

# Torus quotients of homogeneous spaces of the general linear group and the standard representation of certain symmetric groups.

S.S.Kannan, Pranab Sardar

Chennai Mathematical Institute, Plot H1, SIPCOT IT Park,  
Padur Post Office, Siruseri, Tamilnadu - 603103, India.  
kannan@cmi.ac.in, pranab@cmi.ac.in

November 20, 2018

14.08.2007

## Abstract

We give a stratification of the GIT quotient of the Grassmannian  $G_{2,n}$  modulo the normaliser of a maximal torus of  $SL_n(k)$  with respect to the ample generator of the Picard group of  $G_{2,n}$ . We also prove that the flag variety  $GL_n(k)/B_n$  can be obtained as a GIT quotient of  $GL_{n+1}(k)/B_{n+1}$  modulo a maximal torus of  $SL_{n+1}(k)$  for a suitable choice of an ample line bundle on  $GL_{n+1}(k)/B_{n+1}$ .

Keywords: GIT quotient, line bundle, simple reflection.

## Introduction

Let  $k$  be an algebraically closed field. Consider the action of a maximal torus  $T$  of  $SL_n(k)$  on the Grassmannian  $G_{r,n}$  of  $r$ - dimensional vector subspaces of an  $n$ - dimensional vector space over  $k$ . Let  $N$  denote the normaliser of  $T$  in  $SL_n(k)$ . Let  $\mathcal{L}_r$  denote the ample generator of the Picard group of  $G_{r,n}$ . Let  $W = N/T$  denote the Weyl group of  $SL_n(k)$  with respect to  $T$ .

In [5], it is shown that the semi-stable points of  $G_{r,n}$  with respect to the  $T$ -linearised line bundle  $\mathcal{L}_r$  is same as the stable points if and only if  $r$  and  $n$  are co-prime.

In this paper, we describe all the semi-stable points of  $G_{r,n}$  with respect to  $\mathcal{L}_r$ . In this connection, we prove the following result:

First, we introduce some notation needed for the statement of the theorem.

Let  $\mathfrak{h}_j$  be a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{sl}_{j+1}$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{h}_j)$  be the projective space and  $R_j \subseteq \mathfrak{h}_j^*$  be the root system. Let  $V_j$  be the open subset of  $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{h}_j)$  defined by

$$V_j := \{x \in \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{h}_j) : \alpha(x) \neq 0, \forall \alpha \in R_j\}.$$

Here, the Weyl group of  $\mathfrak{sl}_{j+1}$  is  $S_{j+1}$ , and  $\mathfrak{h}_j$  is the standard representation of  $S_{j+1}$ .

With this notation, taking  $m = \lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil$  (for this notation, see lemma 1.6) and  $t = \lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor$  we have

**Theorem:**  ${}_N \backslash \backslash G_{2,n}^{ss}(\mathcal{L}_2)$  has a stratification  $\bigcup_{i=0}^t C_i$  where  $C_0 = {}_{S_{m+1}} \backslash \backslash \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{h}_m)$ , and  $C_i = {}_{S_{i+m+1}} \backslash \backslash V_{i+m}$ .

On the other hand, the GIT quotient of  $GL_{n+1}(k)/B_{n+1}$  modulo a maximal torus of  $SL_{n+1}(k)$  for any ample line bundle on  $GL_{n+1}(k)/B_{n+1}$  and  $GL_n(k)/B_n$  are both birational varieties. So, it is a natural question to ask whether the flag variety  $GL_n(k)/B_n$  can be obtained as a GIT quotient of  $GL_{n+1}(k)/B_{n+1}$  modulo a maximal torus of  $SL_{n+1}(k)$  for a suitable choice of an ample line bundle on  $GL_{n+1}(k)/B_{n+1}$ . We give an affirmative answer to this question. For a more precise statement, see theorem 5.2. In this connection, we also prove that the action of the Weyl group  $S_{n+1}$  on the quotient is given by the standard representation. For a more precise statement, see corollary 5.4.

Section 1 consists of preliminary notation and some combinatorial lemmas about minuscule weights.

In section 2, we describe all Schubert cells in  $G_{r,n}$  admitting semi-stable points.

In section 3, we describe the action of the Weyl group  $W$  on  ${}_T \backslash \backslash G_{r,n}^{ss}(\mathcal{L}_r)$ .

In section 4, we describe a stratification of  ${}_N \backslash \backslash G_{2,n}^{ss}(\mathcal{L}_2)$ .

In section 5, we obtain  $GL_n(k)/B_n$  as a GIT quotient of  $GL_{n+1}(k)/B_{n+1}$  modulo a maximal torus of  $SL_{n+1}(k)$  for a suitable line bundle on  $GL_{n+1}(k)/B_{n+1}$ .

## 1 Preliminary notation and some combinatorial Lemmas

This section consists of preliminary notation and some combinatorial lemmas about minuscule weights. Let  $G$  be a reductive Chevalley group over an algebraically closed field  $k$ . Let  $T$  be a maximal torus of the commutator subgroup  $[G, G]$ ,  $B$  a Borel subgroup of  $G$  containing  $T$  and  $U$  be the unipotent radical of  $B$ . Let  $N$  be the normaliser of  $T$  in  $[G, G]$ . Let  $W = N/T$  be Weyl group of  $[G, G]$  with respect to  $T$  and  $R$  denote the set of roots with respect to  $T$ ,  $R^+$  positive roots with respect to  $B$ . Let  $U_\alpha$  denote the one dimensional

$T$ -stable subgroup of  $G$  corresponding to the root  $\alpha$  and let  $S = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_l\} \in R^+$  denote the set of simple roots. For a subset  $I \subseteq S$  denote  $W^I = \{w \in W | w(\alpha) > 0, \alpha \in I\}$ . Let  $X(T)$  (resp.  $Y(T)$ ) denote the set of characters of  $T$  (resp. one parameter subgroups of  $T$ ). Let  $E_1 := X(T) \otimes \mathbb{R}$ ,  $E_2 = Y(T) \otimes \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : E_1 \times E_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the canonical non-degenerate bilinear form. Choose  $\lambda_j$ 's in  $E_2$  such that  $\langle \alpha_i, \lambda_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$  for all  $i$ . Let  $\overline{C(B)} := \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ -span of the  $\lambda_i$ 's. Let  $\check{\alpha} \in Y(T)$  be as in page-19 of [1]. We also have  $s_\alpha(\chi) = \chi - \langle \chi, \check{\alpha} \rangle \alpha$  for all  $\alpha \in R$  and  $\chi \in E_1$ . Set  $s_i = s_{\alpha_i} \forall i = 1, 2 \dots l$ . Let  $\{\omega_i : i = 1, 2 \dots l\} \subset E_1$  be the fundamental weights; i.e.  $\langle \omega_i, \check{\alpha}_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$  for all  $i, j = 1, 2 \dots l$ .

We now prove some elementary lemmas about minuscule weights. For notation, we refer to [7].

**Lemma 1.1.** *Let  $I$  be any nonempty subset of  $S$ , and let  $\mu$  be a weight of the form  $\sum_{\alpha_i \in I} m_i \alpha_i - \sum_{\alpha_i \notin I} m_i \alpha_i$ , where  $m_i \in \mathbb{Q}$  for all  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq l$ ;  $m_i > 0$  for all  $\alpha_i \in I$  and  $m_i \geq 0$  for all  $\alpha_i \in S \setminus I$ . Then there is an  $\alpha \in I$  such that  $s_\alpha(\mu) < \mu$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $s_\alpha(\mu) = \mu - \langle \mu, \check{\alpha} \rangle \alpha$ , we need to find an  $\alpha \in I$  such that  $\langle \mu, \check{\alpha} \rangle > 0$ . This follows because the Cartan matrix  $(\langle \alpha_i, \check{\alpha}_j \rangle)_{i,j}$  is positive definite, so we can find an  $\alpha \in I$  such that  $\langle \sum_{\alpha_i \in I} m_i \alpha_i, \check{\alpha} \rangle > 0$ . Now we know that for any  $\alpha_i, \alpha_j \in S, i \neq j, \langle \alpha_i, \check{\alpha}_j \rangle \leq 0$ . Hence,  $\langle \sum_{\alpha_i \notin I} m_i \alpha_i, \check{\alpha} \rangle \leq 0$  for this  $\alpha \in I$ . Thus  $\langle \mu, \check{\alpha} \rangle > 0$ . This proves the lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 1.2.** *Let  $\lambda$  be any dominant weight and let  $I = \{\alpha \in S : \langle \lambda, \check{\alpha} \rangle = 0\}$ . Let  $w_1, w_2 \in W^I$  be such that  $w_1(\lambda) = w_2(\lambda)$ . Then  $w_1 = w_2$ .*

*Proof.* See [1] and [2].  $\square$

In the rest of this section,  $\omega$  will denote a minuscule weight and  $I := \{\alpha \in S : \langle \omega, \check{\alpha} \rangle = 0\}$

**Lemma 1.3.** *Let  $\alpha \in S$  and  $\tau \in W$  such that  $l(s_\alpha \tau) = l(\tau) + 1$  and  $s_\alpha \tau \in W^I$ , then  $\tau \in W^I$ ;  $s_\alpha \tau(\omega) = \tau(\omega) - \alpha$ .*

