

# MULTIPLYING SCHUBERT POLYNOMIALS BY SCHUR POLYNOMIALS

SAMI ASSAF, NANTEL BERGERON, AND FRANK SOTTILE

## THE PROBLEM

The Schubert polynomial  $\mathfrak{s}_w \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, x_2, \dots]$  is a polynomial representation for the Schubert class of  $w$  in the cohomology of the flag manifold.

Loosely,  $\mathfrak{s}_w$  is the unique homogeneous polynomial of degree  $\ell(w)$ , the length of  $w$ , representing the Schubert cycle of  $w$ .

Schubert polynomials form an additive basis for  $\mathbb{Z}[x_1, x_2, \dots]$ :

$$\mathfrak{s}_u \cdot \mathfrak{s}_v = \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_\infty} c_{u,v}^w \mathfrak{s}_w$$

The coefficients  $c_{u,v}^w$  enumerate flags in a suitable triple intersection of Schubert varieties, and so they are known to be nonnegative.

**Fundamental Problem:** Find a *positive* combinatorial construction for  $c_{u,v}^w$ .

Possibly,  $c_{u,v}^w$  counts (saturated) chains in Bruhat order from  $u$  to  $w$  satisfying some conditions imposed by  $v$ . (Recall, Bruhat order corresponds to inclusion of Schubert varieties.)

*Special case: Littlewood–Richardson Rule*

The Schur functions  $\{s_\lambda\}$  form an orthonormal basis for the ring of symmetric functions. For given  $\lambda \in \text{Par}(n)$ , the Schur function  $s_{\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_k)}$  is the character of the irreducible representation of  $\text{GL}_k$  indexed by  $\lambda$ .

The Littlewood–Richardson rule states

$$s_\lambda \cdot s_\mu = \sum_{\nu} c_{\lambda,\mu}^\nu s_\nu$$

where  $c_{\lambda,\mu}^\nu$  counts the number of saturated chains in Young’s lattice from  $\lambda$  to  $\nu$  with weight  $\mu$ .

The *Grassmannian permutation* associated to a partition  $\lambda$  and positive integer  $k$ , where  $\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k$ , is the unique permutation of shape  $\lambda$  with a descent at  $k$ , i.e.

$$v(\lambda, k) : i \mapsto i + \lambda_{k+1-i}$$

Schubert polynomials indexed by Grassmannian permutations are Schur functions:

$$s_\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \mathfrak{s}_{v(\lambda, k)}$$

Therefore the Littlewood–Richardson rule is indeed a special case.

The case we consider in this talk is that of a Schubert polynomial times a Schur polynomial:

$$\mathfrak{s}_u \cdot s_\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_\infty} c_{u, v(\lambda, k)}^w$$

Our approach is threefold:

- Bergeron and Sottile (1998) used the *Grassmannian-Bruhat order* to translate this problem into that finding the *Schur coefficients of a certain quasisymmetric function*.
- Assaf used *dual equivalence* to find the *Schur coefficients of certain quasisymmetric functions*.
- Billey, Billera, Stanley organized a *Banff workshop on quasisymmetric functions* and invited Assaf, Bergeron and Sottile.

#### GRASSMANNIAN-BRUHAT ORDER

Bruhat order on  $\mathfrak{S}_\infty$  as cover relations

$$u < w \text{ if } \ell(w) = \ell(u) + 1 \text{ and } w = u \cdot (a, b)$$

Young’s lattice on Par has cover relations

$$\mu < \nu \text{ if } |\nu| = |\mu| + 1 \text{ and } \nu \supset \mu$$

**Monk’s Rule** states that for  $\lambda = (1)$ , where  $v(\lambda, k) = (k, k + 1)$ , we have

$$\mathfrak{s}_u \cdot (x_1 + \dots + x_k) = \sum_{\substack{a \leq k < b \\ \ell(u \cdot (a, b)) = \ell(u) + 1}}$$

There is a nice proof of this using insertion, similar to proving RSK.

