

CATALAN MATROID DECOMPOSITIONS OF CERTAIN POSITROIDS

BRENDAN PAWLOWSKI

ABSTRACT. A *positroid* is the matroid of a matrix whose maximal minors are all nonnegative. Given a permutation w in S_n , the matroid of a generic $n \times n$ matrix whose non-zero entries in row i lie in columns $w(i)$ through $n+i$ is an example of a positroid. We enumerate the bases of such a positroid as a sum of certain products of Catalan numbers, each term indexed by the 123-avoiding permutations above w in Bruhat order. We also give a similar sum formula for their Tutte polynomials. These are both avatars of a structural result writing such a positroid as a disjoint union of matroids, each isomorphic to a direct sum of Catalan matroids and a matroid with one basis.

1. INTRODUCTION

Given a permutation $w \in S_n$, consider a generic $n \times 2n$ matrix M_w whose nonzero entries in row i are in columns $[w(i), i+n]$. Here $[a, b]$ denotes $\{a, a+1, \dots, b\}$ for integers a and b ; we also write $[n]$ for $[1, n]$. For example,

$$M_{2143} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & * & * & * & * & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ * & * & * & * & * & * & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & * & * & * & * & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & * & * & * & * & * & * \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let \mathcal{P}_w be the set of bases of the matroid associated to M_w . That is, \mathcal{P}_w is the set of $I \in \binom{[2n]}{n}$ such that the $n \times n$ minor of M_w in rows $[n]$ and columns I is nonzero.

The matroid \mathcal{P}_w belongs to (at least) two interesting classes of matroids. First, it is a *transversal matroid*; see [4] for an introduction. Take a collection $A = \{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ of finite sets. A *transversal* of A is a set $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ such that $x_i \in A_i$ for each i and all the x_i are distinct. The set of all transversals of A is the set of bases for a matroid. Indeed, if M_A is a generic matrix with n rows whose nonzero entries in row i are in columns $j \in A_i$, then the matroid of M_A is exactly the transversal matroid of A . Thus, M_w is the transversal matroid of the set collection $\{[w(i), i+n] : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$.

Second, \mathcal{P}_w is a *positroid*: the matroid of a real matrix whose maximal minors are all nonnegative. Let $\text{Gr}(k, N)$ be the Grassmann variety of k -planes in \mathbb{C}^N . Given a rank k positroid P on $[N]$, Knutson, Lam, and Speyer considered the closure of the locus of points in $\text{Gr}(k, N)$ having matroid P [6]. Among other nice properties, these *positroid varieties* turn out to be exactly the images of Richardson varieties in the complete flag variety under the projection to $\text{Gr}(k, N)$.

Given any set of intervals $S = \{[a_1, b_1], \dots, [a_k, b_k]\}$ in $[N]$, taking the rowspans of matrices of the form M_S gives a subset of $\text{Gr}(k, N)$ whose closure is an irreducible variety called a *rank variety*. Billey and Coskun showed that rank varieties are exactly the images of Richardson varieties under the projection from the variety of *partial flags* $F_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq F_k \subseteq \mathbb{C}^N$, where

Date: October 15, 2018.

The author was partially supported by grant DMS-1101017 from the NSF.

$\dim F_i = i$ [2]. Every rank variety is therefore a positroid variety, and in particular, \mathcal{P}_w is a positroid.

Our main results concern the size and structure of \mathcal{P}_w . An *anti-fixed point* of $w \in S_n$ is a number $i \in [n]$ such that $w(i) = n - i + 1$. Define a permutation statistic

$$g(w) = C_{\ell_1+1} \cdots C_{\ell_k+1},$$

where ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_k are the lengths of the maximal runs of consecutive anti-fixed points in w , and C_j is the j^{th} Catalan number. For example, in $w = 869753421$ we have underlined the maximal runs of anti-fixed points, and $g(w) = C_2 C_3 = 10$. Write \leq for the strong Bruhat order on S_n .

Theorem 1.1. \mathcal{P}_w has size $\sum_{\substack{v \geq w \\ v \text{ avoids } 123}} g(v)$ for any $w \in S_n$.

Here, a permutation *avoids* 123 if it has no (not necessarily consecutive) increasing subsequence of length 3. In the special case that $w = w_0 = n(n-1) \cdots 1$, Theorem 1.1 reads $\#\mathcal{P}_{w_0} = C_{n+1}$. In fact, \mathcal{P}_{w_0} is isomorphic to the rank $n+1$ Catalan matroid \mathcal{C}_{n+1} defined by Ardila, whose bases are the Dyck paths of length $2n+2$, each path viewed as the set of its upsteps [1].

Theorem 1.1 arises from a stronger structural result for \mathcal{P}_w (cf. Theorem 3.3 below).

Theorem 1.2. There is a partition of $\binom{[2n]}{n}$ into sets \mathcal{Q}_v indexed by 123-avoiding permutations v such that for any $w \in S_n$,

- \mathcal{P}_w is the disjoint union $\bigsqcup_{\substack{v \geq w \\ v \text{ avoids } 123}} \mathcal{Q}_v$
- If v has runs of consecutive anti-fixed points of lengths ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_k , then \mathcal{Q}_v is isomorphic to a direct sum of the Catalan matroids $\mathcal{C}_{\ell_1+1}, \dots, \mathcal{C}_{\ell_k+1}$ plus a matroid with one basis. In particular, $\#\mathcal{Q}_v = g(v)$.

In Section 2, we use a bijection of Krattenthaler between 123-avoiding permutations and Dyck paths to prove Theorem 1.1 in the case where w is the identity permutation. This special case will be useful in proving Theorem 1.2, which we do in Section 3. In Section 4, we give a formula for the Tutte polynomial of \mathcal{P}_w along the lines of Theorem 1.1. Section 5 concludes with some conjectures about a related family of matroids also indexed by permutations.

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Sara Billey, Zach Hamaker, Vic Reiner, Jose Samper, Jair Taylor, and Alex Woo for helpful comments and discussions.

2. STANDARDIZING LATTICE PATHS TO DYCK PATHS

Given a positive integer n , a *Dyck path* of length $2n$ is a lattice path from $(0, 0)$ to $(2n, 0)$ which only uses steps $(1, 1)$ (*upsteps*) or $(1, -1)$ (*downsteps*), and which never goes below the line $y = 0$. Let \mathcal{D}_n be the set of Dyck paths of length $2n$. It is well-known that $\#\mathcal{D}_n$ is the n^{th} Catalan number C_n , and that this is also the number of 123-avoiding $w \in S_n$.

If $w \in S_{2n}$ is the identity permutation, then $\mathcal{P}_w = \binom{[2n]}{n}$. In this case, Theorem 1.1 reads

$$\sum_{\substack{v \in S_n \\ v \text{ avoids } 123}} C_{\ell_1+1} \cdots C_{\ell_k+1} = \binom{2n}{n}, \quad (1)$$

where ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_k are the lengths of runs of anti-fixed points of each v .

Here is a similar identity for Dyck paths. We can view any $I \in \binom{[2n]}{n}$ as a lattice path from $(0, 0)$ to $(2n, 0)$ by taking one step for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, 2n$, either $(1, 1)$ or $(1, -1)$ depending

on whether $i \in I$ or $i \notin I$. We say such a lattice path has a *peak* at step i if step i is an upstep and step $i+1$ is a downstep. The *height* of an upstep i in a Dyck path is the y -coordinate of its endpoint; that is, the number of upsteps (weakly) before i minus the number of downsteps before i . By the height of a peak i we will mean the height of the corresponding upstep.

Definition 2.1. A *saw* in a lattice path is a maximal consecutive sequence of height 1 peaks.

Here, two peaks are *consecutive* if their upsteps occur in positions i and $i + 2$ for some i . The following identity will be the Dyck path analogue of (1).


Lemma 2.2. For any n ,

$$\sum_{D \in \mathcal{D}_n} C_{\ell_1+1} \cdots C_{\ell_k+1} = \binom{2n}{n},$$

where $2\ell_1, \dots, 2\ell_k$ are the lengths of the saws of each Dyck path D .

This identity is not hard to prove. Suppose $I \in \binom{[2n]}{n}$ is a lattice path. The *standardization* of I is the Dyck path $\text{st}(I)$ obtained by replacing each maximal segment of I below the x -axis with a saw of the same length.

Example 2.3. If $n = 9$ and $I = \{1, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17\}$, so I is the lattice path



then $\text{st}(I)$ is




where we have indicated maximal segments below the x -axis and their replacements in $\text{st}(I)$ with bold red.

Proof of Lemma 2.2. Suppose $D \in \mathcal{D}_n$ is a Dyck path with saws of lengths $2\ell_1, \dots, 2\ell_k$. The set $\text{st}^{-1}(D)$ then has size $C_{\ell_1+1} \cdots C_{\ell_k+1}$. Indeed, the members of $\text{st}^{-1}(D)$ are obtained from D by replacing each saw of length $2\ell_i$ with an arbitrary lattice path of the same length which starts and ends on the x -axis and stays below $y = 1$. Prepending a downstep and appending an upstep shows that such lattice paths are in bijection with Dyck paths of length $2\ell_i + 2$. Thus Lemma 2.2 reflects the partition of $\binom{[2n]}{n}$ into the fibers of the standardization map. \square

Given Lemma 2.2, the identity (1) would follow from a bijection from 123-avoiding permutations to Dyck paths which turns anti-fixed points into peaks of height 1. In fact, Krattenthaler has defined such a bijection [7]. For the moment, view Dyck paths as proceeding from the southwest corner of the square $[n] \times [n]$ to the northeast, and remaining above the southwest-northeast diagonal. There is a partial order on Dyck paths where $D_1 \leq D_2$ if D_1 lies between D_2 and the diagonal of the square. If $w \in S_n$ is 123-avoiding, define $K(w)$ to be the reverse of the minimal Dyck path which is northwest of the *graph* of w , i.e. the set of points $\{(i, w(i)) : i \in [n]\} \subseteq [n] \times [n]$.

