

# A residue formula for integrals with hyperplane singularities

ANDREW O'DESKY

This article is concerned with evaluating integrals of the form

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^r} \frac{h(z) dz}{g_1(z) \cdots g_R(z)} \quad (1)$$

where each  $g_k$  is a complex affine function that does not vanish on  $\mathbb{R}^r$ .

When  $r = 1$  the set  $Z$  of poles of the meromorphic form  $\omega = h(g_1 \cdots g_R)^{-1} dz$  has a distinguished subset  $Z_* \subset Z$ , namely those poles in the *upper half-plane*

$$Z_* = Z \cap \mathbb{H} = \{z \in Z : \text{Im } z > 0\}.$$

Under suitable conditions the integral is given by

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{h(z) dz}{g_1(z) \cdots g_R(z)} = 2\pi i \sum_{m \in Z_*} \text{res}[\omega, m].$$

When the dimension is greater than one, the poles of  $\omega$  are indexed by *affine flags*

$$\gamma : H_1 \supset H_1 \cap H_2 \supset \cdots \supset H_1 \cap \cdots \cap H_r = \{m\}$$

cut out by hyperplanes where  $\omega$  is singular. Our residue formula takes the form

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^r} \frac{h(z) dz}{g_1(z) \cdots g_R(z)} = (2\pi i)^r \sum_{\gamma \in Z_*} \text{itres}[\omega, \gamma]$$

where  $Z_* \subset Z$  is a distinguished subset of flags and  $\text{itres}[\omega, \gamma]$  is the iterated residue of  $\omega$  along  $\gamma$ .

The primary contribution of this article is to determine the subset  $Z_*$  of contributing flags using sign conditions on the minors of their defining matrices. We introduce two such conditions for real matrices, which we call *stability* and *compatibility* (see §2.2). To apply them in the present context, we observe each singular hyperplane  $H_k = \{g_k = 0\}$  of  $\omega$  may be expressed as

$$H_k = \{v \in \mathbb{C}^r : f_k(v) - i s_k = 0\}$$

for some real linear form  $f_k$  and constant  $s_k$  with positive real part. For a collection of hyperplanes  $H_1, \dots, H_r$  so expressed let  $J_H$  be the Jacobian of  $(f_1, \dots, f_r) : \mathbb{R}^r \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^r$ .

**Theorem.** *If  $\omega$  admits an iterated residue expansion along  $\overline{\mathbb{H}}^r$  and every singular flag of  $\omega$  is compatible with  $\overline{\mathbb{H}}^r$ , then*

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^r} \int_{\mathbb{R}^r} \frac{h(z) dz}{g_1(z) \cdots g_R(z)} = \sum_{\gamma \in Z_*} \text{itres}[\omega, \gamma]$$

where  $Z_* \subset \{\gamma \in Z : m \in \overline{\mathbb{H}}^r\}$  is the subset of flags cut out by a collection  $H$  of singular hyperplanes whose Jacobian  $J_H$  is stable.

The only other residue formula applying in the present context to our knowledge is [4, Theorem 2]. The advantage of our formula is that only  $Z_*$  is needed whereas theirs sums over the residues of all flags terminating in  $\mathbb{H}^r$ ; in practice, the subset  $Z_*$  is generally much smaller. The essential step in the proof is to show that the sum over residues of flags not in  $Z_*$  vanishes identically (even though individual residues do not vanish). The hypotheses of our residue formula are also more practical to verify. To apply their formula requires a grouping of the singular hyperplanes  $H_1, \dots, H_R$  into  $r$  (generally reducible) divisors  $D_1, \dots, D_r$  satisfying a certain compatibility condition [4, Definition 1]. When  $R \gg r$  finding such a grouping directly appears to be a difficult problem. This question is addressed in §4.3 where we show that our notion of stability leads to a canonical compatible grouping of the hyperplanes.

Beyond their intrinsic interest, integrals of the form (1) arise naturally in the harmonic analysis of toric varieties and are important for understanding the distribution of rational points of bounded height. The approach in [1] was to approximate these integrals. This suffices for determining the main term in the asymptotic number of rational points of bounded height, but to understand the finer aspects of this distribution it is important to have an exact formula. For instance, in [2] an exact formula for the height zeta function of a particular toric surface was used to compute the secondary term in the number of monic abelian cubic trace-one polynomials of bounded height. The residue formula developed here serves as a basis for extending these methods to general toric varieties.

## 1. ITERATED RESIDUES

Let  $V$  be a real vector space of dimension  $r$ . Consider a flag  $\gamma$  in  $V_{\mathbb{C}}$  of the form

$$\gamma : H_1 \supset H_1 \cap H_2 \supset \dots \supset H_1 \cap \dots \cap H_k, \quad \gamma(j) := H_1 \cap \dots \cap H_j, \quad \dim \gamma(j) = r - j.$$

Let  $z = (z_1, \dots, z_r)$  be a basis of  $V_{\mathbb{C}}^{\vee}$ . If  $\omega = g dz_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dz_r$  is a meromorphic form on  $V_{\mathbb{C}}$ , then we write

$$\text{res}_{z_1}[g dz_1, \gamma(1)] = \text{res}_{z_1}[g dz_1, \gamma(1)](z_2, \dots, z_r)$$

for the residue of  $g dz_1$  with respect to  $z_1$  if there exists  $z_1^* \in \mathbb{C}$  such that the vector  $v \in V_{\mathbb{C}}$  with coordinates  $z(v) = (z_1^*, z_2(v), \dots, z_r(v))$  is in  $\gamma(1)$ . If no such  $z_1$  exists, then we set this equal to zero. This recursively defines the *iterated residue of  $\omega$  along  $\gamma$* :

$$\text{itres}_z[\omega, \gamma](z_{k+1}, \dots, z_r) = \text{res}_{z_k}[\dots \text{res}_{z_2}[\text{res}_{z_1}[g dz_1, \gamma(1)] dz_2, \gamma(2)] \dots dz_k, \gamma(k)],$$

a meromorphic top-degree form on  $\gamma(k)$ . We will later see how the iterated residue is related to the classical residue (§4.3).

