# Involution pipe dreams

Zachary Hamaker<sup>†</sup> umichjuft, Eric Marberg hkust, Brendan Pawlowski usc

### Schubert calculus and matrix Schubert varieties

Schubert polynomials and pipedreams

In 1889 Schubert introduced a method for studying problems in enumerative geometry. The Schubert polynomials  $\mathfrak{S}_w$  are (non-unique) polynomial representatives for  $[X_w] \in$ This method can be formulated in modern terms using intersection theory, e.g. via  $H^*(Fl(n))$  and unique representatives for  $[MX_w]_T \in H_T(M(n))$ . They can be defined calculations in the cohomology ring of the flag variety  $Fl(n) := GL(n, \mathbb{C})/B$ , where as generating functions of combinatorial objects called pipedreams, which we explain by  $B \subseteq GL(n)$  is a Borel subgroup. The ring  $H^*(Fl(n))$  has a *Schubert basis*  $\{[X_w]\}_{w \in S_n}$  example. The permutation 1432 has five pipedreams: determined by Schubert varieties  $X_w$ , the closures of the left B-orbits on Fl(n).

The Schubert variety  $X_w$  can be described by rank conditions. Let  $A_{[i][j]}$  be the upper left  $i \times j$  corner of a matrix A, and view  $w \in S_n$  as a permutation matrix. Then

 $X_w = \{A \in \operatorname{GL}(n) : \operatorname{rank}(A_{[i][j]}) \le \operatorname{rank}(w_{[i][j]}) \; \forall i, j\} / B.$ 

The orthogonal and symplectic subgroups O(n) and Sp(n) of GL(n) also decompose

The key properties are that the wires of each pipedream are permuted by 1432 as they travel from left to top and that no pair of strands crosses twice. Note that pipedreams

Fl(n) into finitely many orbits. Their closures, denoted  $\hat{X}_{y}$  and  $\hat{X}_{z}^{FPF}$ , are indexed by involutions y and fixed-point-free (fpf) involutions z in  $S_n$ , respectively.

Let M(n) be the set of  $n \times n$  matrices. By analogy, we have the matrix Schubert variety

 $MX_w = \{A \in M(n) : \operatorname{rank}(A_{[i][j]}) \le \operatorname{rank}(w_{[i][j]}) \forall i, j\}.$ 

Using an explicit map  $\mathbb{Z}[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \to H^*(\operatorname{Fl}(n))$  due to Borel, one can represent the class [X] of a subvariety  $X \subseteq \operatorname{Fl}(n)$  by a (non-unique) polynomial. By contrast, if For example, we have  $\mathfrak{S}_{1432} = x_2^2 x_3 + x_1^2 x_3 + x_1^2 x_2 x_1 x_2 x_3 + x_1 x_2^2,$ V is a representation of the group  $T \subseteq \operatorname{GL}(n)$  of diagonal matrices, the equivariant cohomology ring  $H^*_T(V)$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}[x_1,\ldots,x_n]$ , and we may identify the class where each monomial (from left to right) comes from the corresponding pipedream.  $[X] \in H^*_T(V)$  of a T-stable subvariety  $X \subseteq V$  with a unique polynomial.

# (Skew) Symmetric matrix Schubert varieties

Wyser and Yong have defined polynomial representatives  $\hat{\mathfrak{S}}_y$  and  $\hat{\mathfrak{S}}_z^{\text{FPF}}$  for  $[\hat{X}_y]$  and A pipedream D is symmetric if  $(i, j) \in D \Leftrightarrow (j, i) \in D$ . It is almost symmetric if  $[X_z^{\text{FPF}}]$  in  $H^*(\text{Fl}(n))$ . Let  $SM_n$  be the set of  $n \times n$  symmetric matrices over  $\mathbb{C}$ , and • if  $(i, j) \in D$  then  $(j > i) \in D$  (here i < j); let  $SSM_n$  be the set of  $n \times n$  skew symmetric matrices.