Example 2.4. Say $w = 6475312$. The graph of w is represented using \times 's, while $K(w)$ is the path in bold:



Definition 2.5. A *left-to-right minimum* of $w \in S_n$ is a position $i \in [n]$ such that $j < i$ implies $w(i) < w(j)$. A *right-to-left maximum* is a position i such that $j > i$ implies $w(i) > w(j)$.

Lemma 2.6. Say $w \in S_n$ avoids 123 and $j \in [n]$. Then j is a left-to-right minimum if and only if $w(j) \leq n - j + 1$, a right-to-left maximum if and only if $w(j) \geq n - j + 1$, and an anti-fixed point if and only if it is both.

Proof. Suppose $w(j) \leq n - j + 1$ but j is not a left-to-right minimum, so there is $i < j$ with $w(i) < w(j)$. Since w avoids 123, every k such that $w(j) < w(k)$ must be in $[j] \setminus \{i\}$. But there are at least j such values of k given that $w(j) \leq n - j + 1$, so this is impossible by the pigeonhole principle. Likewise, if $w(j) \geq n - j + 1$, then j is a right-to-left maximum. Every entry of w is either a left-to-right minimum or a right-to-left maximum (a counterexample would yield a 123 pattern), so the converses hold as well. \square

The Dyck path $K(w)$ can now be described as follows. Say $1 = i_1 < \dots < i_k$ are the left-to-right minima of w . Set $w(i_0) = n + 1 = i_{k+1}$. Using U for an upstep and D for a downstep,

$$K(w) = U^{w(i_0)-w(i_1)} D^{i_2-i_1} U^{w(i_1)-w(i_2)} D^{i_3-i_2} \dots U^{w(i_{k-1})-w(i_k)} D^{i_{k+1}-i_k}. \quad (2)$$

Lemma 2.7. Suppose $w \in S_n$ avoids 123. Then j is a left-to-right minimum of w if and only if $K(w)$ has a peak at $n - w(j) + j$, in which case the peak has height $n + 2 - w(j) - j$.

Proof. It is clear from (2) that the left-to-right minima of w correspond to the peaks of $K(w)$. The peak corresponding to i_p is preceded by $\sum_{q=1}^p (w(i_{q-1}) - w(i_q)) = n + 1 - w(i_p)$ upsteps and by $\sum_{q=2}^p (i_q - i_{q-1}) = i_p - 1$ downsteps. The position and height of this peak are, respectively, the sum and difference of these two counts: $n - w(i_p) + i_p$ and $n + 2 - w(i_p) - i_p$. \square

The next two corollaries follow using Lemmas 2.6 and 2.2.

Corollary 2.8. If w avoids 123 and has runs of anti-fixed points of lengths ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_k , then $K(w)$ has saws of lengths $2\ell_1, \dots, 2\ell_k$.

Corollary 2.9. For any n ,

$$\sum_{\substack{v \in S_n \\ v \text{ avoids } 123}} C_{\ell_1+1} \cdots C_{\ell_k+1} = \binom{2n}{n},$$

where ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_k are the lengths of runs of anti-fixed points of each v .

3. THE STRUCTURE OF \mathcal{P}_w

Definition 3.1. The n^{th} Catalan matroid has groundset $[n]$ and bases

$$\mathcal{C}_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\{i \in [n] : i \text{ an upstep of } D\} : D \in \mathcal{D}_n\}.$$

Ardila showed that \mathcal{C}_n is indeed the set of bases of a matroid, and that this matroid can also be represented by a generic $n \times 2n$ matrix of the form

$$A_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{bmatrix} * & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ * & * & * & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ * & * & * & * & * & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ * & * & * & * & * & \cdots & * & * & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

That is, for an n -subset I of $[2n]$, the minor of this matrix in rows $[n]$ and columns I is nonzero if and only if $I \in \mathcal{C}_n$.

Recall that \mathcal{P}_w is the matroid of the matrix M_w as defined in the introduction. Write \mathcal{P}_n for \mathcal{P}_{w_0} where $w_0 = n(n-1)\cdots 321 \in S_n$. Then \mathcal{P}_n is represented by the $n \times 2n$ matrix

$$M_{w_0} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & * & * & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & * & * & * & * & \ddots & \vdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & * & * & * & * & \ddots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & * & \cdots & * & * & * & * & \cdots & * & 0 \\ * & * & \cdots & * & * & * & * & \cdots & * & * \end{bmatrix}$$

Deleting row 1 and columns 1 and $2n + 2$ of A_{n+1} , then permuting columns appropriately, gives the matrix M_{w_0} . Hence \mathcal{P}_n is isomorphic to \mathcal{C}_{n+1} . Specifically, say $\alpha : [2, 2n + 1] \rightarrow [2n]$ is the function sending $2, 3, \dots, n + 1$ to $n + 1, n, n + 2, n - 1, \dots, 2n, 1$. Then $D \in \mathcal{C}_{n+1}$ if and only if $\alpha(D \setminus \{1\}) \in \mathcal{P}_n$.

Lemma 3.2. *If $w_0 \in S_n$ is the reverse permutation, \mathcal{P}_n is the set of $I \in \binom{[2n]}{n}$ such that $\#(I \cap [n - j + 1, n - j]) \geq j$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$.*

Proof. $D \in \binom{[2n+2]}{n+1}$ is the set of upsteps of a Dyck path of length $2n + 2$ if and only if $[k]$ contains at least as many members of D as of $[2n + 2] \setminus D$, for each k . In fact, this only needs to hold for each odd k . Equivalently, $D \in \mathcal{C}_{n+1}$ if and only if $\#(D \cap [2j + 1]) \geq j + 1$ for $0 \leq j \leq n$. Setting $I = \alpha(D \setminus \{1\})$, this condition is equivalent to the lemma. \square

We will need to consider versions of \mathcal{P}_n on groundsets other than $[n]$, for which the following notation will be useful. Given a subset $X = \{x_1 < \cdots < x_k\}$ of $[n]$, write $Z_j X$ for the set

$$\{n - x_j + 1, \dots, n - x_1 + 1, n + x_1, \dots, n + x_j\}$$

Note that $Z_j X$ also depends on n , but we suppress that in the notation. We will abbreviate $Z_{\#X}(X)$ as $Z(X)$. Now for an interval $K \subseteq [n]$ of size k , let $f_{K,n}$ be the unique increasing function $[2k] \rightarrow Z(K)$. Finally, define $\mathcal{P}_{K,n}$ to be $f_{K,n}(\mathcal{P}_k)$. For example, $\mathcal{P}_{[3,4],7}$ is the matroid of a generic matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & * & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & * & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & * & * & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & * & * & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Alternatively, we can give a description in the style of Lemma 3.2: $\mathcal{P}_{K,n}$ consists of the k -subsets I of $Z(K)$ such that $\#(I \cap Z_j K) \geq j$ for each j in $[k]$.

Let $L(w)$ be the set of left-to-right minima of w which are not right-to-left maxima, and $R(w)$ the set of right-to-left maxima which are not left-to-right minima. We can now state our main structural result for \mathcal{P}_w .

Theorem 3.3. *Say $v, w \in S_n$.*

(a) *If $v \leq w$ in Bruhat order, then $\mathcal{P}_w \subseteq \mathcal{P}_v$.*

- (b) The sets $\mathcal{Q}_w \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{P}_w \setminus \bigcup_{v > w} \mathcal{P}_v$ are pairwise disjoint.
(c) If w contains 123, then \mathcal{Q}_w is empty.
(d) If w avoids 123, let A_1, \dots, A_k be the maximal intervals in the set of anti-fixed points of w . Then

$$\mathcal{Q}_w = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathcal{P}_{A_i, n} \oplus \{w(L(w))\} \oplus \{n + R(w)\}.$$

Here, for two families of sets \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} , we write $\mathcal{F} \oplus \mathcal{G}$ for the family $\{I \sqcup J : I \in \mathcal{F}, J \in \mathcal{G}\}$. That is, if \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} are sets of bases for two matroids, then $\mathcal{F} \oplus \mathcal{G}$ is the set of bases for the direct sum of the two matroids. Also, for a set A and integer n , we let $n + A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{i + n : i \in A\}$.

Example 3.4. Take $w = 645312$, which avoids 123. The runs of anti-fixed points occur in positions 1 and 4, and $L(w) = \{2, 5\}$ and $R(w) = \{6, 3\}$. Hence

$$\mathcal{Q}_w = \mathcal{P}_{[1,1],6} \oplus \mathcal{P}_{[4,4],6} \oplus \{\{4, 1\}\} \oplus \{\{12, 9\}\}.$$

We have $\mathcal{P}_{[1,1],6} = \{\{6\}, \{7\}\}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{[4,4],6} = \{\{3\}, \{10\}\}$. So, \mathcal{Q}_w consists of the four sets

$$13469(12), \quad 13479(12), \quad 1469(10)(12), \quad 1479(10)(12).$$

Remark 3.5. The description of \mathcal{Q}_w given by Theorem 3.3(d) can be rephrased in the manner of Lemma 3.2. Let A be the set of anti-fixed points of w , and define

$$G(w) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} w(L(w) \cup A) \cup (n + (R(w) \cup A)) = w(L(w)) \cup (R(w) + n) \cup Z(A).$$

Then \mathcal{Q}_w consists of the n -subsets I of $G(w)$ such that $\#(I \cap Z_j K) \geq j$ for each maximal interval $K \subseteq A$ and each $j \in [\#K]$. In particular, $\#(I \cap Z(A \cap [j])) \geq \#(A \cap [j])$ for any $j \in [n]$.