Let  $B \subset \text{GL}_r(\mathbb{C})$  denote the subgroup of upper-triangular matrices.

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $\gamma : H_1 \supset H_1 \cap H_2 \supset \dots \supset H_1 \cap \dots \cap H_r$  be a flag with defining equations  $H_k = \{g_k = 0\}$ , and let  $\partial g / \partial z$  be the Jacobian matrix of  $(g_1, \dots, g_r) : V_{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^r$  with respect to  $z$ . The value  $z_k^*$  exists at the  $k$ th step of the iterated residue of  $\omega$  along  $\gamma$  for every  $k = 1, \dots, r$  if and only if  $\partial g / \partial z$  is in the open Bruhat cell  $B^T B$ .*

*Remark 1.* Although  $g$  depends on the defining equations for  $\gamma$ , whether or not  $p_k$  vanishes only depends on  $\gamma$ .

*Proof.* Fix  $x_2, \dots, x_r \in \mathbb{C}$ . At the  $k$ th step of the iterated residue  $\text{itres}_z[\omega, \gamma]$ , the residue is taken at the unique value  $z_k = z_k^* = z_k^*(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_r) \in \mathbb{C}$  when it exists for which

$$z_1^* v_1 + \dots + z_k^* v_k + x_{k+1} v_{k+1} + \dots + x_r v_r \in \gamma(k) = H_1 \cap \dots \cap H_k \quad (2)$$

where  $z_1^*, \dots, z_{k-1}^*$  are determined by earlier residues. We claim that  $z_1^*, \dots, z_r^*$  are soluble if and only if  $\partial g / \partial z \in B^T B$ . Let  $\gamma(k)_0$  denote the linear subspace obtained from translating  $\gamma(k)$ . The value for  $z_k^*$  exists in  $\mathbb{C}$  for all  $x_{k+1}, \dots, x_r \in \mathbb{C}$  if and only if the restrictions of the linear forms

$z_{k+1}, \dots, z_r$  to  $\gamma(k)_0$  are linearly independent in  $\gamma(k)_0^\vee$ . Indeed then  $(z_{k+1}, \dots, z_r): \gamma(k) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{r-k}$  is an isomorphism of affine spaces, so its inverse map

$$(z_{k+1}, \dots, z_r) \mapsto z_1^* v_1 + \dots + z_k^* v_k + z_{k+1} v_{k+1} + \dots + z_r v_r$$

determines unique quantities  $z_1^*, \dots, z_k^*$  for any  $x_{k+1}, \dots, x_r \in \mathbb{C}$  such that (2) is satisfied, and this furnishes the required value of  $z_k = z_k^* \in \mathbb{C}$ .

Let  $f_k = g_k - g_k(0)$ . Let  $(w_k)_k \subset V_{\mathbb{C}}$  be the dual basis to  $(f_k)_k \subset V_{\mathbb{C}}^\vee$ . We conclude the values  $z_1^*, \dots, z_k^*$  are soluble if and only if

$$\begin{bmatrix} z_{k+1}(w_{k+1}) & z_{k+1}(w_{k+2}) & \cdots & z_{k+1}(w_r) \\ z_{k+2}(w_{k+1}) & z_{k+2}(w_{k+2}) & \cdots & z_{k+2}(w_r) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ z_r(w_{k+1}) & z_r(w_{k+2}) & \cdots & z_r(w_r) \end{bmatrix}$$

is invertible for every  $k = 1, \dots, r$ ; equivalently, the matrix

$$w_0 \begin{bmatrix} z_1(w_1) & z_1(w_2) & \cdots & z_1(w_r) \\ z_2(w_1) & z_2(w_2) & \cdots & z_2(w_r) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ z_r(w_1) & z_r(w_2) & \cdots & z_r(w_r) \end{bmatrix} w_0$$

has nonvanishing leading principal minors, where  $w_0$  is the longest element of the symmetric group  $S_r$ . The subset of  $\mathrm{GL}_r(\mathbb{C})$  with nonvanishing leading principal minors is  $B^T B$ , so the values  $z_1^*, \dots, z_k^*$  are soluble if and only if

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial z} = \frac{\partial g}{\partial z} = \begin{bmatrix} f_1(v_1) & f_1(v_2) & \cdots & f_1(v_r) \\ f_2(v_1) & f_2(v_2) & \cdots & f_2(v_r) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ f_r(v_1) & f_r(v_2) & \cdots & f_r(v_r) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} z_1(w_1) & z_1(w_2) & \cdots & z_1(w_r) \\ z_2(w_1) & z_2(w_2) & \cdots & z_2(w_r) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ z_r(w_1) & z_r(w_2) & \cdots & z_r(w_r) \end{bmatrix}^{-1}$$

is in  $(\sigma_0 B^T B \sigma_0)^{-1} = B^T B$ . □

## 2. MINORS

In this section we define the notions of stability and compatibility. Consider an  $r$ -form

$$\omega = \frac{h(z) dz}{g_1(z) \cdots g_R(z)}$$

for affine functions  $g_1, \dots, g_R: V_{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  which are nonvanishing on  $V$ . We let  $Z$  denote the set of  $r$ -step flags formed from the singular hyperplanes of  $\omega$ . Any affine hyperplane  $H \subset V_{\mathbb{C}}$  disjoint from  $V$  may be expressed as

$$H = \{v \in V_{\mathbb{C}} : f(v) = is\}$$

for some real linear form  $f: V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and constant  $s$  satisfying  $\mathrm{Re} s > 0$ , so we will assume that each singular hyperplane  $H_k = \{g_k = 0\}$  is defined by  $g_k = f_k - is_k$  for such  $f_k, s_k$ .

