzog, Hibi, and Stamate [11], a systematic study of these rings has begun. Since then, many authors have studied this notion in several contexts like numerical semigroup rings [12, 18], projective monomial curves [16], Ehrhart rings [9], and quotient singularities [1] among others. The idea behind nearly Gorenstein rings relies on the fact that the trace ideal of the canonical module of a ring determines its non-Gorenstein locus. More precisely, let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be a Cohen-Macaulay local ring (or a positively graded \mathbb{K} -algebra) admitting canonical module ω_R , and define the trace ideal of ω_R as the ideal

$$\mathrm{tr}(\omega_R) = \sum_{\varphi \in \mathrm{Hom}_R(\omega_R, R)} \varphi(\omega_R).$$

Given a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{Spec}(R)$, the ring $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is not Gorenstein if and only if $\mathrm{tr}(\omega_R) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$, see [11, Lemma 2.1]. Therefore, R is Gorenstein if and only if $\mathrm{tr}(\omega_R) = R$. The ring R is said to be nearly Gorenstein if $\mathrm{tr}(\omega_R)$ contains the maximal (homogeneous) ideal \mathfrak{m} of R , i.e., if $\mathrm{tr}(\omega_R)$ is equal to either R or \mathfrak{m} . It is clear that a nearly Gorenstein ring is Gorenstein in the punctured spectrum, but the converse is not true; indeed, R is Gorenstein on the punctured spectrum if and only if $\mathrm{tr}(\omega_R)$ is an \mathfrak{m} -primary ideal.

In this paper we are interested in the nearly Gorenstein affine semigroup rings, and especially in their Cohen-Macaulay type, which we call only type for brevity. An affine semigroup S is an additive submonoid of \mathbb{N}^d for some positive integer d . We assume that S is simplicial and fully embedded in \mathbb{N}^d . Its associated affine semigroup ring is the subalgebra of the polynomial ring $\mathbb{K}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d]$ given by $\mathbb{K}[S] = \mathbb{K}[x_1^{a_1} x_2^{a_2} \cdots x_d^{a_d} : (a_1, \dots, a_d) \in S]$, where \mathbb{K} is a field. The case $d = 1$ corresponds (up to isomorphism) to the case of numerical semigroup rings, where the nearly Gorenstein property has been more studied. In this case, if $\mathbb{K}[S]$ has embedding dimension at

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20M25, 05E40, 13H10.

Key words and phrases. Nearly Gorenstein ring, Affine semigroup ring, Type, Canonical module, Trace ideal, Quasi-Frobenius element.

The authors received partial support from the grant PID2022-137283NB-C22 funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033. The second author is a member of the “National Group for Algebraic and Geometric Structures, and their Applications” (GNSAGA - INdAM).

most 3, it is well known that the type of $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is at most 2 [10]. Moreover, if $\mathbb{K}[S]$ has embedding dimension 4 and is nearly Gorenstein, then in [18] it is proved that its type is at most 3.

More generally, for any d , when the embedding dimension of $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is at most $d + 2$, in [15] it is shown that the type of $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is at most 2. In this paper we focus on nearly Gorenstein affine semigroup rings with embedding dimension $d + 3$ and prove that their type is at most 3. Notice that without assuming that $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is nearly Gorenstein, the type is not bounded, even when $d = 1$. Moreover, even in the numerical semigroup case, it is not known if the type of a nearly Gorenstein ring with fixed embedding dimension is bounded, see [20, Question 3.7].

We also prove that, regardless of the embedding dimension, in the nearly Gorenstein case the type is at least d if the ring is not Gorenstein. The starting point to prove these results is the descriptions of the canonical module and its trace ideal in terms of the maximal elements of an Apéry set of S with respect to a suitable order.

The structure of the paper is the following. In the first section, after recalling some definitions and some results, we characterize the canonical module of an affine semigroup ring and its trace ideal, see Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 1.5 respectively. Among the consequences of these results, there is also a characterization of affine semigroup rings that are nearly Gorenstein or Gorenstein on the punctured spectrum, see Corollary 1.6 and Proposition 1.12. In Section 2 we focus on nearly Gorenstein rings $\mathbb{K}[S]$ and their type. For instance, if $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is not Gorenstein, in Corollary 2.4 we prove that its type is at least d . Finally, Section 3 is devoted to prove that if $\mathbb{K}[S]$ has embedding dimension $d + 3$, then its type is at most 3, see Theorem 3.9. Both these bounds are sharp, indeed every possible value among these bounds can be obtained.

Several computations are performed by using Macaulay2 [8], the GAP system [6] and, in particular, the NumericalSgps package [3].

1. THE CANONICAL MODULE AND ITS TRACE

Throughout the paper, $S = \langle \mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{d+r} \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$ will be a simplicial and fully embedded affine semigroup with extremal rays $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_d$. This means that the vectors $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_d$ are linearly independent and for each element $\mathbf{a} \in S$, we have $n\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{N}\mathbf{a}_1 + \dots + \mathbb{N}\mathbf{a}_d$, for some positive integer n . Equivalently

$$S \subseteq \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0} \mathbf{a}_i.$$

Moreover, we assume that \mathbf{a}_i is the smallest generator in its extremal ray for every $i = 1, \dots, d$, i.e., if there is another generator \mathbf{a}_j of S for which $\mathbf{a}_j = q\mathbf{a}_i$ for some non-zero $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, then $q > 1$.

We write $\text{group}(S)$ for the smallest group (up to isomorphism) that contains S , $\text{group}(S) = \{\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b} \mid \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in S\}$. Given two sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$, we write $A + B$ for the set $\{\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b} \mid \mathbf{a} \in A, \mathbf{b} \in B\}$. If $A = \{\mathbf{a}\}$, we simply write $\mathbf{a} + B$, instead of $\{\mathbf{a}\} + B$. A subset $H \subseteq \text{group}(S)$ is called S -ideal of $\text{group}(S)$, if $S + H \subseteq H$. When $H \subseteq S$, we simply say that H is an ideal of S .

Let $R = \mathbb{K}[S]$ be the semigroup ring associated to S . A monomial in the semigroup ring R is an element of the form $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}} = x_1^{a_1} x_2^{a_2} \dots x_d^{a_d}$, where $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_d) \in S$. An ideal $I \subseteq R$ is a monomial ideal if it is generated by monomials. For any subset H of S , let $\mathbb{K}[H]$ denote the \mathbb{K} -linear span of the monomials $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}$ with $\mathbf{a} \in H$. Then, I is a monomial ideal if and only if $I = \mathbb{K}[H]$ for some ideal H of S , or equivalently, if I is homogeneous with respect to the tautological grading on R , which is defined by $\deg(\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}) = \mathbf{a}$. Note that $\mathfrak{m} = \mathbb{K}[M]$, where $M = S \setminus \{0\}$, is the unique monomial maximal ideal of R . Given a monomial fractional ideal I of R , let H be the set of exponents of monomials in I and let $I^{-1} = \{x \in Q(R) \mid xI \subseteq R\}$, where $Q(R)$ is the field of fractions of R , and $H^{-1} = \{\mathbf{z} \in \text{group}(S) \mid \mathbf{z} + H \subseteq S\}$. Then, $I = \mathbb{K}[H]$ and $I^{-1} = \mathbb{K}[H^{-1}]$.

The *Apéry set* of S with respect to an element $\mathbf{b} \in S$ is defined as $\text{Ap}(S, \mathbf{b}) = \{\mathbf{a} \in S ; \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b} \notin S\}$. We will denote the zero vector of \mathbb{N}^d by $\mathbf{0}$. Since $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$, for $\mathbf{b} \neq \mathbf{0}$ we have $\mathbf{0} \in \text{Ap}(S, \mathbf{b})$. For a subset A , we set $\text{Ap}(S, A) = \{\mathbf{a} \in S ; \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b} \notin S, \text{ for all } \mathbf{b} \in A\}$. Let $E = \{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_d\}$ and let l_i be the smallest positive integer such that $l_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i} \in \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbf{a}_j$, for $i = 1, \dots, r$. Then

$$\text{Ap}(S, E) = \bigcap_{i=1}^d \text{Ap}(S, \mathbf{a}_i) \subseteq \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^r n_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i} ; 0 \leq n_i < l_i \right\},$$

is a finite set. We consider the natural partial ordering \preceq_S on S where, for all elements \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} in \mathbb{N}^d , $\mathbf{b} \preceq_S \mathbf{a}$ if there is an element $\mathbf{c} \in S$ such that $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c}$.

Given $\mathbf{b} \in \max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E)$, the element $\mathbf{b} - \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbf{a}_i$ is said to be a *quasi-Frobenius element* and the set of quasi-Frobenius elements of S is denoted by $\text{QF}(S)$, see [15, Defenition 3.1]. If R is Cohen-Macaulay, then the number of quasi-Frobenius elements is equal to the Cohen-Macaulay type of R , [15, Proposition 3.3]. We denote this number by $\text{type}(S)$ and refer to it as the *type* of the semigroup S .

When R is Cohen-Macaulay, a finite graded R -module C is a canonical module of R if there exist homogeneous isomorphisms

$$\text{Ext}_R^i(R/\mathfrak{m}, C) \cong \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } i \neq d, \\ R/\mathfrak{m} & \text{for } i = d. \end{cases}$$

It is unique up to isomorphism and R is Gorenstein exactly when it is a canonical module of itself.

Let $F_i = (\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^d \mathbb{Q}_+ \mathbf{a}_j) \cap S$, and let

$$G_i = \{\mathbf{b} \in \text{group}(S) : \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{a} \in S \text{ for some } \mathbf{a} \in F_i\}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, d$. Let $C_S = -(\cap_{i=1}^d C_i)$, where $C_i = \text{group}(S) \setminus G_i$. If R is Cohen-Macaulay, then $\mathbb{K}[C_S]$ is the canonical module of R by [7, Theorem 3.8]. Let

$$\omega_S = \{-\mathbf{f} : \mathbf{f} \in \text{QF}(S)\} + S \cong \{-\mathbf{m} : \mathbf{m} \in \max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E)\} + S.$$

In [5, Definition 3.6], the authors define the graded canonical module of $\mathbb{K}[S]$ to be $\mathbb{K}[\omega_S]$ and show that in several aspects this definition is consistent with the canonical module as generally defined. In the following we prove that this definition coincide with the abstract definition of a canonical module.

Theorem 1.1. *If R is Cohen-Macaulay, then $\mathbb{K}[\omega_S]$ is a canonical module of R .*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{m} \in \max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E)$. First, we show that $\mathbf{m} - \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbf{a}_i \notin G_i$, for $i = 1, \dots, d$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $i = 1$. If $\mathbf{m} - \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbf{a}_i \in G_1$, then $\mathbf{m} - \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbf{a}_i + \mathbf{a} \in S$, for some $\mathbf{a} = \sum_{i=2}^d \lambda_i \mathbf{a}_i \in S$, where $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{Q}_+$, for $i = 2, \dots, d$. Let l be a positive integer such that $l\lambda_i \in \mathbb{N}$, for $i = 2, \dots, d$. Then $(l-1)\mathbf{a} \in S$, and so

$$\mathbf{m} - \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbf{a}_i + l\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{m} - \mathbf{a}_1 + \sum_{i=2}^d (l\lambda_i - 1)\mathbf{a}_i \in S.$$

Let $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{m} + \sum_{i=2}^d (l\lambda_i - 1)\mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{h}$, for some $\mathbf{h} \in S$. Since $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Ap}(S, \mathbf{a}_1)$, we have $l\lambda_j \neq 1$, for some $j = 2, \dots, d$. Since $\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{a}_1 \in \text{group}(S)$, if $l\lambda_i - 1$ and $l\lambda_j - 1$ are positive for some $i \neq j$, then $\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{a}_1 \in S$, by [7, Theorem 2.6], a contradiction. Therefore, $\sum_{i=2}^d (l\lambda_i - 1)\mathbf{a}_i = (l\lambda_j - 1)\mathbf{a}_j$. Let $\alpha = l\lambda_j - 1$. Then

$$\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{m} + \alpha \mathbf{a}_j = \mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{h},$$

and [19, Theorem 1.1] implies that $\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{a}_j - \mathbf{a}_1 = \mathbf{m} - \mathbf{a}_1 + (\alpha - 1)\mathbf{a}_j \in S$. Applying [19, Theorem 1.1], for $\alpha - 1$ times, we get $\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{a}_1 \in S$, a contradiction.

Hence $\mathbf{m} - \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbf{a}_j \in \cap_{i=1}^d C_i$, and consequently, $\mathbf{x}^{-\mathbf{f}}$ belong to the canonical module of R for every $\mathbf{f} \in \text{QF}(S)$ by [7, Theorem 3.8].