Alternatively, \mathcal{Q}_w is the set of bases of a matroid. For w avoiding 123, let N_w be a generic matrix whose entries are zero except that

- The entries $(i, w(i))$ for $i \in L(w)$ are nonzero.
- The entries $(i, i + n)$ for $i \in R(w)$ are nonzero.
- Suppose w has runs of anti-fixed points in positions A_1, \dots, A_k . For each p , the submatrix of N in rows A_p and columns $Z(A_p)$ is M_{w_0} , where $w_0 \in S_{\#A_p}$.

Then \mathcal{Q}_w is the matroid of N_w . For instance, if $w = 645312$ as above then

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & * & * & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & * & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & * & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & * & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & * & 0 & 0 \\ * & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & * \end{bmatrix}$$

To prove Theorem 3.3, we begin with a characterization of positroids from [8]. An *affine permutation* is a bijection $f : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ such that $f(i + n) = f(i) + n$ for some fixed n (the *quasiperiod* of f) and all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Notice that an affine permutation is determined completely by the word $f(1)f(2) \cdots f(n)$, and we will specify an affine permutation by this word. For example, 4721 sends $4k + 1 \mapsto 4k + 4$ for any k , sends $4k + 2 \mapsto 4k + 7$, and so on.

An affine permutation f is *bounded* if $i \leq f(i) \leq n + i$ for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Suppose f is bounded and that exactly k of the values $f(1), \dots, f(n)$ exceed n . The *juggling sequence* of f is the sequence (J_1, \dots, J_n) of k -subsets of $[n]$ given by $J_i = \{f(j) - i + 1 : j < i\} \cap \mathbb{N}$. Finally, let χ be the cyclic shift permutation $23 \cdots n1 \in S_n$.

Definition 3.6. The *positroid* associated to an f as described above is the matroid on $[n]$ with bases

$$\left\{ I \in \binom{[n]}{k} : \chi^{-i+1}I \geq J_i \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, n \right\}, \quad (3)$$

where $\{a_1 < \dots < a_k\} \leq \{b_1 < \dots < b_k\}$ if $a_i \leq b_i$ for all i .

Postnikov [10] gave various combinatorial descriptions of positroids, and conjectured that Definition 3.6 agrees with the definition of positroid given in the introduction—this conjecture was proven in [8]. The description in terms of bounded affine permutations is due to Knutson, Lam, and Speyer [6].

For $w \in S_n$, let f_w be the bounded affine permutation of quasiperiod $2n$ with

$$f_w(i) = \begin{cases} i + n & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq n \\ w(i) + 2n & \text{if } n + 1 \leq i \leq 2n \end{cases}.$$

For instance, $f_{2143} = 5678(10)9(12)(11)$.

Theorem 3.7. \mathcal{P}_w is the positroid associated to f_w .

Proof. Let Π_w° be the set of n -planes in $\text{Gr}(n, 2n)$ whose matroid is the positroid associated to f_w , and let Σ_w° be the set of n -planes in $\text{Gr}(n, 2n)$ which are rowspaces of matrices of the form M_w whose nonzero entries are algebraically independent. It is shown in [9, §4] that the Zariski closures $\overline{\Pi_w^\circ}$ and $\overline{\Sigma_w^\circ}$ are equal. Because Π_w° is defined by requiring certain Plücker coordinates on $\text{Gr}(n, 2n)$ to be nonzero and the rest to be zero, it is locally closed, so $\overline{\Pi_w^\circ} \setminus \Pi_w^\circ$ is closed. This means that Σ_w° cannot be contained in $\overline{\Pi_w^\circ} \setminus \Pi_w^\circ$, because then its closure would be, contradicting $\overline{\Pi_w^\circ} = \overline{\Sigma_w^\circ}$. It follows that $\Sigma_w^\circ \cap \Pi_w^\circ$ is nonempty. Every member of Σ_w° has matroid \mathcal{P}_w , so this proves the theorem. \square

The juggling sequence (J_1, \dots, J_{2n}) of f_w is easy to describe: $J_1 = \dots = J_{n+1} = [n]$, while $J_{n+j+1} = [n-j] \cup \{w([j]) + n - j\}$ for $j \in [n-1]$. This leads to a correspondingly simpler version of the test for membership in \mathcal{P}_w given by Definition 3.6. Given $I \in \binom{[2n]}{n}$ and some j , write $\chi^{-n-j}I = \{b_1 < \dots < b_n\}$, and define $B_j(I) = \{b_{n-j+1}, \dots, b_n\} - n + j$.

Lemma 3.8. A set $I \in \binom{[2n]}{n}$ is in \mathcal{P}_w if and only if $B_j(I) \geq w([j])$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$.

Proof. By Theorem 3.7, $I \in \mathcal{P}_w$ if and only if $\chi^{-i+1}I \geq J_i$ for $i \in [2n]$. This test is vacuous for $i \leq n+1$ since $J_i = [n]$. If $i = n+j+1$, it reads $\chi^{-n-j}I \geq [n-j] \cup \{w([j]) + n - j\}$, which is equivalent to $B_j(I) \geq w([j])$. \square

Lemma 3.8 can be simplified and rephrased in terms of Bruhat order on words.

Definition 3.9. An *injective word* on \mathbb{N} is a word whose letters are all distinct, i.e. an injective function $v : [\ell] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ for some ℓ . The *Bruhat order* on injective words of length ℓ has $v \geq w$ if and only if $v([j]) \geq w([j])$ for $j \in [\ell]$.

When restricted to permutations of $[\ell]$, the definition of Bruhat order above is sometimes called the *tableau criterion*, and it agrees with the usual strong Bruhat order on permutations [3, Theorem 2.6.3].

Given

$$I = \{i_1 < \dots < i_p \leq n < i_{p+1} < \dots < i_n\} \in \binom{[2n]}{n},$$

let v_I be the injective word with i_{p+1}, \dots, i_n in positions $i_{p+1} - n, \dots, i_n - n$ (in increasing order), and i_p, \dots, i_1 in the remaining positions (in decreasing order). For example, if $n = 6$ and $I = \{1, 2, 5, 7, 10, 11\}$, then $v_I = 752(10)(11)1$.

Lemma 3.10. *For any $w \in S_n$ and $I \in \binom{[2n]}{n}$, $I \in \mathcal{P}_w$ if and only if $v_I \geq w$.*

Proof. This will follow from Lemma 3.8 if we show that $B_{j-1}(I) \subseteq B_j(I)$ for each j and that $B_j(I) \setminus B_{j-1}(I) = \{v_I(j)\}$. For each $j \geq 0$, we have

$$\chi^{-n-j}I = \{i_{p+q(j)} - n < \cdots < i_n - n < i_1 + n < \cdots < i_{p+q(j)-1} + n\} - j,$$

where $q(j) \geq 0$ is such that $i_1 < \cdots < i_{p+q(j)-1} \leq n + j < i_{p+q(j)} < \cdots < i_n$. We must have $n - (p + q(j)) + 1 \leq 2n - (n + j)$, or equivalently $p + q(j) - 1 \geq j$. Therefore

$$B_j(I) = \{i_{p+q(j)-j} < \cdots < i_{p+q(j)-1}\}. \quad (4)$$

There are two cases now. If $j = i_{p+r} - n$ for some $r \geq 1$, then $q(j) = q(j-1) + 1 = r + 1$. One can then see from (4) that $B_j(I) \subseteq B_{j-1}(I)$ and that

$$B_j(I) \setminus B_{j-1}(I) = \{i_{p+q(j-1)}\} = \{i_{p+r}\} = \{v_I(j)\}.$$

On the other hand, if $j \notin \{i_{p+1} - n, \dots, i_n - n\}$ and $j \geq 1$, then $q(j) = q(j-1)$. Again (4) shows that $B_j(I) \subseteq B_{j-1}(I)$, and now

$$B_j(I) \setminus B_{j-1}(I) = \{i_{p+q(j-1)-j}\} = \{i_{p+q(j)-j}\}.$$

Since the sets $B_j(I)$ are nested and get larger by one element with each step, the word formed by the singletons $B_j(I) \setminus B_{j-1}(I)$ must be injective, and its entries are the members of I in some order by (4). We have seen that the entries in positions $\{i_{p+1} - n, \dots, i_n - n\}$ agree with those for v_I . Therefore to show that the remaining entries are i_p, \dots, i_1 , it suffices to show that they come in decreasing order. This follows from the fact that the function $j \mapsto p + q(j) - j$ is weakly decreasing, since $q(j+1) - q(j) \in \{0, 1\}$ for each j . \square

Lemma 3.10 says that \mathcal{P}_w is the inverse image in $\binom{[2n]}{n}$ of the order filter above w in the poset of length n injective words under the map $I \mapsto v_I$. The following dual perspective will also be useful. Given a fixed $I \in \binom{[2n]}{n}$, let $W_I \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{w \in S_n : I \in \mathcal{P}_w\}$. By Lemma 3.10, $W_I = \{w \in S_n : v_I \geq w\}$. Recall that part (b) of Theorem 3.3 claims that the sets $\mathcal{P}_w \setminus \bigcup_{v > w} \mathcal{P}_v$ are pairwise disjoint for $w \in S_n$, which is equivalent to the statement that W_I has a unique maximal element. If v_I and $w_0 = n(n-1) \cdots 321$ have a greatest lower bound, it will be the unique maximal element of W_I . The poset of injective words with Bruhat order is not a lattice, but in fact the greatest lower bound exists in this case.