### 2.0.1. Polyhedra.

**Definition 1.** A closed subset  $\Pi \subset V_{\mathbb{C}}$  is a *polyhedron (with boundary  $V$ )* if there is a linear isomorphism  $V \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{R}^r$  such that  $\Pi$  is identified with the product of the closed upper half-planes in  $\mathbb{C}^r$  under the induced linear isomorphism  $V_{\mathbb{C}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}^r$ . We consider the defining map  $V \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{R}^r$  to be part of the data of  $\Pi$ .

A polyhedron  $\Pi$  may be uniquely expressed as

$$\Pi = V + i\Theta$$

where  $\Theta$  is a cone of the form  $\Theta = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}v_1 + \cdots + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}v_r$  for the distinguished basis  $(v_1, \dots, v_r)$  of  $V$  determined by the defining map. Let  $z = (z_1, \dots, z_r)$  be the dual basis. The polyhedron  $\Pi$  will serve the role of the upper half-plane for evaluating  $\int_V \omega$  via the method of residues. For this to be possible, we impose two conditions on the form  $\omega$  relative to  $\Pi$ .

**2.1. The iterated residue expansion.** The first requirement is a convergence condition which will be clearly seen as necessary for the method of iterated residues to be applicable. Write  $\omega = g(z) dz$ . Fix arbitrary  $x_2, \dots, x_r \in \mathbb{R}$ . At the first step, we require that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} g(z_1, x_2, \dots, x_r) dz_1 = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \int_{C_R} g(z_1, x_2, \dots, x_r) dz_1$$

where  $C_R \subset \overline{\mathbb{H}}$  is the positively oriented centered semi-circle of radius  $R$  resting on the real axis. By Cauchy's residue formula,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} g(z_1, x_2, \dots, x_r) dz_1 = (2\pi i) \sum_H \operatorname{res}_{z_1} [g dz_1, H](x_2, \dots, x_r)$$

where the sum extends over those hyperplanes  $H$  whose imaginary part intersects with the ray  $\{z_1 > 0\}$  in  $\Theta = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^r$ . At the second step, we require for any such hyperplane  $H$  that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{res}_{z_1} [g dz_1, H](z_2, x_3, \dots, x_r) dz_2 = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \int_{C_R} \operatorname{res}_{z_1} [g dz_1, H](z_2, x_3, \dots, x_r) dz_2.$$

In general, the residual forms after  $k$  integrals are indexed by certain  $k$ -step flags  $\gamma$ .

**Definition 2.** The form  $\omega$  admits an iterated residue expansion along the polyhedron  $\Pi$  if  $h$  is holomorphic on a neighborhood of  $\Pi$  in  $V_{\mathbb{C}}$ , the integral  $\int_V \omega$  is absolutely convergent, and each  $k$ -step singular flag arising in the iterated residue expansion satisfies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{itres}_z [\omega, \gamma](z_{k+1}, x_{k+2}, \dots, x_r) dz_{k+1} = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \int_{C_R} \operatorname{itres}_z [\omega, \gamma](z_{k+1}, x_{k+2}, \dots, x_r) dz_{k+1}.$$

for arbitrary  $x_2, \dots, x_r \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $1 \leq k < r$ .

When this holds, it follows directly from Cauchy's residue formula that

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^r} \int_V \omega = \sum_{\gamma \in Z_*} \operatorname{itres}_z [\omega, \gamma]$$

where  $Z_* \subset Z$  is a distinguished subset of flags  $\gamma$ . The problem is to determine  $Z_*$  in terms of  $\Pi$ . Naively one might expect that  $Z_* = \{\gamma \in Z : \gamma(r) \in \Pi\}$  but there are forms  $\omega$  admitting an iterated residue expansion with respect to  $\Pi$  for which  $\int_V \omega \neq 0$  and  $\{\gamma \in Z : \gamma(r) \in \Pi\} = \emptyset$ . This occurs because the iterated residue expansion along  $\Pi$  may pick up poles *outside* of  $\Pi$ . In §5.1 we consider such an integral (see Figure 2). We next formulate a compatibility condition to ensure this cannot occur.

**2.2. Stability and compatibility.** For an  $r \times r$  real matrix  $J = (a_{ij})$ , consider the  $k$ th leading principal minor

$$p_k = \det \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & \cdots & a_{1k} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{k1} & \cdots & a_{kk} \end{bmatrix} \quad (k \in \{1, \dots, r\}),$$

the  $k \times k$  minor

$$q_{k\ell} = \det \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & \cdots & a_{1,k-1} & a_{1\ell} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ a_{k1} & \cdots & a_{k,k-1} & a_{k\ell} \end{bmatrix} \quad (\ell \in \{k+1, \dots, r\}),$$

and the  $(k-1) \times (k-1)$  minor

$$r_{jk} = \det \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & \cdots & a_{1,k-1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{j-1,1} & \cdots & a_{j-1,k-1} \\ a_{j+1,1} & \cdots & a_{j+1,k-1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{k1} & \cdots & a_{k,k-1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (j \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}).$$

Now we formulate the key definitions of the paper.

**Definition 3.** Let  $J$  be a  $k \times r$  real matrix. We say  $J$  is *stable* if

$$p_1, \dots, p_k > 0 \text{ and } (-1)^{\ell-j} r_{j\ell} \geq 0 \text{ for all } 1 \leq j < \ell \leq k.$$

We say  $J$  is *compatible* if either it is not stable or

$$q_{j\ell} \leq 0 \text{ for all } 1 \leq j < \ell \leq k.$$

Let  $H = (H_1, \dots, H_k)$  be a collection of hyperplanes. Let  $\partial f / \partial z$  be the Jacobian matrix of  $(f_1, \dots, f_k): V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  with respect to  $z$ . We say  $H$  is  $\Pi$ -*stable* (resp.  $\Pi$ -*compatible*) if  $J_H = \partial f / \partial z$  is stable (resp. compatible).