Note that the embedding dimension of the canonical module of R is equal to Cohen-Macaulay type of R which is $|\text{QF}(S)|$, by [15, Proposition 3.3]. Therefore, it is enough to show that $\mathbf{x}^{-\mathbf{f}}$ cannot be generated by any other elements of $\mathbb{K}[-\cap_{i=1}^d C_j]$, for $f \in \text{QF}(S)$. Assume by contradiction that $\mathbf{x}^{-\mathbf{f}} = \mathbf{x}^{-\mathbf{c}}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{s}}$, for some $\mathbf{c} \in \cap_{i=1}^d C_i$ and $s \in S$. Then $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{f} + \mathbf{s}$. Let $f = \mathbf{m} - \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbf{a}_i$. Because of the maximality of \mathbf{m} , $\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{s} - \mathbf{a}_k \in S$, for some k , $1 \leq k \leq d$. It follows that $\mathbf{c} + \sum_{i=1, i \neq k}^d \mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{f} + \mathbf{s} + \sum_{i=1, i \neq k}^d \mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{m} + \mathbf{s} - \mathbf{a}_k \in S$, and so $\mathbf{c} \in G_i = \text{group}(S) \setminus C_i$, a contradiction. \square

We always denote the canonical module of R by ω_R . For an R -module N , its *trace*, denoted by $\text{tr}(N)$, is the sum of the ideals $\varphi(N)$ with $\varphi \in \text{Hom}_R(N, R)$. Thus, $\text{tr}(N) = \sum_{\varphi \in \text{Hom}_R(N, R)} \varphi(N)$. If $N_1 \cong N_2$, then $\text{tr}(N_1) = \text{tr}(N_2)$, so while the canonical module ω_R is unique up to isomorphism, its trace is unique. By [11, Lemma 1.1],

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(\omega_R) &= \omega_R \cdot (\omega_R)^{-1} \\ &= \mathbb{K}[\omega_S] \cdot \mathbb{K}[(\omega_S)^{-1}] \\ &= \mathbb{K}[\omega_S + \omega_S^{-1}]. \end{aligned}$$

We define the trace of S , to be the ideal $\text{tr}(S) \subseteq S$ consisting of the exponents of monomials in $\text{tr}(\omega_R)$. Then

$$\text{tr}(S) = \omega_S + \omega_S^{-1}.$$

If $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is Cohen-Macaulay, it is well known that $\text{tr}(S) = S$ if and only if $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is a Gorenstein ring. Moreover, the following result holds:

Proposition 1.2. [11, Lemma 2.1] *Let A be a Cohen-Macaulay finitely generated positively graded \mathbb{K} -algebra, where \mathbb{K} is a field. For a prime ideal \mathfrak{p} of A , the ring $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is not a Gorenstein ring if and only if $\text{tr}(\omega_A) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$.*

The following notion arises from these observations.

Definition 1.3. Assume that A is a Cohen-Macaulay finitely generated positively graded \mathbb{K} -algebra, where \mathbb{K} is a field. Let \mathbf{m} be the graded maximal ideal of A and ω_A a canonical module of A . Then, A is *nearly Gorenstein* if $\mathbf{m} \subseteq \text{tr}(\omega_A)$.

Definition 1.4. Assume that $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is Cohen-Macaulay. We say that S is *nearly Gorenstein* if $M \subseteq \text{tr}(S)$, where $M = \langle \mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{d+r} \rangle$ is the maximal ideal of S . This is equivalent to require that $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is nearly Gorenstein.

We can give a description of the elements of $\text{tr}(S)$, which will yield a characterization of the nearly Gorenstein property.

Proposition 1.5. *Let $\max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E) = \{\mathbf{m}_1, \dots, \mathbf{m}_t\}$. Then*

$$\text{tr}(S) = \{\mathbf{b} \in S ; \text{ there exists } 1 \leq i \leq t \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{m}_i - \mathbf{m}_j \in S \text{ for all } j = 1, \dots, t\}.$$

Proof. Let Γ be the set on the right side. Given $\mathbf{b} \in \Gamma$, there is $1 \leq i \leq t$ such that $\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{m}_i - \mathbf{m}_j \in S$ for all $j = 1, \dots, t$. Thus, $\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{m}_i - \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbf{a}_d \in \omega_S^{-1}$ and $\mathbf{b} = -(\mathbf{m}_i - \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbf{a}_d) + \mathbf{m}_i - \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbf{a}_d + \mathbf{b} \in \text{tr}(S)$.

Now let $\mathbf{a} \in \text{tr}(S)$, so there exist $\mathbf{b}_1 \in \omega_S$ and $\mathbf{b}_2 \in \omega_S^{-1}$ such that $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b}_1 + \mathbf{b}_2$. Since $\mathbf{b}_1 \in \omega_S$, we have $\mathbf{b}_1 = -(\mathbf{m}_i - \sum_{d=1}^d \mathbf{a}_d) + \mathbf{s}$ for some $\mathbf{s} \in S$ and $1 \leq i \leq t$. Since $\mathbf{b}_2 \in \omega_S^{-1}$, we have $\mathbf{b}_2 - (\mathbf{m}_j - \sum_{d=1}^d \mathbf{a}_d) \in S$ for every $j = 1, \dots, t$. Therefore

$$\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{m}_i - \mathbf{m}_j = \mathbf{b}_1 + \mathbf{b}_2 + \mathbf{m}_i - \mathbf{m}_j = \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{b}_2 - (\mathbf{m}_j - \sum_{d=1}^d \mathbf{a}_d) \in S.$$

Hence, $\text{tr}(S) \subseteq \Gamma$. \square

The following corollary is a generalization of [18, Proposition 1.1], which was proved in the case $d = 1$.

Corollary 1.6. *Assume that $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is Cohen-Macaulay and let $\max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E) = \{\mathbf{m}_1, \dots, \mathbf{m}_t\}$. Then, S is nearly Gorenstein if and only if for each $i = 1, \dots, d+r$ there exists $\mathbf{m} \in \max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E)$ such that $\mathbf{a}_i + \mathbf{m} - \mathbf{m}_j \in S$ for each $j = 1, \dots, t$.*

Remark 1.7. If S has type 2 and $\max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E) = \{\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2\}$, then

$$\text{tr}(S) = \{\mathbf{b} \in S ; \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{m}_1 - \mathbf{m}_2 \in S \text{ or } \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{m}_2 - \mathbf{m}_1 \in S\}.$$

In particular, we always have $\{\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2\} \subseteq \text{tr}(S)$.

In the previous results we have assumed that $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is Cohen-Macaulay. However, this property can be read off from the semigroup S , as the next result shows. We denote with $\text{group}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_d)$ the group generated by $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_d$, i.e., $\text{group}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_d) = \text{group}(\langle \mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_d \rangle)$.

Proposition 1.8. [19, Theorem 1.5 and Corollary 1.6] *The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is Cohen-Macaulay;
- (2) For all $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2 \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$, if $\mathbf{w}_1 - \mathbf{w}_2 \in \text{group}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_d)$, then $\mathbf{w}_1 = \mathbf{w}_2$;
- (3) For all $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2 \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$, if $\mathbf{w}_1 + \sum_{i=1}^d l_i \mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{w}_2 + \sum_{i=1}^d l'_i \mathbf{a}_i$ with $l_i, l'_i \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\mathbf{w}_1 = \mathbf{w}_2$ and $l_i = l'_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, d$.

We now start to explore some consequences of Proposition 1.5.

Proposition 1.9. *Assume that $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is Cohen-Macaulay. If there is an hyperplane containing all the generators $\mathbf{a}_{d+1}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{d+r}$ and the origin of coordinates, then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_d \in \text{tr}(S)$;
- (2) $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is Gorenstein;
- (3) $\text{tr}(S) = S$;
- (4) S is nearly Gorenstein.

Proof. Let \mathbb{D} denote the $(d-1)$ -dimensional space that contains $\mathbf{a}_{d+1}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{d+r}$ and the origin of coordinates. Note that all the elements of $\text{Ap}(S, E)$ are on \mathbb{D} and at least one extremal ray \mathbf{a}_i , does not belong to this hyperplane. By Proposition 1.5, there exists $T(\mathbf{a}_i) \in \max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E)$ such that $\mathbf{a}_i + T(\mathbf{a}_i) - \mathbf{m} \in S$ for every $\mathbf{m} \in \max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E)$.

(1) \implies (2) Assume that $\text{type}(S) > 1$ and consider $\mathbf{m} \in \max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E) \setminus \{T(\mathbf{a}_i)\}$. As \mathbf{a}_i is not on \mathbb{D} , we have $T(\mathbf{a}_i) + \mathbf{a}_i - \mathbf{m} \notin \text{Ap}(S, E)$ and then there exist \mathbf{a}_j with $1 \leq j \leq d$ and $s \in S$ such that $\mathbf{a}_i + T(\mathbf{a}_i) - \mathbf{m} = \mathbf{a}_j + s$. Writing $\mathbf{m} + s = \sum_{k=1}^d l_k \mathbf{a}_k + \mathbf{n}$ for some $l_k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{n} \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$, we get $\mathbf{a}_i + T(\mathbf{a}_i) = \mathbf{a}_j + \sum_{k=1}^d l_k \mathbf{a}_k + \mathbf{n}$. By Proposition 1.8, $\sum_{k=1}^d l_k \mathbf{a}_k = 0$ and $i = j$, so that $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{n} = T(\mathbf{a}_i)$, which is a contradiction.

(2) \implies (3), (3) \implies (4), and (4) \implies (1) are clear. \square

The same proof of the previous proposition gives the following result that we will repeatedly use in the next sections.

Corollary 1.10. *Let $\mathbb{K}[S]$ be Cohen-Macaulay. If all the generators $\mathbf{a}_{d+1}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{d+r}$ are on the same line passing through the origin of coordinates, then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) $\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{a}_j \in \text{tr}(S)$ for some $1 \leq i < j \leq d$;
- (2) $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is Gorenstein;
- (3) $\text{tr}(S) = S$;
- (4) S is nearly Gorenstein.

Given $\mathbf{w} \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$, we say that \mathbf{w} has a *unique expression* if it can be written as $\mathbf{w} = \sum_{i=1}^r l_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i}$ with $l_i \in \mathbb{N}$ in a unique way.

Corollary 1.11. *Assume that $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is Cohen-Macaulay and that S has embedding dimension $2d$. If $E \subseteq \text{tr}(S) \subseteq M$, then the non-extremal generators $\mathbf{a}_{d+1}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{2d}$ are linearly independent. In particular, each element of $\text{Ap}(S, E)$ has a unique expression.*

Proof. Note that the cone generated by $\mathbf{a}_{d+1}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{2d}$ is a d dimensional space by Proposition 1.9. This means that there is no relation between them, in particular all the elements in $\text{Ap}(S, E)$ have unique expressions. \square

We end this section by characterizing when $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is Gorenstein on the punctured spectrum. This result generalizes [14, Corollary 3.4].

Proposition 1.12. *Assume that $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is Cohen-Macaulay. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is Gorenstein on the punctured spectrum;
- (2) $\lambda_1 \mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \lambda_d \mathbf{a}_d \in \text{tr}(S)$ for some $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d \in \mathbb{N}$;
- (3) There exist $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \leq r_1, \dots, r_d \leq t$ such that $\lambda_i \mathbf{a}_i + \mathbf{m}_{r_i} - \mathbf{m}_j \in S$ for all $1 \leq j \leq t$;
- (4) For any $1 \leq i \leq d$, there exist $\mathbf{w}_i \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$ and $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\mathbf{w} \preceq \mathbf{w}_i + \lambda_i \mathbf{a}_i,$$

for all $\mathbf{w} \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$.

Proof. (1) \implies (2) It follows by Proposition 1.2 and the fact that $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}_1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}_d}$ provide a system of parameters for $\mathbb{K}[S]$.

(2) \implies (3) It follows by Proposition 1.5.

(3) \implies (4) This is clear.

(4) \implies (1) Let $\mathbf{w}_i \preceq_S \mathbf{m}_{r_i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, d$. As $\mathbf{m}_{r_i} \preceq \mathbf{w}_i + \lambda_i \mathbf{a}_i$, we get $\mathbf{w}_i = \mathbf{m}_{r_i}$. Therefore, $\lambda_i \mathbf{a}_i \in \text{tr}(S)$ by Proposition 1.5. Since $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}_1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}_d}$ provide a system of parameters, it follows that $\text{tr}(\omega_R)$ is an \mathbf{m} -primary ideal. Now, Proposition 1.2 implies (1). \square

By Proposition 1.2, it is clear that a nearly Gorenstein ring is Gorenstein on the punctured spectrum. However, the converse is false, even for affine semigroup rings.

Example 1.13. Let S be the semigroup generated by $\mathbf{a}_1 = (6, 0), \mathbf{a}_2 = (0, 6), \mathbf{a}_3 = (2, 1), \mathbf{a}_4 = (1, 2)$. In this case $\text{Ap}(S, E) = \{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{a}_3, 2\mathbf{a}_3, 3\mathbf{a}_3, \mathbf{a}_4, 2\mathbf{a}_4, 3\mathbf{a}_4, \mathbf{m}_1 = 3\mathbf{a}_3 + \mathbf{a}_4, \mathbf{m}_2 = \mathbf{a}_3 + 3\mathbf{a}_4\}$ and by Proposition 1.8 one can see that $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is Cohen-Macaulay. Moreover, we have that $\mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{m}_2 - \mathbf{m}_1 = 2\mathbf{a}_3$ and $\mathbf{a}_2 + \mathbf{m}_1 - \mathbf{m}_2 = 2\mathbf{a}_4$ belong to S , whereas a simple computation shows that $S \setminus \text{tr}(S) = \{0, \mathbf{a}_3, \mathbf{a}_4, \mathbf{a}_3 + \mathbf{a}_4\}$. Therefore, $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is Gorenstein on the punctured spectrum, but not nearly Gorenstein.