Lemma 3.11. *Let v be an injective word of length n and $w_0 = n(n-1) \cdots 321$. For each j , define*

$$s(j) = \#([v(j)] \cap v([j])) = \#\{1 \leq i \leq j : v(i) \leq v(j)\}.$$

Let $u \in S_n$ be such that $u(j) = v(j)$ if $v(j) \leq n - j + s(j)$, and whose other entries are the other members of $[n]$, in decreasing order. Then u is a greatest lower bound for v and w_0 in Bruhat order.

Proof. Define

$$E_j = \min(v([j]), w_0([j])) = \{\min(b_1, n - j + 1) < \cdots < \min(b_j, n)\},$$

where $v([j]) = \{b_1 < \cdots < b_j\}$. If the sets E_j are nested, the corresponding injective word will be a greatest lower bound for v and w_0 , so we must show that $E_{j-1} \subseteq E_j$ and $E_j \setminus E_{j-1} = \{u(j)\}$ for each j . The proof will be similar to that of Lemma 3.10.

For each j , take $r(j)$ maximal such that $b_{r(j)} \leq n - j + r(j)$, or 0 if there is no such r . For a fixed j , write $v([j-1]) = \{b_1 < \cdots < b_{j-1}\}$. Then

$$E_{j-1} = \{b_1 < \cdots < b_{r(j-1)} < n - j + r(j-1) + 2 < \cdots < n\}.$$

Now we consider two cases.

- Suppose $v(j) \leq n - j + s(j)$. Then $r(j) \geq s(j)$, so $r(j) = r(j-1) + 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} E_j &= \{b_1 < \cdots < b_{s-1} < v(j) < b_s < \cdots < b_{r(j-1)} < n - j + r(j) + 1 < \cdots < n\} \\ &= \{b_1 < \cdots < b_{s-1} < v(j) < b_s < \cdots < b_{r(j-1)} < n - j + r(j-1) + 2 < \cdots < n\} \\ &= E_{j-1} \cup \{v(j)\}. \end{aligned}$$

- Suppose $v(j) > n - j + s(j)$. Then $r(j) \leq s(j) - 1$. In this case we have $r(j) \leq r(j-1)$, and if $r(j) < i \leq r(j-1)$, then $b_i = n - j + i + 1$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} E_j &= \{b_1 < \cdots < b_{r(j)} < n - j + r(j) + 1 < \cdots < n\} \\ E_{j-1} &= \{b_1 < \cdots < b_{r(j)} < n - j + r(j) + 2 < \cdots < n\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{so } E_j = E_{j-1} \cup \{n - j + r(j) + 1\}.$$

In both cases we see that $E_{j-1} \subseteq E_j$, so the permutation u defined by $E_j \setminus E_{j-1} = \{u(j)\}$ is a greatest upper bound for w_0 and v . Moreover, if $v(j) \leq n - j + s(j)$, then $u(j) = v(j)$. If on the other hand j is such that $v(j) > n - j + s(j)$, then $u(j) = n - j + r(j) + 1$; since $j \mapsto r(j) - j$ is a weakly decreasing function, we see that u is weakly decreasing on such positions j , as claimed. \square

Corollary 3.12. For any $I \in \binom{[2n]}{n}$, the set W_I has a unique maximal element u_I .

Proof. u_I is the greatest lower bound of v_I and w_0 given by Lemma 3.11. \square

Remark 3.13. Calculating u_I is simpler than Lemma 3.11 might lead one to believe, because the entries of v_I in $[n]$ form a decreasing sequence, so in the case that $v_I(j) \leq n - j + s(j)$, we actually have $s(j) = 1$. Hence u_I is the permutation in S_n such that $u_I(j) = v_I(j)$ when $v_I(j) \leq n - j + 1$, and whose other entries form a decreasing subsequence. For example, say $n = 9$ and $I = \{1, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17\}$. Then $v_I = (10)9643(15)(16)(17)1$ and $u_I = 986437521$. The next lemma shows that u_I is determined by even less information.

Lemma 3.14. For any $I \in \binom{[2n]}{n}$, we have $u_I(j) < n - j + 1$ if and only if $v_I(j) < n - j + 1$ (and in this case $u_I(j) = v_I(j)$). Moreover, the permutation u_I is uniquely determined by the set $\{(j, v_I(j)) : v_I(j) < n - j + 1\}$.

Proof. The description of u_I in Remark 3.13 shows that u_I is the union of two decreasing subsequences, and so it avoids the pattern 123. A 123-avoiding permutation $z \in S_n$ is uniquely determined by the pairs $(j, z(j))$ for which $z(j) < n - j + 1$, because the other entries will be right-to-left maxima and come in decreasing order. Thus it suffices to prove the first claim.

By Remark 3.13, if $v_I(j) < n - j + 1$ then $u_I(j) = v_I(j)$. Suppose that $u_I(j) < n - j + 1$ but that $u_I(j) \neq v_I(j)$. This implies $v_I(j) > n - j + 1$. By the pigeonhole principle, there must be $k > j$ such that $u_I(k) > n - k + 1$, and the minimal such k must satisfy $u_I(k) > u_I(j)$. For such a k we have $v_I(k) > n - k + 1$. But then the construction of u_I implies that $u_I(j)$ and $u_I(k)$ are part of the same decreasing subsequence. This is a contradiction, since $j < k$ and $u_I(j) < u_I(k)$. \square

We now restate and prove Theorem 3.3.

Theorem (Theorem 3.3). Say $v, w \in S_n$. Then

- If $v \leq w$ in Bruhat order, then $\mathcal{P}_w \subseteq \mathcal{P}_v$.
- The sets $\mathcal{Q}_w = \mathcal{P}_w \setminus \bigcup_{v > w} \mathcal{P}_v$ are pairwise disjoint.
- If w contains 123, then \mathcal{Q}_w is empty.

(d) If w avoids 123, say w has runs of anti-fixed points A_1, \dots, A_k . Then

$$\mathcal{Q}_w = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathcal{P}_{A_i, n} \oplus \{w(L(w))\} \oplus \{n + R(w)\}. \quad (5)$$

Proof.

- (a) Immediate from Lemma 3.10.
 (b) We have $I \in \mathcal{Q}_w$ if and only if w is a maximal element of $W_I = \{w \in S_n : I \in \mathcal{P}_w\}$, so this follows from Corollary 3.12.
 (c) Suppose $I \in \mathcal{Q}_w$. As in (b), this is equivalent to $\max W_I = w$. The description of $u_I = \max W_I$ in Remark 3.13 shows that u_I is the union of two decreasing subsequences, and so it avoids 123.
 (d) Let $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_w$ be the set on the right-hand side of (5), and suppose $I \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_w$. Let us see that $w = u_I$, which implies $I \in \mathcal{Q}_w$. By part (c), u_I avoids 123. As mentioned in the proof of Lemma 3.14, a 123-avoiding permutation z is completely determined by the set $\{(j, z(j)) : z(j) < n - j + 1\}$. Hence, it is enough to show that if $w(j) < n - j + 1$ or $u_I(j) < n - j + 1$, then $w(j) = u_I(j)$. By Lemma 3.14, this is equivalent to the claim that if $w(j) < n - j + 1$ or $v_I(j) < n - j + 1$, then $w(j) = v_I(j)$.

Observe that $v_I(j) < n - j + 1$ if and only if $n + j \notin I$ and $\#(I \cap [v_I(j), n + j]) = j$. Thus, we want either of $w(j) < n - j + 1$ or $v_I(j) < n - j + 1$ to imply $n + j \notin I$ and $\#(I \cap [w(j), n + j]) = j$. The first condition is easy: if $n + j \in I$, then (1) $w(j) \geq n - j + 1$ because j must be a right-to-left maximum of w , and (2) the construction of v_I implies $v_I(j) > n$.

Let A be the set of anti-fixed points of w . Then I is the disjoint union of $w(L(w))$, $R(w) + n$, and $I \cap Z(A)$, and we consider these three pieces of I separately.

- $\#(w(L(w)) \cap [w(j), n + j]) = \#(w(L(w)) \cap [w(j), n]) = \#(L(w) \cap [j])$, where the second equality uses the fact that $j \in L(w)$.
- $\#((R(w) + n) \cap [w(j), n + j]) = \#(R(w) \cap [j])$.
- Lemma 2.6 implies that $[w(j), n + j] \supseteq [n - j + 1, n + j]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \#(I \cap Z(A) \cap [w(j), n + j]) &\geq \#(I \cap Z(A) \cap [n - j + 1, n + j]) \\ &= \#(I \cap Z(A \cap [j])) \geq \#(A \cap [j]), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the description of $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_w$ from Remark 3.5.

Putting these three pieces of $I \cap [w(j), n + j]$ together,

$$\begin{aligned} \#(I \cap [w(j), n + j]) &= \#(L(w) \cap [j]) + \#(R(w) \cap [j]) + \#(I \cap Z(A) \cap [w(j), n + j]) \\ &\geq \#(L(w) \cap [j]) + \#(R(w) \cap [j]) + \#(A \cap [j]) = j. \end{aligned}$$

For the reverse inequality, we use the easy direction of Hall's marriage theorem. Let D_i be the set of *'s in column i of the matrix N_w representing $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_w$ (cf. Remark 3.5). That is,

$$D_i = \begin{cases} \{w^{-1}(i)\} & \text{if } i \in w(L(w)) \\ \{i - n\} & \text{if } i \in R(w) + n \\ [a_\ell - \ell + k, a_\ell] & \text{if } i \text{ or } 2n - i + 1 \text{ is } k^{\text{th}} \text{ in a run of anti-fixed points } a_1, \dots, a_\ell. \end{cases}$$

Since N_w has a transversal in columns I , we must have

$$\#(I \cap [w(j), n + j]) \leq \# \left(\bigcup_{i \in I \cap [w(j), n + j]} D_i \right).$$

Notice that if $w(i) < i' \leq n$ or $n > i' > i + n$, the contents of $D_{i'}$ are bounded above by i . Therefore $\bigcup_{i \in I \cap [w(j), n+j]} D_i \subseteq [j]$, and we get the desired inequality.