*Proof.* The proof of the first part of the lemma is clear. Now  $s_\alpha \tau(\omega) = \tau(\omega) - \langle \tau(\omega), \check{\alpha} \rangle \alpha$ . Since the pairing  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  is  $W$ -invariant,  $\langle \tau(\omega), \check{\alpha} \rangle = \langle \omega, \tau^{-1} \check{\alpha} \rangle$ . Again since  $l(s_\alpha \tau) = l(\tau) + 1$ , we have  $\tau^{-1} \check{\alpha} > 0$ . Let  $\tau^{-1} \check{\alpha} = \sum_{i=1}^l m_i \check{\alpha}_i, m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . Now, if  $\langle \omega, \tau^{-1} \check{\alpha} \rangle = 0$ , then  $m_i > 0 \Rightarrow \langle \omega, \tau^{-1} \check{\alpha}_i \rangle = 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq l$ . This gives a contradiction, since  $s_\alpha \tau \in W^I$  and  $s_\alpha \tau(\tau^{-1} \check{\alpha}) = s_\alpha(\check{\alpha}) < 0$ . Thus,  $\langle \omega, \tau^{-1} \check{\alpha} \rangle = 1$ . Hence the lemma is proved.  $\square$

**Corollary 1.4.** 1. *For any  $w \in W^I$ , the number of times that  $s_i, 1 \leq i \leq n - 1$  appears in a reduced expression of  $w =$  (coefficient of  $\alpha_i$  in  $\omega$ )  $-$  (coefficient of  $\alpha_i$  in  $w(\omega)$ ) and hence it is independent of the reduced expression of  $w$ .*

2. *Let  $w \in W^I$  and let  $w = s_{i_1} \cdot s_{i_2} \dots s_{i_k} \in W^I$  be a reduced expression. Then  $w(\omega) = \omega - \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_{i_j}$ . and  $l(w) = ht(\omega - w(\omega))$ .*

*Proof.* Follows from Lemma 1.3.  $\square$

**Lemma 1.5.** Let  $w = s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \dots s_{i_k} \in W$  such that  $ht(\omega - s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \dots s_{i_k}(\omega)) = k$  then  $w \in W^I$  and  $l(w) = k$ .

*Proof.* This follows from the corollary 1.4.  $\square$

**Lemma 1.6.** Let  $\omega = \sum_{i=1}^l m_i \alpha_i$ ,  $m_i \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$  be a minuscule weight. Let  $I = \{\alpha \in S : \langle \omega, \check{\alpha} \rangle = 0\}$ . Then, there exist a unique  $w \in W^I$  such that  $w(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^l (m_i - [m_i]) \alpha_i$  where for any real number  $x$ ,

$$[x] := \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x \text{ is an integer} \\ [x] + 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* Using lemma 1.1 and the fact that  $\omega$  is minuscule we can find a sequence  $s_{i_k}, s_{i_{k-1}}, \dots, s_{i_1}$  of simple reflections in  $W$  such that for each  $j$ ,  $2 \leq j \leq k+1$ , coefficient of  $\alpha_{i_j}$  in  $s_{i_{j-1}} \dots s_{i_1}(\omega_r)$  is positive and  $(s_{i_k} s_{i_{k-1}} \dots s_{i_1}(\omega_r)) = \omega_r - \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_{i_j}$  for each  $j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq k$ . The existence part of the lemma follows from here. The uniqueness follows from lemma 1.2.  $\square$

**Lemma 1.7.** Let  $\omega = \sum_{i=1}^l m_i \alpha_i$ ,  $m_i \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$  be a minuscule weight. Let  $I = \{\alpha \in S : \langle \omega, \check{\alpha} \rangle = 0\}$ . Then, there exist a unique  $\tau \in W^I$  such that  $\tau(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^l (m_i - [m_i]) \alpha_i$ .

*Proof.* Proof is similar to that of lemma 1.6.  $\square$

Now onwards, we say that for two elements  $w$  and  $\tau$  in  $W$ ,  $w \leq \tau$  if  $l(\tau) = l(w) + l(\tau w^{-1})$ .

**Lemma 1.8.** Let  $\omega$  and  $I$  be as in the lemma 1.6 and  $\tau, \sigma \in W^I$ . Then  $\tau(\omega) \leq \sigma(\omega) \Leftrightarrow \sigma \leq \tau$ .

*Proof.* The proof is by induction on  $ht(\sigma(\omega) - \tau(\omega))$  which is a non-negative integer.  $ht(w(\sigma\omega) - \tau(\omega)) = 1$ : This means  $\sigma(\omega) = \tau(\omega) + \alpha$  for some  $\alpha \in S$ . Applying  $s_\alpha$  on both the sides of this equation, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} s_\alpha \sigma(\omega) &= -\alpha + s_\alpha \tau(\omega) \\ \implies \tau(\omega) - \langle \omega, \sigma^{-1} \alpha \rangle \alpha &= -2\alpha + \tau(\omega) - \langle \omega, \tau^{-1} \alpha \rangle \alpha \\ \implies \langle \omega, \sigma^{-1} \alpha \rangle &= 2 + \langle \omega, \tau^{-1} \alpha \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\omega$  is minuscule, we get  $\langle \omega, \sigma^{-1} \alpha \rangle = 1$  and  $\langle \omega, \tau^{-1} \alpha \rangle = -1$ . This implies, by the lemma 1.5, that  $l(s_\alpha \sigma) = l(\omega) + 1$  and  $s_\alpha \omega \in W^I$ . Now, we have  $s_\alpha \sigma(\omega) = \tau(\omega)$ . Hence, by lemma 1.2, we get  $\tau = s_\alpha \sigma$  with  $l(\tau) = l(\sigma) + 1$ . Thus the result follows in this case.

Let us assume that the result is true for  $ht(\sigma(\omega) - \tau(\omega)) \leq m - 1$ .

$ht(\sigma(\omega) - \tau(\omega)) = m$ : Let  $\sigma(\omega) - \tau(\omega) = \sum_{\alpha_i \in J} m_i \alpha_i$  where  $J \subseteq S$  and  $m_i$ 's are positive integers. Since  $\langle \sum_{\alpha_i \in J} m_i \alpha_i, \sum_{\alpha_i \in J} m_i \check{\alpha}_i \rangle \geq 0$  there exist an  $\alpha_j \in J$  such that  $\langle \sigma(\omega) - \tau(\omega), \check{\alpha}_j \rangle > 0$ . Hence either  $\langle \sigma(\omega), \check{\alpha}_j \rangle > 0$  or  $\langle \tau(\omega), \check{\alpha}_j \rangle < 0$ .

Case I: Let us assume  $\langle \sigma(\omega), \check{\alpha}_j \rangle > 0$ . Then  $l(s_{\alpha_j} \sigma) = l(\sigma) + 1$  and  $s_{\alpha_j} \sigma \in W^I$ . Now

$ht(s_{\alpha_j}\sigma(\omega) - \tau(\omega)) = m - 1$ . Hence, by induction  $\tau = \phi_1 s_{\alpha_j} \sigma$  with  $l(\tau) = l(\phi_1) + l(s_{\alpha_j}\sigma)$ . Thus taking  $\phi = \phi_1 \cdot s_{\alpha_j}$  we are done in this case.

Case II: Let us assume  $\langle \tau(\omega), \check{\alpha}_j \rangle < 0$ . Then  $l(s_{\alpha_j}\tau) = l(\tau) - 1$  and  $s_{\alpha_j}\tau \in W^I$ . Since  $\sigma(\omega) - s_{\alpha_j}\tau(\omega) = m - 1$  by induction  $s_{\alpha_j}\tau = \phi_2\sigma$  with  $l(s_{\alpha_j}\tau) = l(\phi_2) + l(\sigma)$ . Thus taking  $\phi = s_{\alpha_j}\phi_2$  we are done in this case also. This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 1.9.** *Let  $\omega, w$  and  $I$  be as in lemma 1.6. Let  $\sigma \in W^I$  be such that  $\sigma(n\omega) \leq 0$  for some positive integer. Then, we have  $w \leq \sigma$ .*

*Proof.* The proof follows from lemma 1.6, 1.8 and the fact that  $\omega$  is minuscule.  $\square$

**Corollary 1.10.** *Let  $\omega, w$  and  $I$  be as in lemma 1.6. Let  $\sigma \in W^I$  be such that  $\sigma(n\omega) \geq 0$  for some positive integer. Then, we have  $\sigma \leq w$*

*Proof.* The proof follows from lemma 1.7, 1.8 and the fact that  $\omega$  is minuscule.  $\square$

## 2 Description of Schubert varieties in the Grassmannian having semi-stable points

In this section, we have the following notation. Let  $G = GL_n(k)$  with characteristic of  $k$  is either zero or bigger than  $n$ . Let  $r \in \{2, \dots, n - 2\}$ . Consider the action of a maximal torus  $T$  of  $SL_n(k)$  on the Grassmannian  $G_{r,n}$ . Let  $B$  be a Borel subgroup of  $G$  containing  $T$ . Let  $S = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}\}$  be the set of simple roots with respect to  $B$  arranged in the ordering of the vertices in the Dynkin diagram of type  $A_{n-1}$ . Let  $I_r = S \setminus \{\alpha_r\}$ . We first note that  $G_{r,n}$  is the homogeneous space  $GL_n(k)/P_r$  where  $P_r = BW_{I_r}B$  is the maximal parabolic subgroup of  $GL_n(k)$  containing  $B$  associated to the simple root  $\alpha_r$ . Let  $\omega_r$  be the fundamental weight associated to the simple root  $\alpha_r$  and let  $\mathcal{L}_r$  denote the line bundle on  $GL_n(k)/P_r$  corresponding to  $\omega_r$ . We describe all Schubert cells in  $GL_n(k)/P_r$  admitting semi-stable points for the above mentioned action of  $T$  with respect to the line bundle  $\mathcal{L}_r$ .