*Remark 2.* The signs of the minors  $p_k(J)$  and  $q_{k\ell}(J)$  are invariant under  $J \mapsto bJ$  for any

$$b \in B_+^T = \{\text{lower-triangular with positive diagonal}\} \subset \text{GL}_r(\mathbb{R}),$$

while the signs of the  $r_{jk}$  minors are invariant under the subgroup of  $B_+^T$  stabilizing the  $j$ th coordinate axis. The signs of these minors are therefore invariant under the diagonal subgroup of  $B_+$ . Thus the conditions of  $\Pi$ -stability and  $\Pi$ -compatibility do not depend on the real forms  $f$  used to express each hyperplane as  $H = \{f(v) = is\}$  with  $\text{Re } s > 0$ . Note the notion of  $\Pi$ -compatibility makes sense for flags however  $\Pi$ -stability does not.

*Remark 3* (A conjecture). It appears likely that if  $J \in \text{GL}_r(\mathbb{R})$  is stable and  $w \in S_r$  is a nontrivial permutation, then  $wJ$  is unstable. When this holds for every Jacobian of a given integral, the residue formula simplifies since each unordered set  $\{H_1, \dots, H_r\}$  of hyperplanes which cuts out a flag in  $Z_*$  for *some* ordering in fact has a *canonical* ordering  $H$  for which  $J_H$  is stable. Unfortunately we have been unable to prove this so we leave it as an open question.

### 3. A LEMMA

Here we study the behavior of residues under a variation in the hyperplane parameters  $s$ . It turns out that some flags do not contribute to the iterated residue expansion for a non-empty open subset of parameters  $s$  whereas others contribute irrespective of  $s$ . We prove the latter flags are precisely those cut out by a  $\Pi$ -stable collection of hyperplanes.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $H_1, \dots, H_k$  be linearly independent singular hyperplanes. The flag  $\gamma_H(s) : H_1 \supset H_1 \cap H_2 \supset \cdots \supset H_1 \cap \cdots \cap H_k$  arises in the iterated residue expansion of  $\omega = \omega(s)$  for all parameters with  $\text{Re } s_1, \dots, \text{Re } s_R > 0$  if and only if  $H = (H_1, \dots, H_k)$  is  $\Pi$ -stable.*

**Example 1.** For a two-dimensional integral with two singular hyperplanes  $H_1$  and  $H_2$ , the pole at  $H_1 \cap H_2$  is given by  $m = z_1^* v_1 + z_2^* v_2$  where

$$\begin{aligned} z_1^* &= p_1^{-1}(i s_1 - z_2^* q_{12}), \\ z_2^* &= i p_2^{-1}(p_1 s_2 - s_1 r_{12}). \end{aligned}$$

The flag  $H_1 \supset H_1 \cap H_2$  arises in the iterated residue expansion for all  $s_1, s_2$  with positive real parts if and only if  $p_1, p_2 > 0$  and  $r_{12} \leq 0$ . For instance, consider the form

$$\omega = \frac{dz}{(x^2 + s_1^2)((x+y)^2 + s_2^2)}$$

with singular hyperplanes  $H_1 = \{x = i s_1\}$ ,  $H_2 = \{x + y = i s_2\}$ ,  $H_3 = \{-x = i s_1\}$ ,  $H_4 = \{-x - y = i s_2\}$ . The Jacobian of  $H = (H_1, H_2)$  with respect to the standard polyhedron  $\overline{\mathbb{H}}^2$  is

$$J_H = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad p_1 = 1, \quad p_2 = 1, \quad r_{12} = 1, \quad q_{12} = 0; \quad J_H \text{ is unstable.}$$

The flag  $\gamma_H(s) : H_1 \supset H_1 \cap H_2$  contributes to the iterated residue expansion of  $\omega$  along  $\overline{\mathbb{H}}^2$  if and only if  $\operatorname{Re} s_2 \geq \operatorname{Re} s_1$ .

*Proof.* Set  $\gamma = \gamma_H(s)$ . The flag  $\gamma$  arises in the iterated residue expansion of  $\omega$  along  $\Pi$  if and only if the values  $z_1^*, \dots, z_k^*$  in the iterated residue expansion are soluble and in  $\mathbb{H}$  (cf. (2)). We will show this occurs for all  $s_1, \dots, s_R > 0$  if and only if  $H = (H_1, \dots, H_k)$  is  $\Pi$ -stable. Let  $(w_k)_k \subset V$  be the dual basis to  $(f_k)_k \subset V^\vee$ . Let  $v = z_1^* v_1 + \dots + z_k^* v_k + x_{k+1} v_{k+1} + \dots + x_r v_r$  and consider the following vector

$$v^k := (-1)^{k-1} v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_{k-1} \wedge w_{k+1} \wedge \dots \wedge w_r \in \wedge^{r-1} V.$$

One easily finds that

$$v \wedge v^k = (z_k^* p_k + x_{k+1} q_{k,k+1} + \dots + x_r q_{kr}) w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge w_r \in \wedge^r V$$

and for any integer  $j \leq k$  that

$$w_j \wedge v^k = (-1)^{k-j} r_{jk} w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge w_r \in \wedge^r V.$$

Thus  $v - i s_1 w_1 - \dots - i s_k w_k \in \ker(v \mapsto v \wedge v^k) = \operatorname{span}(v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}, w_{k+1}, \dots, w_r)$  if and only if

$$z_k^* = p_k^{-1}(i(s_k p_{k-1} - s_{k-1} r_{k-1,k} + \dots + (-1)^{k-1} s_1 r_{1k}) - x_{k+1} q_{k,k+1} - \dots - x_r q_{kr}). \quad (3)$$

Since the coefficients of  $v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}$  are determined by earlier residues, and changing  $v$  by multiples of  $w_{k+1}, \dots, w_r$  does not affect the condition that  $v \in H_1 \cap \dots \cap H_k$ , the element  $v - i s_1 w_1 - \dots - i s_k w_k$  is in  $\ker(v \mapsto v \wedge v^k)$  if and only if  $v \in H_1 \cap \dots \cap H_k$ . The rest follows by induction on  $k$ .  $\square$