2. NEARLY GORENSTEIN AFFINE SEMIGROUPS

In this section we focus on nearly Gorenstein affine semigroups and their type. As in the previous section, S will always be a simplicial affine semigroup fully embedded in \mathbb{N}^d and minimally generated by $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{d+r}$, whose extremal rays are $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_d$. Recall that S is nearly Gorenstein if $\mathbf{a}_i \in \text{tr}(S)$ for every $i = 1, \dots, d+r$. Moreover, by Proposition 1.5, $\mathbf{a}_i \in \text{tr}(S)$ exactly when there exists $\mathbf{m} \in \max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E)$ such that $\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{a}_i - \mathbf{n} \in S$ for all $\mathbf{n} \in \max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E)$. In the following lemma we show that if this happens for an extremal ray, then \mathbf{m} is unique.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\mathbf{a}_i \in \text{tr}(S)$ for some $1 \leq i \leq d$. Then, there exists a unique $\mathbf{m} \in \max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E)$ such that $\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{a}_i - \mathbf{n} \in S$ for all $\mathbf{n} \in \max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E)$.*

Proof. Assume contrary that there are two maximal elements \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} with this property. Then

$$\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{n} + \mathbf{w}, \quad \mathbf{n} + \mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{m} + \mathbf{w}'$$

for some $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}' \in S$. Thus

$$\mathbf{m} + 2\mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{n} + \mathbf{a}_i + \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{m} + \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{w}',$$

which implies that $2\mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{w}'$. As \mathbf{a}_i is on an extremal ray of the cone generated by S , it follows that $\mathbf{w} = l\mathbf{a}_i$ and $\mathbf{w}' = l'\mathbf{a}_i$ for some $l, l' \in \mathbb{Q}$ with $l + l' = 2$. Thus, either $l \leq 1$ or $l' \leq 1$. Since \mathbf{a}_i is the smallest element on this extremal ray, we have $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{a}_i$ and $\mathbf{w}' = \mathbf{a}_i$ and consequently $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{n}$. \square

Example 2.2. In the previous lemma we need that \mathbf{a}_i is the smallest element in its extremal ray, otherwise the statement is false. For instance, let S be the semigroup generated by $\mathbf{a}_1 = (2, 0)$, $\mathbf{a}_2 = (0, 2)$, $\mathbf{a}_3 = (0, 3)$, $\mathbf{a}_4 = (1, 1)$, $\mathbf{a}_5 = (1, 2)$. We have $\max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E) = \{\mathbf{m}_1 = (1, 1), \mathbf{m}_2 = (1, 2), \mathbf{m}_3 = (0, 3)\}$ and

$$\begin{array}{llll} \mathbf{m}_3 + \mathbf{a}_1 - \mathbf{m}_1 \in S & \mathbf{m}_3 + \mathbf{a}_1 - \mathbf{m}_2 \in S & \mathbf{m}_1 + \mathbf{a}_1 - \mathbf{m}_2 \notin S & \mathbf{m}_2 + \mathbf{a}_1 - \mathbf{m}_3 \notin S, \\ \mathbf{m}_2 + \mathbf{a}_2 - \mathbf{m}_1 \in S & \mathbf{m}_2 + \mathbf{a}_2 - \mathbf{m}_3 \in S & \mathbf{m}_1 + \mathbf{a}_2 - \mathbf{m}_2 \notin S & \mathbf{m}_3 + \mathbf{a}_2 - \mathbf{m}_1 \notin S. \end{array}$$

Therefore, as we proved in the previous lemma, for $i = 1, 2$ there is only one $\mathbf{m} \in \max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E)$ for which $\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{a}_i - \mathbf{n} \in S$ for all $\mathbf{n} \in \max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E)$. However, this is not true for \mathbf{a}_3 , even though it is in the same line of \mathbf{a}_2 . Indeed, both \mathbf{m}_1 and \mathbf{m}_2 work for \mathbf{a}_3 .

Using Proposition 1.5 and Proposition 1.8, it is not difficult to see that S is nearly Gorenstein. Moreover, also for \mathbf{a}_4 and \mathbf{a}_5 there are two maximal elements of $\text{Ap}(S, E)$ for which the equalities above hold.

Throughout the paper, $T(\mathbf{a}_i)$ will denote the unique maximal Apéry element assigned to \mathbf{a}_i in Lemma 2.1 for $i = 1, \dots, d$.

Proposition 2.3. *Let $\mathbb{K}[S]$ be Cohen-Macaulay with $\text{type}(S) \geq 2$. If $1 \leq r < s \leq d$, then $T(\mathbf{a}_r) \neq T(\mathbf{a}_s)$.*

Proof. Assume on the contrary that $T(\mathbf{a}_r) = T(\mathbf{a}_s)$ and set $\mathbf{m} = T(\mathbf{a}_r) = T(\mathbf{a}_s)$. Since $\text{type}(S) \geq 2$, we may choose $\mathbf{n} \in \max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E) \setminus \{\mathbf{m}\}$. Then $\mathbf{b}_r = \mathbf{m} + \mathbf{a}_r - \mathbf{n}$ and $\mathbf{b}_s = \mathbf{m} + \mathbf{a}_s - \mathbf{n}$ belong to S . Let $\mathbf{b}_r = \mathbf{w}_r + \sum_{i=1}^d l_i \mathbf{a}_i$ and $\mathbf{b}_s = \mathbf{w}_s + \sum_{i=1}^d l'_i \mathbf{a}_i$, where $\mathbf{w}_r, \mathbf{w}_s \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$. Note that

$$\mathbf{b}_r - \mathbf{b}_s = \mathbf{w}_r - \mathbf{w}_s + \sum_{i=1}^d (l_i - l'_i) \mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{a}_r - \mathbf{a}_s.$$

Since S is Cohen-Macaulay, Proposition 1.8 implies that $\mathbf{w}_r = \mathbf{w}_s$ and $\sum_{i=1}^d l_i \mathbf{a}_i + \mathbf{a}_s = \sum_{i=1}^d l'_i \mathbf{a}_i + \mathbf{a}_r$. Since $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_d$ are linearly independent, $l_r = l'_r + 1 > 0$. As $\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{n} + \mathbf{a}_r = \mathbf{w}_r + \sum_{i=1}^d l_i \mathbf{a}_i$, we get $\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{w}_r + \sum_{i \neq r} l_i \mathbf{a}_i + (l_r - 1) \mathbf{a}_r \in S$, which is a contradiction. \square

As a consequence, if S is nearly Gorenstein and $\text{type}(S) \geq 2$, then there exists at least d different maximal elements in $\text{Ap}(S, E)$.

Corollary 2.4. *If S is nearly Gorenstein but not Gorenstein, then $\text{type}(S) \geq d$.*

Example 2.5. The bound in the previous corollary is sharp. For instance, let S be the semigroup generated by $\mathbf{a}_1 = (0, 3)$, $\mathbf{a}_2 = (3, 1)$, $\mathbf{a}_3 = (1, 2)$, $\mathbf{a}_4 = (2, 2)$, $\mathbf{a}_5 = (3, 3)$. In this case $\text{type}(S) = 2 = d$ because $\max_{\leq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E) = \{(5, 7), (6, 6)\}$. By Proposition 1.8, $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is Cohen-Macaulay. Moreover, by applying Remark 1.7, it is straightforward to see that all the generators are in $\text{tr}(S)$, and then S is nearly Gorenstein.

We have already seen that being $\mathbb{K}[S]$ Gorenstein on the punctured spectrum does not imply that $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is nearly Gorenstein. Notice that this happens even if $\text{type}(S) = d$, indeed in Example 1.13 we have $\text{type}(S) = d = 2$.

We can also say something about the embedding dimension of a nearly Gorenstein semigroup, but we first need a technical lemma.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $\mathbb{K}[S]$ be Cohen-Macaulay, $\mathbf{m} \in \max_{\leq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E)$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$ such that $\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{m} + \sum_{t=1}^r l_t \mathbf{a}_{d+t}$ for some $1 \leq i \leq d$ and $l_1, \dots, l_r \in \mathbb{N}$. If $l_j \neq 0$, then $\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{a}_{d+j} = \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{a}_i$, where $\mathbf{w} \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$ and $\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{a}_{d+j} \notin S$. In particular, $\mathbf{v} - (\sum_{t=1}^{j-1} l_t \mathbf{a}_{d+t} + (l_j - 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + \sum_{t=j+1}^r l_t \mathbf{a}_{d+t}) \in S$.*

Proof. As $\mathbf{m} \in \max_{\leq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E)$, $\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{a}_{d+j} \notin \text{Ap}(S, E)$ and we get $\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{a}_{d+j} = \mathbf{w} + \sum_{t=1}^d h_t \mathbf{a}_t$ for some $\mathbf{w} \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$. Then

$$\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{w} + \sum_{t=1}^d h_t \mathbf{a}_t + \sum_{\substack{t=1 \\ t \neq j}}^r l_t \mathbf{a}_{d+t} + (l_j - 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+j} = \sum_{t=1}^d h_t \mathbf{a}_t + \mathbf{w}' + \sum_{t=1}^d h'_t \mathbf{a}_t,$$

for some $\mathbf{w}' \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$ and $h_t, h'_t \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is Cohen-Macaulay and $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}' \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$, by Proposition 1.8 we have that $\sum_{t=1}^d (h_t + h'_t) \mathbf{a}_t = \mathbf{a}_i$, which implies $\sum_{t=1}^d h_t \mathbf{a}_t = \mathbf{a}_i$. Therefore, $\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{a}_{d+j} = \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{a}_i$. Finally, $\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{a}_{d+j} = \mathbf{m} - \mathbf{a}_i \notin S$ and $\mathbf{v} - (\sum_{t=1}^{j-1} l_t \mathbf{a}_{d+t} + (l_j - 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + \sum_{t=j+1}^r l_t \mathbf{a}_{d+t}) = \mathbf{m} + \mathbf{a}_{d+j} - \mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{w} \in S$. \square

Proposition 2.7. *The following statements hold when S is nearly Gorenstein.*

- (1) *If $\text{type}(S) = d$, then $\text{edim}(S) \geq 2d - 1$.*
- (2) *If $\text{type}(S) > d$, then $\text{edim}(S) \geq 2d$.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{m}_i = T(\mathbf{a}_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, d$. Take $j \in \{1 \dots d\}$ and $\mathbf{m} \in \max_{\leq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E) \setminus \{\mathbf{m}_j\}$. Then

$$\mathbf{m}_j + \mathbf{a}_j = \mathbf{m} + \sum_{i=1}^r l_{j,i} \mathbf{a}_{d+i}.$$

If $l_{j,i} \neq 0$, then $\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{a}_{d+i} = \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{a}_j$ for some $\mathbf{w} \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$, by Lemma 2.6. If $\text{type}(S) > d$ and we choose $\mathbf{m} \in \max_{\leq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E) \setminus \{\mathbf{m}_1, \dots, \mathbf{m}_d\}$, by Proposition 1.8 it is not possible to have $\mathbf{w} + \mathbf{a}_j = \mathbf{w}' + \mathbf{a}_{j'}$ with $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}' \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$ and $j \neq j'$. Therefore, the number of elements in the set $\{i; l_{j,i} > 0 \text{ for some } j\}$ is d and this implies that there are at least other d minimal generators. The case in which $\text{type}(S) = d - 1$ is similar. \square

By Proposition 2.7 and [15, Theorem 3.5] we immediately get the following corollary.

Corollary 2.8. *If S is nearly Gorenstein with $d \leq 3$, then $\text{edim}(S) \geq 2d$.*

When there is at least one $T(\mathbf{a}_i)$ having a unique expression, it is also possible to give an upper bound for $\text{type}(S)$. This will follow from the next lemma.

Lemma 2.9. *Let $\mathbb{K}[S]$ be Cohen-Macaulay and assume that $\mathbf{m} \in S$ has a unique expression. If $\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{a}_t = \mathbf{n} + \sum_{i=1}^r l_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i}$ for some $1 \leq t \leq d$, $\mathbf{n} \in \max_{\leq S} \text{Ap}(S, E)$ and $l_1, \dots, l_r \in \mathbb{N}$, then there is only one i , $1 \leq i \leq r$, for which $l_i \neq 0$.*

Proof. Let \mathbf{m} have the unique expression $\sum_{j=1}^r \lambda_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j}$. Then $\lambda_j = \max\{l ; \mathbf{m} - l \mathbf{a}_{d+j} \in S\}$. If $l_j \neq 0$, then $\mathbf{n} + \mathbf{a}_{d+j} = \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{a}_i$ for some $\mathbf{w} \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$, by Lemma 2.6, which implies that $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{w} + (l_j - 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + l_1 \mathbf{a}_{d+1} + \dots + \widehat{l_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j}} + \dots + l_r \mathbf{a}_{d+r}$. Therefore, $l_j \leq \lambda_j$ for $j \neq i$. Now, if there are $1 \leq t \neq k \leq r$ with $l_t > 0, l_k > 0$, then $l_j \leq \lambda_j$ for all $j = 1, \dots, r$ which implies $\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{a}_t \in S$, a contradiction. Thus, there is only one $1 \leq j \leq r$, with $l_j \neq 0$. \square

As a consequence we get the following result.

Proposition 2.10. *If S is nearly Gorenstein and $T(\mathbf{a}_i)$ has a unique expression for some $1 \leq i \leq d$, then $\text{type}(S) \leq r + 1$.*

We conclude this section collecting some properties that we will repeatedly use in the next section in the particular case $r = 3$.