Some of the elementary facts about the combinatorics of  $W^{I_r}$  that is being used in this section can be found in [7]. For the convenience of the reader, we prove them here.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $w \in W^I, w \neq id$ . Then there exists an  $i \in \mathbb{N}, i \leq r$  and a sequence of positive integers  $\{a_j\}, j = 1, 2, \dots, r$  such that the following holds.*

(a)  $a_j \geq j$  for all  $j, i \leq j \leq r$

(b)  $w = (s_{a_i} \cdot s_{a_i-1} \dots s_i)(s_{a_{i+1}} \cdot s_{a_{i+1}-1} \dots s_{i+1}) \dots (s_{a_r} \cdot s_{a_r-1} \dots s_r)$  with  $l(w) = \sum_{j=i}^r (a_j - j + 1)$

*Proof.* Let  $i$  be the least positive integer such that  $s_{\alpha_i} \leq w$ . The rest of the proof follows from braid relations in  $W$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $w, \tau \in W^I$ . Write  $w = (s_{a_i} \cdot s_{a_i-1} \dots s_i)(s_{a_{i+1}} \cdot s_{a_{i+1}-1} \dots s_{i+1}) \dots (s_{a_r} \cdot s_{a_r-1} \dots s_r)$  and  $\tau = (s_{b_k} \cdot s_{b_k-1} \dots s_k)(s_{b_{k+1}} \cdot s_{b_{k+1}-1} \dots s_{k+1}) \dots (s_{b_r} \cdot s_{b_r-1} \dots s_r)$  be as in the lemma 2.1. Then  $w \leq \tau \Leftrightarrow k \leq i$  and  $b_j \geq a_j$  for all  $j, i \leq j \leq r$ .*



where the array has  $r$  rows, and the length of the  $i$ -th row is  $a_i - (i - 1)$ . Note that  $\beta_{1,a_1} = \alpha_{a_1}$ , and for  $2 \leq i \leq r$ ,  $\beta_{i,a_i-i+1} = \alpha_{a_i}$ , only if  $a_i \geq a_{i-1} + 2$ . In this case, for all  $j$ ,  $i \leq j \leq r$ ,  $\beta_{j,a_{i-1}-i+2} = \beta_{i-1,a_{i-1}-i+2} + \alpha_{a_{i-1}+1} + \alpha_{a_{i-1}+2} + \cdots + \alpha_{a_j}$  and  $\beta_{j,a_{i-1}-i+3} = \alpha_{a_{i-1}+2} + \alpha_{a_{i-1}+3} + \cdots + \alpha_{a_j}$ . If  $a_i = a_{i-1} + 1$ , then  $a_i - i + 1 = a_{i-1} - (i - 1) + 1$ , therefore, the  $(i - 1)$ -th and  $i$ -th rows have same length. In this case for all  $j$ ,  $i \leq j \leq r$ ,  $\beta_{j,a_i-i+1} = \beta_{i-1,a_i-i+1} + \alpha_{a_{i-1}+1} + \alpha_{a_{i-1}+2} + \cdots + \alpha_{a_j}$ .

For any  $w \in W^I$ , let  $X(w) := \overline{BwP_r/P_r}$  denote the Schubert variety in  $GL_n(k)/P_r$ .

We recall  $BwP_r/P_r = U_w w P_r$ , where  $U_w$  is the product  $\prod_{\alpha \in R^+(w^{-1})} U_\alpha$  of the root groups  $U_\alpha$ , and we describe below the ordering of roots in which the product is taken.

Consider the open set

$$V := \left\{ \prod_{\beta_{ij} \in R^+(w^{-1})} u_{\beta_{ij}}(x_{\beta_{ij}}) \cdot w \cdot P_r : x_{\beta_{ij}} \neq 0, \forall \beta_{ij} \in R^+(w^{-1}) \right\}$$

of  $X(w)$  in  $GL_n/P_r$  where the order in which the product is taken is as follows: Put a partial order on  $R^+(w^{-1})$  by declaring  $\beta_{ij} \leq \beta_{kl}$  if either  $i = k$  and  $j \geq l$  or if  $i < k$ . Now we take the product so that whenever  $\beta_{ij} \leq \beta_{kl}$ ,  $u_{\beta_{ij}}(x_{\beta_{ij}})$  appears on the right hand side of  $u_{\beta_{kl}}(x_{\beta_{kl}})$ . Note that  $u_{\beta_{ij}}(x_{\beta_{ij}})$ 's commute with each other, since  $\beta_{i_1,j_1}, \beta_{i_2,j_2} \in R^+(w^{-1})$  implies  $\beta_{i_1,j_1} + \beta_{i_2,j_2}$  is not a root. This follows from the fact that no element of  $R^+(w^{-1})$  starts or ends with  $\alpha_{a_k+1}$ , for any  $k$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq r - 1$  (i.e. for all  $\beta_{i,j} \in R^+(w^{-1})$  and  $1 \leq k \leq r - 1$ ,  $\beta_{i,j} - \alpha_{a_k+1} \neq 0$  is not a root.)

Now the natural action of the maximal torus  $T$  on  $GL_n(k)/P_r$ , induces an action of  $T$  on  $V$ .

**Lemma 2.6.** *Consider the torus  $T' = \prod_{\beta \in R^+(w^{-1})} G_{m,\beta}$  where  $G_{m,\beta} = G_m$  for each  $\beta \in R^+(w^{-1})$ . We have a natural action of  $T$  on  $T'$  through the homomorphism of algebraic groups  $\Phi : T \rightarrow T'$  defined by  $\Phi(t) = (\beta(t))_\beta$  for all  $t \in T$ . The map  $V \rightarrow T'$  defined by  $\prod u_\beta(x_\beta)w \cdot P \mapsto (x_\beta)_\beta$  is a  $T$ -equivariant isomorphism of varieties.*

*Proof.* Proof is easy. □

We now describe all the Schubert varieties admitting semi-stable points.

Let  $n = qr + t$ , with  $1 \leq t \leq r$  and let  $w \in W^{I_r}$ .

**Lemma 2.7.** *Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $X(w)_{T'}^{ss}(L_r)$  is non-empty.
- (2)  $\tau_r \leq w$  and  $w\tau_r^{-1} \leq (\tau^{n-r})^{-1}$ .
- (3)  $w = (s_{a_1} \cdots s_1) \cdots (s_{a_r} \cdots s_r)$ , where  $\{a_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, r\}$  is an increasing sequence of positive integers such that  $a_i \geq i(q + 1) \forall i \leq t - 1$  and  $a_i = iq + (t + 1) \forall t \leq i \leq r$ .

*Proof.* By Hilbert-Mumford criterion (theorem 2.1 of [3]) a point  $x \in G/P_r$  is semi-stable if and only if  $\mu^L(\sigma x, \lambda) \leq 0$  for all  $\lambda \in \overline{C(B)}$  and for all  $\sigma \in W$ . By the lemma 2.1 of

[6], this statement is equivalent to  $\langle -w_\sigma(\omega), \lambda \rangle \geq 0$  for all  $\lambda \in \overline{C(B)}$  and for all  $\sigma \in W$ , where  $w_\sigma \in W^{I_r}$  is such that  $\sigma x \in U_{w_\sigma} w_\sigma P_r$ . Thus, by corollary 1.8 applied to the situation  $\omega = \omega_r$ , a point  $x$  is semi-stable if and only if  $x$  is not in the  $W$ - translates of  $U_\tau \tau P_r$  with  $\tau \in W^{I_r}$  and  $\tau_r \not\leq \tau$ .

Now, for a  $w \in W^{I_r}$ ,  $X(w)$  is not contained in the finite union  $\bigcup_{\tau \not\leq \tau_r} U_\tau \tau P_r$  if and only if  $\tau_r \leq w$ . The second condition  $w \tau_r^{-1} \leq (\tau^{n-r})^{-1}$  is an immediate consequence when  $w \geq \tau_r$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.8.** *Let  $X_{i,j}$  denote the regular function on  $V$  defined by  $\prod u_{\beta_{kl}}(x_{\beta_{kl}})w.P \mapsto x_{\beta_{ij}}$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq r-1$  and  $1 \leq j \leq a_i - i + 1$ ; and let  $Y_{i,j} := \frac{X_{i,a_i-i+1} \cdot X_{i+1,j}}{X_{i,j} \cdot X_{i+1,a_i-i+1}}$ . Then the ring of  $T$ -invariant regular functions is generated by  $Y_{i,j}, Y_{i,j}^{-1}$ , where  $1 \leq j \leq a_i - i$ , for each  $i$ , and  $1 \leq i \leq r-1$ ;  $Y_{i,j}$  are algebraically independent.*

*Proof.* Now, consider the homomorphism of tori,

$$T \xrightarrow{\Psi} T' \text{ defined by}$$

$$\Psi(t) = (t^{\beta_{ij}}), \quad i = 1, 2 \dots r, j = 1, 2 \dots a_i - i + 1.$$

Proof of the proposition follows from the following claim.

Claim:  $E_{i,a_i-(i-1)} - E_{i+1,a_i-(i-1)} - E_{i,j} + E_{i+1,j}; i = 1, 2 \dots r-1$  and  $j = 1, 2 \dots a_i - i$  forms a basis for  $\text{Ker}(\Psi^* : X(T) \rightarrow X(T'))$ , where  $E_{i,k}$  is the matrix with 1 in the  $(i, k)^{\text{th}}$  place and 0 elsewhere.

Proof of the claim: Now any character of  $T'$  is of the form  $(t_\beta) \mapsto \prod t_\beta^{m_\beta}$  where  $m_\beta$  are integers. Now such a character is  $T$ -invariant iff the sum  $\sum_\beta m_\beta \beta$  is zero. Plugging in the expression of  $\beta$ 's in terms of the simple roots  $\alpha_k$ 's and noting that they are linearly independent we get a set of linear equations over  $\mathbb{Z}$ , by equating to zero the coefficient of each  $\alpha_k$ . Let us denote by  $R(p)$ ,  $1 \leq p \leq r$  the set of roots appearing in  $p$ -th row of the array described above; and let  $C(q)$ ,  $1 \leq q \leq a_r - (r-1)$  denote the set of roots appearing in the  $q$ -th column of the array.