*Remark 4.* The values  $z_j^*$  are soluble in  $\mathbb{C}$  for  $1 \leq j \leq k$  if and only if the leading principal minors  $p_1, \dots, p_k$  are nonzero (cf. Proposition 1). The stronger condition of  $\Pi$ -stability ensures  $z_j^*$  is not only soluble but in  $\mathbb{H}$ . Finally if  $H$  is  $\Pi$ -stable and  $\Pi$ -compatible, then  $z_j^*$  is not only in  $\mathbb{H}$  at the  $j$ th step but remains so up to the  $k$ th step of the iterated residue. This amounts to ensuring  $z_j^*(v) \in \mathbb{H}$  for any  $v \in \gamma(k) \cap \Pi$  (letting  $v = z_1^* v_1 + \dots + z_j^* v_j + x_{j+1} v_{j+1} + \dots + x_r v_r$  vary in  $\gamma(k) \cap \Pi$  is the same as letting  $x_{j+1}, \dots, x_k$  vary in  $\overline{\mathbb{H}}$ ).

## 4. PROOF OF THE RESIDUE FORMULA

**Theorem 1.** *If  $\omega$  admits an iterated residue expansion along the polyhedron  $\Pi$  and every singular flag of  $\omega$  is  $\Pi$ -compatible, then*

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^r} \int_V \frac{h(z) dz}{g_1(z) \cdots g_R(z)} = \sum_{\gamma \in Z_*} \text{itres}_z[\omega, \gamma]$$

where  $Z_* \subset \{\gamma \in Z : \gamma(r) \in \Pi\}$  is the subset of flags cut out by a collection of  $\Pi$ -stable singular hyperplanes.

*Proof.* Fix arbitrary  $x_2, \dots, x_r \in \mathbb{R}$ . For each linearly independent ordered collection  $H = (H_1, \dots, H_r)$  of singular hyperplanes with associated flag  $\gamma = \gamma_H$  let  $z_k^* = z_k^*(s, \gamma)$  be given by (3). Note  $z_k^*$  only depends on  $\gamma$  and not the particular  $H$  used to define  $\gamma$ . Let  $\mathbb{C}_+^R \subset \mathbb{C}^R$  denote the half-space with positive real parts. There is a dense Zariski-open subset  $U \subset \mathbb{C}_+^R$  such that for all  $s \in U$  each singular flag of  $\omega = \omega(s)$  is cut out by a *unique* ordered collection of singular hyperplanes.<sup>1</sup> A flag  $\gamma$  arises in the iterated residue expansion if and only if  $z_k^*(s, \gamma) \in \mathbb{H}$  for all  $k$ . Thus for all  $s \in U$  we have

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^r} \int_V \omega = \sum_H \text{itres}_z[\omega, \gamma_H] \cdot 1_{\gamma_H}(s)$$

where the sum is over all linearly independent  $r$ -sets  $H$  of singular hyperplanes and  $1_\gamma$  is the characteristic function of the open subset of parameters

$$S_\gamma = \{s \in \mathbb{C}_+^R : \text{Im}(z_k^*(s, \gamma)) > 0 \text{ for all } 1 \leq k \leq r\}.$$

(When  $s \notin U$  one must instead sum over flags.) Write  $H >_\Pi 0$  to mean  $H$  is  $\Pi$ -stable. If  $H >_\Pi 0$  then  $S_{\gamma_H} = \mathbb{C}_+^R$  by the lemma so for all  $s \in U$  we have

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^r} \int_V \omega = \sum_{H >_\Pi 0} \text{itres}_z[\omega, \gamma_H] + \sum_{H \not>_\Pi 0} \text{itres}_z[\omega, \gamma_H] \cdot 1_{\gamma_H}(s)$$

Since  $\int_V \omega$  is absolutely convergent by assumption, it varies analytically with the parameters  $s \in \mathbb{C}_+^R$ . Meanwhile if  $H >_\Pi 0$  then the  $z_1^*(s, \gamma_H), \dots, z_r^*(s, \gamma_H)$  are soluble for all  $s \in U$  and so  $\text{itres}_z[\omega, \gamma_H]$  is a meromorphic function of  $s \in \mathbb{C}_+^R$ . Therefore

$$R := \sum_{H \not>_\Pi 0} \text{itres}_z[\omega, \gamma_H] \cdot 1_{\gamma_H}(s) = \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^r} \int_V \omega - \sum_{H >_\Pi 0} \text{itres}_z[\omega, \gamma_H]$$

is a meromorphic function of  $s \in U$ . Suppose it is not identically zero. Say  $H \not>_\Pi 0$  and  $\text{itres}_z[\omega, \gamma] 1_\gamma(s) \neq 0$  where  $\gamma = \gamma_H$ . The lemma implies  $S_\gamma$  is a proper subset of  $\mathbb{C}_+^R$ . From (3) it is clear that the complement  $\mathbb{C}_+^R - S_\gamma$  has nonempty interior, and thus  $\partial S_\gamma$  is nonempty. The boundary  $\partial S_\gamma$  has real codimension one in  $\mathbb{C}_+^R$  since  $S_\gamma$  is a real open cone in  $\mathbb{C}_+^R$ , so it cannot be covered by the complement of  $U$  or the divisor where  $R$  is singular since these have real codimension two. Thus  $R$  is regular at some boundary point  $z \in \partial S_\gamma \cap U$ , but this must also be a point of discontinuity for  $R$ . This contradiction implies  $R = 0$ . We conclude

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^r} \int_V \omega = \sum_{H >_\Pi 0} \text{itres}_z[\omega, \gamma_H]$$

<sup>1</sup>Equivalently, each terminal point of a singular flag is simple in the sense of [5, §II.5.2].

for all  $s \in U$ . Both sides admit meromorphic continuation to  $\mathbb{C}_+^R$ . A meromorphic expression for the right-hand side valid for any  $s \in \mathbb{C}_+^R$  is

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{Z}_*} \text{itres}_z[\omega, \gamma]$$

which proves the formula.  $\square$

**4.1. A converse.** The hypothesis of  $\Pi$ -compatibility cannot be dropped. Let  $\Omega$  denote the set of all  $r$ -forms of the form (1) for some  $s \in \mathbb{C}_+^R$ . Our theorem is the ‘if’ direction of the next proposition and we omit the easy proof of the ‘only if’ direction.