Lemma 2.11. *Assume that S is nearly Gorenstein and let $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. For every $\mathbf{m} \in \max_{\leq S} \text{Ap}(S, E) \setminus \{T(\mathbf{a}_i)\}$ there exist $\lambda_{i,1}^{\mathbf{m}}, \dots, \lambda_{i,r}^{\mathbf{m}} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$T(\mathbf{a}_i) + \mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{m} + \sum_{s=1}^r \lambda_{i,s}^{\mathbf{m}} \mathbf{a}_{d+s}.$$

- (1) *If $\lambda_{i,s}^{\mathbf{m}} > 0$, for some $1 \leq s \leq r$, then $\lambda_{j,s}^{\mathbf{m}} = 0$ for $j \in \{1, \dots, d\} \setminus \{i\}$ with $\mathbf{m} \neq T(\mathbf{a}_j)$.*
- (2) *If there is only one s with $\lambda_{i,s}^{\mathbf{m}} \neq 0$, then $\lambda_{i,s}^{\mathbf{m}} - 1 = \max\{l; T(\mathbf{a}_i) - l \mathbf{a}_{d+s} \in S\}$.*
- (3) *Let $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \max_{\leq S} \text{Ap}(S, E) \setminus \{T(\mathbf{a}_i), T(\mathbf{a}_j)\}$ for some $1 \leq i, j \leq d$. Then*

$$\sum_{s=1}^r \lambda_{i,s}^{\mathbf{m}} \mathbf{a}_{d+s} + \sum_{s=1}^r \lambda_{j,s}^{\mathbf{n}} \mathbf{a}_{d+s} = \sum_{s=1}^r \lambda_{i,s}^{\mathbf{n}} \mathbf{a}_{d+s} + \sum_{s=1}^r \lambda_{j,s}^{\mathbf{m}} \mathbf{a}_{d+s}.$$

- (4) *Let $\mathbf{m} = T(\mathbf{a}_i)$ and $\mathbf{n} = T(\mathbf{a}_j)$ for some $1 \leq i, j \leq d$. Then*

$$\mathbf{a}_i + \mathbf{a}_j = \sum_{s=1}^r \lambda_{i,s}^{\mathbf{n}} \mathbf{a}_{d+s} + \sum_{s=1}^r \lambda_{j,s}^{\mathbf{m}} \mathbf{a}_{d+s}.$$

- (5) *Let $1 \leq i \neq j \leq d$, $\mathbf{n} = T(\mathbf{a}_j)$ and $\mathbf{m} \in \max_{\leq S} \text{Ap}(S, E) \setminus \{T(\mathbf{a}_i), T(\mathbf{a}_j)\}$. Then*

$$\sum_{s=1}^r \lambda_{i,s}^{\mathbf{n}} \mathbf{a}_{d+s} + \sum_{s=1}^r \lambda_{j,s}^{\mathbf{m}} \mathbf{a}_{d+s} = \sum_{s=1}^r \lambda_{i,s}^{\mathbf{m}} \mathbf{a}_{d+s} + \mathbf{a}_j.$$

Proof. (1) By Lemma 2.6, $\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{a}_{d+s} = \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{a}_i$ for some $\mathbf{w} \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$. If $\lambda_{j,s}^{\mathbf{m}} > 0$, for some j , then using again Lemma 2.6, we get $\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{a}_{d+s} = \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{a}_j$ for some $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$. Therefore, $i = j$ by Proposition 1.8.

(2) We have $T(\mathbf{a}_i) + \mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{m} + \lambda_{i,s}^{\mathbf{m}} \mathbf{a}_{d+s}$ with $\lambda_{i,s}^{\mathbf{m}} > 0$. As in (1), it follows that $\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{a}_{d+s} = \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{a}_i$ with $\mathbf{w} \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$, and then $T(\mathbf{a}_i) = \mathbf{w} + (\lambda_{i,s}^{\mathbf{m}} - 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+s}$. This means that $T(\mathbf{a}_i) - (\lambda_{i,s}^{\mathbf{m}} - 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+s} \in S$. On the other hand, $T(\mathbf{a}_i) - \lambda_{i,s}^{\mathbf{m}} \mathbf{a}_{d+s}$ is not in S because $T(\mathbf{a}_1) - \lambda_{i,s}^{\mathbf{m}} \mathbf{a}_{d+s} = \mathbf{m} - \mathbf{a}_i$ and $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$.

(3), (4), and (5) are easy computations. \square

Let \mathfrak{m} be the monomial maximal ideal of $\mathbb{K}[S]$. Recall that an ideal J of $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is said to be a reduction of \mathfrak{m} if $\mathfrak{m}^{n+1} = \mathfrak{m}^n J$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and a reduction is called minimal if there are no other reductions contained in it. The case in which \mathfrak{m} admits a monomial minimal reduction has been studied in [2], where several properties of $\mathbb{K}[S]$ and its associated graded ring have been characterized. As a consequence of the previous lemma, in this case a nearly Gorenstein ring is also Gorenstein.

Corollary 2.12. *Let $\mathbb{K}[S]$ be nearly Gorenstein. If the monomial maximal ideal of $\mathbb{K}[S]$ has a monomial minimal reduction, then $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is Gorenstein.*

Proof. It follows by Lemma 2.11(4) and [2, Lemma 2.4 and Theorem 3.2]. \square

3. NEARLY GORENSTEIN SEMIGROUPS WITH CODIMENSION THREE

Assume that $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is Cohen-Macaulay. If the codimension of S is at most two, then its type is either one or two, see [15, Theorem 3.5]. On the other hand, if the codimension is three, the type can be arbitrarily large as showed in [15, Example 3.8]. However, when $d = 1$ and $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is nearly Gorenstein, in [18] it has been proved that the type is at most three (see also [17] for the almost Gorenstein case). In this section we focus on nearly Gorenstein simplicial affine semigroups with codimension three, which means that S is minimally generated by the extremal rays $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_d$ and three more generators $\mathbf{a}_{d+1}, \mathbf{a}_{d+2}, \mathbf{a}_{d+3}$. In particular, our goal is to prove that the type of such a semigroup is at most three. We start with a general lemma about elements of \mathbb{N}^d .

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{b}_3 \in \mathbb{N}^d$. If there exist positive integers $\lambda_i, \lambda_j, \mu_i, \mu_k, \gamma_j, \gamma_k$ and non-negative integers $l_k, l'_k, l_j, l'_j, l_i, l'_i$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_i \mathbf{b}_i + l_k \mathbf{b}_k &= \lambda_j \mathbf{b}_j + l'_k \mathbf{b}_k \\ \mu_i \mathbf{b}_i + l_j \mathbf{b}_j &= \mu_k \mathbf{b}_k + l'_j \mathbf{b}_j \\ \gamma_j \mathbf{b}_j + l_i \mathbf{b}_i &= \gamma_k \mathbf{b}_k + l'_i \mathbf{b}_i, \end{aligned}$$

then $\mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{b}_j, \mathbf{b}_k$ are on the same line passing through the origin of coordinates.

Proof. If $l_k \geq l'_k$, then the first equation implies that \mathbf{b}_j belongs to the cone generated by $\mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{b}_k$. By the second equation, we have either \mathbf{b}_i belongs to the cone generated by $\mathbf{b}_j, \mathbf{b}_k$, or \mathbf{b}_k belongs to the cone generated by $\mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{b}_j$. In both cases it follows that $\mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{b}_j, \mathbf{b}_k$ are on the same line passing through the origin.

Now, assume that $l_k < l'_k$. Then the first equation implies that \mathbf{b}_i belongs to the cone generated by $\mathbf{b}_j, \mathbf{b}_k$. By the third equation, we have either \mathbf{b}_j belongs to the cone generated by $\mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{b}_k$, or \mathbf{b}_k belongs to the cone generated by $\mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{b}_j$. In both cases it follows that $\mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{b}_j, \mathbf{b}_k$ are on the same line passing through the origin. \square

By Corollary 1.6, for any $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$ and $1 \leq i \leq d$ we have $T(\mathbf{a}_i) + \mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{m} + \sum_{s=1}^3 \lambda_s \mathbf{a}_{d+s}$ with $\lambda_s \in \mathbb{N}$ for $s = 1, 2, 3$. Having a deep understanding of these possible writings will be crucial in order to count the possible $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$. We start by showing that it is not possible that λ_s is positive for all s .

Corollary 3.2. *Let S be nearly Gorenstein of embedding dimension $d + 3$ that is not Gorenstein and let $1 \leq i \leq d$. If $T(\mathbf{a}_i) + \mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{m} + \sum_{s=1}^3 \lambda_s \mathbf{a}_{d+s}$, for some $\mathbf{m} \in \max_{\leq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E)$, then there exists $1 \leq s \leq 3$, with $\lambda_s = 0$.*

Proof. Assume on the contrary that $\lambda_s > 0$ for $s = 1, 2, 3$. Then $\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{a}_{d+s} = \mathbf{w}_s + \mathbf{a}_i$, for some $\mathbf{w}_s \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$, by Lemma 2.6. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} T(\mathbf{a}_i) &= \mathbf{w}_1 + (\lambda_1 - 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+1} + \lambda_2\mathbf{a}_{d+2} + \lambda_3\mathbf{a}_{d+3} \\ &= \mathbf{w}_2 + \lambda_1\mathbf{a}_{d+1} + (\lambda_2 - 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+2} + \lambda_3\mathbf{a}_{d+3} \\ &= \mathbf{w}_3 + \lambda_1\mathbf{a}_{d+1} + \lambda_2\mathbf{a}_{d+2} + (\lambda_3 - 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+3}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathbf{w}_s - \mathbf{a}_{d+s} \notin S$. Let $\mathbf{w}_1 = l_2\mathbf{a}_{d+2} + l_3\mathbf{a}_{d+3}$, $\mathbf{w}_2 = h_1\mathbf{a}_{d+1} + h_3\mathbf{a}_{d+3}$ and $\mathbf{w}_3 = \mu_1\mathbf{a}_{d+1} + \mu_2\mathbf{a}_{d+2}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (l_2 + 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+2} + (l_3 + \lambda_3)\mathbf{a}_{d+3} &= (h_1 + 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+1} + (h_3 + \lambda_3)\mathbf{a}_{d+3} \\ (l_2 + \lambda_2)\mathbf{a}_{d+2} + (l_3 + 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+3} &= (\mu_1 + 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+1} + (\mu_2 + \lambda_2)\mathbf{a}_{d+2} \\ (h_1 + \lambda_1)\mathbf{a}_{d+1} + (h_3 + 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+3} &= (\mu_1 + \lambda_1)\mathbf{a}_{d+1} + (\mu_2 + 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, Lemma 3.1 implies that $\mathbf{a}_{d+1}, \mathbf{a}_{d+2}, \mathbf{a}_{d+3}$ are on the same line passing through the origin of coordinates, a contradiction by Corollary 1.10. \square

If there are exactly two positive integers among λ_1, λ_2 , and λ_3 , we are not so lucky. However, in the next lemma we prove that for every choice of a couple of indices there is only one possible $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let S be nearly Gorenstein of embedding dimension $d + 3$, and take some indices s, i , and j such that $1 \leq s \leq d$ and $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$. Then, there exists at most one element $\mathbf{m} \in \max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E)$ such that $T(\mathbf{a}_s) + \mathbf{a}_s = \mathbf{m} + \lambda_i\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + \lambda_j\mathbf{a}_{d+j}$ with $\lambda_i, \lambda_j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E)$ such that

$$T(\mathbf{a}_s) + \mathbf{a}_s = \mathbf{m} + \lambda_i\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + \lambda_j\mathbf{a}_{d+j} = \mathbf{n} + \mu_i\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + \mu_j\mathbf{a}_{d+j},$$

with $\lambda_i, \lambda_j, \mu_i, \mu_j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. By Lemma 2.6, there exist $\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{w}'_i, \mathbf{w}'_j \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$ such that $\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{a}_{d+i} = \mathbf{w}_i + \mathbf{a}_s$, $\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{a}_{d+j} = \mathbf{w}_j + \mathbf{a}_s$, $\mathbf{n} + \mathbf{a}_{d+i} = \mathbf{w}'_i + \mathbf{a}_s$, $\mathbf{n} + \mathbf{a}_{d+j} = \mathbf{w}'_j + \mathbf{a}_s$. Note that $\mathbf{w}_i - \mathbf{a}_{d+i}, \mathbf{w}'_i - \mathbf{a}_{d+i}, \mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{a}_{d+j}, \mathbf{w}'_j - \mathbf{a}_{d+j}$ are not in S . Therefore, $\mathbf{w}_i = h_j\mathbf{a}_{d+j} + h_k\mathbf{a}_{d+k}$, $\mathbf{w}_j = f_i\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + f_k\mathbf{a}_{d+k}$, $\mathbf{w}'_i = h'_j\mathbf{a}_{d+j} + h'_k\mathbf{a}_{d+k}$ and $\mathbf{w}'_j = f'_i\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + f'_k\mathbf{a}_{d+k}$ for some $h_j, h_k, h'_j, h'_k, f_i, f_k, f'_i, f'_k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (h_j + 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+j} + h_k\mathbf{a}_{d+k} &= (f_i + 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + f_k\mathbf{a}_{d+k} \\ (h'_j + 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+j} + h'_k\mathbf{a}_{d+k} &= (f'_i + 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + f'_k\mathbf{a}_{d+k}. \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $h_k \leq f_k$. Then

$$(h_j + 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+j} = (f_i + 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + (f_k - h_k)\mathbf{a}_{d+k}$$

implies that \mathbf{a}_{d+j} belongs to the cone generated by \mathbf{a}_{d+i} and \mathbf{a}_{d+k} . If $h'_k > f'_k$, then $(h'_j + 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+j} + (h'_k - f'_k)\mathbf{a}_{d+k} = (f_i + 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+i}$, will put \mathbf{a}_{d+i} in the cone generated by \mathbf{a}_{d+j} and \mathbf{a}_{d+k} , which implies that all three vectors $\mathbf{a}_{d+i}, \mathbf{a}_{d+j}, \mathbf{a}_{d+k}$ are on the same line passing through the origin, a contradiction by Corollary 1.10. Thus, $h'_k \leq f'_k$. If $h_j = h'_j$, then \mathbf{w}_i and \mathbf{w}'_i are comparable with respect to \preceq_S which means that \mathbf{m} and \mathbf{n} are comparable, a contradiction. So, assume without loss of generality that $h_j < h'_j$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w}'_i &= (h_j + 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+j} + (h'_j - h_j - 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+j} + h'_k\mathbf{a}_{d+k} \\ &= (f_i + 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + (f_k - h_k + h'_k)\mathbf{a}_{d+k} + (h'_j - h_j - 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+j}, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction since $\mathbf{w}'_i - \mathbf{a}_{d+i} \notin S$. \square

The previous lemma already implies that the type of S is bounded. Indeed, for each $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Ap}(S, E) \setminus \{T(\mathbf{a}_1)\}$ we know that $T(\mathbf{a}_1) + \mathbf{a}_1 = \mathbf{m} + \sum_{s=1}^3 \lambda_s \mathbf{a}_{d+s}$ with $\lambda_s \in \mathbb{N}$ for $s = 1, 2, 3$. Of course, at least one λ_s has to be positive. If only one is positive, then by Lemma 2.11(2) it does not depend on \mathbf{m} , and therefore there is only one possible \mathbf{m} for every index $s = 1, 2, 3$. By the previous lemma, there are at most 6 possible $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$ with exactly two positive λ_s . Hence, counting also $T(\mathbf{a}_1)$, this means that the type of S is at most 10. In order to reduce this bound, in the next lemmas we show that all these elements cannot exist at the same time.