We have now shown that $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_w \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_w$ for all 123-avoiding w . By parts (a) and (b), the non-empty \mathcal{Q}_w partition $\mathcal{P}_{12\dots n} = \binom{[2n]}{n}$. Thus to get $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_w = \mathcal{Q}_w$, it is enough to show that

$$\sum_{\substack{w \in S_n \\ w \text{ avoids } 123}} \#\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_w = \binom{2n}{n},$$

which we have done in Corollary 2.9. □

Because $\#\mathcal{P}_{K,n} = C_{\#K+1}$, we get an immediate enumerative corollary.

Corollary 3.15. The size of \mathcal{P}_w is

$$\sum_{\substack{v \geq w \\ v \text{ avoids } 123}} C_{\ell_1+1} \cdots C_{\ell_k+1},$$

where ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_k are as in the statement of Theorem 3.3, the lengths of the runs of anti-fixed points in each v .

We conclude this section with a few results on symmetries of positroids which will be useful later. For $x \in [2n]$, write $\bar{x} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2n + 1 - x$.

Theorem 3.16. $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_w = \mathcal{P}_{w_0 w^{-1} w_0}$ for any $w \in S_n$.

Proof. This follows from the matrix identity $w_0 w^{-1} M_w w_0^{(2n)} = M_{w_0 w^{-1} w_0}$, where w_0 is the reverse permutation in S_n and $w_0^{(2n)}$ is the reverse permutation in S_{2n} . □

Corollary 3.17. $u_{\bar{I}} = w_0 u_I^{-1} w_0$ for any $I \in \binom{[2n]}{n}$.

Proof. Theorem 3.16 is equivalent to $W_{\bar{I}} = w_0 W_I^{-1} w_0$. Since $w \mapsto w_0 w^{-1} w_0$ is an automorphism of Bruhat order,

$$u_{\bar{I}} = \max W_{\bar{I}} = w_0 (\max W_I)^{-1} w_0 = w_0 u_I^{-1} w_0. \quad \square$$

If M is a matroid with groundset E , then $\{E \setminus I : I \text{ a basis of } M\}$ is also the set of bases for a matroid, the *dual matroid* M^* .

Theorem 3.18. \mathcal{P}_w^* is isomorphic to $\mathcal{P}_{w^{-1}}$ for any permutation w .

Proof. Set $w_n^* = (n+1) \cdots (2n) 1 \cdots n \in S_n$. Let us see that $w_n^* \mathcal{P}_w^* = \mathcal{P}_{w^{-1}}$. Since inversion is an automorphism of Bruhat order and $\mathcal{P}_w = \bigcup_{v \geq w} \mathcal{Q}_v$ by Theorem 3.3, it is enough to show that $w_n^* \mathcal{Q}_v^* = \mathcal{Q}_{v^{-1}}$. Let A be the set of anti-fixed points of v , and A_1, \dots, A_k the maximal intervals in A . Since $[n]$ is the disjoint union $L(v) \cup R(v) \cup A$, we have

$$\mathcal{Q}_v^* = \{vR(v)\} \oplus \{L(v) + n\} \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathcal{P}_{A_i, n}^*.$$

Also, $L(v) = v^{-1}L(v^{-1})$ and $R(v) = v^{-1}R(v^{-1})$, so

$$w_n^* \mathcal{Q}_v^* = \{v^{-1}L(v^{-1})\} \oplus \{R(v^{-1}) + n\} \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^k w_n^* \mathcal{P}_{A_i, n}^*.$$

The set of anti-fixed points of v^{-1} is $n+1-A$, so all we need to do is show $w_n^* \mathcal{P}_{K,n}^* = \mathcal{P}_{n+1-K,n}$ for any interval $K \subseteq [n]$. When pushed through the isomorphism of $\mathcal{P}_{K,n}$ with $\mathcal{C}_{\#K+1}$ given at the beginning of this section, this identity becomes $w_0 \mathcal{C}_{\#K+1}^* = \mathcal{C}_{\#K+1}$, where $w_0 \in S_{\#K+1}$. But the latter identity is certainly true: it reflects the existence of the automorphism of the set of Dyck paths which reverses the path and interchanges the notions of upstep and downstep. \square

4. THE TUTTE POLYNOMIAL OF \mathcal{P}_w

Theorem 3.3 writes \mathcal{P}_w as the disjoint union of matroids \mathcal{Q}_v over 123-avoiding permutations v above w in Bruhat order, with each \mathcal{Q}_v isomorphic to a direct sum of Catalan matroids and a matroid with one basis. In this section we give an analogous formula for the Tutte polynomial of \mathcal{P}_w , writing it as a sum over 123-avoiding permutations v above w of certain modifications of the Tutte polynomials of the \mathcal{Q}_v . First we recall one definition of the Tutte polynomial.

Definition 4.1. Given a matroid M with groundset S , the *rank* of a subset $I \subseteq S$ is the maximal size of an intersection of I with a basis of M . Write $\text{rank}_M(I)$ for this number. The *Tutte polynomial* of M is then the bivariate generating function

$$T_M(x, y) = \sum_{I \subseteq S} (x-1)^{\text{rank}(M) - \text{rank}_M(I)} (y-1)^{\#I - \text{rank}_M(I)}.$$

Here $\text{rank}(M)$ is the size of any basis of M .

Let $T_n(x, y)$ be the Tutte polynomial of the matroid \mathcal{P}_n . If M is the matroid on $\{2n+1, 2n+2\}$ with bases $\{\{2n+1\}\}$, then $M \oplus \mathcal{P}_n$ is isomorphic to \mathcal{C}_{n+1} . The Tutte polynomial of M is xy , and Tutte polynomials are multiplicative on direct sums, so $T_n(x, y)$ is the Tutte polynomial of \mathcal{C}_{n+1} divided by xy .

Given a Dyck path D , let $\text{ht}(D)$ be the height of the first peak and $\text{tch}(D)$ the number of times D touches the x -axis, not counting the first. In [1], Ardila shows that

$$\sum_{D \in \mathcal{D}_n} x^{\text{ht}(D)} y^{\text{tch}(D)}.$$

is the Tutte polynomial of \mathcal{C}_n . Hence

$$T_n(x, y) = \sum_{D \in \mathcal{D}_{n+1}} x^{\text{ht}(D)-1} y^{\text{tch}(D)-1}. \quad (6)$$

It is more natural to give $T_n(x, y)$ as a sum over \mathcal{P}_n using the bijection to \mathcal{C}_{n+1} given at the beginning of Section 3. Define a total order \prec on $[2n]$ by

$$n+1 \prec n \prec n+2 \prec n-1 \prec \dots \prec 2n \prec 1.$$

For $I \in \mathcal{P}_n$, define $c(I)$ as the length of the longest \prec -initial segment of $[2n]$, and $d(I)$ as the number of integers $j \in [2n]$ such that $\#(I \cap [n+1, n+j]) = \#(I \cap [n-j+1, n-1])$. Then Ardila's formula (6) translates to

$$T_n(x, y) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{P}_n} x^{c(I)} y^{d(I)}. \quad (7)$$

Given an interval $K \subseteq [n]$, define a modified version of T_n as follows:

$$T_{K,n}(x, y) = \begin{cases} T_{\#K}(x, y) & \text{if } K = [n] \\ T_{\#K}(x, 1) & \text{if } 1 \in K \text{ and } n \notin K \\ T_{\#K}(1, y) & \text{if } 1 \notin K \text{ and } n \in K \\ T_{\#K}(1, 1) & \text{if } 1, n \notin K \end{cases}$$

Notice that $T_{\#K+1}(1, 1) = C_{\#K+1}$, the number of bases in $\mathcal{P}_{K,n}$. Also, given a 123-avoiding $w \in S_n$ with runs of anti-fixed points A_1, \dots, A_k , define

$$U_w(x, y) = \prod_{i=1}^k T_{A_i, n}(x, y).$$

Theorem 4.2. *For any permutation $w \in S_n$, the Tutte polynomial of \mathcal{P}_w is*

$$U_{w_0}(x, y) + (1 - (x - 1)(y - 1)) \sum_{\substack{w \leq v < w_0 \\ v \text{ avoids } 123}} U_v(x, y).$$

We start with a characterization of ranks in \mathcal{P}_w . Recall that Lemma 3.10 associates to each n -subset I of $[2n]$ an permutation $u_I \in S_n$ in such a way that $I \in \mathcal{P}_w$ if and only if $u_I \geq w$. We will follow a similar strategy here, and construct, for any nonnegative integer r and any $I \subseteq [2n]$, a permutation u_I^r such that I has rank at least r in \mathcal{P}_w if and only if $u_I^r \geq w$.

Say $I \subseteq [2n]$ has size at least r . Define $J_r(I)$ to be the \prec -lexicographically smallest n -set such that $\#(J_r(I) \cap I) \geq r$. Explicitly, if

$$I = \{i_1 \prec i_2 \prec \dots\} \quad \text{and} \quad [2n] \setminus \{i_1, \dots, i_r\} = \{j_1 \prec j_2 \prec \dots\},$$

then $J_r(I) = \{i_1, \dots, i_r, j_1, \dots, j_{n-r}\}$. Now define $u_I^r = u_{J_r(I)}$.

Theorem 4.3. *The set I has rank at least r in \mathcal{P}_w if and only if $J_r(I) \in \mathcal{P}_w$, or equivalently, $u_I^r \geq w$.*

Remark 4.4. What is really important here is the partial order

$$n + 1, n \prec n + 2, n - 1 \prec \dots \prec 2n, 1.$$

One can show that although $J_r(I)$ depends on the choice of linear extension of this partial order to a total order, u_I^r does not (indeed, this is a consequence of Theorem 4.3).