**Proposition 2.** *The residue formula holds for all  $\omega \in \Omega$  which admit an iterated residue expansion along  $\Pi$  (if and) only if every flag formed from the hyperplanes  $H_1 = \{g_1 = 0\}, \dots, H_R = \{g_R = 0\}$  is  $\Pi$ -compatible.*

**4.2. Sufficient conditions for convergence.** Since our convergence condition is formulated in terms of one-dimensional integrals, the classical Jordan lemma may be directly applied to give sufficient conditions for convergence. These are easier to check than [4, Definition 2] which involves auxiliary forms.

**Proposition 3.** *Suppose that every singular flag of  $\omega = h(z) dz / (g_1 \cdots g_R)$  is  $\Pi$ -compatible.*

- (1) *If  $R > r$  and  $h(z)$  is a bounded holomorphic function on  $\Pi$ , then  $\omega$  admits an iterated residue expansion along  $\Pi$ .*
- (2) *If  $\psi \in V^\vee$  is a real linear form satisfying  $\psi(\theta) > 0$  for each  $\theta \in \Theta(1)$ ,  $h(z)$  is a holomorphic function on  $\Pi$  satisfying  $h(z) = o(|z|^R)$ , and  $\int_V \omega$  is absolutely convergent, then  $\omega$  admits an iterated residue expansion along  $\Pi$ .*

**4.3. Classical residues.** Although it is not necessary to apply our residue formula, here we explain how to express it using classical residues. We recall the definition. Consider a meromorphic  $r$ -form  $\omega$  on an open set  $U \subset V_{\mathbb{C}}$ . By a *system of divisors of  $\omega$  at a point  $m$*  we mean a collection  $D = (D_1, \dots, D_r)$  of divisors in  $U$  such that  $\omega$  is regular away from the union  $D_1 \cup \cdots \cup D_r$  and  $D_1 \cap \cdots \cap D_r$  is a discrete set containing  $m$ . Suppose that  $D_k = \{g_k = 0\}$  and define the topological  $r$ -cycle

$$\Gamma_g = \{z \in V_{\mathbb{C}} : |g_j(z)| = \varepsilon_j \text{ for all } j = 1, \dots, r\} \quad (4)$$

where the positive constants  $\varepsilon_j$  are sufficiently small that  $\Gamma_g \subset U$ ; this  $r$ -cycle is equipped with its unique orientation for which  $d(\arg g_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge d(\arg g_r) \geq 0$ .

**Definition 4.** *The residue of the form  $\omega$  with respect to the system of divisors  $D$  at  $m$  is*

$$\text{res}_D[\omega, m] = (2\pi i)^{-r} \int_{\Gamma_g} \omega.$$

*Remark 5.* The residue is independent of the  $\varepsilon_j$  by Stokes’s theorem, cf. [5, §II.5.1].

*Remark 6.* In the algebraic geometry literature this is also called the *Grothendieck local residue* and denoted

$$\text{res} \left[ \begin{array}{c} h dz \\ g_1, \dots, g_r \end{array} \right]$$

where  $\omega = h dz / (g_1 \cdots g_r)$ . It admits a purely algebraic definition [3, §III.9].

One is tempted to regard  $\text{res}_D[\omega, m]$  as determined by  $\omega$  and  $m$ , but it crucially depends on the system of divisors. If the divisors are irreducible, then this ambiguity amounts to a sign. However, if any of the divisors is *reducible*, then there are multiple ways to group the irreducible singular divisors into  $r$  divisors  $D_1, \dots, D_r$  and different groupings generally result in independent



residues. See §5.2 for an integral with three different groupings  $g$  leading to three non-homologous cycles  $\Gamma_g$ .

Let  $z = (z_1, \dots, z_r)$  be a basis of  $V_{\mathbb{C}}^{\vee}$ . For each singular flag  $\gamma : H_1 \supset H_1 \cap H_2 \supset \dots \supset H_1 \cap \dots \cap H_r$  with defining equations  $H_k = \{g_k = 0\}$ , let  $\partial g_{\gamma}/\partial z$  be the Jacobian matrix of  $(g_1, \dots, g_r) : V_{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^r$  with respect to  $z$ .

**Proposition 4.** *Let  $D = (D_1, \dots, D_r)$  be a system of divisors of  $\omega$  at  $m$ . Let  $F \subset Z$  denote the set of flags  $\gamma$  which terminate at  $m$  and arise from  $D$  in the sense that  $\gamma : H_1 \supset H_1 \cap H_2 \supset \dots \supset H_1 \cap \dots \cap H_r$  and  $H_k \subset D_k$  for all  $1 \leq k \leq r$ . If  $\partial g_{\gamma}/\partial z \in B^T B$  for every  $\gamma \in F$ , then*

$$\text{res}_D[\omega, m] = \sum_{\gamma \in F} \text{itres}_z[\omega, \gamma].$$

Set  $H = (H_1, \dots, H_r)$  and let  $\gamma = \gamma_H$ . Then

$$\text{itres}_z[\omega, \gamma] = \text{res}_H[\omega, m] 1_{B^T B}(\partial g_{\gamma}/\partial z)$$

where  $1_{B^T B}$  is the characteristic function of  $B^T B$ .