Motivated by this rule, define the *Grassmannian-Bruhat order* on  $\mathfrak{S}_\infty$  by cover relations

$$u <_k w \text{ if } \ell(w) = \ell(u) + 1 \text{ and } w = u \cdot (a, b) \text{ and } a \leq k < b$$

The *Grassmannian-Bruhat interval*  $[u, w]_k$  is the set of saturated chains in this order from  $u$  to  $w$ , e.g.

$$\mathcal{C} : \{u = x_1 \xrightarrow{(a_1, b_1)} x_2 \xrightarrow{(a_2, b_2)} \dots \xrightarrow{(a_n, b_n)} x_{n+1} = w\}$$

Define the *descent set* of such a chain by

$$\text{Des}(\mathcal{C}) = \{i \mid b_i > b_{i+1}\} \subseteq [n - 1]$$

**Theorem** (Bergeron–Sottile 1998)

$$G_{[u,w]_k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{C \in [u,w]_k} Q_{\text{Des}(C)} \stackrel{\text{thm}}{=} \sum_{\lambda} c_{u,v(\lambda,k)}^w s_{\lambda}$$

The idea of the proof is to use the formula

$$(x_1 + \cdots + x_k)^n = \sum_{\lambda \in \text{Par}(n)} f^{\lambda} s_{\lambda}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$$

to deduce that

$$|[u,w]_k| = \sum_{\lambda} f^{\lambda} c_{u,v(\lambda,k)}^w$$

### QUASISYMMETRIC FUNCTIONS

Quasisymmetric functions are a superset of symmetric functions with monomial basis

$$M_{1,3} = x_1 x_2^2 x_3 + x_1 x_2^2 x_4 + x_1 x_3^2 x_4 + x_2 x_3^2 x_4$$

Gessel’s *fundamental basis* for quasisymmetric functions is

$$Q_D = \sum_{\substack{i_1 \leq \cdots \leq i_n \\ j \in D \Rightarrow i_j < i_{j+1}}} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_n}$$

These two basis are triangularly related

$$Q_{1,3} = M_{1,3} + M_{1,2,3}$$

A *standard Young tableau* is a saturated chain in Young’s lattice. The *descent set* of a tableau is

$$\text{Des}(T) = \{i \mid \text{box for } i+1 \text{ lies above box for } i\}$$

**Theorem** (Gessel 1984) For  $\lambda$  a partition, we have

$$\sum_{T \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)} Q_{\text{Des}(T)} = s_{\lambda}$$

### DUAL EQUIVALENCE

Haiman defined involutions  $d_i$ ,  $1 < i < n$ , that interchanges  $i$  and  $i \pm 1$ , whichever is further away in the reading order.

**Theorem** (Haiman 1992) For  $T \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$ , we have

$$[T] = \text{SYT}(\lambda)$$

Therefore we can shift paradigms

$$\sum_{T \in [T_{\lambda}]} Q_{\text{Des}(T)} = s_{\lambda}$$

where  $T_\lambda$  is the superstandard tableau of shape  $\lambda$ .

**Definition** (Assaf) Given any set of combinatorial objects  $\mathcal{A}$  and any descent statistic  $\text{Des} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow 2^{[n-1]}$ , a family of involutions  $\{\varphi_i\}$  ( $1 < i < n$ ) is a *strong dual equivalence* if

- (i)  $\varphi_i$  has specific fixed points
- (ii)  $\varphi_i$  changes descents in a specific way
- (iii)  $\varphi_i = \varphi_{i+1}$  under specific conditions
- (iv)  $\varphi_i \circ \varphi_j = \varphi_j \circ \varphi_i$  whenever  $|i - j| \geq 3$
- (v) a non-local minimality condition (painful to verify)

**Theorem** (Assaf) If  $\{\varphi_i\}$  is a strong dual equivalence for  $(\mathcal{A}, \text{Des})$ , then

$$\sum_{T \in \mathcal{A}} Q_{\text{Des}(T)} = \sum_{\lambda} a_{\lambda} s_{\lambda}$$

where  $a_{\lambda}$  has a simple, explicit description corresponding to dual equivalence classes.

**Definition** (Assaf) A *weak dual equivalence* excludes condition (v), weakens condition (iii), and must arise "from words".

**Theorem** (Assaf) If  $\{\varphi_i\}$  is a weak dual equivalence for  $(\mathcal{A}, \text{Des})$ , then

$$\sum_{T \in \mathcal{A}} Q_{\text{Des}(T)} = \sum_{\lambda} a_{\lambda} s_{\lambda}$$

where  $a_{\lambda}$  has an explicit description, but isn't so easy to describe.

#### THE SOLUTION

Bergeron and Sottile developed a monoid(e) structure from the Grassmannian-Bruhat order that involves a six case involution on chains in the Grassmannian-Bruhat order.

**Theorem** (Assaf–Bergeron–Sottile) These involutions give a weak dual equivalence for  $([u, w]_k, \text{Des})$ . Therefore we have a combinatorial proof that  $c_{u, v(\lambda, k)}^w \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Theorem** (Assaf–Bergeron–Sottile) If  $wu^{-1}$  avoids six specific patterns of length up to 7, then these involutions give a strong dual equivalence. Therefore we have a nice combinatorial formula for  $c_{u, v(\lambda, k)}^w$  in this case.