Lemma 3.4. *Let S be nearly Gorenstein of embedding dimension $d + 3$ and*

$$T(\mathbf{a}_s) + \mathbf{a}_s = \mathbf{n}_1 + \mu_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i} = \mathbf{n}_2 + \mu_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j},$$

for some $1 \leq s \leq d$, $\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2 \in \max_{\leq S} \text{Ap}(S, E)$, $\mu_i, \mu_j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ with $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$. Then the following statements hold.

- (1) $T(\mathbf{a}_s) - \lambda_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i} - \lambda_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j} \in S$ where $\lambda_t = \mu_t - 1 = \max\{l ; T(\mathbf{a}_s) - l \mathbf{a}_{d+t} \in S\}$ for $t = i, j$.
- (2) Let $T(\mathbf{a}_s) + \mathbf{a}_s = \mathbf{m} + \sum_{t=1}^3 l_t \mathbf{a}_{d+t}$ where $\mathbf{m} \in \max_{\leq S} \text{Ap}(S, E)$ and $l_t \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\{t ; 1 \leq t \leq 3, l_t \neq 0\} \neq \{i, j\}$.

Proof. Let $\{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $s = 1$, for simplicity.

(1) Note that $\mu_t - 1 = \max\{l ; T(\mathbf{a}_1) - l \mathbf{a}_{d+t} \in S\}$ for $t = i, j$, by Lemma 2.11(2). Lemma 2.6 implies that $\mathbf{n}_1 + \mathbf{a}_{d+i} = \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{a}_s$ and $\mathbf{n}_2 + \mathbf{a}_{d+j} = \mathbf{w}' + \mathbf{a}_s$ for some $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}' \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$. Note that $\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{a}_{d+i}$ and $\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{a}_{d+j}$ are not in S . So, $\mathbf{w} = h_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + h_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k}$ and $\mathbf{w}' = h'_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + h'_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k}$ for some $h_j, h_k, h'_i, h'_k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$(3.1) \quad T(\mathbf{a}_s) = (\mu_i - 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + h_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + h_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k} = (\mu_j - 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + h'_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + h'_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k}.$$

Consequently,

$$(\mu_i - 1 - h'_i) \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + h_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k} = (\mu_j - 1 - h_j) \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + h'_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k}.$$

Note that, $h'_i \leq \mu_i - 1$ and $h_j \leq \mu_j - 1$. If one of them is an equality, we have done. Assume that it is not the case. If $h_k \neq h'_k$, then either $\mu_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i} - (\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + \mathbf{a}_{d+k}) \in S$ or $\mu_j \mathbf{a}_{d+i} - (\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + \mathbf{a}_{d+k}) \in S$, both contradict Corollary 3.2. Therefore, $h_k = h'_k$ and so $(\mu_i - 1 - h'_i) \mathbf{a}_{d+i} = (\mu_j - 1 - h_j) \mathbf{a}_{d+j}$. Then

$$T(\mathbf{a}_s) + \mathbf{a}_s = \mathbf{n}_1 + (1 + h'_i) \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + (\mu_j - 1 - h_j) \mathbf{a}_{d+j} = \mathbf{n}_2 + (1 + h_j) \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + (\mu_i - 1 - h'_i) \mathbf{a}_{d+i}.$$

Now, Lemma 3.3 implies that $h_j = \mu_j - 1$ or $h'_i = \mu_i - 1$, which along with (3.1) yields the result.

- (2) By the statement (1)

$$T(\mathbf{a}_s) = \lambda_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + \lambda_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + \mu \mathbf{a}_{d+k},$$

for some $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $L = \{t ; 1 \leq t \leq 3, l_t \neq 0\}$. Assume on the contrary that $L = \{i, j\}$. Then

$$(3.2) \quad T(\mathbf{a}_s) + \mathbf{a}_s = \mathbf{m} + l_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + l_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j},$$

with $l_i, l_j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. By Lemma 2.6, $\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{a}_{d+i} = \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{a}_s$ and $\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{a}_{d+j} = \mathbf{w}' + \mathbf{a}_s$ for some $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}' \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$. Note that $\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{a}_{d+i}$ and $\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{a}_{d+j}$ are not in S . Therefore, $\mathbf{w} = h_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + h_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k}$ and $\mathbf{w}' = h'_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + h'_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k}$ for some $h_j, h_k, h'_i, h'_k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we get

$$\begin{aligned} T(\mathbf{a}_s) &= \lambda_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + \lambda_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + \mu \mathbf{a}_{d+k} \\ &= (l_i - 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + (h_j + l_j) \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + h_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k} \\ &= (h'_i + l_i) \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + (l_j - 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + h'_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\lambda_i \geq l_i - 1, h'_i + l_i$ and $\lambda_j \geq l_j - 1, h_j + l_j$. Therefore, $h_k, h'_k \geq \mu$ and

$$(\lambda_i - l_i + 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + (\lambda_j - h_j - l_j) \mathbf{a}_{d+j} = (h_k - \mu) \mathbf{a}_{d+k},$$

$$(\lambda_i - h'_i - l_i)\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + (\lambda_j - l_j + 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+j} = (h'_k - \mu)\mathbf{a}_{d+k}.$$

Since $\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{a}_{d+i}$ and $\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{a}_{d+j}$ are not in S , we should have $h_k = h'_k = \mu$, which implies $\lambda_i = l_i - 1 = l_i + h'_i$, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 3.5. *Let S be nearly Gorenstein of embedding dimension $d + 3$ such that*

$$\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{m}_1 + \mu_1\mathbf{a}_{d+1} = \mathbf{m}_2 + \mu_2\mathbf{a}_{d+2} = \mathbf{m}_3 + \mu_3\mathbf{a}_{d+3},$$

where $\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2, \mathbf{m}_3$ are three different elements in $\max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E)$ and $\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3 \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\mathbf{w} \neq T(\mathbf{a}_i) + \mathbf{a}_i$ for any $1 \leq i \leq d$.

Proof. Assume on the contrary that $\mathbf{w} = T(\mathbf{a}_i) + \mathbf{a}_i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq d$. By Lemma 3.4(1),

$$\begin{aligned} T(\mathbf{a}_i) &= \lambda_1\mathbf{a}_{d+1} + \lambda_2\mathbf{a}_{d+2} + \lambda'_3\mathbf{a}_{d+3} \\ &= \lambda_1\mathbf{a}_{d+1} + \lambda'_2\mathbf{a}_{d+2} + \lambda_3\mathbf{a}_{d+3} \\ &= \lambda'_1\mathbf{a}_{d+1} + \lambda_2\mathbf{a}_{d+2} + \lambda_3\mathbf{a}_{d+3}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda'_1, \lambda'_2, \lambda'_3 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda_t = \mu_t - 1 = \max\{l ; T(\mathbf{a}_i) - l\mathbf{a}_{d+t} \in S\}$ for $t = i, j$. If $\lambda_t > \lambda'_t$ for some $1 \leq t \leq 3$, then

$$(\lambda_3 - \lambda'_3)\mathbf{a}_{d+3} = (\lambda_2 - \lambda'_2)\mathbf{a}_{d+2} = (\lambda_1 - \lambda'_1)\mathbf{a}_{d+1},$$

a contradiction with Corollary 1.10. Therefore, $\lambda_t = \lambda'_t$ for $t = 1, 2, 3$ which means that $T(\mathbf{a}_i)$ has a unique expression. By Proposition 2.10, we get $\text{type}(S) = 4$ which implies that $d \geq 2$, by [18, Theorem 2.4]. Thus, $\max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E) = \{T(\mathbf{a}_i), \mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2, \mathbf{m}_3\}$. Assume, without loss of generality, that $T(\mathbf{a}_j) = \mathbf{m}_1$ for some $1 \leq j \neq i \leq d$. Then

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} T(\mathbf{a}_i) + \mathbf{a}_i &= T(\mathbf{a}_j) + \mu_1\mathbf{a}_{d+1} = \mathbf{m}_2 + \mu_2\mathbf{a}_{d+2} = \mathbf{m}_3 + \mu_3\mathbf{a}_{d+3}, \\ T(\mathbf{a}_j) + \mathbf{a}_j &= \mathbf{m}_2 + l_1\mathbf{a}_{d+1} + l_3\mathbf{a}_{d+3} = \mathbf{m}_3 + h_1\mathbf{a}_{d+1} + h_2\mathbf{a}_{d+2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $l_1, l_3, h_1, h_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, by Lemma 2.11(1). Note that

$$(3.4) \quad h_1\mathbf{a}_{d+1} + (\mu_2 + h_2)\mathbf{a}_{d+2} = l_1\mathbf{a}_{d+1} + (\mu_3 + l_3)\mathbf{a}_{d+3},$$

from Lemma 2.11(3). By this non-trivial relation it follows that $\mathbf{a}_{d+1}, \mathbf{a}_{d+2}, \mathbf{a}_{d+3}$ belong to a two dimensional cone, which implies $d = 2$ by Proposition 1.9. Without loss of generality, let $h_1 \leq l_1$. Then \mathbf{a}_{d+2} belongs to the cone generated by \mathbf{a}_{d+1} and \mathbf{a}_{d+3} . We may order the generating vectors by their slopes as the following

$$\text{slop}(\mathbf{a}_1) \leq \text{slop}(\mathbf{a}_{d+1}) \leq \text{slop}(\mathbf{a}_{d+2}) \leq \text{slop}(\mathbf{a}_{d+3}) \leq \text{slop}(\mathbf{a}_2),$$

where $\{1, 2\} = \{i, j\}$. By Lemma 2.11(3),

$$(\mu_1 + h_1)\mathbf{a}_{d+1} + h_2\mathbf{a}_{d+2} = \mu_3\mathbf{a}_{d+3} + \mathbf{a}_j,$$

Which implies $j = 1$ and so $i = 2$. If \mathbf{a}_{d+1} and \mathbf{a}_{d+2} have the same slope, then all three vectors are on the same line passing through the origin of coordinates by (3.4), which makes a contradiction by Corollary 1.10. Thus,

$$(3.5) \quad \text{slop}(\mathbf{a}_1) \leq \text{slop}(\mathbf{a}_{d+1}) < \text{slop}(\mathbf{a}_{d+2}) \leq \text{slop}(\mathbf{a}_{d+3}) \leq \text{slop}(\mathbf{a}_2).$$

If $T(\mathbf{a}_j)$ has two different expressions, then there exists $f_2 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $f_2\mathbf{a}_{d+2} \preceq_S T(\mathbf{a}_j)$ and $f_2\mathbf{a}_{d+2} = f_1\mathbf{a}_{d+1} + f_3\mathbf{a}_{d+3}$ for some $f_1, f_3 \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $f_2 \geq \mu_2$, which along with (3.3) implies that $\mathbf{m}_2 - \mu_1\mathbf{a}_{d+1} \in S$. As $T(\mathbf{a}_i) = \sum_{t=1}^3 (\mu_t - 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+t}$, looking again at (3.3), we get

$$(\mu_3 - 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+3} + \mathbf{a}_2 = \mathbf{m}_2 - (\mu_1 - 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+1} + \mathbf{a}_{d+2}.$$

As \mathbf{a}_{d+1} appears in an expression of the right hand side of the above equation, it makes a contradiction by the order of slopes in (3.5). Therefore, $T(\mathbf{a}_j)$ has a unique expression and so $0 \in \{l_1, l_3\} \cap \{h_1, h_2\}$, by Lemma 2.9. If $l_1 = 0$, then $h_1 = 0$ and the equation (3.4) implies

that \mathbf{a}_{d+2} and \mathbf{a}_{d+3} have the same slope, a contradiction. Thus, $l_3 = 0$. As \mathbf{m}_2 and \mathbf{m}_3 are not comparable with respect to \preceq_S , we have $h_2 \neq 0$ and so $h_1 = 0$. Therefore,

$$T(\mathbf{a}_1) + \mathbf{a}_1 = T(\mathbf{a}_2) + e_3\mathbf{a}_{d+3} = \mathbf{m}_2 + l_1\mathbf{a}_{d+1} = \mathbf{m}_3 + h_2\mathbf{a}_{d+2},$$

for some $e_3 \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$T(\mathbf{a}_2) + \mathbf{a}_2 = T(\mathbf{a}_1) + \mu_1\mathbf{a}_{d+1} = \mathbf{m}_2 + \mu_2\mathbf{a}_{d+2} = \mathbf{m}_3 + \mu_3\mathbf{a}_{d+3}.$$

Note that $T(\mathbf{a}_1) = (l_1 - 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+1} + (h_2 - 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+2} + (e_3 - 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+3}$ by Lemma 2.11(2), and $T(\mathbf{a}_2) + e_3\mathbf{a}_{d+3} + \mu_2\mathbf{a}_{d+2} = T(\mathbf{a}_1) + \mu_1\mathbf{a}_{d+1} + l_1\mathbf{a}_{d+1}$. Thus,

$$(\mu_1 - 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+1} + (2\mu_2 - 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+2} + (\mu_3 - 1 + e_3)\mathbf{a}_{d+3} = (\mu_1 + 2l_1 - 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+1} + (h_2 - 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+2} + (e_3 - 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+3},$$

which implies

$$(2\mu_2 - 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+2} + \mu_3\mathbf{a}_{d+3} = 2l_1\mathbf{a}_{d+1} + (h_2 - 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+2}.$$

This equation is impossible by (3.5). \square

The previous lemma allows us to prove that $\text{type}(S) \leq 3$ when some $T(\mathbf{a}_i)$ has a unique expression. We will make use of this fact later.