*Proof.* Assume  $\partial g_{\gamma}/\partial z \in B^T B$  for every  $\gamma \in F$ . Fix  $x_2, \dots, x_r \in \mathbb{C}$ . By Proposition 1 each of the values  $z_1^*, \dots, z_k^*$  is soluble for every  $\gamma \in F$ . Since  $z_1^*$  is soluble for the first residue of each flag  $\gamma \in F$ , the slice of the cycle  $\Gamma_g$  with coordinates  $x_2, \dots, x_r$  is a union of simple loops in the  $z_1$ -complex plane around these  $z_1^*$  values. By Cauchy's residue theorem  $(2\pi i)^{-r} \int_{\Gamma_g} \omega = (2\pi i)^{-(r-1)} \sum_{H \subset D_1} \text{itres}_{z_1}[\omega, H](x_2, \dots, x_r)$ . The rest of the first claim follows by induction. For the second claim, if  $\partial g_{\gamma}/\partial z \notin B^T B$  then we are done by Proposition 1, and if  $\partial g_{\gamma}/\partial z \in B^T B$  then the formula follows from the first claim.  $\square$

Now we may explain how to obtain a system of divisors satisfying [4, Definition 1] from a meromorphic form whose singular flags are  $\Pi$ -compatible.

**Corollary 1.** *Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be the set of all collections  $H = (H_1, \dots, H_r)$  of singular hyperplanes of  $\omega$  giving rise to any one of the flags  $\gamma \in Z_*$ . Let  $D_k = \cup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} H_k$  and set  $D = (D_1, \dots, D_r)$ . Then  $D_1 \cap \dots \cap D_r$  is discrete and*

$$\sum_{m \in D_1 \cap \dots \cap D_r} \text{res}_D[\omega, m] = \sum_{\gamma \in Z_*} \text{itres}_z[\omega, \gamma].$$

*If every singular flag of  $\omega$  is  $\Pi$ -compatible, then  $D$  satisfies [4, Definition 1]. If additionally  $\omega$  admits an iterated residue expansion along the polyhedron  $\Pi$ , then*

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^r} \int_V \frac{h(z) dz}{g_1(z) \cdots g_r(z)} = \sum_{m \in D_1 \cap \dots \cap D_r} \text{res}_D[\omega, m].$$

## 5. TWO EXAMPLES

We compute two two-dimensional integrals with the residue formula. The relevant minors for a  $2 \times 2$  matrix  $\begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix}$  are  $p_1 = a$ ,  $p_2 = ad - bc$ ,  $r_{12} = c$ , and  $q_{12} = b$ . The standard basis of  $\mathbb{R}^2$  is denoted by  $e_1, e_2$ .

**5.1. Example 1.** Let  $s_0, s_1, s_2 > 0$  and  $n_1, n_2 \geq 1$  be real parameters. Consider the integral

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{n_1^{2\pi i x} n_2^{2\pi i y} dx \wedge dy}{(-x - is_1)(-y - is_2)(x + y - is_0)}.$$

There are six flags in  $Z$  formed from the three singular hyperplanes  $H_1, H_2, H_0$ , and three terminal points  $m_{10}, m_{20}, m_{12}$ .




FIGURE 1. The configuration of singular hyperplanes in imaginary space.




FIGURE 2. An example of incompatibility.

5.1.1. *An incompatible polyhedron.* Take  $\Pi = \overline{\mathbb{H}^2} = \mathbb{R}^2 + i\Theta$  defined by the standard basis. The ordered collection  $H = (H_0, H_1)$  with Jacobian matrix

$$J_H = \begin{bmatrix} f_0(v_1) & f_0(v_2) \\ f_1(v_1) & f_1(v_2) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad p_1 = 1, \quad p_2 = 1, \quad q_{12} = 1, \quad r_{12} = -1$$

is  $\Pi$ -stable but not  $\Pi$ -compatible. If  $n_2 \geq n_1$ , then  $\omega$  admits an iterated residue expansion along  $\Pi$ , however the residue formula with respect to  $\Pi$  does not hold since  $\{\gamma : m = \gamma(2) \in \mathbb{H}^2\} = \emptyset$  yet  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \omega \neq 0$ . The second step of the integral leaves the polyhedron  $\Pi$  (see the path to  $m_{10}$  in Figure 2).

5.1.2. *A compatible polyhedron.* There is no single polyhedron that works for any  $n_1$  and  $n_2$ , but the following choices work:

$$\Pi = \begin{cases} \mathbb{R}^2 + i\Theta_A = \mathbb{R}^2 + i\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\langle -e_1 + e_2, e_2 \rangle & \text{if } n_2 \geq n_1, \\ \mathbb{R}^2 + i\Theta_B = \mathbb{R}^2 + i\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\langle e_1 - e_2, e_1 \rangle & \text{if } n_1 \geq n_2. \end{cases}$$




FIGURE 3. Staying in the polyhedron when  $n_2 \geq n_1$  (left) or  $n_2 \leq n_1$  (right).

For  $n_2 \geq n_1$  the only  $\Pi$ -stable collection of two hyperplanes is  $(H_1, H_0)$  for which

$$J_{(H_1, H_0)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad p_1 = 1, \quad p_2 = 1, \quad q_{12} = 0, \quad r_{12} = 0.$$

Similarly for  $n_1 \geq n_2$  the only  $\Pi$ -stable collection of two hyperplanes is  $(H_2, H_0)$  and  $J_{(H_2, H_0)}$  is the identity matrix. In either case, each of the six collections of two hyperplanes is compatible with the specified polyhedra. The distinguished subset  $Z_* \subset Z$  has only the flag  $H_1 \supset H_1 \cap H_0 = \{m_{10}\}$  if  $n_2 \geq n_1$ , or  $H_2 \supset H_2 \cap H_0 = \{m_{20}\}$  if  $n_1 \geq n_2$ , and the respective iterated residues for these flags are

$$\begin{aligned} \text{itres}_{z_A}[\omega, H_1 \supset H_1 \cap H_0] &= \frac{-in_1^{2\pi s_1} n_2^{-2\pi(s_0+s_1)}}{s_0 + s_1 + s_2}, \\ \text{itres}_{z_B}[\omega, H_2 \supset H_2 \cap H_0] &= \frac{in_1^{2\pi(s_0+s_2)} n_2^{2\pi s_2}}{s_0 + s_1 + s_2}. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude from the residue formula that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{n_1^{2\pi i x} n_2^{2\pi i y} dx \wedge dy}{(-x - is_1)(-y - is_2)(x + y - is_0)} = (2\pi i)^2 \begin{cases} \frac{-in_1^{2\pi s_1} n_2^{-2\pi(s_0+s_1)}}{s_0 + s_1 + s_2} & \text{if } n_2 \geq n_1, \\ \frac{in_1^{2\pi(s_0+s_2)} n_2^{2\pi s_2}}{s_0 + s_1 + s_2} & \text{if } n_2 \leq n_1. \end{cases}$$