Comparing the coefficient of  $\alpha_1$ , we have  $\sum_{\beta \in C(1)} m_\beta = 0$ .

Comparing the coefficient of  $\alpha_2$ , and using the above observation, we get  $\sum_{\beta \in C(2)} m_\beta = 0$ . Proceeding this way, we get

$$\sum_{\beta \in C(j)} m_\beta = 0 \quad \forall j, 1 \leq j \leq a_1.$$

Let  $k$  be the least positive integer such that  $\alpha_k + \dots + \alpha_{a_i}$  is the first root in the column  $C(a_1 + 1)$ .

Comparing the coefficient of  $\alpha_k$ , we get  $\sum_{\beta \in C(a_1+1)} m_\beta = 0$ .

Proceeding this way, we get

$$\sum_{\beta \in C(j)} m_\beta = 0 \quad \forall j, 1 \leq j \leq a_r - r + 1.$$



Now comparing the coefficient of  $\alpha_{a_r}$ , we get  $\sum_{\beta \in R(r)} m_\beta = 0$ .  
Comparing the coefficient of  $\{\alpha_j : j = a_{r-1}, 2 + a_{r-1}, \dots, a_r\}$ , we get

$$\sum_{\beta \in R(r-1)} m_\beta + \sum_{\beta \in R(r)} m_\beta = 0.$$

Thus we have

$$\sum_{\beta \in R(r-1)} m_\beta = 0.$$

Proceeding this way, we get

$$\sum_{\beta \in R(i)} m_\beta = 0 \quad \forall i, 1 \leq i \leq r.$$

□

### 3 Description of the action of the Weyl group on the quotient $T \backslash \backslash G_{r,n}^{ss}(\mathcal{L}_r)$

In this section, we describe the action of the Weyl group on the quotient  $T \backslash \backslash G_{r,n}^{ss}(\mathcal{L}_r)$ .

We first write down the stabiliser of  $X(w)$  in  $W$ . Let  $w = (s_{a_1} \cdots s_1)(s_{a_2} \cdots s_2) \cdots (s_{a_r} \cdots s_r) \in W^{I_r}$  be such that  $w \geq \tau_r$ . Then, we have

**Lemma 3.1.** *Description of the set  $\{s_i : s_i(X(w)) \subseteq X(w), i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ :*

1.  $\{s_j : 1 \leq j \leq a_1 - 2\}$ .
2.  $\{s_j : a_p + 2 \leq j \leq a_{p+1} - 2, p = 1, 2, \dots, r-1\}$ .
3.  $\{s_{a_p-1} : p = 1, 2, \dots, r\}$ .
4.  $\{s_{a_p} : p = 1, 2, \dots, r\}$ .

*Proof.* Proof uses braid relations of the Weyl group  $S_n$ . □

We now explicitly describe the action of the stabilisers on

**Proposition 3.2.** *Description of the action:*

1.  $s_j$  interchanges  $Y_{i,j}$  and  $Y_{i,j+1}$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, r-1$ , and keeps all other  $Y_{i,k}$ 's fixed.
2.  $s_j$  interchanges  $Y_{i,j-p}$  and  $Y_{i,j-p+1}$  for  $p+1 \leq i \leq r-1$ , and keeps all other  $Y_{i,k}$ 's fixed.
- 3(a). If  $2 \leq p \leq r$ , then  $s_{a_p-1}$  fixes all the  $Y_{i,k}, 1 \leq i \leq p-1$ .  
(b). If  $p \leq i \leq r-1$ ,  $a_p - p = a_i - i$  and  $1 \leq k \leq a_p - p$ , then  $s_{a_p-1}(Y_{i,a_p-p}) = Y_{i,a_p-p}^{-1}$ , and  $s_{a_p-1}(Y_{i,k}) = Y_{i,k} \cdot Y_{i,a_p-p}^{-1}$ .
- (c). If  $p+1 \leq i \leq r-1$ ,  $a_i - i \geq a_p - p$ , then  $s_{a_p-1}(Y_{i,a_p-p}) = Y_{i,a_p-p+1}$ , and keeps all other

$Y_{i,k}$ 's fixed.

4(a).  $2 \leq p \leq r-1$ , and  $a_p = a_{p-1} + 1$ .

(i). If  $3 \leq p \leq r$  and  $1 \leq k \leq a_{a_{p-2}-p+2}$ , then  $s_{a_p}(Y_{p-2,k}) = Y_{p-2,k} \cdot Y_{p-1,k} \cdot Y_{p-1,a_{p-2}-p+3}^{-1}$ .

(ii). If  $1 \leq k \leq a_p - p$  then  $s_{a_p}(Y_{p-1,k}) = Y_{p-1,k}^{-1}$  and  $s_{a_p}(Y_{p,k}) = Y_{p,k} \cdot Y_{p-1,k}$ .

(iii).  $Y_{i,k}$ 's are fixed for  $i \neq p-2, p-1, p$  and  $1 \leq k \leq a_i - i$ .

(b)(i). If  $1 \leq i \leq p-1$  or  $a_p - p + 1 \leq k \leq a_r$ ,  $Y_{i,k}$ 's are fixed.

(ii). If  $i = p$  and  $1 \leq k \leq a_p - p$  then  $s_{a_p}(Y_{p,k}) = 1 - Y_{p,k}$ .

(iii) If  $p+1 \leq i \leq r-1$  and  $1 \leq k \leq a_p - p$ , then,  $s_{a_p}(Y_{i,k}) = \frac{1 - \prod_{m=p}^i (Y_{m,k}/Y_{m,a_p-p+1})}{1 - \prod_{m=p}^{i-1} (Y_{m,k}/Y_{m,a_p-p+1})} \times Y_{i,a_p-p+1}$ .

(c). Action of  $s_{a_r}$ :

(i). If  $a_r = a_{r-1} + 1$  then  $s_{a_r}(Y_{r-2,k}) = Y_{r-2,k} \cdot Y_{r-1,k} \cdot Y_{r-1,a_{r-2}-r+3}^{-1}$ , for  $1 \leq k \leq a_{r-2} - r + 2$  and  $s_{a_r}(Y_{r-1,k}) = Y_{r-1,k}^{-1}$ , for  $1 \leq k \leq a_r - r$ .

(ii). If  $a_{r-1} + 2 \leq a_r$  then  $Y_{r,k}$ 's are fixed for  $1 \leq k \leq a_r - r + 1$ .

*Proof.* Proof is essentially based on the following properties of groups with  $BN$ -pair and commutator relations:

$$(i) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{x} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x & 1 \\ 0 & \frac{-1}{x} \end{pmatrix}, \text{ and}$$

$$(ii) [u_\alpha(x_\alpha), u_\beta(x_\beta)] = \begin{cases} u_{\alpha+\beta}(x_\alpha \cdot x_\beta) & \text{if } \alpha = \epsilon_i - \epsilon_j \text{ and } \beta = \epsilon_j - \epsilon_k, i < j < k; \\ u_{\alpha+\beta}(-x_\alpha \cdot x_\beta) & \text{if } \alpha = \epsilon_i - \epsilon_j \text{ and } \beta = \epsilon_k - \epsilon_i, k < i < j. \end{cases}$$

We first consider the action of  $W$  on the  $X_{j,k}$ 's and then describe resulting action on the  $Y_{j,k}$ 's. If  $1 \leq i \leq a_1 - 2$  then  $s_i$  interchanges  $X_{j,i}$  and  $X_{j,i+1}$  for all  $j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq r$ . Therefore, it follows that  $s_i$  interchanges  $Y_{j,i}$  and  $Y_{j,i+1}$  for all  $j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq r-1$  and keeps all other  $Y_{j,k}$ 's fixed. Similarly for  $p \geq 2$  and  $a_p + 2 \leq a_{p+1}$ , if  $a_p + 2 \leq i \leq a_{p+1} - 2$ ,  $s_i$  interchanges  $X_{j,i-p}$  and  $X_{j,i-p+1}$ . Thus  $s_i$  interchanges  $Y_{j,i-p}$  and  $Y_{j,i-p+1}$  for all  $j$ ,  $i+1 \leq j \leq r-1$  and keeps all other  $Y_{j,k}$ s fixed. Now, we compute the actions of  $s_{a_i-1}$ ,  $s_{a_i}$  and  $s_{a_i+1}$ .

Action of  $s_{a_i+1}$  for each  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r-1$

Case I:  $a_i + 2 \leq a_{i+1}$  In this case we have

$$\begin{aligned} & s_{a_i+1}w \\ &= s_{a_1+1} \cdot (s_{a_1} \dots s_1) \cdot (s_{a_2} \dots s_2) \dots (s_{a_r} \dots s_r) \\ &= (s_{a_1} \dots s_1) \dots (s_{a_i+1} \cdot s_{a_i} \dots s_i) \dots (s_{a_r} \dots s_r) \end{aligned}$$

which is a reduced expression and  $s_{a_i+1} \cdot w \in W^I$  by lemma 1.12. Now lemma 1.13 implies that  $s_{a_i+1} \cdot w \geq w$ . Hence,  $X(w)$  is not stable under the action of  $s_{a_i+1}$ .

Case II:  $a_i + 1 = a_{i+1}$  In this case  $s_{a_i+1} = s_{a_i+1}$  and the action will be described in the later part of this paragraph. In fact we see that in this case  $(s_{a_i+1}w)^I = w$ . Hence  $X(w)$  is stable under the action of  $s_{a_i+1}$ .