Corollary 3.6. *If S is nearly Gorenstein of embedding dimension $d + 3$ and $T(\mathbf{a}_i)$ has a unique expression for some $1 \leq i \leq d$, then $\text{type}(S) \leq 3$.*

Proof. Note that $\text{type}(S) \leq 4$, by Proposition 2.10. Assume on the contrary that $\text{type}(S) = 4$ and let $\max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E) = \{T(\mathbf{a}_1), \mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2, \mathbf{m}_3\}$. Then by Lemma 2.9,

$$T(\mathbf{a}_1) + \mathbf{a}_1 = \mathbf{m}_1 + l_i\mathbf{a}_{d+i} = \mathbf{m}_2 + l_j\mathbf{a}_{d+j} = \mathbf{m}_3 + l_k\mathbf{a}_{d+k},$$

where $\{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $l_i, l_j, l_k \in \mathbb{N}$. This is a contradiction by Lemma 3.5. \square

In order to prove that the type of S is always at most three, we need other two lemmas.

Lemma 3.7. *Let S be nearly Gorenstein of embedding dimension $d + 3$ with $d \geq 2$ and $1 \leq s \leq d$. Let $\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2 \in \max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E)$ such that*

$$T(\mathbf{a}_s) + \mathbf{a}_s = \mathbf{m}_1 + f_i\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + f_j\mathbf{a}_{d+j} = \mathbf{m}_2 + g_i\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + g_k\mathbf{a}_{d+k},$$

where $\{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $f_i, f_j, g_i, g_k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. Then:

- (1) $T(\mathbf{a}_s) - \mathbf{a}_{d+t} \in S$, for $t = 1, 2, 3$;
- (2) \mathbf{a}_{d+i} is an interior point of the cone generated by \mathbf{a}_{d+j} and \mathbf{a}_{d+k} ;
- (3) $T(\mathbf{a}_s) + \mathbf{a}_s \neq \mathbf{n} + l\mathbf{a}_{d+i}$, for any $\mathbf{n} \in \max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E)$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}$;
- (4) $T(\mathbf{a}_t) \in \{\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2\}$ for $t \in \{1, \dots, d\} \setminus \{s\}$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.6, $\mathbf{m}_1 + \mathbf{a}_{d+i} = h_j\mathbf{a}_{d+j} + h_k\mathbf{a}_{d+k} + \mathbf{a}_s$ and $\mathbf{m}_1 + \mathbf{a}_{d+j} = h_i\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + h'_k\mathbf{a}_{d+k} + \mathbf{a}_s$ for some $h_j, h_i, h_k, h'_k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$T(\mathbf{a}_s) = (f_i - 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + (h_j + f_j)\mathbf{a}_{d+j} + h_k\mathbf{a}_{d+k} = (h_i + f_i)\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + (f_j - 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+j} + h'_k\mathbf{a}_{d+k},$$

and consequently

$$(3.6) \quad (h_j + 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+j} + h_k\mathbf{a}_{d+k} = (h_i + 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + h'_k\mathbf{a}_{d+k}.$$

By a similar argument, we get $\mathbf{m}_2 + \mathbf{a}_{d+i} = e_j\mathbf{a}_{d+j} + e_k\mathbf{a}_{d+k} + \mathbf{a}_s$ and $\mathbf{m}_2 + \mathbf{a}_{d+k} = e'_i\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + e'_j\mathbf{a}_{d+j} + \mathbf{a}_s$ for some $e_j, e_k, e'_i, e'_j \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$T(\mathbf{a}_s) = (g_i - 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + (e_k + g_k)\mathbf{a}_{d+k} + e_j\mathbf{a}_{d+j} = (e'_i + g_i)\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + (g_k - 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+k} + e'_j\mathbf{a}_{d+j},$$

implies the statement (1), and

$$(3.7) \quad (e_k + 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+k} + e_j\mathbf{a}_{d+j} = (e'_i + 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + e'_j\mathbf{a}_{d+j}.$$

If $h_k \leq h'_k$, then by (3.6) it follows that \mathbf{a}_{d+j} belongs to the cone generated by \mathbf{a}_{d+i} and \mathbf{a}_{d+k} . By (3.7), we have either \mathbf{a}_{d+k} belongs to the cone of \mathbf{a}_{d+i} and \mathbf{a}_{d+j} or \mathbf{a}_{d+i} belongs to the cone generated by \mathbf{a}_{d+k} and \mathbf{a}_{d+j} , both cases will imply that $\mathbf{a}_{d+i}, \mathbf{a}_{d+j}, \mathbf{a}_{d+k}$ are on the same line passing through the origin, which contradicts Corollary 1.10. So that $h_k > h'_k$. Then \mathbf{a}_{d+i} belongs to the interior of the cone generated by \mathbf{a}_{d+k} and \mathbf{a}_{d+j} from (3.6), which is the subject of (2).

Note that $h_i + 1 \leq h_i + f_i \leq \lambda_i$, where $\lambda_i = \max\{l ; T(\mathbf{a}_s) - l\mathbf{a}_{d+i} \in S\}$. If $T(\mathbf{a}_s) + \mathbf{a}_s = \mathbf{n} + l\mathbf{a}_{d+i}$, for some $\mathbf{n} \in \max_{\leq S} \text{Ap}(S, E)$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}$, then by Lemma 2.11(2) and the equation (3.6),

$$T(\mathbf{a}_s) + \mathbf{a}_s = \mathbf{m}_i + (\lambda_i + 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+i} = \mathbf{m}_i + (\lambda_i - h_i)\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + (h_j + 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+j} + (h_k - h'_k)\mathbf{a}_{d+k},$$

which is a contradiction by Corollary 3.2. Thus the statement (3), is obtained.

In order to prove (4), assume on the contrary that $T(\mathbf{a}_t) \notin \{\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2\}$, then

$$T(\mathbf{a}_t) + \mathbf{a}_t = \mathbf{m}_2 + \mu_j\mathbf{a}_{d+j} = \mathbf{m}_1 + \mu_k\mathbf{a}_{d+k},$$

for some $\mu_j, \mu_k \in \mathbb{N}$, by Lemma 2.11(1). Now, using Lemma 2.11(3), we get

$$g_i\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + g_k\mathbf{a}_{d+k} + \mu_k\mathbf{a}_{d+k} = f_i\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + f_j\mathbf{a}_{d+j} + \mu_j\mathbf{a}_{d+j}.$$

Consequently,

$$(g_i - f_i)\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + (g_k + \mu_k)\mathbf{a}_{d+k} = (f_j + \mu_j)\mathbf{a}_{d+j},$$

which along with the statement (2), implies that $\mathbf{a}_{d+i}, \mathbf{a}_{d+j}, \mathbf{a}_{d+k}$ are on the same line passing through the origin, a contradiction by Corollary 1.10. \square

Lemma 3.8. *Let S be nearly Gorenstein of embedding dimension $d + 3$ with $d \geq 2$ and let*

$$M_i^1 = \{\mathbf{m} \in \max_{\leq S} \text{Ap}(S, E) ; T(\mathbf{a}_1) + \mathbf{a}_1 = \mathbf{m} + \mathbf{a}_{d+i}\},$$

$$M_i^2 = \{\mathbf{m} \in \max_{\leq S} \text{Ap}(S, E) ; T(\mathbf{a}_1) + \mathbf{a}_1 = \mathbf{m} + \lambda\mathbf{a}_{d+i} \text{ with } \lambda \geq 2\},$$

$$M_{i,j} = \{\mathbf{m} \in \max_{\leq S} \text{Ap}(S, E) ; T(\mathbf{a}_1) + \mathbf{a}_1 = \mathbf{m} + \lambda\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + \mu\mathbf{a}_{d+j} \text{ with } \lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}\},$$

for $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$ and $i \neq j$. Then the following statements hold, where $\{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$.

- (1) Each of M_i^1, M_i^2 and $M_{i,j}$ has at most one element.
- (2) If M_i^1 is not empty, then $M_i^2 = M_{i,j} = M_{i,k} = \emptyset$.
- (3) If $M_{i,j}$ and $M_{i,k}$ are not empty, then $M_{j,k} = M_t^1 = M_t^2 = \emptyset$ for $t = 1, 2, 3$.
- (4) If M_i^2 and M_j^2 are two different non-empty sets, then $M_k^2 \cup M_k^1 \subset M_i^2 \cup M_j^2$ and $M_t^1 = M_{i,j} = M_{i,k} = M_{j,k} = \emptyset$, for $t = i, j$.

Proof. (1) If $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in M_i^1$, then $T(\mathbf{a}_1) + \mathbf{a}_1 = \mathbf{m} + \lambda\mathbf{a}_{d+i} = \mathbf{n} + \mu\mathbf{a}_{d+i}$ for some $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{N}$, which implies $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{n}$, since \mathbf{m} and \mathbf{n} are maximal elements. Now, Lemma 3.3 completes the proof.

Assume that $M_t^1 \subseteq \{\mathbf{n}_t\}$, $M_t^2 \subseteq \{\mathbf{m}_t\}$ and $M_{t,s} \subseteq \{\mathbf{m}_{t,s}\}$ for $1 \leq t, s \leq 3$. In the case that M_t^2 is not empty, we let

$$(3.8) \quad T(\mathbf{a}_1) + \mathbf{a}_1 = \mathbf{m}_t + \mu_t\mathbf{a}_{d+t},$$

for some integer $\mu_t \geq 2$ and in the case that $M_{t,s}$ is not empty, let

$$(3.9) \quad T(\mathbf{a}_1) + \mathbf{a}_1 = \mathbf{m}_{t,s} + f_{t,s}\mathbf{a}_{d+t} + g_{t,s}\mathbf{a}_{d+s},$$

for some $f_{t,s}, g_{t,s} \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$.

(2) As $T(\mathbf{a}_1) + \mathbf{a}_1 = \mathbf{n}_i + \mathbf{a}_{d+i}$, if any of $M_i^2, M_{i,j}, M_{i,k}$ is non-empty, then $\mathbf{n}_i \in \{\mathbf{m}_i + (\mu_i - 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+i}, \mathbf{m}_{i,j} + (f_{i,j} - 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + g_{i,j}\mathbf{a}_{d+j}, \mathbf{m}_{i,k} + (f_{i,k} - 1)\mathbf{a}_{d+i} + g_{i,k}\mathbf{a}_{d+k}\}$, a contradiction.