Definition: The symmetric matrix Schubert variety associated to the involution y is  $MX_y = \{A \in SM_n : \operatorname{rank}(A_{[i][j]}) \le \operatorname{rank}(y_{[i][j]}) \text{ for } i, j \in [n]\}.$ The skew-symmetric matrix Schubert variety associated to the fpf involution z is

 $M\hat{X}_z^{\text{FPF}} = \{A \in SSM_n : \operatorname{rank}(A_{[i][j]}) \le \operatorname{rank}(z_{[i][j]}) \text{ for } i, j \in [n]\}$ 

are determined by set the of +'s contained in  $\{(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : i + j \leq n\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{RP}(w)$ be the set of pipedreams for w.

Definition: (Billey-Jockusch-Stanley '93)

 $\mathfrak{S}_w = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |x_i|$  $D \in \mathcal{RP}(w) \ (i,j) \in D$ 

A Billey-Jockusch-Stanley formula

• if  $(j,i) \in D$  and  $(i,j) \notin D$ , the strands crossing at (j,i) also pass through (i,j).

For example, the last two pipedreams of 1432 above are almost symmetric.

an involution and z a fpf involution in  $S_n$ , define



#### Theorem 1

The class  $[M\hat{X}_y]$  in  $H_T(SM_n)$  equals  $2^{\kappa(y)}\hat{\mathfrak{S}}_y$ , where  $x \in T$  acts by x.A = xAx. Similarly, the class  $[M\hat{X}_z^{\text{FPF}}]$  in  $H_T(SSM_n)$  equals  $\hat{\mathfrak{S}}_z^{\text{FPF}}$ .

#### Remarks:

- Theorem 2 generalizes many classical results on degeneracy loci, e.g, Salmon 1862, Segre 1900, Giambelli 1906, Jozefiak-Pragacz 1980
- Work by Fink, Rajchgot and Sullivant relates varieties over  $SM_n$  and  $SSM_n$  cut out by *north-east* rank conditions to Type B/C Schubert calculus.

 $\mathcal{IP}(y) = \{D \cap \square_n : D \in \mathcal{RP}(y) \text{ and } D \text{ is almost symmetric} \}$  and  $\mathcal{FP}(z) = \{ D \cap \bowtie_n^{\neq} : D \in \mathcal{RP}(z) \text{ is symmetric with } (i,i) \in D \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n/2 \}.$ Let  $\kappa(y)$  be the number of 2-cycles in y.

#### Theorem 2

$$\hat{\mathfrak{S}}_{y} = 2^{\kappa(y)} \sum_{D \in \mathcal{IP}(y)} \prod_{(i,j) \in D} 2^{-\delta_{ij}} (x_i + x_j) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mathfrak{S}}_{z}^{\text{FPF}} = \sum_{D \in \mathcal{FP}(z)} \prod_{(i,j) \in D} (x_i + x_j).$$

Example:  $\hat{\mathfrak{S}}_{1432} = 2\left((x_2 + x_1)(x_3 + x_1) + (x_2 + x_1)2^{-1}(x_2 + x_2)\right)$ .