Action of  $s_{a_i-1}$

In case  $i = 1$ , we may assume that  $a_1 \neq 1$ , and for  $i \geq 2$ ,  $a_{i-1} \neq a_i - 1$ . Now  $s_{a_i-1}$  interchanges the  $(a_i - i)$ -th and  $(a_i - i + 1)$ -th columns of each of the  $j$ -th row, of the array

of roots  $R^+(w^{-1})$ , for  $i \leq j \leq r$ ; thus  $s_{a_i-1}$  interchanges  $X_{j,a_i-i}$  and  $X_{j,a_i-i+1}$  for each  $j$ ,  $i \leq j \leq r$ . Therefore, the action of  $s_{a_i-1}$  is as follows:

- (1)  $s_{a_i-1}$  fixes all the  $Y_{j,k}$ , for  $1 \leq j \leq i-1$ , for  $i \geq 2$ .
- (2) For  $j \geq i \leq r-1$  and  $a_i - i = a_j - j$ ,  $Y_{j,a_i-i} \mapsto Y_{j,a_i-i}^{-1}$ , and for  $Y_{j,k} \mapsto Y_{j,k} \cdot Y_{j,a_i-i}^{-1}$  for  $1 \leq k < a_i - i$ .
- (3) For  $i+1 \leq j \leq r-1$  if  $a_j - j > a_i - i$ , then  $s_{a_i-1}$  interchanges  $Y_{j,a_i-i}$  and  $Y_{j,a_i-i+1}$  and keeps all other  $Y_{j,k}$ 's fixed.

Action of  $s_{a_i}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq r$

Let us show that  $X(w)$  is stable under the action of each of the  $s_{a_i}$ . Let

$$w = (s_{a_1} \dots s_1) \cdot (s_{a_2} \dots s_2) \dots (s_{a_r} \dots s_r)$$

Thus

$$s_{a_i} w = (s_{a_1} \dots s_1) \dots (s_{a_{i-2}} \dots s_{i-2}) \cdot s_{a_i} \cdot (s_{a_{i-1}} \dots s_{i-1}) \cdot (s_{a_i} \dots s_i) \dots (s_{a_r} \dots s_r)$$

*Case 1:*  $i = 1$ , or  $a_{i-1} + 2 \leq a_i$  for  $i \geq 2$ . In this case it is clear that

$$s_{a_i} w = (s_{a_1} \dots s_1) \dots (s_{a_{i-2}} \dots s_{i-2}) \cdot (s_{a_{i-1}} \dots s_{i-1}) \cdot (s_{a_i-1} \dots s_i) \dots (s_{a_r} \dots s_r)$$

which, by lemma 1.12 and 1.13, is in  $W^I$  and  $s_{a_i} w \leq w$ .

*Case 2:*  $a_{i-1} + 1 = a_i$ . Note that,

$$w_1 = (s_{a_{i-1}} \dots s_{i-1}) \cdot (s_{a_i} \dots s_i) \in W^J$$

where  $J = S \setminus \{\alpha_i\}$ . Now,

$$\begin{aligned} w_1(\omega_i) &= \omega_i - \sum_{j=i-1}^{a_i-1} \alpha_j - \sum_{j=i}^{a_i} \alpha_j \\ \Rightarrow s_{a_i} w_1(\omega_i) &= s_{a_i}(\omega_i) - \sum_{j=i-1}^{a_i-1} \alpha_j - \sum_{j=i}^{a_i} \alpha_j \end{aligned}$$

Now, if  $a_i = i$ , then  $a_{i-1} = i-1$ ; so  $s_{a_i} w_1 = s_i \cdot s_{i-1} \cdot s_i = s_{i-1} \cdot s_i \cdot s_{i-1} = w_1 \cdot s_{i-1}$ . Otherwise,  $a_i \neq i$ . This implies that  $s_{a_i}(\omega_i) = \omega_i$ . Therefore,  $s_{a_i} w_1(\omega_i) = w_1(\omega_i)$ . Hence, by lemma 1.3, we get  $s_{a_i} w_1 = w_1 \cdot s_\alpha$  for some  $\alpha \in J$ . This gives  $w_1^{-1} s_{a_i} w_1 = s_{w_1^{-1}(\alpha_{a_i})} = s_\alpha$ . Now it follows that  $w_1^{-1}(\alpha_{a_i}) = \alpha_{i-1}$ . Hence,  $s_{a_i} w_1 = w_1 \cdot s_{i-1}$ . Therefore, in both the sub-cases  $s_{a_i} \cdot w = w \cdot s_{i-1}$ ; in particular  $(s_{a_i} \cdot w)^I = w$ . Now we shall compute the action of  $s_{a_i}$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq r$ .

*Case I:*  $2 \leq i \leq r-1$  and  $a_i = a_{i-1} + 1$ . In this case,  $s_{a_i}$  interchanges  $X_{i,k}$  and  $X_{i-1,k}$  for  $1 \leq k \leq a_i - i + 1$  and keeps all other  $X_{j,k}$ 's fixed. Hence, the action of  $s_{a_i}$  on the  $Y_{j,k}$ 's is as follows:

- (1) If  $i \geq 3$ ,  $Y_{i-2,k} \mapsto Y_{i-2,k} \cdot Y_{i-1,k} \cdot Y_{i-1,a_{i-2}-i+3}^{-1}$  for  $1 \leq k \leq a_{i-2} - i + 2$
- (2)  $Y_{i-1,k} \mapsto Y_{i-1,k}^{-1}$  for  $1 \leq k \leq a_i - i$ .
- (3)  $Y_{i,k} \mapsto Y_{i,k} \cdot Y_{i-1,k}$  for  $1 \leq k \leq a_i - i$ .
- (4)  $Y_{j,k}$  is fixed for  $1 \leq k \leq a_j - j$  for each  $j \neq i-2, i-1, i$ .

Case II:  $a_i \geq a_{i-1} + 2$  for  $2 \leq i \leq r-1$ , or  $i = 1$ . In this case  $s_{a_i}$  changes only the  $i$ -th row and the  $(a_i - i + 1)$ -th column of the array of roots  $R^+(w^{-1})$ . The resulting  $i$ -th row turns out to be

$\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \cdots + \alpha_{a_i-1}$ ,  $\alpha_2 + \cdots + \alpha_{a_i-1}$ ,  $\cdots$ ,  $\alpha_{a_1} + \cdots + \alpha_{a_i-1}$ ,  $\alpha_{a_1+2} + \cdots + \alpha_{a_i-1}$ ,  $\cdots$ ,  $\alpha_{a_i-1}$ ,  $-\alpha_{a_i}$   
and the transpose of the  $(a_i - i + 1)$ -th column turns out to be

$$-\alpha_{a_i}, \alpha_{a_i+1} + \cdots + \alpha_{a_{i+1}}, \alpha_{a_i+1} + \cdots + \alpha_{a_{i+2}}, \cdots, \alpha_{a_i+1} + \cdots + \alpha_{a_r}$$

Let  $\beta_{j,k}$  be any root which is fixed under the action of  $s_{a_i}$ . and let  $\beta_{p,q}$  be any root of the  $i$ -th row or the  $(a_i - i + 1)$ -th column, i.e. either  $p = i$  or  $q = a_i - i + 1$ . We claim that  $u_{\beta_{i,j}}(X_{i,j})$  and  $u_{s_{a_i}\beta_{p,q}}(X_{p,q})$  commute. This follows from the fact that  $\beta_{j,k} - \alpha_{a_i} \notin R^+(w^{-1})$  and the observation that for any root  $\beta \in R^+(w^{-1})$  and  $1 \leq m \leq r$   $\beta - \alpha_{a_{m+1}} \notin R^+$ . Let us denote by  $M$  the sub-array consisting of  $\beta_{k,l}$  where  $k \geq i$  and  $1 \leq l \leq a_i - i + 1$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} & s_{a_i} \cdot (u_{\beta_{r,1}}(X_{r,1}) \cdot u_{\beta_{r,2}}(X_{r,2}) \cdots u_{\beta_{r,a_r-r+1}}(X_{r,a_r-r+1}) \cdot u_{\beta_{r-1,1}}(X_{r-1,1}) \cdot u_{\beta_{r-1,2}}(X_{r-1,2}) \\ & \cdots u_{\beta_{r-1,a_r-1-r+2}}(X_{r-1,a_r-1-r+2}) \cdots u_{\beta_{1,1}}(X_{1,1}) \cdot u_{\beta_{1,2}}(X_{1,2}) \cdots u_{\beta_{1,a_1}}(X_{1,a_1})) \cdot w.P \\ & = (\prod_{\beta_{k,l} \notin M} u_{\beta_{k,l}}(X_{k,l})) \cdot s_{a_i} \cdot (u_{\beta_{r,1}}(X_{r,1}) \cdot u_{\beta_{r,2}}(X_{r,2}) \cdots u_{\beta_{r,a_i-i+1}}(X_{r,a_i-i+1})) \cdot (u_{\beta_{r-1,1}}(X_{r-1,1}) \cdots \\ & u_{\beta_{r-1,2}}(X_{r-1,2}) \cdots u_{\beta_{r-1,a_i-i+1}}(X_{r-1,a_i-i+1})) \cdots u_{\beta_{i,1}}(X_{i,1}) \cdot u_{\beta_{i,2}}(X_{i,2}) \cdots u_{\beta_{i,a_i-i+1}}(X_{i,a_i-i+1})) \cdot w.P \end{aligned}$$

Thus the action of  $s_{a_i}$  in this case is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} X_{i,a_i-i+1} & \mapsto X_{i,a_i-i+1}^{-1}; \quad X_{i,k} \mapsto X_{i,k} \cdot X_{i,a_i-i+1}^{-1} \text{ for } k \leq a_i - i \\ X_{j,k} & \mapsto X_{j,k} - \frac{X_{j,a_i-i+1} \cdot X_{i,k}}{X_{i,a_i-i+1}} \text{ for } i+1 \leq j \leq r \text{ and } 1 \leq k \leq a_i - i \\ X_{j,a_i-i+1} & \mapsto -X_{j,a_i-i+1} / X_{i,a_i-i+1} \text{ for } i+1 \leq j \leq r \end{aligned}$$