(3) If $M_{j,k} \neq \emptyset$, then by Lemma 3.7(2), each of the vectors $\mathbf{a}_{d+i}, \mathbf{a}_{d+j}, \mathbf{a}_{d+k}$ belongs to the cone generated by two others, which means that they are on the same line passing through the origin,

a contradiction by Corollary 1.10. Thus, $M_{j,k} = \emptyset$. As $T(\mathbf{a}_1) - \mathbf{a}_{d+t} \in S$, for $t = i, j, k$, by Lemma 3.7(1), we get $M_i^1 = M_j^1 = M_k^1 = \emptyset$ along with Lemma 2.11(2). We also have $M_i^2 = \emptyset$, by Lemma 3.7(3). Note that

$$(3.10) \quad h_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i} = h_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + h_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k},$$

for some $h_i, h_j, h_k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, by Lemma 3.7(2). It follows $d = 2$ by Proposition 1.9. We may order the generating vectors by their slopes as the following

$$(3.11) \quad \text{slop}(\mathbf{a}_p) \leq \text{slop}(\mathbf{a}_{d+k}) \leq \text{slop}(\mathbf{a}_{d+i}) \leq \text{slop}(\mathbf{a}_{d+j}) \leq \text{slop}(\mathbf{a}_q),$$

where $\{p, q\} = \{1, 2\}$. Note that $T(\mathbf{a}_2) \in \{\mathbf{m}_{i,k}, \mathbf{m}_{i,j}\}$ by Lemma 3.7(4). Without loss of generality, assume that $T(\mathbf{a}_2) = \mathbf{m}_{i,j}$. By Lemma 2.11(1)

$$\begin{aligned} T(\mathbf{a}_1) + \mathbf{a}_1 &= T(\mathbf{a}_2) + f_{i,j} \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + g_{i,j} \mathbf{a}_{d+j} = \mathbf{m}_{i,k} + f_{i,k} \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + g_{i,k} \mathbf{a}_{d+k}, \\ T(\mathbf{a}_2) + \mathbf{a}_2 &= \mathbf{m}_{i,k} + f_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j}, \end{aligned}$$

where $f_j \in \mathbb{N}$, and by Lemma 2.11(5) we get

$$f_{i,j} \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + (g_{i,j} + f_j) \mathbf{a}_{d+j} = f_{i,k} \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + g_{i,k} \mathbf{a}_{d+k} + \mathbf{a}_2,$$

which implies $q = 2$ and so $p = 1$. If $M_j^2 \cup M_k^2 \neq \emptyset$, then either $T(\mathbf{a}_1) + \mathbf{a}_1 = \mathbf{m}_j + \mu_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j}$ or $T(\mathbf{a}_1) + \mathbf{a}_1 = \mathbf{m}_k + \mu_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k}$, for some $\mu_j, \mu_k \in \mathbb{N}$. Comparing with the above equations of $T(\mathbf{a}_1) + \mathbf{a}_1$, and the fact that $\mathbf{a}_{d+i}, \mathbf{a}_{d+j}, \mathbf{a}_{d+k}$ are not on the same line passing through the origin, we get that $T(\mathbf{a}_1), T(\mathbf{a}_2), \mathbf{m}_{i,k}, \mathbf{m}_t$, with $t \in \{j, k\}$, are four different elements. Therefore, $T(\mathbf{a}_2)$ does not have a unique expression, by Corollary 3.6. Let h_i be the minimum positive integer satisfied the equation 3.10. Then $T(\mathbf{a}_2)$ has an expression $T(\mathbf{a}_2) = \sum_{t=1}^3 l_t \mathbf{a}_{d+t}$ with $l_t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $l_i \geq h_i$. As

$$T(\mathbf{a}_1) + \mathbf{a}_1 = T(\mathbf{a}_2) + f_{i,j} \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + g_{i,j} \mathbf{a}_{d+j},$$

there exists $e_i, e_k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $T(\mathbf{a}_2) + \mathbf{a}_{d+j} = e_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + e_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k} + \mathbf{a}_1$, by Lemma 2.6. Then $e_i < h_i \leq l_i$, as $T(\mathbf{a}_2) - \mathbf{a}_1 \notin S$. Therefore,

$$(l_i - e_i) \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + (l_j + 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + l_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k} = e_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k} + \mathbf{a}_1.$$

Since $l_i - e_i > 0$ and $l_j + 1 > 0$, we have $e_k - l_k > 0$. Considering the order of slopes in (3.11), the above equation implies that $\mathbf{a}_{d+i}, \mathbf{a}_{d+j}, \mathbf{a}_{d+k}$ have the same slope, a contradiction with Corollary 1.10. Therefore, $M_j^2 \cup M_k^2 = \emptyset$.

(4) Note that $M_k^2 \cup M_k^1 \subset M_i^2 \cup M_j^2$ by Lemma 3.5 and $M_{i,j} = \emptyset$ by Lemma 3.4(2). Since M_i^2 is not empty, $T(\mathbf{a}_1) - \mathbf{a}_{d+i} \in S$ and so $M_i^1 = \emptyset$, by Lemma 2.11(1). Now, assume on the contrary that $M_{i,k}$ is not empty. Then

$$(3.12) \quad T(\mathbf{a}_1) + \mathbf{a}_1 = \mathbf{m}_{i,k} + f_{i,k} \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + g_{i,k} \mathbf{a}_{d+k}.$$

By Lemma 2.6, $\mathbf{m}_{i,k} + \mathbf{a}_{d+i} = \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{a}_1$ and $\mathbf{m}_{i,k} + \mathbf{a}_{d+k} = \mathbf{w}' + \mathbf{a}_1$ for some $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}' \in \text{Ap}(S, E)$. Note that $\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{a}_{d+i}$ and $\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{a}_{d+k}$ are not in S . Therefore, $\mathbf{w} = h_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + h_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k}$ and $\mathbf{w}' = h'_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + h'_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j}$ for some $h_j, h_k, h'_i, h'_j \in \mathbb{N}$. Then using also Lemma 3.4(2) we get

$$\begin{aligned} T(\mathbf{a}_1) &= \lambda_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + \lambda_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + \mu \mathbf{a}_{d+k} \\ &= (f_{i,k} - 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + h_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + (g_{i,k} + h_k) \mathbf{a}_{d+k} \\ &= (h'_i + f_{i,k}) \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + h'_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + (g_{i,k} - 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+k}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_t = \max\{l ; T(\mathbf{a}_1) - l \mathbf{a}_{d+t} \in S\}$ for $t = i, j$. Then $\lambda_i \geq f_{i,k} + h'_i > f_{i,k} - 1$ and $\lambda_j \geq h_j, h'_j$. Thus, $\mu \leq g_{i,k} - 1 < g_{i,k} + h_k$ and the equation

$$(3.13) \quad (g_{i,k} + h_k - \mu) \mathbf{a}_{d+k} = (\lambda_i - f_{i,k} + 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + (\lambda_j - h_j) \mathbf{a}_{d+j},$$

shows that $\mathbf{a}_{d+1}, \mathbf{a}_{d+2}, \mathbf{a}_{d+3}$ belong to a two dimensional cone, which implies $d = 2$ by Proposition 1.9. We may order the generating vectors by their slopes as the following

$$(3.14) \quad \text{slop}(\mathbf{a}_s) \leq \text{slop}(\mathbf{a}_{d+i}) \leq \text{slop}(\mathbf{a}_{d+k}) \leq \text{slop}(\mathbf{a}_{d+j}) \leq \text{slop}(\mathbf{a}_t),$$

where $\{s, t\} = \{1, 2\}$. Note that $\mathbf{m}_{i,k}, \mathbf{n}_i, \mathbf{n}_j$ are three different elements. If $T(\mathbf{a}_2) \notin \{\mathbf{n}_i, \mathbf{n}_j\}$, then

$$T(\mathbf{a}_2) + \mathbf{a}_2 = \mathbf{n}_i + f_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + f_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k} = \mathbf{n}_j + g_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + g_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k},$$

by Lemma 2.11(1), and

$$(\mu_i + g_i) \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + g_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k} = (\mu_j + f_j) \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + f_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k},$$

by Lemma 2.11(3). But the recent equation, along with (3.13), implies that $\mathbf{a}_{d+i}, \mathbf{a}_{d+j}, \mathbf{a}_{d+k}$ are on the same line passing through the origin of coordinates, contradiction by Corollary 1.10. Therefore, $T(\mathbf{a}_2) \in \{\mathbf{n}_i, \mathbf{n}_j\}$ and

$$T(\mathbf{a}_2) + \mathbf{a}_2 = \mathbf{m}_{i,k} + (\lambda_j + 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+j},$$

by Lemma 2.11(1). If $T(\mathbf{a}_2) = \mathbf{n}_i$, then

$$T(\mathbf{a}_2) + \mathbf{a}_2 = \mathbf{n}_j + g_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + g_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k},$$

for some $g_i, g_k \in \mathbb{N}$, by Lemma 2.11(1), and

$$(\mu_i + g_i) \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + (\mu_k + g_k) \mathbf{a}_{d+k} = \mu_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + (\lambda_j - 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+j}.$$

by Lemma 2.11(3). But the recent equation, along with (3.13), implies that $\mathbf{a}_{d+i}, \mathbf{a}_{d+j}, \mathbf{a}_{d+k}$ have the same slope, contradiction by Corollary 1.10. Therefore, $T(\mathbf{a}_2) \neq \mathbf{n}_i$ and so $T(\mathbf{a}_2) = \mathbf{n}_j$ and

$$(3.15) \quad T(\mathbf{a}_1) + \mathbf{a}_1 = T(\mathbf{a}_2) + (\lambda_j + 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+j} = \mathbf{n}_1 + (\lambda_i + 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+i} = \mathbf{m}_{i,k} + f_{i,k} \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + g_{i,k} \mathbf{a}_{d+k},$$

$$(3.16) \quad T(\mathbf{a}_2) + \mathbf{a}_2 = T(\mathbf{a}_1) + \sum_{t=1}^3 q_t \mathbf{a}_{d+t} = \mathbf{n}_i + f_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + f_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k} = \mathbf{m}_{i,k} + \mu_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j},$$

where $q_1, q_2, q_3, \mu_j \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that $f_k \neq 0$, because otherwise $\mathbf{m}_{i,k}$ and \mathbf{n}_i will be comparable with respect \preceq_S . If $q_i = 0$, then we have the following cases:

- (1) If $f_j > 0$, then either $q_j = 0$ or $q_k = 0$, by Lemma 3.3. As $T(\mathbf{a}_1)$ is not comparable with $\mathbf{m}_{i,j}$, $q_k > 0$. Thus, $q_j = 0$ which is contradicts Lemma 3.4(2).
- (2) If $f_j = 0$, then $q_j > 0$ and $q_k > 0$, because $T(\mathbf{a}_1), \mathbf{n}_i, \mathbf{m}_{i,k}$ are not comparable. This contradicts Lemma 3.4(2).

Therefore, $q_i > 0$. By Lemma 2.11(4), $\sum_{t=1}^3 q_t \mathbf{a}_{d+t} + (\lambda_j + 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+j} = \mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{a}_2$. Let $\mathbf{c} = \sum_{t=1}^3 q_t \mathbf{a}_{d+t} + (\lambda_j + 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+j} - \mathbf{a}_{d+i}$. Then

$$\mathbf{c} = (q_i - 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + (q_j + \lambda_j + 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + q_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k} \in \text{Ap}(S, E),$$

and so $\mathbf{c} \preceq_S \mathbf{n} \in \max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E)$. As $M_k^2 \cup M_k^1 \subset M_i^2 \cup M_j^2$ and $M_{i,j} = \emptyset$,

$$\max_{\preceq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E) = \{T(\mathbf{a}_1), T(\mathbf{a}_2) = \mathbf{n}_j, \mathbf{n}_i, \mathbf{m}_{i,k}\} \cup M_{j,k}.$$

If $M_{j,k}$ is not empty, then $T(\mathbf{a}_2) + \mathbf{a}_2 = \mathbf{m}_{j,k} + p_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i}$ for some $p_i \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that $\mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{a}_2 = \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{a}_{d+i} \not\preceq_S T(\mathbf{a}_1) + \mathbf{a}_1$ and $\mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{a}_2 = \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{a}_{d+i} \not\preceq_S T(\mathbf{a}_2) + \mathbf{a}_2$. Therefore, $\mathbf{c} \not\preceq_S \mathbf{m}$ for $\mathbf{m} \in \{\mathbf{n}_i, \mathbf{m}_{i,k}, \mathbf{m}_{j,k}\}$. Since $\lambda_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j} \preceq_S \mathbf{c}$, we have $\mathbf{c} \not\preceq_S T(\mathbf{a}_1)$. Thus, $\mathbf{c} \preceq_S T(\mathbf{a}_2) = \mathbf{n}_j$. Let $T(\mathbf{a}_2) = \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{v}$. Then $\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{a}_{d+i} \notin S$ and

$$\sum_{t=1}^3 q_t \mathbf{a}_{d+t} + (\lambda_j + 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+j} - \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{a}_2 = T(\mathbf{a}_2) + \mathbf{a}_2 = T(\mathbf{a}_1) + \sum_{t=1}^3 q_t \mathbf{a}_{d+t},$$

from (3.16). Recall that $T(\mathbf{a}_1) = \lambda_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + \lambda_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + \mu \mathbf{a}_{d+k}$ and $\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{a}_{d+i} \notin S$. Let $\mathbf{v} = r_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + r_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k}$. Then

$$(3.17) \quad (r_j + 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + r_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k} + \mathbf{a}_2 = (\lambda_i + 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + \mu \mathbf{a}_{d+k}.$$

By Lemma 2.11(3), we have

$$(\lambda_j + 1 + \mu_j) \mathbf{a}_{d+j} = l_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + l_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k} + \mathbf{a}_2.$$

which implies that in (3.14), $t = j$ and so $s = i$. Now, equation (3.17) is in contradiction with (3.14). Therefore, $M_{i,k} = \emptyset$. The same argument, replacing i with j , shows that $M_{j,k} = \emptyset$. \square

We are now ready to prove our main theorem.

Theorem 3.9. *Let S be nearly Gorenstein of embedding dimension $d + 3$. If S is not Gorenstein, then $d \leq \text{type}(S) \leq 3$.*

Proof. By Corollary 2.4, it is enough to show that $\text{type}(S) \leq 3$. We may assume that $d > 1$ by [18, Theorem 2.4] and $\text{type}(S) \geq 2$. Let $M_i^1, M_i^2, M_{i,j}$ be as defined in Lemma 3.8 for $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$ and $i \neq j$. Then $\max_{\leq S} \text{Ap}(S, E) = \{T(\mathbf{a}_1)\} \cup (\cup_{i=1}^3 M_i^1) \cup (\cup_{i=1}^3 M_i^2) \cup M_{1,2} \cup M_{1,3} \cup M_{2,3}$, by Corollary 3.2.