We postpone the proof of Theorem 4.3 since it is somewhat involved, and move on to its consequences for ranks in \mathcal{P}_w . Let $\mathcal{P}_w^r = \{I \subseteq [2n] : I \text{ has rank at least } r \text{ in } \mathcal{P}_w\}$, and $\mathcal{Q}_w^r = \mathcal{P}_w^r \setminus \bigcup_{v > w} \mathcal{P}_v^r$. Theorem 4.3 shows that \mathcal{Q}_w^r is the set of I such that $u_I^r = w$. Equivalently, if we think of J_r as a function $2^{[2n]} \rightarrow \binom{[2n]}{n}$, then $\mathcal{Q}_w^r = \bigcup_{K \in \mathcal{Q}_w^r} J_r^{-1}(K)$, and we can give a reasonable description of $J_r^{-1}(K)$ for a fixed K .

Lemma 4.5. *Let K be an n -subset of $[2n]$, and $0 \leq r \leq n$. Write $K = E \cup F$ where E is the maximal initial segment of $[2n]$ in K (in the order \prec). Then $J_r^{-1}(K)$ is the collection of sets of the form $E' \cup F \cup G$, where $E' \in \binom{E}{\#E - n + r}$ and $G \subseteq [2n]$ satisfies $\min(G) > \max(F)$.*

Proof. Say $I = E' \cup F \cup G$ where E', F, G are as in the statement of the lemma, and write $I = \{i_1 \prec i_2 \prec \dots\}$. Since $\#E' + \#F = r$, we have $\{i_1, \dots, i_r\} = E' \cup F$. Thus $[2n] \setminus \{i_1, \dots, i_r\}$ contains $E \setminus E'$, which has size $n - r$. Since E is an initial segment, the smallest $n - r$ elements of $[2n] \setminus \{i_1, \dots, i_r\}$ are exactly $E \setminus E'$, so $J_r(I) = (E' \cup F) \cup (E \setminus E') = K$.

Conversely, suppose $J_r(I) = K$, with $[2n] \setminus I = \{j_1 \prec j_2 \prec \dots\}$ as in the definition of J_r . Let E' consist of the \prec -first $\#E - n + r$ elements of I (noting that $\#E - n + r \leq r \leq \#I$). Since E is an initial segment of size $\#E' + n - r$, we must have $E' \cup \{j_1 \prec \dots \prec j_{n-r}\} = E$.

But this forces $F = \{i_{\#E'+1} \prec \cdots \prec i_r\} \subseteq I$, and then defining $C = \{i_{r+1} \prec \cdots \prec i_n\}$ gives the desired decomposition $I = E' \cup F \cup G$. \square

Finally, we will need a description of U_w in the style of (7). As above, let $c(K)$ be the length of the largest \prec -initial segment of $[2n]$ contained in K , and let $\bar{c}(K)$ be the length of the largest \prec -final segment in $[2n] \setminus K$.

Lemma 4.6. *For any 123-avoiding $w \neq w_0$,*

$$U_w(x, y) = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{Q}_w} x^{c(K)} y^{\bar{c}(K)}.$$

Proof. Suppose w avoids 123, and has runs of anti-fixed points A_1, \dots, A_k . Then any $K \in \mathcal{Q}_w$ is a disjoint union

$$L_1 \cup \cdots \cup L_k \cup w(L(w)) \cup (R(w) + n),$$

where $L_i \in \mathcal{P}_{A_i, n}$.

Suppose $K \in \mathcal{Q}_w$ contains as a maximal \prec -initial segment $E = \{n+1, \dots, n+\alpha, n, n-1, \dots, n-\beta+1\}$ for some α, β . By definition of \mathcal{Q}_w , this means w has right-to-left maxima in positions $1, \dots, \alpha$. But this is only possible if w has anti-fixed points in those positions. Likewise, w has left-to-right minima with values $n, n-1, \dots, n-\beta+1$, hence anti-fixed points in positions $1, \dots, \beta$. This shows that $E \subseteq L_1$ if $w(1) = n$, and that $E = \emptyset$ if $w(1) \neq n$. Hence $c(K) = c(L_1)$ if $w(1) = n$, and $c(K) = 0$ otherwise. An analogous argument shows that $\bar{c}(K) = \bar{c}(L_r)$ if $w(n) = 1$, and $\bar{c}(K) = 0$ otherwise. Now we see that:

- If $w(1) \neq n$ and $w(n) \neq 1$, then

$$\sum_{K \in \mathcal{Q}_w} x^{c(K)} y^{\bar{c}(K)} = \#\mathcal{Q}_w = \prod_{i=1}^k T_{\#A_i}(1, 1) = U_w(x, y).$$

- If $w(1) = n$ and $w(n) \neq 1$, then using (7),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{Q}_w} x^{c(K)} y^{\bar{c}(K)} &= \sum_{L \in \mathcal{P}_{\#A_1}} x^{c(L)} \prod_{i=2}^k T_{\#A_i}(1, 1) \\ &= T_{\#A_1}(x, 1) \prod_{i=2}^k T_{\#A_i}(1, 1) = U_w(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

- If $w(1) \neq n$ and $w(n) = 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{Q}_w} x^{c(K)} y^{\bar{c}(K)} &= \sum_{L \in \mathcal{P}_{\#A_k}} y^{\bar{c}(L)} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} T_{\#A_i}(1, 1) \\ &= \sum_{L \in \mathcal{P}_{\#A_k}} y^{c(L)} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} T_{\#A_i}(1, 1) \\ &= T_{\#A_k}(y, 1) \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} T_{\#A_i}(1, 1) \end{aligned}$$

To get the second equality, we use the fact from Theorem 3.18 that $I \mapsto w_n^*([2n] \setminus I)$ is an automorphism of \mathcal{P}_n , and that it exchanges the statistics c and \bar{c} . Taking the

dual of a matroid corresponds to switching the variables in the Tutte polynomial, so $T_n(x, y) = T_n(y, x)$ since \mathcal{P}_n is self-dual. Thus

$$\sum_{K \in \mathcal{Q}_w} x^{c(K)} y^{\bar{c}(K)} = T_{\#A_k}(1, y) \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} T_{\#A_i}(1, 1) = U_w(x, y).$$

- If $w(1) = n$ and $w(n) = 1$, then $k > 1$ since $w \neq w_0$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{Q}_w} x^{c(K)} y^{\bar{c}(K)} &= \sum_{L \in \mathcal{P}_{\#A_1}} x^{c(L)} \sum_{L \in \mathcal{P}_{\#A_k}} y^{\bar{c}(L)} \prod_{i=2}^{k-1} T_{\#A_i}(1, 1) \\ &= T_{\#A_1}(x, 1) T_{\#A_k}(1, y) \prod_{i=2}^{k-1} T_{\#A_i}(1, 1) = U_w(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

□

Let $T_w(x, y)$ be the Tutte polynomial of \mathcal{P}_w . Recall that Theorem 4.2 claims that

$$T_w(x, y) = U_{w_0}(x, y) + (1 - (x - 1)(y - 1)) \sum_{\substack{w \leq v < w_0 \\ v \text{ avoids } 123}} U_v(x, y).$$

The Möbius function of Bruhat order on S_n is $\mu(w, v) = (-1)^{\ell(v) - \ell(w)}$. By Möbius inversion, for any particular $w \in S_n$, Theorem 4.2 is equivalent to

$$\sum_{v \geq w} (-1)^{\ell(v) - \ell(w)} T_v(x, y) = \begin{cases} U_{w_0}(x, y) = T_n(x, y) & \text{if } w = w_0 \\ (1 - (x - 1)(y - 1)) U_w & \text{if } w \neq w_0 \text{ avoids } 123. \\ 0 & \text{if } w \text{ contains } 123 \end{cases}$$

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Write $\text{rank}_v(I)$ for the rank of I in \mathcal{P}_v . By Theorem 4.3, $\text{rank}_v(I) = r$ if and only if $v \leq u_I^r$ and $v \not\leq u_I^{r+1}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \geq w} (-1)^{\ell(v) - \ell(w)} T_v(x, y) &= \sum_{v \geq w} (-1)^{\ell(v) - \ell(w)} \sum_{I \subseteq [2n]} (x - 1)^{n - \text{rank}_v(I)} (y - 1)^{\#I - \text{rank}_v(I)} \\ &= \sum_{I \subseteq [2n]} \sum_{r=0}^n (x - 1)^{n-r} (y - 1)^{\#I-r} \sum_{v \in [w, u_I^r] \setminus [w, u_I^{r+1}]} (-1)^{\ell(v) - \ell(w)}. \end{aligned}$$

The term $(x - 1)^{n-r} (y - 1)^{\#I-r}$ will occur frequently, so we will simply write f for it in the rest of the proof.