**5.2. Example 2.** Consider the integral

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{h(x, y) dx \wedge dy}{(x - i)(y - i)(x + y - 2i)}.$$

**5.2.1. Classical residues.** There are three groupings of the singular hyperplanes into two divisors, so there are three corresponding residues. We will see that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{res} \begin{bmatrix} h dx \wedge dy \\ H_0 H_1, H_2 \end{bmatrix} &= \partial_x h(i, i), \\ \text{res} \begin{bmatrix} h dx \wedge dy \\ H_0 H_2, H_1 \end{bmatrix} &= -\partial_y h(i, i), \\ \text{res} \begin{bmatrix} h dx \wedge dy \\ H_1 H_2, H_0 \end{bmatrix} &= \partial_y h(i, i). \end{aligned}$$




FIGURE 4. The configuration of singular hyperplanes in imaginary space.

Thus the 2-cycles  $\Gamma$  defined by (4) for these three groupings are non-homologous. For the first grouping the 2-cycle  $\Gamma$  whose pairing with the closed form  $\omega$  gives the residue is the topological 2-torus

$$\Gamma = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |(x + y - 2i)(x - i)| = \varepsilon_1, |y - i| = \varepsilon_2\}.$$

It is oriented so that we first integrate along  $x$  and then  $y$ , both in a positive sense. The integral over  $x$  contributes two residues, and the remaining integral over  $y$  is a positive loop around  $y = i$ . This obtains

$$\operatorname{res} \left[ \frac{h dx \wedge dy}{H_0 + H_1, H_2} \right] = (2\pi i)^{-1} \int \left( \frac{h(i, y)}{(y - i)^2} - \frac{h(-y + 2i, y)}{(y - i)^2} \right) dy = \partial_x h(i, i).$$

The local residue for the grouping  $(H_0 H_2, H_1)$  is similarly computed. For the third grouping  $(H_1 H_2, H_0)$ , the first integral over  $x$  only contributes a single residue at  $x = i$ , and the remaining integral over  $y$  is again a positive loop around  $y = i$ , resulting in

$$\operatorname{res} \left[ \frac{h dx \wedge dy}{H_1 H_2, H_0} \right] = (2\pi i)^{-1} \int \frac{h(i, y) dy}{(y - i)^2} = \partial_y h(i, i).$$

5.2.2. *Computing the integral using the residue formula.* We use the polyhedron

$$\Pi = \mathbb{R}^2 + i\Theta, \quad \Theta = \langle e_1, -e_1 + e_2 \rangle.$$

We have the compatible and stable Jacobians

$$J_{(H_1, H_2)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad J_{(H_1, H_0)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad J_{(H_0, H_2)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The three other ordered pairs of hyperplanes are unstable so are compatible by definition. There are only two flags in  $Z_*$ ,

$$\gamma_{12} = \gamma_{10} : H_1 \supset \{(i, i)\}, \quad \gamma_{02} : H_0 \supset \{(i, i)\},$$

with iterated residues

$$\operatorname{itres}[\omega, \gamma_{12}] = \partial_y h(i, i), \quad \operatorname{itres}[\omega, \gamma_{02}] = \partial_x h(i, i) - \partial_y h(i, i).$$

The system of divisors at  $(i, i)$  determined by these flags is  $D = (H_0 H_1, H_2)$  (cf. Corollary 1).

Now let  $h$  be any holomorphic function on  $\Pi$  which decays sufficiently quickly so that  $\omega$  admits an iterated residue expansion along  $\Pi$  (e.g.  $h = e^{2\pi i(x+2y)}$ ). Then

$$\begin{aligned} (2\pi i)^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{h(x, y) dx \wedge dy}{(x-i)(y-i)(x+y-2i)} &= \text{res} \left[ \frac{h dx \wedge dy}{H_0 H_1, H_2} \right] \\ &= \text{itres}[\omega, \gamma_{12}] + \text{itres}[\omega, \gamma_{02}] \\ &= \partial_y h(i, i) + (\partial_x h(i, i) - \partial_y h(i, i)) = \partial_x h(i, i). \end{aligned}$$

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank Roman Ulvert and Lauren Williams for some helpful comments.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] V. V. Batyrev and Y. Tschinkel. Manin’s conjecture for toric varieties. *J. Algebr. Geom.*, 7(1):15–53, 1998.
- [2] S. Bhattacharya and A. O’Desky. On monic abelian trace-one cubic polynomials, 2023.
- [3] R. Hartshorne. *Residues and duality. Lecture notes of a seminar on the work of A. Grothendieck, given at Harvard 1963/64.*, volume 20 of *Lect. Notes Math.* Springer, Cham, 1966.
- [4] M. Passare, A. Tsikh, and O. Zhdanov. A multidimensional Jordan residue lemma with an application to Mellin–Barnes integrals. In *Contributions to complex analysis and analytic geometry. Based on a colloquium dedicated to Pierre Dolbeault, Paris, France, June 23-26, 1992*, pages 233–241. Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1994.
- [5] A. K. Tsikh. *Multidimensional residues and their applications. Transl. from the Russian by E. J. F. Primrose. Transl. edited by S. Gelfand*, volume 103 of *Transl. Math. Monogr.* Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society, 1992.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS  
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

*Email address:* andy.odesky@gmail.com