Note that each M_i^1, M_i^2 and $M_{i,j}$ has at most one element by Lemma 3.8(1). We distinguish the following cases:

Case 1, $M_{i,j} = M_{i,k} = M_{j,k} = \emptyset$. If M_i^2, M_j^2, M_k^2 are not empty, then $M_i^2 \cup M_j^2 \cup M_k^2$ has at most two elements, by Lemma 3.5. We may assume that $M_k^2 \subseteq M_i^2 \cup M_j^2$. If M_i^2 and M_j^2 are both non-empty, then by Lemma 3.4(1),

$$T(\mathbf{a}_1) = \lambda_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + \lambda_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + \mu \mathbf{a}_{d+k},$$

where $\lambda_t = \max\{l ; T(\mathbf{a}_1) - l \mathbf{a}_{d+t} \in S\}$ for $t = i, j$. Now, if $M_k^1 \neq \emptyset$, then $T(\mathbf{a}_1) - \mathbf{a}_{d+k} \notin S$, by Lemma 2.11(2) and so $\mu = 0$. This means that $T(\mathbf{a}_1)$ has a unique expression which implies $\text{type}(S) \leq 3$ by Corollary 3.6. So, we may also assume that $M_k^1 = \emptyset$. As M_i^2 and M_j^2 are not empty, we have $M_i^1 = M_j^1 = \emptyset$, by Lemma 3.8(2). If M_j^2 is also empty, then the only possible non-empty sets are $M_i^2 = M_k^2, M_j^1$ and M_k^1 , which implies $\text{type}(S) \leq 3$.

Case 2, $M_{i,j}$ and $M_{i,k}$ are not empty. Then $M_{j,k} = M_t^1 = M_t^2 = \emptyset$ for $t = 1, 2, 3$, by Lemma 3.8(3).

Case 3, $M_{i,j}$ is not empty, but $M_{i,k} = M_{j,k} = \emptyset$. Then $M_i^1 = M_j^1 = \emptyset$, and $M_i^2 \cup M_k^2 \cup M_j^2$ has at most one element by Lemma 3.8(4). Note that M_k^2 and M_k^1 can not be non-empty at the same time, by Lemma 3.8(2). Therefore, it is enough to show that if M_t^2 is not empty for some $t \in \{i, j\}$, then $M_k^1 = \emptyset$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $t = i$. Assume on the contrary that

$$(3.18) \quad T(\mathbf{a}_1) + \mathbf{a}_1 = \mathbf{m}_{i,j} + f_{i,j} \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + g_{i,j} \mathbf{a}_{d+j} = \mathbf{m}_i + \mu_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i} = \mathbf{n}_k + \mathbf{a}_{d+k}.$$

By Lemma 2.6, $\mathbf{m}_{i,j} + \mathbf{a}_{d+i} = h_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + h_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k} + \mathbf{a}_1$ and $\mathbf{m}_{i,j} + \mathbf{a}_{d+j} = h_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + h'_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k} + \mathbf{a}_1$ for some $h_j, h_k, h'_k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$T(\mathbf{a}_1) = (f_{i,j} - 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + (h_j + g_{i,j}) \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + h_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k} = (h_i + f_{i,j}) \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + (g_{i,j} - 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + h'_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k}$$

If $M_k^1 \neq \emptyset$, then $T(\mathbf{a}_1) - \mathbf{a}_{d+k} \notin S$, by Lemma 2.11(2) and so $h_k = h'_k = 0$. In particular,

$$(h_i + 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+i} = (h_j + 1) \mathbf{a}_{d+j}.$$

For $\mathbf{v} \in \{\mathbf{m}_{i,j}, \mathbf{m}_i, \mathbf{n}_k\}$, let $[\mathbf{v}]_k = l \mathbf{a}_{d+k}$, where $l = \max\{l ; \mathbf{v} - l \mathbf{a}_{d+k} \in S\}$. Then, along with (3.18),

$$[\mathbf{m}_{i,j}]_k = [\mathbf{m}_i]_k = [\mathbf{n}_k]_k + 1,$$

as $\mathbf{a}_{d+i}, \mathbf{a}_{d+j}, \mathbf{a}_{d+k}$ are not on the same line, by Corollary 1.10. If $T(\mathbf{a}_2) \notin \{\mathbf{n}_k, \mathbf{m}_{i,j}\}$, then

$$T(\mathbf{a}_2) + \mathbf{a}_2 = \mathbf{n}_k + g_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + g_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j} = \mathbf{m}_{i,j} + g_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k}.$$

Since $[\mathbf{m}_{i,j}]_k + g_k > [\mathbf{n}_k]_k$, it provides a non-trivial relation between \mathbf{a}_{d+k} and the points on the line passing through \mathbf{a}_{d+i} and \mathbf{a}_{d+j} , which means all three points are on the same line, a contradiction.

If $T(\mathbf{a}_2) = \mathbf{n}_k$, then

$$T(\mathbf{a}_2) + \mathbf{a}_2 = \mathbf{m}_{i,j} + g_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k} = \mathbf{m}_i + e_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + e_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k}.$$

Note that $g_k > e_k$. As $[\mathbf{m}_i]_k = [\mathbf{m}_{i,j}]_k$, the above equation provides a non-trivial relation between \mathbf{a}_{d+k} and the points on the line passing through \mathbf{a}_{d+i} and \mathbf{a}_{d+j} , which means all three points are on the same line.

If $T(\mathbf{a}_2) = \mathbf{m}_{i,j}$, then

$$T(\mathbf{a}_2) + \mathbf{a}_2 = \mathbf{n}_k + g_i \mathbf{a}_{d+i} + g_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j} = \mathbf{m}_i + e_j \mathbf{a}_{d+j} + e_k \mathbf{a}_{d+k}.$$

As \mathbf{a}_{d+k} is not on the line passing through \mathbf{a}_{d+i} and \mathbf{a}_{d+j} , we get $[\mathbf{n}_k]_k = [\mathbf{m}_i]_k + e_k = [\mathbf{n}_k]_k + 1 + e_k$, a contradiction. \square

The bounds obtained in the previous theorem are sharp. More precisely, for each possible value t between these bounds there exist nearly Gorenstein semigroups with embedding dimension $d + 3$ having type t . This is well known for $d = 1$, see for instance [18, Example 2.7]. When $d = 2$, in Example 2.5 we have seen such a semigroup having type 2. For the two missing cases we provide examples below.

Example 3.10. Let $\mathbf{a}_1 = (5, 0), \mathbf{a}_2 = (0, 3), \mathbf{a}_3 = (3, 1), \mathbf{a}_4 = (1, 2), \mathbf{a}_5 = (2, 2)$ and let S be the affine semigroup generated by them. The extremal rays of S are \mathbf{a}_1 and \mathbf{a}_2 , and $\max_{\leq_S} \text{Ap}(S, E) = \{\mathbf{m}_1 = (5, 10), \mathbf{m}_2 = (8, 8), \mathbf{m}_3 = (7, 9)\}$, thus $\text{type}(S) = 3$. By Proposition 1.8, $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is Cohen-Macaulay. Moreover, We have the equalities

$$(5, 10) + \mathbf{a}_1 = (7, 9) + \mathbf{a}_3 = (8, 8) + \mathbf{a}_5, \quad (8, 8) + \mathbf{a}_2 = (7, 9) + \mathbf{a}_4 = (5, 10) + \mathbf{a}_3,$$

which immediately imply that S is nearly Gorenstein by Corollary 1.6.

Example 3.11. Let $\mathbf{a}_1 = (2, 0, 0), \mathbf{a}_2 = (0, 2, 0), \mathbf{a}_3 = (0, 0, 2), \mathbf{a}_4 = (1, 1, 0), \mathbf{a}_5 = (1, 0, 1), \mathbf{a}_6 = (0, 1, 1)$ and $S = \langle \mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_3, \mathbf{a}_4, \mathbf{a}_5, \mathbf{a}_6 \rangle$. In this case $\text{Ap}(S, E) = \{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{a}_4, \mathbf{a}_5, \mathbf{a}_6\}$, and then $\text{type}(S) = 3$. Using Proposition 1.8 it is possible to see that $\mathbb{K}[S]$ is Cohen-Macaulay, whereas by the equalities

$$\mathbf{a}_6 + \mathbf{a}_1 = \mathbf{a}_4 + \mathbf{a}_5, \quad \mathbf{a}_5 + \mathbf{a}_2 = \mathbf{a}_4 + \mathbf{a}_6, \quad \mathbf{a}_4 + \mathbf{a}_3 = \mathbf{a}_5 + \mathbf{a}_6$$

and Corollary 1.6 it is easy to see that S is nearly Gorenstein.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Caminata and F. Strazzanti, *Nearly Gorenstein cyclic quotient singularities*, Beiträge zur Algebra und Geometrie / Contributions to Algebra and Geometry **62** (2021), 857-870. [1](#)
- [2] M. D'Anna, R. Jafari, and F. Strazzanti, *Simplicial affine semigroups with monomial minimal reduction ideals*, Mediterr. J. Math. **19** (2022), no.2, Paper No. 84, 17 pp. [10](#)
- [3] M. Delgado, P.A. García-Sánchez, and J. Morais, *NumericalSgps, a package for numerical semigroups*, GAP package, Version 1.3.1 (2022). [2](#)
- [4] S. Ding, *A note on the index of Cohen-Macaulay local rings*, Communications in Algebra **21**, no. 1, pp. 53–71, 1993. [1](#)
- [5] K. Eto, N. Matsuoka, T. Numata, and K. Watanabe, *Almost Gorenstein simplicial semigroup rings*, arXiv:2406.05781 (2024). [3](#)
- [6] The GAP Group, *GAP – Groups, Algorithms, and Programming*, Version 4.10.2 (2019). [2](#)
- [7] S. Goto, N. Suzuki, and K. Watanabe, *On affine semigroup rings*, Japan. J. Math. (N.S.) **2** (1976), no. 1, 1–12. [3, 4](#)

- [8] D.R. Grayson and M.E. Stillman, *Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry*, available at <https://faculty.math.illinois.edu/Macaulay2/> **2**
- [9] T. Hall, M. Kobl, K. Matsushita, and S. Miyashita, *Nearly Gorenstein polytopes*, *Electron. J. Combin.* **30** (2023), no. 4, P4.42. **1**
- [10] J. Herzog, *Generators and relations of abelian semigroups and semigroup rings*, *Manuscr. Math.* **3** (1970), 175–193. **2**
- [11] J. Herzog, T. Hibi, and D.I. Stamate, *The trace of the canonical module*, *Israel J. Math.* **233** (2019), 133–165. **1, 4**
- [12] J. Herzog, T. Hibi, and D.I. Stamate, *Canonical trace ideal and residue for numerical semigroup rings*, *Semigroup Forum* **103** (2021), 550–566. **1**
- [13] C. Huneke and A. Vraciu, *Rings that are almost Gorenstein*, *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* **225**, pp. 85–102, 2006. **1**
- [14] R. Jafari, A. Taherizadeh, and M. Yaghmaei, *On the Gorenstein locus of simplicial affine semigroup rings*, *Comm. Algebra* **50** (2022), no. 9, 4032–4039. [Corrigendum: *Comm. Algebra* **51** (2023), no. 4, 1777.] **6**
- [15] R. Jafari and M. Yaghmaei, *Type and conductor of simplicial affine semigroups*, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **226** (2022), no. 3, 106844. **2, 3, 4, 8, 10**
- [16] S. Miyashita, *Nearly Gorenstein projective monomial curves of small codimension*, *J. Commut. Algebra* **16** (2024), no. 2, 231–243. **1**
- [17] A. Moscariello, *On the type of an almost Gorenstein monomial curve*, *J. Algebra* **456** (2016), 266–277. **10**
- [18] A. Moscariello and F. Strazzanti, *Nearly Gorenstein vs almost Gorenstein affine monomial curves*, *Mediterr. J. Math.* **18** (2021), no. 4, Paper No. 127, 14 pp. **1, 2, 5, 10, 13, 18, 19**
- [19] J. C. Rosales and P. A. García-Sánchez, *On Cohen-Macaulay and Gorenstein simplicial affine semigroups*, *Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc.* **41** (1998), no. 3, 517–537. **4, 5**
- [20] D.I. Stamate, *Betti numbers for numerical semigroup rings*, in *Multigraded Algebra and Applications, NSA 2016, Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics* **238** (2018). **2**
- [21] J. Striuli and A. Vraciu, *Some homological properties of almost Gorenstein rings, Commutative algebra and its connections to geometry*, 201–215, *Contemp. Math.*, 555, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2011. **1**

MOSAHEB INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, KHARAZMI UNIVERSITY, TEHRAN, IRAN.

Email address: `rjafari@khu.ac.ir`

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, DIPARTIMENTO DI ECCELLENZA 2023-2027, UNIVERSITÀ DI GENOVA, VIA DO-
DECANESO 35, 16146 GENOVA, ITALY.

Email address: `francesco.strazzanti@gmail.com`

DEPARTAMENT DE MATEMÀTIQUES I INFORMÀTICA, UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA, GRAN VIA DE LES CORTS
CATALANES 585, 08007 BARCELONA, SPAIN.

Email address: `szarzuela@ub.edu`