# Proof of Theorem 2 by Example

#### Then $\hat{\mathfrak{S}}_{y} = \frac{\mathfrak{S}_{53241} + \mathfrak{S}_{45312}}{m + m} = \frac{4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{2})(x_{1} + x_{3})((x_{1} + x_{4}) + (x_{2} + x_{3}))}{m + m} = 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{2})(x_{1} + x_{4}) + 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{2})(x_{2} + x_{3}) = 2^{\kappa(y)} \sum_{m + m} \frac{2^{-\delta_{ij}}(x_{i} + x_{j})}{m + m} = 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{2})(x_{1} + x_{4}) + 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{2})(x_{2} + x_{3}) = 2^{\kappa(y)} \sum_{m + m} \frac{2^{-\delta_{ij}}(x_{i} + x_{j})}{m + m} = 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{2})(x_{1} + x_{3}) + 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{2})(x_{2} + x_{3}) = 2^{\kappa(y)} \sum_{m + m} \frac{2^{-\delta_{ij}}(x_{i} + x_{j})}{m + m} = 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{2})(x_{1} + x_{3}) + 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{2})(x_{2} + x_{3}) = 2^{\kappa(y)} \sum_{m + m} \frac{2^{-\delta_{ij}}(x_{1} + x_{3})}{m + m} = 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{2})(x_{1} + x_{3}) + 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{3}) = 2^{\kappa(y)} \sum_{m + m} \frac{2^{-\delta_{ij}}(x_{1} + x_{3})}{m + m} = 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{3}) + 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{3}) = 2^{\kappa(y)} \sum_{m + m} \frac{2^{-\delta_{ij}}(x_{1} + x_{3})}{m + m} = 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{3}) + 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{3}) = 2^{\kappa(y)} \sum_{m + m} \frac{2^{-\delta_{ij}}(x_{1} + x_{3})}{m + m} = 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{3}) + 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{3}) = 2^{\kappa(y)} \sum_{m + m} \frac{2^{-\delta_{ij}}(x_{1} + x_{3})}{m + m} = 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{3}) + 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{3}) = 2^{\kappa(y)} \sum_{m + m} \frac{2^{-\delta_{ij}}(x_{1} + x_{3})}{m + m} = 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{3}) + 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{3}) = 2^{\kappa(y)} \sum_{m + m} \frac{2^{-\delta_{ij}}(x_{1} + x_{3})}{m + m} = 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{3}) + 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{3}) = 2^{\kappa(y)} \sum_{m + m} \frac{2^{-\delta_{ij}}(x_{1} + x_{3})}{m + m} = 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{3}) + 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{3}) = 2^{\kappa(y)} \sum_{m + m} \frac{2^{-\delta_{ij}}(x_{1} + x_{3})}{m + m} = 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{3}) + 4x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{3}) = 2^{\kappa(y)} \sum_{m + m} \frac{2^{-\delta_{ij}}(x_{1} + x_{3})}{m + m} = 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{3}) + 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{3}) = 2^{\kappa(y)} \sum_{m + m} \frac{2^{-\delta_{ij}}(x_{1} + x_{3})}{m + m} = 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{3}) = 2^{\kappa(y)} \sum_{m + m} \frac{2^{-\delta_{ij}}(x_{1} + x_{3})}{m + m} = 4x_{1}x_{2}(x_{1} + x_{3}) = 2^{\kappa(y)} \sum_{m + m} \frac{2^{-\delta$ $x_1 + x_3$ $x_1 + x_3$ $D \in \mathcal{IP}(y) \ (i,j) \in D$

For arbitrary y, the first equality is a recurrence on the  $\hat{\mathfrak{S}}_y$ 's, the second is a base case for dominant involutions and the final equality requires combinatorial proof.

# Connecting the theorems

# Abbreviated Bibliography

Our proof of Theorem 1 relies on passing from an O(n)-orbit on GL(n)/B to a B-orbit S. Billey, W. Jockusch, R. Stanley Some Combinatorial Properties of Schubert Polynoon GL(n)/O(n) whose closure in  $SM_n$  is  $MX_y$ . Geometric considerations then force *mials*, J. Algebraic Combin. (1993).  $\hat{\mathfrak{S}}_y$  to be a sum of monomials in variables  $(x_i + x_j)$  as in Theorem 2.

W. Fulton Flags, Schubert polynomials, degeneracy loci, and determinantal formulas, Set-theoretically,  $M\hat{X}_y$  is the vanishing locus of an ideal  $\hat{I}_y$  generated by minors of a Duke Math. J. (1992).

symmetric matrix  $\mathcal{X}_n = (x_{ij})_{i \ge j \in [n]}$ . For example,  $\hat{I}_{2143} = \langle x_{11}, \det \mathcal{X}_3 \rangle$ . Following B. Wyser, A. Yong Polynomials for symmetric orbit closures in the flag variety, Trans-Knutson-Miller, we conjecture that  $\hat{I}_y$  is prime and that it has a primary decomposition form. Groups (2017).

of  $\hat{I}_y$  whose top-dimensional components correspond to  $\mathcal{IP}(y)$ .

A. Knutson, E. Miller *Gröbner geometry of Schubert polynomials*, Ann. Math. (2005).

zachary.hamaker@gmail.com