From this the resulting action on the  $Y_{j,k}$  turns out to be as follows:

- (1)  $s_{a_i}$  fixes  $Y_{j,k}$ 's provided  $j \leq i-1$  or  $k \geq a_i - i + 1$ .  
We now make the convention that  $Y_{j,k} := 1$  if  $k \geq a_j - j + 1$  or if  $j \geq r$ .  
(2)  $j = i$ . Here, for  $k \leq a_i - i$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{i,k} & = \frac{X_{i,a_i-i+1} \cdot X_{i+1,k}}{X_{i+1,a_i-i+1} \cdot X_{i,k}} \\ \therefore s_{a_i}(Y_{i,k}) & = \frac{X_{i,a_i-i+1}^{-1} \cdot (X_{i+1,k} - \frac{X_{i+1,a_i-i+1} \cdot X_{i,k}}{X_{i,a_i-i+1}})}{X_{i,k} \cdot X_{i,a_i-i+1}^{-1} \cdot (-X_{i+1,a_i-i+1} / X_{i,a_i-i+1})} \\ & = 1 - Y_{i,k} \end{aligned}$$

- (3)  $i+1 \leq j \leq r-1$  and  $1 \leq k \leq a_i - i$ . Define  $Y'_{j,k} = (X_{i,a_i-i+1} \cdot X_{j,k}) / (X_{j,a_i-i+1} \cdot X_{i,k})$ . Then, we have  $s_{a_i}(Y_{j,k}) = 1 - Y_{j,k}$ . It follows that  $Y_{j,k} = Y'_{j+1,k} \cdot Y'_{j,k}^{-1} \cdot Y_{j,a_i-i+1}$ . Hence,  
 $s_{a_i}(Y_{j,k}) = \frac{1 - Y'_{j+1,k}}{1 - Y'_{j,k}} \cdot Y_{j,a_i-i+1}$ . Now,

$$\begin{aligned} Y'_{j,k} & = \prod_{m=i}^{j-1} \frac{X_{m,a_i-i+1} \cdot X_{m+1,k}}{X_{m+1,a_i-i+1} \cdot X_{m,k}} \\ & = \prod_{m=i}^{j-1} \left\{ \left( \frac{X_{m,a_m-m+1} \cdot X_{m+1,k}}{X_{m+1,a_m-m+1} \cdot X_{m,k}} \right) \times \left( \frac{X_{m,a_m-m+1} \cdot X_{m+1,a_i-i+1}}{X_{m+1,a_m-m+1} \cdot X_{m,a_i-i+1}} \right)^{-1} \right\} \\ & = \prod_{m=i}^{j-1} (Y_{m,k} / Y_{m,a_i-i+1}) \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have,

$$s_{a_i}(Y_{j,k}) = \frac{1 - \prod_{m=i}^j (Y_{m,k}/Y_{m,a_i-i+1})}{1 - \prod_{m=i}^{j-1} (Y_{m,k}/Y_{m,a_i-i+1})} \times Y_{j,a_i-i+1}$$

*Case III: Action of  $s_{a_r}$ :* (1) If  $a_r = a_{r-1} + 1$ , then  $s_{a_r}$  interchanges  $X_{r-1,k}$  and  $X_{r,k}$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq a_r - r + 1$ . A straightforward checking proves as in *Case I* above, that in this case the action of  $s_{a_r}$  is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{r-2,k} &\mapsto Y_{r-2,k} \cdot Y_{r-1,k} \cdot Y_{r-1,a_{r-2}-r+3}^{-1} && \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq a_{r-2} - r + 2 \\ Y_{r-1,k} &\mapsto Y_{r-1,k}^{-1} && \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq a_r - r \end{aligned}$$

(2) If  $a_r \geq a_{r-1} + 2$ ,  $s_{a_r}$  changes only  $X_{r,k}$ 's for  $1 \leq k \leq a_r - r + 1$ , as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} X_{r,k} &\mapsto X_{r,k} \cdot X_{r,a_r-r+1}^{-1} && \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq a_r - r \\ X_{r,a_r-r+1} &\mapsto X_{r,a_r-r+1}^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

It can be easily checked from here that the  $Y_{i,j}$ 's are all fixed by  $s_{a_r}$ . □

## 4 A stratification of $_{N \setminus \setminus} G_{2,n}^{ss}(\mathcal{L}_2)$ .

In this section, we give a stratification of  $_{N \setminus \setminus} G_{2,n}^{ss}(\mathcal{L}_2)$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $w \in W^{I_2}$ . Let  $x \in U_w w P_2^{ss}$  be such that  $x$  is not in the  $W$ -translate of  $X_\tau$ ,  $\tau < w$ . If  $\sigma(x) \in U_w w P_2$ , then  $\sigma \in \text{Stabiliser of } X(w) \text{ in } W$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\sigma \in W$  be of minimal length such that  $\sigma x \in U_w w P_2$ . Then  $\sigma = \sigma_1 \sigma_2$  with  $l(\sigma) = l(\sigma_1) + l(\sigma_2)$  and  $\sigma_2 \cdot w \in W^I$ ,  $w \leq \sigma_2 w$ .

Let  $\sigma_2$  be of maximal length with this property. So  $\sigma \cdot w = s_{m+t+1} s_{m+t} \cdots s_{m+1} w$ ,  $t \geq 1$ , and  $w = (s_m \cdots s_1)(s_{n-1} \cdots s_2)$ .

Now,  $\sigma_1(\sigma_2 u_w w P_2) \in U_w w P_2$ . ... (1)

Since  $\sigma_2$  is of maximal length  $s_{m+j} \not\leq \sigma_1$  for some  $j \geq 1$ . ... (2)

Now,  $\sigma_2 x \in U_{\sigma_2 w} \sigma_2 w P_2$ . Since  $l(\sigma) = l(\sigma_1) + l(\sigma_2)$  and  $\sigma^{-1}(\alpha_{m+t+1}) < 0$ ,  $\sigma_2$  is of maximal length, we may assume that  $\sigma_1(\alpha_j) > 0$ . ... (3)

From (1), (2) and (3),  $\sigma_1$  must take a reduced form as

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1 &= (\phi s_{m+t-1} s_{m+t+1} s_{m+t}) \sigma_2 \\ &= \phi s_{m+t-1} (s_{m+t+1} s_{m+t} s_{m+t+1}) s_{m+t} \sigma_2' \\ &= \phi s_{m+t-1} s_{m+t} s_{m+t+1} \sigma_2' \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts the assumption that  $l(\sigma) = l(\sigma_1) + l(\sigma_2)$ .

This completes the proof. □

The longest element of  $W^{I_2}$  is

$$w_0^I = (s_{n-2} \cdot s_{n-3} \cdots s_1) \cdot (s_{n-1} \cdot s_{n-2} \cdots s_2)$$

and the unique minimal element  $\tau_2$  of  $W^I$  such that  $\tau_2(n\omega_2) \leq 0$  is

$$\tau_2 = (s_{\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil} \cdot s_{\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil - 1} \cdots s_1) \cdot (s_{n-1} \cdot s_{n-2} \cdots s_2)$$

Therefore any element  $w \in W^I$  such that  $X(w)_T^{ss}(\mathcal{L}_2) \neq \emptyset$  is of the form

$$w = (s_m \cdot s_{m-1} \cdots s_{\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil} \cdot s_{\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil - 1} \cdots s_1) \cdot (s_{n-1} \cdot s_{n-2} \cdots s_2)$$

with  $m \geq \lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil$ .

**Proposition 4.2.** *Let  $r = 2, w = (s_m \cdots s_1)(s_{n-1} \cdots s_2), \lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil \leq m \leq n - 2$ . We can arrange the  $Y_{ij}$ 's as  $Y_1, Y_2, \cdots, Y_{m-1}$  with*

$$\begin{aligned} s_i(Y_i) &= Y_{i+1}, \\ s_i(Y_j) &= Y_j \text{ if } j = k, i + 1 \text{ and } i = 1, 2 \cdots m - 2, \\ s_{m-1}(Y_i) &= Y_i \cdot Y_{m-1}^{-1}, \text{ if } i \leq m - 2, \\ s_{m-1}(Y_{m-1}) &= Y_{m-1}^{-1}, \\ s_m(Y_i) &= 1 - Y_i \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \cdots m - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Further, we have

$$s_i(Y_j) = Y_j \quad \forall i = m + 2, \cdots n - 1, \text{ when } m \leq n - 3$$

and

$$s_{n-1}(Y_j) = Y_j^{-1} \quad \forall j \text{ when } m = n - 2.$$

*Proof.* Proof follows from the proposition 3.2. □

Let  $w$  be as in the proposition 4.2. Now, let  $T_{m-1}$  be a maximal torus of  $\mathbb{P}GL_m$ ,  $R_m$  is the root system of  $\mathbb{P}GL_m$ . Here, the Weyl group is  $S_m$ , the symmetric group on  $m$  symbols. Let  $U = \{t \in T : e^\alpha(t) \neq 1, \alpha \in R_m\}$ . Clearly,  $U$  is  $S_m$ -stable. On the other hand,  $S_m$  stabilises  $(U_w w P_2 / P_2)_T^{ss}(\mathcal{L}_2)$ . Let  $Y(w) = {}_T \backslash \backslash (U_w w P_2)_T^{ss}(\mathcal{L}_2)$ . Then, we have

**Corollary 4.3.** *There is a  $S_m$ -equivariant isomorphism  $\Psi_1 : Y(w) \xrightarrow{\sim} U$  such that  $\Psi_1^*(e^{\alpha_i + \cdots + \alpha_{m-1}}) = Y_i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m - 1$ .*

*Proof.* Proof follows from proposition 4.2. □

Let  $\mathfrak{h}_m$  be a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{sl}_{m+1}$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{h}_m)$  be the projective space and  $R_m \subseteq \mathfrak{h}_m^*$  be the root system. Let  $V_m$  be the open subset of  $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{h}_m)$  defined by

$$V_m := \{x \in \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{h}_m) : \alpha(x) \neq 0, \forall \alpha \in R_m\}.$$

Clearly  $V_m$  is  $S_{m+1}$ -stable.