Any Bruhat interval with more than one element has the same number of elements of even length and of odd length [3], so

$$\sum_{v \in [w, u_I^r] \setminus [w, u_I^{r+1}]} (-1)^{\ell(v) - \ell(w)} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } w \neq u_I^r \text{ and } w \neq u_I^{r+1} \\ 1 & \text{if } w = u_I^r > u_I^{r+1} \\ -1 & \text{if } u_I^r > u_I^{r+1} = w \end{cases}$$

Observe that $w = u_I^r > u_I^{r+1}$ if and only if $I \in \mathcal{Q}_w^r \setminus \mathcal{Q}_w^{r+1}$, and $u_I^r > u_I^{r+1} = w$ if and only if $I \in \mathcal{Q}_w^{r+1} \setminus \mathcal{Q}_w^r$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \geq w} (-1)^{\ell(v) - \ell(w)} T_v(x, y) &= \sum_{r=0}^n \left[\sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_w^r \setminus \mathcal{Q}_w^{r+1}} f - \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_w^{r+1} \setminus \mathcal{Q}_w^r} f \right] \\ &= \sum_{r=0}^n \left[\sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_w^r} f - \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_w^{r+1}} f \right] \\ &= \sum_{r=0}^n \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_w^r} f - (x-1)(y-1) \sum_{r=1}^{n+1} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_w^r} f. \end{aligned}$$

We may as well assume $w \neq w_0$, in which case $\mathcal{Q}_w^0 = \emptyset$. Also, $\mathcal{Q}_w^{n+1} = \emptyset$ for any w , so

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \geq w} (-1)^{\ell(v) - \ell(w)} T_v(x, y) &= [1 - (x-1)(y-1)] \sum_{r=0}^n \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_w^r} f \\ &= [1 - (x-1)(y-1)] \sum_{r=0}^n \sum_{K \in \mathcal{Q}_w} \sum_{I \in J_r^{-1}(K)} f. \end{aligned}$$

As in Lemma 4.6, let $c(K)$ denote the length of the largest initial segment of $[2n]$ in K in the order \prec , and $\bar{c}(K)$ the length of the largest final segment in $[2n] \setminus K$. By Lemma 4.5, a member of $J_r^{-1}(I)$ with size $j+r$ corresponds to a choice of (1) a $(c(K) - n + r)$ -subset of a set of size $c(K)$, and (2) a j -subset of the maximal \prec -final segment of $[2n] \setminus K$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{I \in J_r^{-1}(K)} f &= \sum_{I \in J_r^{-1}(K)} (x-1)^{n-r} (y-1)^{\#I-r} \\ &= \binom{c(K)}{c(K) - n + r} (x-1)^{n-r} \sum_{j=0}^{\bar{c}(K)} \binom{\bar{c}(K)}{j} (y-1)^j \\ &= \binom{c(K)}{c(K) - n + r} (x-1)^{n-r} y^{\bar{c}(K)}. \end{aligned}$$

Continuing on,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \geq w} (-1)^{\ell(v) - \ell(w)} T_v(x, y) &= [1 - (x-1)(y-1)] \sum_{K \in \mathcal{Q}_w} \sum_{r=0}^n \binom{c(K)}{c(K) - n + r} (x-1)^{n-r} y^{\bar{c}(K)} \\ &= [1 - (x-1)(y-1)] \sum_{K \in \mathcal{Q}_w} \sum_{r=0}^n \binom{c(K)}{c(K) - n + r} (x-1)^{n-r} y^{\bar{c}(K)} \end{aligned}$$

This is equal to $[1 - (x-1)(y-1)]U_w(x, y)$ by Lemma 4.6. \square

To prove Theorem 4.3, we will need some lemmas giving a Bruhat relation between u_I and u_J for two sets I and J . Write $I \trianglelefteq J$ if I is the \prec -lexicographically minimal $\#I$ -subset of $I \cup J$. Equivalently, $I \trianglelefteq J$ if and only if $J \cap I = J \cap [\max_{\prec}(I)]$. This is a partial order on finite subsets of \mathbb{N} of a fixed size.

Lemma 4.7. *Suppose $I, J \in \binom{[2n]}{n}$ are such that either*

- (a) $I \trianglelefteq J$, or
- (b) $J = I \setminus \{i\} \cup \{j\}$, where i is contained in a \prec -initial segment in I and $i \preceq j$.

Then $u_I \geq u_J$.

Proof. For the case where $I \trianglelefteq J$, we may assume that $J = I \setminus \{i\} \cup \{j\}$ where $i \in I$ and $j \succ \max_{\prec}(I)$, since this is the covering relation for \trianglelefteq . Recall the injective word v_I , with the property that u_I is the greatest lower bound of v_I and w_0 , and whose entries are $I \cap [n+1, 2n]$ in increasing order together with $I \cap [n]$ in decreasing order.

Suppose for the moment that $j \leq n$. In passing from v_I to v_J , we remove one entry (i), insert a new entry (j) into the decreasing subsequence formed by $I \cap [n]$ in the unique way that keeps the subsequence decreasing, and then shift part of the subsequence either right or left to fill the gap left by i . If $i \leq n$, then $j \succ i$ implies $j < i$. Thus, j enters right of the gap left by i , so we shift leftward. This means that v_J is entrywise less than or equal to v_I , which implies the weaker statement that $v_J \leq v_I$ in Bruhat order. Therefore $u_J \leq u_I$.

Next suppose that $j \leq n$ still, but now $i > n$. We consider cases (a) and (b) separately. In case (b), where i is contained in a \prec -initial segment in I , v_I begins $(n+1)(n+2)\cdots(n+b)\cdots$, with i being one of those first b entries. Thus, every entry of the decreasing sequence is right of i , and in particular j does enter to the right of it when we pass to v_J . In case (a), we have $j \succeq \max_{\prec}(I)$, which implies $j \leq \min(I)$ (in the usual order), so j will be the last entry in the decreasing sequence in v_J . In particular, j enters right of the gap where i was. In both cases we end up with v_J entrywise less than or equal to v_I as before, as in the last paragraph.

Finally, assume that $j > n$. We will apply the map $x \mapsto \bar{x} = 2n + 1 - x$ and use Corollary 3.17. The arguments above only depend on \prec being a linear extension of the partial order

$$n+1, n \prec n+2, n-1 \prec \cdots \prec 2n, 1$$

and so they still go through if we replace \prec with the total order $\bar{\prec}$ defined by

$$n \bar{\prec} n+1 \bar{\prec} n-1 \bar{\prec} n+2 \bar{\prec} \cdots \bar{\prec} 1 \bar{\prec} 2n.$$

The hypotheses of the lemma still hold for \bar{I} , \bar{i} , and \bar{j} using the order $\bar{\prec}$.

As $\bar{j} \leq n$, the previous arguments show that $u_{\bar{J}} \geq u_{\bar{I}}$, or $w_0 u_{\bar{I}}^{-1} w_0 \geq w_0 u_{\bar{J}}^{-1} w_0$ by Corollary 3.17. Since $w \mapsto w_0 w^{-1} w_0$ is an automorphism of Bruhat order, this is equivalent to $u_I \geq u_J$. \square

Lemma 4.8. *Say $I, I' \in \binom{[2n]}{r}$, where $r \leq n$. If $I \trianglelefteq I'$, then $J_r(I) \trianglelefteq J_r(I')$.*

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 4.7, we can assume that $I' = I \setminus \{i\} \cup \{j\}$, where $i \in I$ and $j \succ \max_{\prec}(I)$. Write $I = \{i_1 \prec \cdots \prec i_r\}$ and $[2n] \setminus I = \{j_1 \prec j_2 \prec \cdots\}$, so $J_r(I) = \{i_1, \dots, i_r, j_1, \dots, j_{n-r}\}$. There are several cases.

- If $j \preceq j_{n-r}$, then $J_r(I') = J_r(I)$.
- If $i \preceq j_{n-r} \prec j$, then $J_r(I') = J_r(I) \setminus \{j_{n-r}\} \cup \{j\}$. Here $j \succ \max_{\prec}(I)$ and $j \succeq j_{n-r}$, so $j \succ \max_{\prec} J_r(I)$.
- If $j \prec i \preceq j$, then $J_r(I') = J_r(I) \setminus \{i\} \cup \{j\}$. Once again, $j \succ \max_{\prec}(I)$ and $j \succ i \succeq j_{n-r}$, so $j \succ \max_{\prec} J_r(I)$.

\square

We can now prove Theorem 4.3; recall it claims that $I \in \mathcal{P}_w$ has rank $\geq r$ if and only if $u_I^r \geq w$.

Proof of Theorem 4.3. Define $W_I^r = \{w \in S_n : I \in \mathcal{P}_w^r\}$. It is clear from Theorem 3.3 that W_I^r is a lower order ideal in Bruhat order. Theorem 4.3 is equivalent to the assertion that u_I^r is the unique maximal element of W_I^r .

First we reduce to the case where $\#I = r$. Notice that $I \in \mathcal{P}_w^r$ if and only if $I' \in \mathcal{P}_w^r$ for some r -subset I' of I . Equivalently,

$$W_I^r = \bigcup_{I' \in \binom{I}{r}} W_{I'}^r.$$

If I' is the \prec -lexicographically least r -subset of I , then $J_r(I') = J_r(I)$, so $u_{I'}^r = u_I^r$. For any other r -subset I'' of I , we have $I' \preceq I''$. Lemma 4.8 then says $J_r(I') \preceq J_r(I'')$, so Lemma 4.7 implies $u_{I'}^r \geq u_{I''}^r$. Thus if we knew that each $W_{I''}^r$ has $u_{I''}^r$ as a unique maximum, we would be done: the unique maximum of W_I^r would be $u_{I'}^r$. In other words, we can assume $\#I = r$.

Now we induct (downward) on r , assuming $\#I = r$. If $r = n$, then $W_I^r = W_I$ has $u_I^r = u_I$ as its unique maximum by Theorem 3.3. Suppose $r < n$. Then $I \in \mathcal{P}_w^r$ if and only if $I \cup x \in \mathcal{P}_w^{r+1}$ for some $x \notin I$, or equivalently,

$$W_I^r = \bigcup_{x \notin I} W_{I \cup x}^{r+1}.$$

By induction, each $W_{I \cup x}^{r+1}$ has $u_{I \cup x}^{r+1}$ as its unique maximal element. What we want to show, therefore, is that if $x \notin I$, then $u_I^r \geq u_{I \cup x}^{r+1}$, with equality holding for some x .