**Corollary 4.4.** *Let  $w = (s_m \dots s_1)(s_{n-1} \dots s_2)$ ,  $\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil \leq m \leq n-2$ . Then, there is a  $S_{m+1}$ -equivariant isomorphism  $\Psi_2 : Y(w) \xrightarrow{\sim} V$  of affine varieties.*

*Proof.* For  $i = 1, 2 \dots m-1$ , take  $Z_i = \frac{\alpha_i + \dots + \alpha_m}{\alpha_m}$  and define  $\Psi_2$  such that  $\Psi_2^*(Z_i) = Y_i$ .  $\square$

With notations as above and taking  $t = \lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil$  and  $m = \lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil$  we have

**Theorem:**  ${}_{N \setminus \setminus} G_{2,n}^{ss}(\mathcal{L}_2)$  has a stratification  $\bigcup_{i=0}^t C_i$  where  $C_0 = {}_{S_{m+1}} \setminus \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{h}_m)$ , and  $C_i = {}_{S_{i+m+1}} \setminus V_{i+m}$ .

*Proof.* Proof follows from lemma 4.1, proposition 4.2 and corollary 4.4.  $\square$

## 5 Flag variety as a GIT quotient of flag variety of higher dimension

Let  $G = GL_{n+1}(k)$ . Let  $T$  be a maximal torus of  $SL_{n+1}(k)$ . Let  $B_{n+1}$  be a Borel subgroup of  $G$  containing  $T$ . Let  $S = \{\alpha_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$  denote the set of simple roots with respect to  $B_{n+1}$ , let  $W = S_{n+1}$  be the Weyl group. Let  $s_i$  be the simple reflection corresponding to the simple root  $\alpha_i$ . Let  $I := S \setminus \{\alpha_n\}$ , let  $W_I$  be subgroup of  $W$  generated by  $\{s_i : i \in I\}$  and  $w_{0,I}$  denote the longest element of  $W_I$ .

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $\chi = \sum_{i=1}^n m_i \alpha_i$  be a regular dominant character, where  $m_i \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $m_{i+1} > m_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ . Let  $w \in W$ . Then  $w(\chi) \leq 0 \Leftrightarrow w = s_1 \cdot s_2 \dots s_n \cdot \tau$  for some  $\tau \in W_I$ .*

*Proof.*  $\Rightarrow$ : Since  $\chi$  is dominant and  $\tau \leq w_{0,I}$ , for all  $\tau \in W_I$ , we have  $\tau(\chi) \geq w_{0,I}(\chi)$ ; using the fact that  $w_{0,I}(\alpha_i) = -\alpha_{n-i}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n-1$  and  $w_{0,I}(\alpha_n) = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \dots + \alpha_n$  we have  $w_{0,I}(\chi) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (m_n - m_{n-i}) \alpha_i + m_n \cdot \alpha_n$ . Therefore,  $\tau(\chi) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i \alpha_i + m_n \alpha_n$ ,  $a_i > 0$ . Now, let  $w = \phi \tau$  with  $\phi \in W^I$ ,  $\tau \in W_I$ . Therefore,  $w(\chi) = \phi(\tau(\chi)) = \phi(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i \alpha_i + m_n \alpha_n)$ . Thus  $w(\chi) \leq 0$  implies that  $\phi = s_1 \cdot s_2 \dots s_n$ .

$\Leftarrow$ : Let  $w = s_1 \cdot s_2 \dots s_n \cdot \tau$ ,  $\tau \in W_I$ . Now,

$$\begin{aligned} w(\chi) &= s_1 \cdot s_2 \dots s_n \tau(\chi) \\ &= s_1 \cdot s_2 \dots s_n (\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i \alpha_i + m_n \alpha_n) \\ &= -m_n \alpha_1 + \sum_{i=2}^n (a_{i-1} - m_n) \alpha_i \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\chi$  is a dominant weight we have  $\chi - \tau(\chi) \geq 0$ . Hence we have  $a_i \leq m_i \leq m_n$ . Thus  $w(\chi) \leq 0$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

Consider  $GL_n(k)$  as a subgroup of  $GL_{n+1}(k)$  given by the inclusion  $g \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} g & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ . Let  $B_n = B_{n+1} \cap GL_n(k)$  as a Borel subgroup with  $I$  as the simple roots.

Let  $\chi$  be a regular dominant character as in Lemma (5.1).

**Theorem 5.2.** *We have an isomorphism*

$$\Psi : {}_T \backslash \backslash (GL_{n+1}(k)/B_{n+1})^{ss}(L_\chi) \xrightarrow{\sim} GL_n(k)/B_n.$$

*Proof.* Proof uses cellular decomposition of both homogeneous spaces  $GL_{n+1}(k)/B_{n+1}$  and  $GL_n(k)/B_n$ . First, we fix a total order on the set of positive roots of  $B_{n+1}$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i > \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \alpha_i > \cdots > \alpha_1 > \sum_{i=2}^n \alpha_i > \cdots > \alpha_2 > \sum_{i=3}^n \alpha_i > \cdots > \alpha_3 > \cdots > \alpha_{n-1} + \alpha_n > \alpha_n$ . Now any  $GL_{n+1}/B_{n+1}$  (resp.  $GL_n/B_n$ ) is the union of cells  $U_w w B_{n+1}$  (resp.  $U_\tau \tau B_n$ ) with  $w \in W$  (resp.  $\tau \in W_I$ ). Using the total order above we can write each element  $x \in U_w$  as a product of  $u_\alpha$  in the decreasing order from the left to the right. Let  $X_\alpha$  (resp.  $Y_\beta$ ) be the co-ordinate function on  $U_w w B_{n+1}$  (resp.  $U_\tau \tau B_n$ ) corresponding to the root  $\alpha$  (resp.  $\beta$ ).

With these notations we proceed the proof:

Let  $\tau \in W_I$ . Let  $w := s_1 s_2 \cdots s_n \tau$ .  $V_\tau^0 := \{x = U_w w B_{n+1} : X_\alpha(x) \neq 0 \forall \alpha \geq \alpha_1\}$ .

Set  $V^0 := \bigcup_{\tau \in W_I} V_\tau^0$ .

Step1: We prove that  $(GL_{n+1}(k)/B_{n+1})^{ss}(L_\chi) \subset V^0$ .

This can be seen as follows.

By Hilbert-Mumford criterion [see theorem 2.1 of [3]], a point  $x \in GL_{n+1}/B_{n+1}$  is semi-stable  $\Leftrightarrow \mu^L(x, \lambda) \geq 0$  for all 1- parameter subgroup  $\lambda$  of  $T \Leftrightarrow \mu^L(\sigma x, \lambda) \geq 0$  for all one parameter subgroups  $\lambda \in \overline{C(B)}$  and for all  $\sigma \in W$ . By the lemma 2.1 of [6], this statement is equivalent to  $\langle -w_\sigma \chi, \lambda \rangle \geq 0$  for all  $\lambda \in \overline{C(B)}$  where  $\sigma x \in U_{w_\sigma} w_\sigma B$ . But this is equivalent to  $w_\sigma(\chi) \leq 0$ . And this is equivalent to  $w_\sigma$  is of the form  $(s_1 \dots s_n) \cdot \tau_1$  for some  $\tau_1 \in W_I$ . Now let  $x \in U_w w B_{n+1}$  with  $w = (s_1 \dots s_n) \tau$ ,  $\tau \in W_I$ .

Now, let  $X_\alpha(x) = 0$  for some  $\alpha \geq \alpha_1$ . Let  $\alpha = \sum_{j=1, \dots, i} \alpha_j$ . Then, we have  $s_1 s_2 \cdots s_i x = u' \phi B_{n+1}$  with  $\phi \neq s_1 \cdots s_n \tau$  for any  $\tau \in W_I$ . Hence, by the above discussion,  $x$  is not semi-stable.

Step 2:  $(GL_{n+1}(k)/B_{n+1})^{ss}(L_\chi) = V^0$ . This can be seen by the above discussion and from the following *claim*.

*claim:*  $V$  is  $W$ -stable.

Proof of claim: Let  $\tau \in W_I$ . Let  $x \in U_{s_1 s_2 \cdots s_n \tau} s_1 s_2 \cdots s_n \tau B_{n+1}$ , with  $X_\alpha(x) \neq 0$  for all  $\alpha \geq \alpha_1$ . Then, we have  $s_1 x \in U_{s_1 s_2 \cdots s_n \tau} B_{n+1}$  with  $X_\alpha(s_1 x) = -\frac{X_\alpha(x)}{X_{\alpha_1}(x)}$  for  $\alpha > \alpha_1$ , and  $X_{\alpha_1}(s_1 x) = \frac{1}{X_{\alpha_1}(x)}$ . Hence,  $s_1 x \in V^0$ .

Now, let  $i \neq 1$ . If  $X_{\alpha_i}(u) = 0$ , then,  $s_i x = u' s_1 s_2 \cdots s_n s_{i-1} \tau B_{n+1}$  with  $X_\alpha(s_1 x) = X_{s_i(\alpha)}(x)$ . Hence,  $s_i(x) \in V^0$ . Otherwise, we must have  $s_i x \in U_{s_1 s_2 \cdots s_n \tau} B_{n+1}$  with  $X_\alpha(s_i x) = X_\alpha(x)$  for all such that  $s_i(\alpha) = \alpha$ ,  $X_\alpha(s_i x) = \frac{X_\alpha(x)}{X_{\alpha_i}(x)}$  for all  $\alpha$  of the form  $\alpha = \sum_{j=k}^i \alpha_j$  such that  $k < i$ ,  $X_{\alpha_i}(s_i x) = \frac{1}{X_{\alpha_i}(x)}$ , and  $X_\alpha(s_i x) = \frac{-X_\alpha(x)}{X_{\alpha_i}(x)}$  for all  $\alpha$  of the form  $\alpha = \sum_{j=i}^k \alpha_j$  such that  $k > i$ .

Hence  $s_i V^0 \subset V^0$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Thus, the *claim* follows from the fact that  $W$  is



generated by  $s_i$ 's.

Step 3: Now, for each  $\tau \in W_I$ , we exhibit an isomorphism

$$\Psi_\tau :_{T \setminus \setminus} V_\tau^0 \xrightarrow{\sim} U_\tau \tau B_n / B_n.$$

Let  $\tau \in W_I$ , consider the map  $\pi_\tau : V_\tau^0 \rightarrow (U_\tau \tau B_n) / B_n$  defined by  $\phi_\tau(x) = y$  with for each  $\beta \not\geq \alpha_1$   $Y_{s_n \dots s_1(\beta)}(y) = \left( \frac{-X_\beta(x) X_{\beta'}(x)}{X_{\beta+\beta'}(x)} \right)$  where for each  $\beta \in R^+(w^{-1})$  with  $\beta \not\geq \alpha_1$ ,  $\beta'$  is the unique element of  $R^+$  with  $\beta' \geq \alpha_1$  such that  $\beta + \beta' \in R^+$ . Clearly this map is  $T$ -invariant. Thus the morphism  $\pi_\tau$  give rise to a morphism

$$\Psi_\tau :_{T \setminus \setminus} V_\tau^0 \rightarrow U_\tau \tau B_n / B_n.$$

Clearly  $\Psi_\tau$  is surjective. We now prove that  $\Psi_\tau$  is injective:

$\pi_w$  is injective for each  $w \in W$  of the form  $w = s_1 \cdot s_2 \dots s_n \tau$ , for some  $\tau \in W_I$ . Let  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  be two points of  $V_\tau^0$  such that

$\pi_\tau(x_1) = \pi_\tau(x_2)$ . Hence,  $\frac{X_\beta(x_1) X_{\beta'}(x_1)}{X_{\beta+\beta'}(x_1)} = \frac{X_\beta(x_2) X_{\beta'}(x_2)}{X_{\beta+\beta'}(x_2)}$ . Let  $t \in T$  be such that  $(\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_i)(t) = \frac{X_{\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_i}(x_2)}{X_{\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_i}(x_1)}$  for all  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Then, it is easy to check that  $t \cdot x = y$ . Thus  $\Psi_\tau$  is bijective for each  $\tau \in W_I$ .

Step 4:  $\Psi_\tau$  puts together to give an isomorphism

$$\Psi :_{T \setminus \setminus} V^0 \xrightarrow{\sim} GL_n(k) / B_n.$$

Since the  $W$ - translates of  $V_{w_{0,I}}^0$  is the whole of  $V^0$ , and  $W_I$ - translates of  $U_{w_{0,I}} w_{0,I} B_n$  is the whole of  $GL_n / B_n$ , and there is an isomorphism from  $W_{S \setminus \{\alpha_1\}}$  to  $W_I$  taking  $s_i$  to  $s_{i-1}$  for each  $i = 2, \dots, n$ , to prove the Theorem, it is sufficient to prove that the  $T$ -invariant morphisms  $\pi_\tau : V_\tau^0 \rightarrow U_\tau \tau B_n$ , and  $\pi_{s_{i-1} \tilde{\tau}} U_{s_{i-1} \tilde{\tau}} \rightarrow U_{s_{i-1} \tilde{\tau}}$  satisfy the following:

$Y_\alpha(\pi_\tau(x)) = Y_\alpha(s_{i-1}(\pi_{s_{i-1} \tilde{\tau}}(s_i x)))$  for each  $\alpha \in R^+(\tau^{-1})$ . (Here, the notation  $s_{i-1} \tilde{\tau} = \tau$  if  $s_{i-1} \tau < \tau$ , and  $s_{i-1} \tilde{\tau} = s_{i-1} \tau$  otherwise.)

We make use of the following observations using commutator relations:

$$X_\alpha(s_i; x) = \begin{cases} \frac{-X_\alpha(x)}{X_{\alpha_i}(x)} & \text{if } \alpha = \alpha_i + \dots + \alpha_k, \ i < k \text{ and } w^{-1}(\alpha_{i+1} + \dots + \alpha_k) > 0, \\ \frac{1}{X_{\alpha_i}(x)} & \text{if } \alpha = \alpha_i, \\ X_{s_i(\alpha)}(x) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Let  $\alpha \in R^+(\tau^{-1})$

Case 1:  $\alpha = \alpha_{k-1} + \dots + \alpha_{i-1}$ ,  $k < i$ ,  $w^{-1}(\alpha_k + \dots + \alpha_i) = \tau^{-1}(\alpha_{k-1} + \dots + \alpha_{i-1}) > 0$  and  $s_{i-1} \tilde{\tau} = \tau$ .

In this case,  $Y_\alpha(s_{i-1}(\pi_\tau(x))) = \frac{X_{\alpha_1+\dots+\alpha_{k-1}}(x)X_{\alpha_k+\dots+\alpha_i}(x)}{X_{\alpha_1+\dots+\alpha_{i-1}}(x)} = Y_\alpha(\pi_\tau(s_i x))$ .

Case 2:  $\alpha = \alpha_{i-1} + \dots + \alpha_{k-1}$ ,  $i < k$  and  $w^{-1}(\alpha_i + \dots + \alpha_k) = \tau^{-1}(\alpha_{i-1} + \dots + \alpha_{k-1}) > 0$  and  $s_{i-1}\tilde{\tau} = \tau$ .

In this case,  $Y_\alpha(s_{i-1}(\pi_\tau(x))) = -\frac{X_{\alpha_1+\dots+\alpha_i}(x)X_{\alpha_i+\dots+\alpha_k}(x)}{X_{\alpha_i}(x)X_{\alpha_1+\dots+\alpha_k}(x)} = Y_\alpha(\pi_\tau(s_i x))$ .

Case 3:  $\alpha = \alpha_{i-1}$ .  $Y_\alpha(s_{i-1}(\pi_\tau(x))) = \frac{X_{\alpha_1+\dots+\alpha_i}(x)}{X_{\alpha_1+\dots+\alpha_{i-1}}(x)X_{\alpha_i}(x)} = Y_\alpha(\pi_\tau(s_{i-1}(x)))$ .

In all other cases, we have:  $Y_\alpha(s_{i-1}(\pi_{s_{i-1}\tilde{\tau}}(s_i x))) = \frac{X_{s_i s_1 \dots s_n(\alpha)}(x)X_{s_i(\beta')}(x)}{X_{s_i(s_1 \dots s_n(\alpha) + \beta')}(x)} = Y_\alpha(\pi_\tau(x))$ , where  $\beta'$  is the unique root such that  $\beta' \geq \alpha_1$  and  $s_1 \dots s_n(\alpha) + \beta'$  is a root.

This completes the proof.  $\square$

With  $Y_\alpha$ 's as in the proof of theorem 5.2, we have

**Corollary 5.3.**

$$s_1(Y_\alpha) = \begin{cases} -(1 + Y_\alpha) & \text{if } \alpha \geq \alpha_1. \\ Y_\alpha & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

*Proof.* Proof follows from the fact that

$$X_\alpha(s_1 x) = \begin{cases} X_{\alpha_1} X_\alpha(x) + X_{\alpha_1 + \alpha}(x) & \text{if } \alpha = \alpha_2 + \dots + \alpha_i, \ 2 \leq i, \\ \frac{-X_\alpha(x)}{X_{\alpha_1}(x)} & \text{if } \alpha = \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_i, \ i \geq 2, \\ X_\alpha(x) & \text{if } \alpha = \alpha_3 + \dots + \alpha_i, \ i \geq 3 \end{cases}.$$

$\square$

**Corollary 5.4.** *Let  $\mathfrak{h}_n$  be a Cartan subalgebra of  $sl_{n+1}(k)$ . Let  $\chi$  be a regular dominant character as in Theorem 5.2. Then, the action of  $W$  on the GIT quotient*

$${}_{\tau \setminus \setminus} (GL_{n+1}(k)/B_{n+1})^{ss}(L_\chi) \simeq GL_n(k)/B_n$$

*is given by the  $n$ -dimensional representation  $\mathfrak{h}_n$  of  $W$ .*

*Proof.* Proof follows from theorem 5.2 and corollary 5.3.  $\square$

## References

- [1] R.W. Carter, Finite Groups of Lie type, John Wiley, New York, 1993.
- [2] J.E.Humphreys, Introduction to Lie algebras and representation theory, Springer, Berlin Heidelberg, 1972.

- [3] D. Mumford, J. Fogarty and F. Kirwan, Geometric Invariant theory, (Third Edition), Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, New York, 1994.
- [4] P.E. Newstead, Introduction to Moduli Problems and Orbit Spaces, TIFR Lecture Notes, 1978.
- [5] S. Senthamarai Kannan, Torus quotients of homogeneous spaces, Proc. Indian Acad. Sci.(Math. Sci), 108(1998) 1-12.
- [6] C.S. Seshadri, Quotient spaces modulo reductive algebraic groups, Ann. Math. 95(1972) 511-556.
- [7] C.S. Seshadri, Introduction to Standard Monomial theory, Lecture notes No.4, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA, 1985.