As in the definition of $J_r(I)$, write $I = \{i_1 \prec \dots \prec i_r\}$ and $[2n] \setminus I = \{j_1 \prec j_2 \prec \dots\}$, so that $J_r(I) = \{i_1, \dots, i_r, j_1, \dots, j_{n-r}\}$. Then

$$J_{r+1}(I \cup x) = \begin{cases} J_r(I) & \text{if } x \preceq j_{n-r} \\ J_r(I) \setminus \{j_{n-r}\} \cup \{x\} & \text{if } x \succ j_{n-r} \end{cases}$$

In particular, if x is \prec -minimal in $[2n] \setminus I$, then $x \preceq j_{n-r}$, so $u_I^r = u_{I \cup x}^{r+1}$.

We can now assume that $x \succ j_{n-r}$. By definition, j_{n-r} is part of a \preceq -initial segment in $J_r(I)$, so Lemma 4.7 shows that

$$u_I^r = u_{J_r(I)} \geq u_{J_{r+1}(I \cup x)} = u_{I \cup x}^{r+1}.$$

□

5. TRANSVERSAL MATROIDS ASSOCIATED TO PERMUTATION DIAGRAMS

In this section we give some conjectures to the effect that results like Theorem 3.3 and Theorem 4.2 hold for another family of rank n matroids on $[2n]$ indexed by S_n .

Definition 5.1. The *Rothe diagram* of $w \in S_n$ is

$$D(w) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(i, w(j)) \in [n] \times [n] : i < j, w(i) > w(j)\}.$$

Given $w \in S_n$, let \tilde{M}_w be a generic $n \times 2n$ matrix $[I_n \mid A]$, where I_n is an $n \times n$ identity matrix, and A is $n \times n$ with $A_{ij} = 0$ whenever $(i, j) \in D(w)$. The *diagram matroid* DM_w of w is the matroid of \tilde{M}_w .

Example 5.2. Say $w = 31524$. Then

$$D(w) = \begin{array}{cccccc} & \circ & \circ & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ & \cdot & \circ & \cdot & \circ & \cdot \\ & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{array},$$

where we use matrix coordinates, and \circ for lattice points in $D(w)$, \cdot for those not in $D(w)$. The diagram matroid of w is then the matroid of a generic matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & * & * & * \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & * & * & * & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & * & 0 & * & 0 & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & * & * & * & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & * & * & * & * & * \end{bmatrix}.$$

Conjecture 5.3. Theorem 1.1 holds for DM_w . That is, for any $w \in S_n$, the number of bases of DM_w is

$$\sum_{\substack{v \geq w \\ v \text{ avoids } 123}} C_{\ell_1+1} \cdots C_{\ell_k+1},$$

where ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_k are the lengths of the runs of anti-fixed points of v .

Theorem 3.3 no longer holds: it can happen that $w \leq v$ but $DM_v \not\subseteq DM_w$. One can still hope to prove Conjecture 5.3 by Möbius inversion, but a less trivial sign-reversing involution would be required. Conjecture 5.3 would follow from a stronger conjecture on Tutte polynomials.

Conjecture 5.4. For any $w \in S_n$, the Tutte polynomial of DM_w is equal to the Tutte polynomial of \mathcal{P}_w .

If DM_w and \mathcal{P}_w were isomorphic, then Conjecture 5.4 would of course be true, but this need not be the case.

Conjecture 5.5. The matroids DM_w and \mathcal{P}_w are isomorphic if and only if w avoids the pattern 21354.

These conjectures have all been verified through S_7 . Despite this, their Tutte polynomials seem to agree, also verified through S_7 .

There is a combinatorial procedure called *shifting* that relates DM_w and \mathcal{P}_w (and which has geometric connections making it useful in studying positroid varieties and other subvarieties of Grassmannians [5, 9]). Given integers i and j , and a set I , let

$$\text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} I = \begin{cases} I \setminus \{i\} \cup \{j\} & \text{if } i \in I \text{ and } j \notin I \\ I & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

If X is a collection of sets, and $I \in X$, then we define

$$\text{III}_{i \rightarrow j, X} I = \begin{cases} \text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} I & \text{if } \text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} I \neq I \text{ and } \text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} I \notin X \\ I & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Finally, define $\text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} X$ to be $\{\text{III}_{i \rightarrow j, X} I : I \in X\}$.

Let $\mathcal{B}(A)$ denote the set of bases of the matroid of a matrix A . We can also apply shifting to matrices. Let $\text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} A$ be the matrix of the same size as A such that

$$A_{pq} = \begin{cases} A_{pi} & \text{if } q = j \text{ and } A_{pj} = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } q = i \text{ and } A_{pj} = 0 \\ A_{pq} & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

We have $\#(\text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} X) = \#X$, but it need not be the case that $\mathcal{B}(\text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} A) = \text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} \mathcal{B}(A)$. For example, if A is a 2×2 identity matrix, then $\text{III}_{2 \rightarrow 1} \mathcal{B}(A) = \{12\}$, while $\mathcal{B}(\text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} A)$ is empty. In general, we only get a containment.

Lemma 5.6. *If the entries of A are algebraically independent, then $\mathcal{B}(\text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} A) \subseteq \text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} \mathcal{B}(A)$.*

Proof. Suppose $I \in \mathcal{B}(\text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} A)$, where $I = \{b_1 < \dots < b_n\}$. Then there is a transversal of A in columns I , i.e. a bijection $\pi : I \rightarrow [n]$ such that $(\text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} A)_{\pi(b_p)b_p} \neq 0$ for each p . We consider various cases.

- If $i, j \notin I$, then $I \in \mathcal{B}(A)$ and $\text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} I = I$, so $I \in \text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} \mathcal{B}(A)$.
- If $i \in I, j \notin I$, then again $I \in \mathcal{B}(A)$, because $\text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} A$ restricted to columns I is A restricted to columns I with some nonzero entries made zero. Since $(\text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} A)_{\pi(i)i}$ is nonzero, $A_{\pi(i)j}$ must be nonzero. Therefore the bijection $\pi' : I \setminus \{i\} \cup \{j\} \rightarrow [n]$ which agrees with π on $I \setminus \{i\}$ and having $\pi'(j) = \pi(i)$ is a transversal of A . This shows that $\mathcal{B}(A)$ also contains $\text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} I$. But then $I \in \text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} \mathcal{B}(A)$.
- Suppose $i \notin I, j \in I$. If $A_{\pi(j)i} \neq 0$, then modifying π appropriately as in the last case will give a transversal of A in columns $I \setminus \{j\} \cup \{i\}$. Then $I = \text{III}_{i \rightarrow j}(I \setminus \{j\} \cup \{i\}) \in \text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} \mathcal{B}(A)$.
If $A_{\pi(j)i} = 0$, then $A_{\pi(j)j} = (\text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} A)_{\pi(j)j} \neq 0$, and so $I \in \mathcal{B}(A)$. Then $I = \text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} I \in \text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} \mathcal{B}(A)$.
- Suppose $i, j \in I$. Since $(\text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} A)_{\pi(i)i}$ is nonzero, so is $A_{\pi(i)i}$. Therefore if $A_{\pi(j)j} \neq 0$, then π is still a transversal of A in columns I .

Now suppose $A_{\pi(j)j} = 0$. Then, since $(\text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} A)_{\pi(j)j}$ is nonzero, so is $A_{\pi(j)i}$. Also, since $(\text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} A)_{\pi(i)i}$ is nonzero, so is $A_{\pi(i)j}$. Therefore the bijection $\pi' : I \rightarrow [n]$ agreeing with π on $I \setminus \{i, j\}$, and having $\pi'(i) = \pi(j)$, $\pi'(j) = \pi(i)$, is a transversal of A in columns I .

Either way we see that $I \in \mathcal{B}(A)$, and so $I = \text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} I \in \text{III}_{i \rightarrow j} \mathcal{B}(A)$. □

The matrices M_w and \tilde{M}_w defining \mathcal{P}_w and DM_w turn out to be related by a sequence of shifts. Let III_w be the composition $\text{III}_{2n \rightarrow w(n)} \cdots \text{III}_{n+2 \rightarrow w(2)} \text{III}_{n+1 \rightarrow w(1)}$.

Lemma 5.7 ([9], Theorem 5.5). *For any permutation w , $\text{III}_w M_w = \tilde{M}_w$.*

Thus, Lemma 5.6 shows that $DM_w \subseteq \text{III}_w \mathcal{P}_w$. Since shifting preserves the size of a collection of sets, we see that Conjecture 5.3 is equivalent to:

Conjecture 5.8. $\text{III}_w \mathcal{P}_w = DM_w$ for any permutation w .

REFERENCES

- [1] Federico Ardila. The Catalan matroid. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory Series A*, 104(1):49–62, 2003.
- [2] Sara Billey and Izzet Coskun. Singularities of generalized Richardson varieties. *Comm. Algebra*, 40(4):1466–1495, 2012.
- [3] Anders Björner and Francesco Brenti. *Combinatorics of Coxeter Groups*. Springer, 2005.
- [4] Joseph E. Bonin. An introduction to transversal matroids. Retrieved in January 2015 from <http://home.gwu.edu/~jbonin/TransversalNotes.pdf>.
- [5] Allen Knutson. Schubert calculus and shifting of interval positroid varieties. 2014. arXiv:1408.1261.
- [6] Allen Knutson, Thomas Lam, and David Speyer. Positroid varieties: Juggling and geometry. *Compos. Math.*, 149:1710–1752, 2013.
- [7] Christian Krattenthaler. Permutations with restricted patterns and Dyck paths. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 27:510–530, 2001.
- [8] Suho Oh. Positroids and Schubert matroids. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory Series A*, 118:2426–2435, 2011.
- [9] Brendan Pawlowski. Cohomology classes of rank varieties and a conjecture of Liu. 2014. arXiv:1410.7419.
- [10] Alexander Postnikov. Total positivity, Grassmannians, and networks. arXiv:math/0609764, 2006.